12-2009

Why Foreign Counterinsurgency Campaigns Fail

Donald Frederick Butler
University of Tennessee - Knoxville

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Donald Frederick Butler entitled "Why Foreign Counterinsurgency Campaigns Fail." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Political Science.

Brandon Prins, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

John Scheb, David Brulé, David Folz, James Klett

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Donald Frederick Butler entitled "Why Foreign Counterinsurgency Campaigns Fail." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Political Science.

Brandon Prins, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

John Scheb

David Brulé

David Folz

James Klett

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges
Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records)

Why Foreign Counterinsurgency Campaigns Fail

A DISSERTATION

Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Donald Frederick Butler
December 2009

ABSTRACT

Why have foreign counterinsurgency operations had such low success rates since 1945? While operations of this type succeeded at the rate of 85.71% during the period of 1816-1945, they declined by 56.30 percentage points to just 29.49% during period of 1945-1997 (Sarkees, 2000: 123-144). This occurred even though foreign powers were often fighting in the same territories where they had previously been overwhelmingly victorious.

I argue that military defeats suffered by European states during the Second World War convinced the peoples of the developing world that colonial control could be successfully challenged. As guerrilla struggles emerged in post-war Asia and Africa, colonial powers conducting counterinsurgency operations in those regions were constrained by a revised international order in which the existing multi-polar world had been replaced by a nuclear-armed, bi-polar East-West confrontation that offered the possibility of real-time, system-wide deadly responses to provocations. The United Nations Charter also offered support for territorial self-determination in Articles 1, 55, 73, and 76 (United Nations Charter, 1945, Articles 1, 55, and 73); support that was heightened by the growing number of former colonial states within the United Nations membership. This broad political and military support for native rule legitimated the existence and heightened the resolve of post-war nationalism (Westad, 1992), making nationalistic insurgencies virtually impossible to truly defeat, regardless of the counterinsurgency strategy employed.

To further evaluate these arguments, I developed hypotheses that advance the propositions that (a) counterinsurgency campaigns facing significant United Nations

opposition will fail more often than those which do not, (b) insurgencies which receive broad support from great powers will be more likely to succeed than those which do not, and (c) the employment of either of the two primary counterinsurgency strategies will not be significant in success or failure of counterinsurgency efforts. Those hypotheses were then tested by briefly comparing information across the 17 case studies contained in the Correlates of War (COW) Extra-State Dataset for the period of 1945-1997 (see Appendix I), and then evaluated in depth through four case studies drawn from that dataset. The results were compelling, and offer significant support for all three hypotheses.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Background

Between 1945 and 1999, about 3.3 million battle deaths occurred during the course of 25 interstate wars around the globe. During that same period, however, roughly 16.2 million people died during the course of approximately 127 civil wars (13 of which were colonial conflicts); a death rate nearly five times that of the interstate wars (Fearon and Laitin, 2003: 75-77). The causes of such vicious conflicts have been the subject of extensive academic research during the past 60 years, as governments have struggled to formulate appropriate responses to outbreaks of civil violence within their own frontiers.

Prior to 1945, counterinsurgency operations conducted by either indigenous governments or foreign intervening powers were nearly always successful in quelling native insurrections. While indigenous governments have continued to find success in these undertakings during the post-1945 time period, advanced industrial powers, be they European, Eurasian, or American, have lost most of their campaigns, even when the political stakes for losing were high (see Appendices I and II). This is proven beyond doubt through an examination of the COW Extra-State Dataset, which determines the intervening power to have been successful in only five of the 17 campaigns conducted during that time period (or 29.41%), while the insurgency achieved victory on twelve occasions (or 70.58%) (Sarkees, 2000: 123-144). What factors have emerged to deny the world's most advanced countries the ability to assert their political will while still allowing native governments – most of which exist in the developing Third World – to crush their adversaries in the majority of cases?

It is not overstating the issue to write that Western governments have historically misunderstood the basic, essential elements of counterinsurgency. While the United Kingdom's Malayan campaign of 1948-1960 is now often cited as a model of counterinsurgency strategy, it stumbled during its initial four years as the British Army sought to fight Marxist insurgents much as it had fought conventional forces in Europe less than three years earlier. During the 1946-1954 French campaign in Indochina, French forces powers sought to utilize conventional warfare methods far more suitable to countering the Soviets in Central Europe than to reducing a local insurgency in Southeast Asia. In 1960s Vietnam, General William Westmoreland, Commander, Military Assistance Command, Vietnam (MACV), tried to apply concepts he learned in conventional warfare campaigns in the Second World War and Korea while essentially ignoring basic theories of insurgency development, even though excellent counterinsurgency documents such as The Small Wars Manual (1940) were widely available at the time. This limited scope of military thought extended into the early stages of United Kingdom's 1969-1997 campaign against the Provisional Irish Republican Army (IRA).[1] Although viable British counterinsurgency doctrine developed in Malaya, Cyprus, Kenya, Borneo, and Aden had been widely published in such documents as Keeping the Peace (1963) and Counter-Revolutionary Warfare (1969), poor judgment by British authorities (such as granting unqualified support to a highly-partisan, Protestant-dominated police force, utilizing internment without trial, and conducting large, brigade-sized cordon-and-search operations against residential targets based on very limited intelligence) allowed a small-scale insurrection to develop

[1] The Irish Republican Army is known in Irish Gaelic as Óglaigh na hÉireann.

into a full-blown insurgency that would last nearly 30 years (Kiszely, 2007: 6-7, 9-10). Not for nothing did Howard write that “the complacent anti-intellectualism which has long been a predominate tendency of a British Army . . . takes a perverse delight in learning its lessons the hard way” (Clausewitz, 1984 [1832]: 38).

Military institutions themselves often possess internal prejudices that preclude taking full advantage of the learning process. Howard accuses the British Army of relying up ‘a book’ for advice on confronting insurgencies instead of conducting a serious historical study of the true nature of past counterinsurgency campaigns. British Lieutenant-General Sir John Kiszely writes that the more rigid and proud the organization, the less able it is to accommodate criticism, either internal (which it finds threatening) or external (which it finds irrelevant). He notes that since military institutions are notoriously conservative organizations and are cautious about invoking change, much of the advancement in military science comes from external intellectuals with military experience rather than from active-duty military personnel, adding that militaries around the world often confuse ongoing activity with actual progress, and invariably train hard for the wrong purpose (Kiszely, 2007: 6-9).

Military institutions are also constrained from a serious study of insurgencies by an official political reluctance to formally acknowledge burgeoning guerilla activities as insurgencies; as organized popular movements. Instead, they prefer to portray such activities as simple terrorism to be resolved by purely military responses (which often simply intensify new-born insurgencies), blaming resulting counterinsurgency failures upon political constraints regarding the use of firepower. In such cases, military counterinsurgency doctrine is either ignored completely or treated as a general template

to be unquestioningly followed, regardless of the sui generis circumstances of the conflict at hand. To overcome these misunderstandings, Kiszely stresses that both political and military commanders need to clearly understand the precise nature of the conflict upon which they are embarking before ever considering military operations (Kiszely, 2007: 7-10). Boot sums the issue up succinctly with the words, “small wars cannot be fought by big war methods” (Boot, 2002: 285).

Placing a military unit into a counterinsurgency environment often clashes with the basic ‘warrior ethos’ structure of combat units, since achievable goals against a conventional enemy are replaced with the complexity, ambiguity, and uncertainty of dealing with an unseen, misunderstood adversary against which realistic goals may be difficult to determine. Successful counterinsurgency warfare requires the exercise of both hard and soft power, emphasizing decidedly unwarrior-like qualities such as emotional intelligence, empathy, subtlety, sophistication, nuance, and political adroitness to distinguish between insurgents and members of the general population, and elite military units trained solely for conventional warfighting (such as those found in Russia and Israel) often fare poorly in such environments. Conversely, ill-funded and ill-trained Third World military forces are also a poor fit for counterinsurgency campaigns, since they often unwittingly strengthen the guerilla support base by looting and pillaging in the name of combating terrorism and banditry (Keen 1998; Kiszely, 2007: 7-9).

Counterinsurgency campaigns that result in large-scale civilian casualties may also serve to increase popular support of insurgencies. Preventing such casualties is a difficult proposition for even advanced industrialized powers to resolve, and the United States experience in Vietnam (Avant, 1994; Krepinevich, 1986), the Soviet experience

in Afghanistan, and the early British campaign in Northern Ireland (Kennedy-Pipe 1997) serve as exemplars of failure on this account (Fearon and Laitin, 2003: 80). Crawford writes that, since guerillas characteristically mingle with the population, defeating a guerilla movement strictly on military terms cannot occur unless counterinsurgency forces are essentially willing to annihilate the population among which the guerillas are nurtured. Such an apocalyptical strategy has historical precedents: German troops crushed native insurgencies in Southwest Africa during the early 20th century only after killing 50% of the Nama people and 80% of the Herero tribesmen (Crawford, 2003: 18). While such virtually genocidal measures may successfully cow a population to submission in the short term, failure to address the very real contest for public support between insurgents and the government can doom long term counterinsurgency efforts (Siqueira and Sandler, 2006: 879-880).

Kahl argues that the United States may be at a unique disadvantage in adjusting to counterinsurgency operations. First, its conventional, enemy-centered mindset provides a poor transition to operations relating to stability and counterinsurgency. Second, the emphasis upon the enemy as the focus of operational activity encourages the view of all military-aged native men as potential threats, rather than as a population with which to bond. Third, the inclination to use overwhelming force against enemy combatants often leads to high collateral damage against the populations of occupied countries. Fourth, the use of search-and-destroy methodology often alienates formerly objective populations and may lead them to directly support insurgencies (Kahl, 2007: 43-45). I add a fifth notation here; that being a deep and troubling lack of understanding on the part of American officials for indigenous nationalism that encourages the United

States to force developing countries into an American political mold without regard for native history and culture (George, 1994: 94-100).

These issues have re-emerged during the current United States-led military occupation of Iraq. As Iraqi society collapsed along tribal and family lines following the March 2003 invasion, Sunni imams moved into the political power vacuum left from the crushing of political and military elements of the Hussein regime, and mosques emerged as the center of information, rumor, and resistance to the American presence (West, 2006: 2-4). Within a month, an indigenous insurgency had taken shape that soon graduated from individuals using small arms against American soldiers to heavy infantry weapons being deployed by roughly 4,000-9,000 dedicated insurgents against American combat units (White and Schmidmayr, 2003: 21-26). The American reaction, which initially focused upon denying the very existence of the insurgency,[2] quickly denounced the guerilla activity as a restoration movement for ousted Iraqi President Saddam Hussein, rather than a nationalist reaction to the fundamental problem of an intrusive, foreign military occupation (Titorenko, 2004: 31-37; MacGregor, 2007: 11).[3]

[2] When Major General Raymond Odierno, commander of the 4th Infantry Division (Mechanized), was asked on June 18, 2003 if guerilla warfare was not, in fact, underway, he responded with verbiage indicative of a military in denial. "This is not guerilla warfare; it is not close to guerilla warfare because it's not coordinated," he said. "They [the insurgents] do not have the will . . . I'm not sure they really believe in what they're doing." He added that "when I talk about organized guerilla warfare, it's a very complex organization that plans very complex guerilla operations" (Official Transcript, 2003).

[3] The notion of a restoration movement for Saddam Hussein became difficult to sustain after the killing of Hussein's sons during July 2003 and the capture of Hussein himself during December 2003 failed to terminate the insurgency (Hashim, 2003; Titorenko, 2004: 31-37). Eisenstadt and White argue that the insurgency is indeed the result of a potent Iraqi nationalism based upon political interpretation of Sunni Islam and enhanced by a sense of religious/cultural entitlement shared among many Sunnis (Eisenstadt and White, 2006: 33-34). Wide popular support among the Sunni population for the insurgency was indicated by a poll jointly conducted by ABC News, the British Broadcasting Company, and Japan's NHK during August 17-24, 2007 of 2,112 Iraqis (margin of error: +- 2.5%) which found 93% of Sunnis supporting lethal insurgent attacks against American troops (Iraq: Where Things Stand, 2007: 24, 26).

With the insurgency thus dismissed as illegitimate, the United States military responded to what was still a low-level guerilla movement with a coercive campaign of the cost-benefit model that included dragnet-type sweeps of the Sunni Triangle resulting in the detention of tens of thousands of innocent Iraqis (many of whom subsequently reported rough and degrading treatment at the hands of American troops), air strikes involving heavy bombers and attack aircraft dropping 500 pound bombs and satellite-guided missiles, long-range artillery bombardments against often-congested areas, and food, water, and electricity control among the population (Blanche, 2004: 10; Eisenstadt and White, 2005: 3; In Their Own Words, 2006: 22).[4] The perception of a brutal military occupation was quickly reflected in a Pew Global Attitudes Project study (issued on June 3, 2003) that found over 90% of Jordanian, Moroccan, Palestinian, and Turkish respondents, 80% of Indonesian and Pakistani respondents, and 70% of Brazilians, French, Russians, and South Koreans stating that the United States "didn't try very hard" to avoid Iraqi civilian casualties (Pew Global Attitudes Project, 2003: 24-25); a perception that may have been compounded by the widely-publicized abuse of Iraqi detainees by American troops at Abu Ghraib Prison (Kahl, 2007: 7).[5]

How did the United States government miscalculate the outcome of its March 2003 invasion of Iraq so badly? A significant body of evidence exists that the Bush

[4] During late July 2004, Lieutenant General Thomas F. Metz, then commanding general for United States forces in Iraq, announced that "I don't think we will put much energy into trying the old saying, 'win hearts and minds;'" adding that he didn't view that concept as representing "one of the metrics of success" (Christenson, 2004: 1; Krepinevich, 2005: 101). Lynn also questioned the validity of the social welfare approach, writing that policies calling for "winning hearts and minds" were misleading since "acts of kindness are not a particularly good fit for vigilant armed warriors," and "winning people over to new beliefs is at best a long process and a notably difficult task for outside forces" (Lynn, 2005: 24).

[5] Perhaps not surprisingly, a movie entitled Valley of the Wolves that depicted American atrocities in Iraq (including the massacre of guests at a wedding party and the fire-bombing of a mosque during evening prayer) opened in Turkish theaters during early 2006 to record audiences (Kahl, 2007: 7).

Administration completely underestimated the costs of establishing and maintaining a viable, pro-American regime in Baghdad (Dalder and Lindsay, 2003; Johnson, 2004; Record and Terrill, 2004, Sullivan, 2007: 518). An 2007 evaluation conducted by the RAND Corporation determined that the necessary organization, training, equipment, and cultural sensitization required for counterinsurgency warfare was "unfortunately lacking" in the American forces who initially confronted the Iraqi insurgency (Hosmer, 2007: 143), and United States efforts to link the insurgency to regional terrorism or the revival of a global Islamic khalifate prevented American officials from properly evaluating the devastating impact of the occupation upon the indigenous population (Davis and Perry, 2007: 1-2). It also appears that 1950s-era theories of modernization (which had previously guided much of the doctrine involved in pacifying 1960s South Vietnam) had driven much of the planning and implementation for the occupation of Iraq, under the questionable concept that Iraqi culture would be malleable to the point that issues of ethnicity, religion, and a past history of authoritarian rule would matter very little in the new, pro-American Iraqi state that was to be created under United States supervision (Latham, 2006: 39). Dr. Noah Feldman, assigned to work as a constitutional advisor for the American occupation authority in Iraq, writes that his colleagues were reading books relating to the American occupation and reconstruction of post-Second World War Germany and Japan rather than conducting any serious research on the Middle East in general or Iraq in specific, under the apparent belief that American-style nation-building would be globally transportable (Feldman, 2004: 1). The British experience in 1920s Iraq, in which the physical presence of British troops served to unite the disparate tribal nature of the country into a more unified nationalist

resistance movement, was apparently overlooked entirely (Hudson, 1977: 269-270), with the idea that the employment of overwhelming American military force through 'shock and awe' would paralyze the Iraqi population into unquestioning compliance (Ullman and Wade, 1996: Chapter 15). President George W. Bush subsequently sought to downplay adverse Iraqi reactions to the occupation by noting that the United States itself had endured "years of chaos" during the American Revolution and the failures of the Articles of Confederation (Stevenson, 2005: A12); again viewing a distinctly Iraqi resistance movement through an American prism of questionable relevance.

Meanwhile, the United Nations as a whole has also declined to offer any realistic critique of the American-led invasion and occupation of Iraq, implicitly granting to the United States a free hand in determining its policies there. Prior to the March 2003 invasion, United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan advised American officials that an American attack against Iraq without Security Council endorsement "would not be in conformity with the [UN] Charter" (Jervis, 2003: 375), and further clarified that position on September 8, 2004 by stating that, "from the Charter point of view, it was illegal" (Iraq War Illegal, Says Annan, 2003: 1). The United Nations itself has been far more circumspect regarding its commentary on the invasion and occupation of Iraq, however, with most Security Council resolutions simply affirming the 'sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq' (United Nations Security Council Resolutions #1472, #1483, #1490, #1500, #1511, #1546, #1557, #1619, #1637, #1700, #1723, #1770, and #1790, 2003-2008), occasionally stating that the situation there 'constituted a threat to international peace and security' (United Nations Security Council Resolutions #1483, #1511, #1518,

#1637, 2003, 2005), and occasionally calling for international action to deprive the 'terrorists' of arms and sanctuary (United Nations Security Council Resolutions #1511, #1546, #1637, #1723, and #1790, 2003-2006). About the strongest rebuke to be found for the United States among these resolutions has been the occasional reminder that 'the day when Iraqis govern themselves must come quickly' (United Nations Security Council Resolutions #1483 and #1511, 2003), verbiage 'looking forward to the end of the occupation' (United Nations Security Council Resolution #1546, 2004), and statements 'recognizing the importance of consent of the sovereign government of Iraq for the presence of the multinational force' (United Nations Security Council Resolutions #1723 and #1790, 2006-2008). The silence of the General Assembly has been even more surprising. During 2003-2008, that body issued only two resolutions, both of which related strictly to funding issues involving the United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission (United Nations General Assembly Resolutions #58/304 and #60/274, 2004, 2006); a benign performance indeed given the Assembly's past record of activism in such issues as African decolonization and the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan.

Great power opposition to the conflict in Iraq has also been relatively benign, consisting of little more than a grudging intolerance of a fait accompli brought about by an American military force operating in a unipolar world. Within hours of the onset of the invasion, Russian President Vladimir Putin rebuked the American military action with statesman-like verbiage. "If we allow fist law [to] replace international law under which the strongest is always right, can do everything it wants and does not limit itself when selecting the means and methods then the basic principles [of] international law – the

sovereignty of states – will be doubted. In this world nobody, not a single country will feel safe. The vast sea of instability that has emerged today will expand and cause negative developments in many other regions of the world" (http://www.president.kremlin.ru/text/psmes/2003/03/40900.shtml). At the same time, however, Lukin notes that Russian officials "avoided Cold War parlance and the danger of becoming the most radical critic of the United States" while making inroads with 'Old Europe' and strengthening Russia's position in the Arab world (Lukin, 2003: 12). He adds that China and Russia, both of whom objected to the invasion, understood the need to maintain good relations with the United States, and simply seek to join with like-minded governments such as those of France and Germany to seek to limit American unilateralism (Lukin, 2003: 16-17, 21). Further great power opposition was likely moderated by the Bush Administration's strategy of the 'Coalition of the Willing'; a grouping of 49 states that, through various means, offered support for the United States invasion and occupation of Iraq. While only two of those countries – Japan and the United Kingdom – could truly be considered great powers, the American strategy did tend to dilute both great power and United Nations opposition to the military campaign and grant to the United States extensive flexibility in conducting subsequent counterinsurgency operations (Who are the Current Coalition Members?, 2003: 1).

With the passage of the years, this lack of any viable international opposition led the Bush administration to pursue the idea that complete victory over the Iraqi insurgency was achievable once appropriate counterinsurgency techniques were developed. By mid-2007, those techniques were stressing the social welfare approach detailed within Counterinsurgency (Field Manual 3-24), a sea change from the cost-

benefit approach utilized during the first four years of the conflict (Kahl, 2006: 73-76). While the new manual comprised a fairly exhaustive analysis of modern counterinsurgency doctrine (including the key point that "eventually all foreign armies are seen as interlopers or occupiers" (Counterinsurgency, 2006: 1-26), I argue that some of its basic tenets are spurious in nature, including the idea that an affected population will have greater faith in the vitality of its own government once it is clearly understood that a long-term commitment by American military forces is in place (Counterinsurgency, 2006: 1-24). I believe that quite the opposite is true; that a nationalistic population will always seek to remove the foreign occupier no matter how kind or coercive he may be, and that a declaration of a long-term foreign presence will simply serve to shatter the credibility of the indigenous government and heighten support for the insurgency.[6] In short, foreign counterinsurgency forces eventually become the focus of the entire insurgent effort, rather than the remedy for guerilla violence.[7]

[6] Research conducted by Dominguez also tends to question the claim that long-term staying power on the part of occupying forces inevitably wears out insurgencies. He notes that colonial conflicts have, in fact, often been won by states willing to offer flexible political alternatives. Whereas long-term French and Portuguese efforts to indefinitely continue metropolitan provincial status for Algeria and Portuguese Africa eventually ultimately failed, British plans for eventual independence for their restive colonial territories may have allowed them not only to persevere in both Kenya and Malaya, but to maintain a modicum of influence there after their withdrawal (Dominguez, 1986: 808).

[7] Lawrence Korb, former Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel during the Presidential administration of Ronald Reagan, notes that many Iraqis view the presence of American troops as "an occupying force reminiscent of colonial times, not an army that liberated an oppressed people," and may tend to support virtually any grouping that seeks their expulsion (Korb and Boorstin, 2005: 5). Khalidi appears to agree, noting that most native Iraqis simply do not wish to be governed by foreigners; especially when those foreigners are non-Muslims (Khalidi, 2004: 55). Many Muslims also believe that Twelfth Imam Muhammad al-Mahdi, in occultation for over 1,100 years and eventually to return to convert the world to Islam, is planning to conduct that return in Samarrah, Iraq, and that the United States occupation of the country is actually a cover to prevent al-Mahdi's reappearance (Davis, 2007: 33-34). Clearly, the perception of a foreign occupation force designed to pre-empt Islamic eschatology could provide a strong nationalistic/religious motivation for long-term insurgency.

It is surprising that we did not learn this lesson 35 years ago in Vietnam, after spending nearly ten years and tremendous amounts of blood and treasure in a vain attempt to remake the Vietnamese in our own image, only to find that the Vietnamese already possessed a strong nationalist identity of their own that precluded foreign domination. The stirring words of North Vietnamese negotiator Lê Đức Thọ to National Security Advisor Henry Kissinger at a meeting in Paris, France on February 21, 1970 are worth repeating here. "If our generation cannot win, then our sons and nephews will continue. We will sacrifice everything, but we will not again have slavery. This is our iron will. We have been fighting for twenty-five years, the French and you. You wanted to quench our spirit with bombs and shells. But they cannot force us to submit" (Berman, 2007: 59).[8]

Outline of the Dissertation

The difficulties inherent in conducting successful counterinsurgency campaigns are explored in depth within the course of this dissertation. Chapter One encompasses the literature review, which covers a broad spectrum of counterinsurgency issues including the challenges of counterinsurgency, the impact of foreign control or influence, enabling measures for insurgencies confronting foreign control, and the impact of great power/United Nations/political bloc intervention. In Chapter Two, theoretical bases of insurgency development will be evaluated along with counterinsurgency strategies

[8] A classic case study in individual Vietnamese nationalism can be found in Phạm Xuân Ẩn, a member of a prominent South Vietnamese family who attended Orange Coast College in California during 1957-1959 and went on to become a respected and highly sought-after reporter for Time Magazine during the 1960s. Following the April 1975 fall of Saigon, Ẩn was revealed to have been a long-term North Vietnamese intelligence officer who had used his journalist position as cover for espionage activities directed against the South Vietnamese government and its American allies (Berman, 2007: 83-209). "As much as I love the United States, it had no right here," he said during and interview conducted in 2005. "The Americans had to be driven out of Vietnam one way or another. We must sort this place out ourselves" (Berman, 2007: 253).

relating to both social welfare/hearts and minds programs and repressive, cost-benefit measures; counterinsurgency programs designed to fulfill those strategies will also be examined. An examination of the COW Database through its Intra-State and Extra-State Datasets will also be conducted to provide background for the stated argument regarding why foreign counterinsurgency campaigns fail, and a series of hypotheses will be developed in an effort to further examine this basic research question. Chapter Three provides a brief summary of evidence across the 17 insurgencies contained within the COW Extra-State Dataset that may impact the hypotheses. Chapter Four provides an in-depth assessment of four empirical case studies selected on a basis designed to test those hypotheses. Finally, in Chapter Five, the results will be evaluated to produce a summary of what has been learned and offer suggestions on how this research may be extended in the future.

CHAPTER I: LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Introduction

Commanders of conventional military units are often amazed at the ability of small groups of disaffected natives to create wide-ranging national movements that are eventually able to confront and potentially defeat foreign armies (Herbst, 2004: 361). In many cases, neither side is able to bring the conflict to a decisive outcome, and an equilibrium may eventually be reached with guerillas controlling the rural areas and counterinsurgency troops ensconced in the cities (as in the case of late 1970s Rhodesia), or counterinsurgents controlling the daytime while ceding the night to the insurgency (as in 1960s South Vietnam) (Herbst, 2004: 363-364: Preston, 2004: 68). In other cases, governments have attempted to co-opt secessionism and insurgency by entering into power-sharing arrangements, empowering local languages, or granting heightened autonomy to restive provinces (Rudolph and Thompson, 1985: 296, 301)

Local insurgencies in the developing world have not always been such a troublesome issue for Western governments to resolve. During the 19th century through the early part of the 20th century, European armies were able to decisively enforce their will against the undisciplined guerillas they intermittently encountered despite the unquestioned motivation and courage displayed by the latter (Mack, 1975: 176). The dynamics of international affairs were altered radically in the post-1945 era, however, with a burgeoning, Third World nationalism being dramatically magnified through the focus of the newly-formed United Nations that did not accept the legitimacy of non-indigenous rule (United Nations Charter, 1945; United Nations General Assembly Resolution #1514, 1960), and courted by a new bi-polar competition for influence

between the United States and the Soviet Union that required the perceived interests of the two new superpowers to be taken into account everywhere (Hurley, 1945; Tonnesson, 1985: 11; Saperstein, 1991: 195; Westad, 1992: 455-462). Indigenous guerillas had always held the advantage of being able to operate on their own territory with either the active or passive support of a local population (Maxwell, 1976: 250-260; Mandelbaum, 1991/1992: 165-167-169, 173-174; Hammes, Thomas, 2006: 20), but they now found their footing confronting foreign powers shocked by the level of suffering that Third World nationalist insurgencies were willing to endure to expel a foreign presence, hobbled by unrelenting international pressure to withdraw their forces from the developing world, and increasingly unable to maintain the support of domestic electorates for long, drawn-out, stalemated campaigns (Rosen, 1972: 169; Mack, 1975: 177; Mueller, 1980; Shafer, 1988, 58-60, 64, 77; Edelstein, 2004: 58; Claessen, 2007: 98-99; Sullivan, 2007: 498). As a result, Western governments were finding themselves defeated by insurgent forces from Southeast Asia to North Africa during the latter half of the 20th century, and, by 1960, even the United Kingdom – the former bastion of European colonial domination - was making it clear that imperial pretensions were no longer viable in either Africa or Asia (Hourani, 1991: 354-355, 364, 368; Westad, 1992: 455-462).

In this dissertation I seek to evaluate the elements that make indigenous insurgencies so difficult for foreign powers to defeat in the post-Second World War era. I argue that imperial, intervening armies trained for conventional warfare are ultimately unable to decisively defeat a vaguely defined indigenous adversary that refuses to accept the presence of foreign military forces, regardless of the ability of those forces to

inflict pain and suffering. In this chapter I first review the basic challenges of counterinsurgency for modern armies. Next, the impact of foreign control or influence upon population alienation and insurgency formation is evaluated. Then, the motivations for insurgencies confronting foreign occupation are detailed. Lastly, the impact of great power/United Nations/political bloc intervention upon counterinsurgency efforts is examined. By analyzing each link in the chain of insurgency deployment, heightened insight may be gained into the nature of the driving force within these guerilla movements that allows them to withstand the extreme levels of punishment delivered against them by counterinsurgent forces.

B. The Challenges of Counterinsurgency

While established militaries possess superior weaponry, technology, administration, and personnel training, serious advantages traditionally lie with the insurgents during the course of counterinsurgency campaigns. First, insurgencies may extend for decades; outlasting the resources and political ability of counterinsurgency forces to continue the conflict. The Palestinians have directly challenged Israeli control of Judea/Samaria for over 40 years, the Vietnamese fought both French and American forces for 30 years, and the Chinese Communists fought Chinese Nationalist forces for 27 years. Even in Malaya, where the British successfully defeated ethnic Chinese guerillas, the insurgency ground on for 12 years before it finally collapsed. Second, the extreme technological advantages possessed by the government or intervening foreign power may have little impact against entrenched insurgencies. Quite the reverse; the historical example is that the side with the simplest technology proves victorious. Third, while the government and/or foreign intervention forces must govern and provide

effective security, the insurgency has only to propose the possibility of a better alternative, while taking active measures to defeat the existing regime's ability to operate (Hammes, 2006: 18-19).[9] Fourth, a lack of unity within insurgencies is not necessarily a strategic vulnerability for them. Such a lack of centralized control may actually complicate counterinsurgency efforts, since little discernable pattern in guerilla activity can ever be detected (Hammes, Thomas, 2006: 20). Fifth, democratic governments can face an additional disadvantage in combating insurgencies given their need to maintain electorate support, since public dissatisfaction with seemingly unending conflicts can be co-opted by opposition parties advocating military disengagement (Claessen, 2007: 98-99).[10] Sixth, conflicts of this type can fracture society itself, both within the country threatened by the insurgency and within the third power (if one is present) conducting counterinsurgency operations, and lead to strong political pressure to resolve the conflict. Military forces involved in the conflict, along with colonizers residing in the affected area (be they Israelis in Gaza, French in Algeria, or British in Kenya), experience a very different war from that perceived by the population as a whole, and as enthusiasm for the conflict recedes among the general population, it typically heightens for both military and the colonizers; the former believing they will be blamed for losing the war, and the latter seeing a direct existential threat to their livelihood. Such societal cleavages may eventually result in attempted coups

[9] As Henry Kissinger observed in 1969, "the guerilla wins if he does not lose" (Kissinger, 1969: 214). Conversely, the intervening state or the regime in power loses if it does not win.

[10] Arreguin-Toft writes that democracies cannot initiate conflicts without politically justifying them to their electorates, and notes that "one can hardly think of an example of a democratic state launching a small war it didn't claim . . . was of vital importance to its survival; albeit via domino logic" (Arreguin-Toft, 2005: 16). Once that validating claim is placed into effect, insurgents can inflict a political penalty against the government by prolonging the conflict and questioning the true nature of the government's motivation (Claessen, 2007: 99).

d'état by elements of society seeking to either maintain the status quo or terminate the debilitating conflict once and for all.[11] Seventh, military intervention by a foreign power often unwittingly serves to bring temporary unity to an otherwise politically fractured insurgency. Insurgents in 1968-2008 Palestine, 1980s (and 2001-2008) Afghanistan, 1994-2008 Chechnya, and 2003-2008 Iraq have typically been united by little more than the undying belief that the outsider had to go (Maxwell, 1976: 250-260; Mandelbaum, 1991/1992: 165-167-169, 173-174; Claessen, 2007: 98-102).

Gurr writes that the onset of rebellion is determined by motivation, opportunity, and identity (Gurr, 1970). Insurgent motivation may be positive, such as a desire for wealth, or negative, as in a grievance against the existing authorities or peer groups (Collier and Hoeffler, 1998). Ellingsen terms this latter motivation *frustration* (Ellingsen, 2000: 229), and Lynn argues that grievances against the ruling regime, rather than

[11] During May 1958, fears on the part of Algerian colons and French Army troops that the French government would consider granting independence to Algeria led to an unsuccessful move by members of both groups to overthrow the French government, seize political power, and maintain French sovereignty in the North African territory (Claessen, 2007: 98-101). During April 1974, the Portuguese Movimento das Forças Armadas, exhausted by 13 years of colonial wars in Angola, Cape Verde, Portuguese Guinea, Mozambique, and São Tomé and Príncipe, launched a successful coup d'état against the existing government in Lisbon that ended the country's historic military involvement in Africa and brought an end to the Portuguese colonial empire (Maxwell, 1976: 250-260). During November 1995, a Jewish extremist, opposed to Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin's moves toward a two-state solution in Israeli/Palestine, assassinated the Prime Minister and seriously undercut negotiations between the Israelis and the Palestinians (Jager, 2008).

The perception that the government has engaged in a military misadventure may also impact the political future of the executive in other ways. President Lyndon Johnson's March 31, 1968 surprise withdrawal from the 1968 Presidential race came about during the course of the National Liberation Front (NLF)'s Tet offensive in South Vietnam (Claessen, 2007: 101-102). Efforts by Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, to reduce repressive political measures and establish among nine of the existing 15 Soviet republics a 'union treaty' that would have greatly reduced the central power of the Soviet government led an unsuccessful coup d'état against him on August 19, 1991 by an eight-man junta representing the Communist Party, the Komitat Gosudar'stvenei Bezopasnosti (KGB), and the Soviet military. The crushing of that coup three days later led to the collapse of the Soviet Union, the political independence of its constituent republics, and the end of Gorbachev's very position as head of state (Mandelbaum, 1991/1992: 165-167-169, 173-174).

issues of religious or ethnic diversity, typically supply the most compelling arguments for insurgent legitimacy (Lynn, 2005: 22).[12] Opportunity for viable insurgency movements comes into play through such elements as the availability of forest or mountain cover, the number of international frontiers, and available finances such as lootable resources (Collier, 1999; Collier and Hoeffler, 1999; Buhuag, Gates and Lujala, 2002; Lujala, Gleditsch, and Gilmore, 2005: 539-541). International frontiers may play an especially important role, in that artificial demarcations which separate ethno-regional tribal groups also tend to encourage foreign intervention into civil disturbances (Reed, 1998); intervention which may or may not serve the interests of the insurgents (Azam, 2002: 133). A common identity is also essential for insurgency formation, since individual guerillas will not act together unless they are able to view themselves as possessing a common background or destiny. Group cohesion is also vital if the insurgency is to prevent itself from splintering (Lujala, Gleditsch, and Gilmore, 2005: 539-541), and significant confrontation along ethnic, religious, political, and ideological lines may lead

[12] An examination of peer group rivalry also provides a surprising element of insurgent/loyalist motivation that cuts across cultures on a global basis. Shy's in-depth study of Bergen County, New Jersey during the American Revolution discovered that bloody battles between rebels and loyalists were in fact based upon pre-war animosities among ethnic groups, churches, political rivals, and contentious neighbors (Shy, 1976: 206). Lear's studies of the Japanese-occupied Philippines found that guerilla recruiting on Leyte concentrated on individuals who had failed to win the previous municipal elections; the winners having already been drafted into Japanese service (Lear, 1961). During the same period in China, clan rivalries rather than political ideologies often determined whether rural peasants sided with Communists or Nationalists (Kalyvas, 2003: 478). Much of the motivation for the massacres that took place in Indonesia during 1965-1966 – ostensibly focused around the Communist/anti-Communist schism – can be traced to pre-existing communal conflicts: among Muslims and Javanese transmigrant settlers in Southern Sumatra, Muslims and Protestants in Timor, Balinese and Chinese in Lombok, local Muslims in Central and East Java, various patronage groups in Bali, and followers of local cults in other areas (Cribb, 1990). Similar local political factors came into play during the Nicaraguan civil war of the 1980s, in which virtually every rural encounter between the Sandinistas and the Contras embodied local clan politics (Berman, 1996: 65). Even more long-term political cleavages came into play during the Liberian civil war of the 1990s, when feuds dating back sixty years were reopened and local vendettas among families settled by force of arms (Ellis, 1995: 128-129).

to the untimely collapse of a burgeoning insurgent movement (Kalyvas, 2003: 477-481).

Fearon and Laitin argue that state weakness marked by poverty, social instability, and a large, primarily rural population offer the best conditions for the transformation of initial rebellion into operational insurgent activity (Fearon and Laitin, 2003: 81, 88). Countries with limited state capacities also invite insurgent activity, and underdeveloped African countries, plagued by authoritarian leadership, weak national infrastructures relating to bridges, rail lines, power stations, and oil pipelines, and a lack of military heritage, are especially at risk in this area (Herbst, 2004: 359, 361, 363). While Skocpol's theory of the maladaptive state focuses upon the role of state capacity in civil war duration and outcome (Skocpol, 1979), insurgent ethnicity/nationality, the viability of existing national political parties, and the general perception of a government's legitimacy can also play a role in insurgency formation and survival (Weitz, 1986/Collier and Hoeffler, 1999).[13]

Even in favorable circumstances, insurgencies generally start out with very small numbers of followers. The Eritrean Liberation Front was initiated in Eritrea during 1961 with eleven people, the Frente de Libertação de Moçambique (FRELIMO) began in Dar as Salaam, Tanganyika in 1962 with 250, the National Resistance Movement in Uganda started in 1979 with 27, the National Patriotic Front of Charles Taylor crossed into

[13] While the presence of inclusionary democratic institutions may afford an outlet for minority views and provide a means for peaceful resolution of ethnicity-based conflicts (Collier and Hoeffler, 1999; Collier and Hoeffler, 2002a; Elbadawi and Sambanis, 2002; Goodwin and Skocpol, 1989; Gurr, 2000), a significant body of scholarly research indicates that countries with a midlevel democracy are more likely to suffer civil conflict than are strongly repressive regimes, suggesting that a certain level of political freedom may be necessary to initiate anti-regime activities (Collier and Hoeffler, 2000; Ellingsen, 2000; Hegre, Ellingsen, Gleditsch, and Gates, 2001; Sambanis, 2001; Reynal-Querol, 2002: 44-45). Further research by Fearon indicates that democracy has no impact whatsoever upon civil war duration (Fearon, 2004).

Liberia in 1989 with approximately 100, and the Revolutionary United Front began in Uganda in 1991 with 35. Not surprisingly, it is at this early, vulnerable stage that insurgencies are most easily defeated (Herbst, 2004: 361).[14] Facing established governments with standing armed forces, insurgent survival depends entirely upon the lack of government intelligence information regarding their whereabouts. Insurgents must also rely upon *local knowledge* of social interactions to allow them to threaten retribution against informants. For this reason, insurgencies are more likely to form in rural areas where local knowledge is more absolute than in urban areas where informant anonymity is more easily achieved (Fearon and Laitin, 2003: 79-81). Even so, basic survival is the greatest challenge for insurgencies in their early phases; even more important than attacking regime assets. Major Kenneth Ruhinda, a guerilla fighter in the National Resistance Army (NRA) in 1980s Uganda, confirmed this notion in an interview conducted in 1993. After stating the effectiveness of sniper attacks against isolated government troops, he added that care must be taken not overly endanger one's own life. "Just kill one," Major Ruhinda said. "So that your job is to reduce the numbers of the enemy but to preserve yourself" (Schubert, 2006: 93).

During this early period of initial survival, guerilla leaders face the task of quickly recruiting a viable following, and they typically accomplish this on the basic of multiple incentives, including status, honor, and reputation (Wood, 2003), the affirmation of

[14] The initial onset of an insurgency may actually have little impact upon a well-penetrated state, since an effective bureaucracy and a competent military provide the ability to adequately police rural areas, provide required social services, control national territory, and secure national frontiers (Balch-Lindsay and Enterline, 2000; Fearon and Laitin, 2003; Goodwin and Skocpol,1989, Knack, 2001; Schock, 1996). Even if emerging insurgencies manage to build support and challenge government forces, the combination of these elements may reduce the possibility of direct insurgent victory, and provide greater opportunities for negotiated settlements (De Rouen and Sobek, 2004: 306-307).

collective identity/activation of tight social networks (Taylor, 1988), the resolution of social and political grievances (Moore, 1966; Paige, 1975; Scott, 1976), and financial rewarding through the looting of natural resources (Keen, 1998; Collier and Hoeffler, 2000; Ross, 2004a, 2004b).[15] Insurgencies based upon ethnic issues differ strongly from those based upon non-ethnic issues, since potential guerillas in those situations make choices based upon ethnic affinities rather than material rewards (Sambanis, 2001; Weinstein, 2005: 600). Insurgencies based upon ideology, meanwhile, rely upon non-pecuniary rewards of 'fighting the good fight' and advancing ideological metrics. Individuals with sadistic tendencies may also be recruited through the functional reward of gaining license to commit acts of extreme violence (Mueller, 2001; Gates, 2002: 114-115). The use of 'child soldiers' also reflects a certain logic not always apparent to the Western mind, since many children, faced with poverty, boredom, or no family to bond with, join insurgencies voluntarily; once in, they are less likely to question orders from adults, have no wife or family to return to, are too young to truly understand fear, and thus make dedicated soldiers indeed (Kalashnikov Kids, 1999; Gates, 2002: 128).

To reduce the influx of low-commitment personnel, insurgent groups must utilize proper methodology in evaluating potential recruits. Three principal methods have emerged to accomplish this feat: community linkage, vouching, and costly induction. Guerilla organizers possessing extensive personal linkage throughout their communities may be able to collect information regarding potential recruits through knowledgeable societal leaders. These relationships can lead to a fairly reliable means of

[15] Financial rewarding is enhanced when a low per capita income is in place, since gaining recruits is less challenging when economic alternatives are limited. Insurgencies are also enhanced by the presence of high-value, low-weight goods such as coca, opium, diamonds, etc. that can be easily transported and sold to finance guerilla campaigns (Fearon and Laitin, 2003: 79-81).

authenticating the honesty and commitment of prospective personnel, and assure that no government informers are being dangled before the insurgency. Vouching is even more stringent, and refers to existing guerillas providing supporting information regarding the qualifications of potential applicants. Should the new recruits fail to live up to expectations, the reputations of both the recruits and their contacts within the insurgency will bear the costs of those failures. Costly induction involves such practices as sustained study of ideology and political messages of the insurgency group (confirmed by examination), or a required period of apprenticeship in which recruits actively participate in attacks without the use of weaponry. While the time element of the former practice serves to screen out low-commitment, disinterested individuals, the level of physical risk involved in the latter provides a strong inducement for such individuals to seek opportunistic gain elsewhere (Weinstein, 2005: 606-607). Once recruited on the basis of a rewards system, guerillas must be placed under discipline to prevent defection. While such discipline will likely include a benefit stream to reward compliance, a system of punishments for poor performance will make defection costly, given that those measures may eventually involve extremely harsh sanctions with permanent ramifications. Punishment in insurgent groups is, by the very nature of their ongoing activity, harsh and sometimes ruthless, and often includes execution for failing to sound the alarm against a deserting companion (Gates, 2002: 116).

Modern civil wars taking place in poor countries rarely involve direct confrontations between government troops and guerilla units in any case. More commonly, both forces move into illicit business dealings and organized crime as opportunities arise (Carins, 1997: 5), since most rural guerilla warfare involves a

mixture of both political and criminal activity (Lichback, 1994: 398). A strong resource base may thus tend to serve as a double-edged sword to an insurgency in the initial recruitment stage, with low-commitment personnel enlisting in order to simply exploit financial resources (Weinstein, 2005: 603-605). Many such recruits will possess criminal backgrounds and seek to use guerilla activity as a natural cover for simple banditry; crowding out more committed personnel in the process, and tainting the international image of the insurgency with their activities (Kalyvas, 2003: 476).[16] Conversely, resource-restrained groups that make financial rewards contingent upon overthrowing the existing regime are more likely to attract high-commitment personnel willing to serve for the long run. Serving for promises of future payment requires extensive credibility on the part of insurgent leadership, however, along with a reasonable probability of a rebel victory: not an easy argument for a newly-initiated guerilla movement to make. Evaluating academic achievement may also play an important part in determining quality recruits. Research conducted by Krueger and Maleckova during 2003 suggests that high levels of education may be indicative of more sincere commitment to the long-term goals of the insurgency (Krueger and Maleckova, 2003; Weinstein, 2005: 603-605, 607).

Numerous factors may impact the viability of an indigenous insurgency; among them geography, the perception of foreign control, and the existence of viable political parties to serve as an outlet for popular frustration. Fidel Castro's anti-government insurgency of 1950s Cuba benefited by its principal area of operations being in the

[16] Kalyvas estimates that nearly half of the 300,000 anti-Japanese resistance fighters in 1930s Manchuria had criminal backgrounds, and the 1920s-1940s Chinese Civil War itself was often fought by diverse coalitions of bandits and local militias in which the cause of Communism (or nationalism) was little more than a flag of convenience for criminal enterprises (Kalyvas, 2003: 476).

remote Sierra Maestra region; an area far from Cuban military basing, and whose inhabitants were dissatisfied with the existing government of Fulgencio Batista. That fortunate combination allowed Castro's forces to build strength among a supportive population before attempting to challenge the army itself. In contrast, the base of operations for the Bolivian insurgency of the 1960s was so remote from the country's urban centers that guerilla activity had little impact upon political events, even though substantial opposition existed in the cities to the military government of Rene Barrientos Ortuno (Weitz, 1986: 399, 403-404).[17] The appearance of substantial foreign involvement can also undermine insurgencies. When a three-ton arms cache from Cuba was seized by Venezuelan authorities during November 1963, President Romula Betancourt claimed his country was the target of hostile foreign subversion, and the Organization of American States supported the allegation. The public image of the insurgency in Bolivia of the same period also suffered from the perception of foreign control, especially after the arrival of Ernesto "Che" Guevara.[18] Countries lacking viable political parties may also leave disaffected citizens little choice but to support the

[17] Some geographical factors appear to impact conflict outcomes across the board. Civil conflicts taking place within states possessing multiple frontiers are more likely to be won by insurgents, since such states are typically large and difficult to adequately police, and neighboring states are often more likely to wittingly or unwittingly grant safe havens to insurgents than to intervene on the side of the embattled government due to the difficulty of establishing collective action polices. Insurgents are also more likely to preserve some measure of autonomy in mountainous states, given the difficulties governments incur in moving and re-supplying large armies through isolated, unfriendly terrain. Meanwhile, conflicts taking place within highly forested states are likely to become stalemated, while insurgents appear to have a somewhat lower probability of winning conflicts based upon ethnicity, religion, or identity, especially in extremely heterogeneous states, and are also at a disadvantage when conflicts are predicated over exploitable resources (Regan, 1996; De Rouen and Sobek, 2004: 311, 314).

[18] Following the first successful ambush conducted by the guerillas, a government communiqué declared that "the national territory has been invaded by an armed group of diverse nationalities, the majority adhering to the Castro-Communist line" (Weitz, 1986: 408), and entries in Guevara's diary indicate that the significant number of non-Bolivians involved in the insurgency indeed concerned him regarding the movement's long-term viability (Weitz, 1986: 408).

insurgency. In 1950s Cuba, established political parties were often leaderless and/or disorganized, an unstructured situation which allowed Fidel Castro's guerillas to march into a political vacuum. In 1970s Nicaragua, the family of Anastasio Somoza Debayle directly controlled the Liberal Party, while candidates from the opposing Conservative Party were often bought off by government-sponsored electoral pacts that guaranteed the party a fixed number of legislative seats. With neither party able to present a credible alternative to continued rule by the Somoza family, those who sought political change began to see the Sandinista insurgents as a logical alternative. In comparison, the governments of Venezuela and Bolivia of the 1960s successfully mobilized their parties' mass organizations to limit the appeal of the insurgents (Weitz, 1986: 408, 411).

Mason and Fett argue that extended conflict duration may well serve the interests of the insurgency more than those of the government, as they tend to offset the imbalance between government and insurgent capabilities. As the insurgency moves into a long-term phase of operations, the accumulated costs for the government and tend to undermine its level of popular support and its ability to wage war (Mason and Fett, 1996: 552).[19] Historical predicators for long-term conflict have been determined by Fearon to include ethnic diversity, low per-capita income (which tends to

[19] The advent of the Internet, cellular telephones, and telefacsimile machines have also made it far more difficult for besieged governments to isolate insurgent grievances and goals from the population at large. The Palestinians, during the First Intifada, successfully utilized informational technology to portray Israeli authorities as oppressive occupiers in Gaza and Judea/Samaria, and strongly impacted both liberal and secular elements of Israeli society. The result of those activities was a political rift within the conservative Likud Party over appropriate counterinsurgency tactics to be utilized, and the subsequent election of a Labour government that went on to conduct the Oslo negotiations. Mexico's Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional (EZLN) insurgents, otherwise known as the Zapatistas, have also exploited such technologies to spread their populist message and constrain the actions of the Mexican government (Claessen, 2007: 98-100).[19]

favor contraband financing), and violence within the context of secessionist and autonomy-seeking movements (Fearon, 2004: 286-288). Societies that have experienced one civil war are also more likely to experience further such conflicts (with Burundi, Indonesia, Iraq, Iran, Rwanda, and Sri Lanka serving as examples) than societies with no prior history of civil violence, with fully 36% of civil wars occurring globally during 1945 – 1996 (22 out of 58) being followed by an additional conflict within the same time period (Walter, 2004: 371). Given that, at the height of global civil conflict during the early 1990s less than half that number (just under 18%) of states were experiencing civil wars, the idea that over one third of countries still recovering from civil strife would be again convulsed in armed violence is shocking indeed (Hegre, 2004: 244).

The tipping point at which an insurgency may achieve victory occurs when significant numbers of government troops join the rebellion; indeed, no mass rebellion can succeed without defection of at least some of the regime's armed forces (Russell, 1974; Herbst, 2000). While ideological-based guerilla groups have an advantage in inducing such defection, the phenomenon is least likely to occur within ethnically homogeneous groups; be they government security forces or insurgent groups (Gates, 2002: 122). By that point, the civilian population itself will have paid the greatest price for the contest between guerillas and counterinsurgent forces, with a widely-quoted estimate reflecting 84% of casualties in such conflicts being non-combatants (Cairns, 1997: 17).[20] Examples abound of this phenomena, especially in Africa: Angola, 1975-

[20] The Economist claims an even higher figure of 90% non-combatant casualties in modern civil conflicts (The Global Menace of Local Strife, 2003: 23).

1991, resulted in an estimated 21,000 military deaths and 320,000 civilian deaths; Burundi, 1972, 20,000 compared to 80,000; Mozambique, 1975-1992, 11,000 compared to 110,000; Rwanda, 1956-1965, 3,000 compared to 102,000; Sudan, 1983-1990, 10,000 compared to 500,000; and Uganda, 1981-1989, 6,000 compared to 100,000. Exceptions exist to this rule, of course. In Nigeria's Biafran conflict of 1967-1970, 1,000,000 soldiers died along with 1,000,000 civilians. Likewise, in Somalia's decade-long conflict of 1980-1990, 5,000 soldiers died along with 5,000 civilians (Azam, 2002: 132).[21]

Fearon, in evaluating 128 civil wars occurring during 1945-2004, identified several classes of civil wars whose basic structure tends to determine how long the conflict will last. In general, the median for such conflicts was 6 years and the mean, 8.8 years. Conflicts arising from attempted coups d'état and popular revolutions (Argentina, 1955; Costa Rica, 1948; Bolivia, 1952; Dominican Republic, 1965; Iraq, 1959; Paraguay, 1947; and North Yemen, 1948) were typically quite brief in duration, however, with a median of 2.1 years and a mean of three years. Anti-colonial conflicts lasted somewhat longer, with a median of 4.7 years and a mean of 7.3 years. Primordial 'Sons of the Soil' conflicts, centering upon peripheral peoples who take up arms against migrants (who often are being resettled in response to government development projects), are most often found in Asia (Bangladesh's Chakmas, China's

[21] These figures, staggering as they are, do not include the millions of mutilated children, raped women, destroyed homes, stolen property, damaged crops, and millions of displaced refugees that accompany these fratricidal conflicts (Azam, 2002: 132). Nor do they include the vast amounts of badly-needed capital required to continue these seemingly-unending wars. A report commissioned by the charitable organization Oxfam, International concluded, during the fall of 2007, that African conflicts consume at least 15% of the gross national product for African states in general (Hillier, 2007: 7-9). Evidence also exists that suggests the AIDS crisis in Africa has been heightened by prolonged civil war across the continent; further misery for peoples already numbed by decades of seemingly unending violence (Smallman-Raynor and Cliff, 1991: 78).

Uighurs, India's northeastern tribal peoples, Indonesia's Acehnese and West Papuans, Myanmar's Karens, Pakistan's Mohajirs, Papua New Guinea's Bougainvilleans, the Philippines' Moros, and Sri Lanka's Tamils), although examples exist in Africa (Chadian rebels, Ethiopia's Eritreans and Ogaden Somalis, Mali's Tuaregs, and Sudan's southern Christians/Animists), also. Conflicts of this type can be extremely extended, with a median of 23.2 years and a mean of 33.7 years. Finally, contraband-financed conflicts (diamonds in Angola, cocaine in Columbia, opium in Myanmar, and diamonds in Sierra Leone) tend to survive the longest, with a median of 28.1 years and a mean of 38.2 years (Fearon, 2004: 276-277, 280-284).

Research conducted by de Rouen and Sobek found that one of the most important predicators of civil conflict outcomes was the intervention of the United Nations or other interested third-parties. Such high-level intervention is most likely to occur during the course of protracted conflicts, and tends to increase the probability of both truce and treaty. Walter, speaking of the credibility-commitment theory of civil war resolution, argues that proffered agreements by warring parties to disarm only become believable when outside enforces enter the fray to enforce them. Under these third-party guarantees, cheating by either side becomes much more costly, while promises to cooperate gain heightened validity. To be truly credible, however, third-party guarantees must ensure that the outside power is, in some manner, operating in its own self-interest, is willing to use a defined level of force, and has the ability to establish long-term resolve (Walter, 1997: 336, 340-341). Laitin, using the case of Cyprus as an example, writes that civil conflicts can be moderated when the international community is willing to commit long-term policing forces to grant credibility to agreements reached

among warring parties. While these international security arrangements may eventually devolve into de-facto international mandates, such outcomes might still be preferable to unending civil conflict (Laitin: 1999: 172-173).[22]

How successful are insurgencies? An evaluation of conflict data stored within the COW database indicates that indigenous government troops were successful in 140 out of the 213 intra-state wars fought during the period of 1816-1997, for a success rate of 75.16% (Sarkees, 2000: 123-144).[23] The historical record for states fighting insurgencies in territories outside of their own metropolitan areas has historically been even higher, with the intervening power achieving success in 83 out of 108 extra-state wars fought during the same time, for a success rate of 80.58%. Determining when a counterinsurgency campaign has actually achieved success is not easy, however, since confidence-building metrics utilized in conventional wars such as the attainment of geographical objectives and the destruction of enemy governments are not applicable when the enemy can simultaneously be everywhere and nowhere. As a result, the most commonly-used point of measurement is that of enemy body-counts. Utilized to a fault during the Vietnam conflict where military briefing officers tended to significantly overestimate enemy casualties as a measure of mission accomplishment, reporting of body-counts began to be used by American commanders in Iraq during May 2004, and has since been utilized there extensively (Boettcher and Cobb, 2006: 831-833).

[22] Laitin also argues that the unwillingness of the United States in the post-Cold War era to continue to prop up authoritarian regimes as bulwarks against Soviet/Russian expansionism meant that those regimes could be more successful challenged (Laitin, 1999: 156-157).

[23] Research conducted by Weede and Muller during 1998 into mass rebellions against indigenous central governments since 1900 suggests that government troops had been even more capable, successfully crushing their irregular adversaries nearly 86% of the time (Weede and Muller, 1998: 49-51).

Lacking more empirical measures, even obvious failures in counterinsurgency campaigns may be politically recast by opportunistic politicians to claim victory in the face of defeat. As late as 2005, Melvin Laird, Secretary of Defense from 1969 to 1973, was claiming that although Vietnam had been forcibly unified in 1975 under Communist rule, American counterinsurgency efforts there had in fact been successful since the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China (PRC) had been forced to focus exclusively upon South Vietnam, and prevented from encroaching further in Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, the Philippines, and India (Laird, 2005: 33-37).

During the post-Second World War period, both foreign powers and national governments attempted a multitude of non-military strategies to moderate secessionism and insurgency, few of which exhibited complete success. France has, of late, sought to address secessionism in such regions as Alsace, Brittany, and Corsica by making concessions of a limited power-sharing nature, while the governments of Canada and the United Kingdom have moved to empower local languages (French in Quebec and Welsh Gaelic in Wales) in an effort to defuse language-based secessionism (Rudolph and Thompson, 1985: 296, 301).[24] States with limited capacity (as is the case in much of Africa) facing determined insurgencies often reach a sort of equilibrium, in which the guerillas control much of the countryside and the government controls the urban population centers. The military policy of Rhodesia during the final years of its existence centered upon protecting 'vital asset ground' without which the state could not adequately function, and implicitly ceding significant portions of the countryside to the

[24] Language-empowerment policies of this type may backfire, however, by unwittingly stimulating further secessionism (Rudolph and Thompson, 1985: 296, 301).

ZANU insurgency; a questionable strategy which disallowed any realistic possibility of a government victory (Herbst, 2004: 363-364; Preston, 2004: 68).[25]

The prospect of unending violence and state instability has also led governments plagued with secessionist provinces to consider cutting their losses and conducting a physical territorial partition in order to end unwinnable conflicts and bring a measure of peace to the resulting rump state. A sharp debate exists, however, between those scholars who favor partition to solve ethnic conflict (e.g. Mearsheimer & Van Evera, 1995; Kaufmann, 1996, 1998) and those who do not (e.g. Hachey, 1972; Fraser, 1984; Horowitz, 1985; de Silva & May, 1991; Brown, 1993; McGarry & O'Leary, 1993; Posen, 1993; Kumar, 1997; Rothchild, 1997; Sambanis, 2000; Walter, 2004). Not all voters who support secessionist candidates actually support political secession in any case; many simply view strong showings by such candidates as being necessary for attracting financial subsidies and policies of accommodation from the central government. Indeed, Rawkins echoes Max Weber in writing that nationalist demands can often be met through a combination of "temporary accommodation of material and ideal interests" and "coercion and compliance relations" (Rawkins, 1978: 521). Even if territorial partition is conducted, it is far from being a complete panacea for ethnic violence, since conflict may re-ignite when a remnant of the partitioned grouping

[25] The acceptance of operational equilibriums between government forces and insurgencies often leads to volatile political environments that are difficult to reverse. During the early 1980s, NRA insurgents established bases and training camps in Uganda's Luwero Triangle, forcing government forces of the Uganda National Liberation Army (UNLA) to avoid the area out of fear of confrontation. The central government finally challenged the equilibrium at the end of 1982 with a brutal, massive counterinsurgency campaign that alienated important elements of the population, and forced the NRA to withdraw to the country's northern areas. There, the NRA began recruiting local residents (who found UNLA forces more threatening than the guerillas) and building its strength to the point that it was able, by 1985, to engage the UNLA on conventional terms, and, by January 1986, to successfully take the capital of Kampala and place NRA leader Yoweri Museveni in power as President; a position he continues to hold to this day (Schubert, 2006: 96, 100-101).

remains behind in the rump, original state, such as Roman Catholics in Northern Ireland, Croatians in Bosnia, or Kosovar Albanians in Serbia's Presevo Valley. In addition, mistreatment of rump state nationals in the newly partitioned territory may invite intervention by the rump state to protect its ethnic kin, as has occasionally been threatened by Russian officials regarding ethnic Russians in former Soviet states (Tir, 2005: 55).

C. The Impact of Foreign Control or Influence

For centuries, great powers successfully projected military force abroad to acquire/defend territory, protect and/or expand material or ideological interests, and to thwart the ambitions of rival powers (Van Wingen and Tillema, 1980: 291-292). During the late 19th century, European powers involved in such military campaigns seemingly had little difficulty in defeating either regular or insurgent forces in the Third World, and often held little but contempt for the latter. Prince von Schwarzenberg, commander of the allied forces during the Napoleonic campaigns, dismissed the issue of irregular insurgents by threatening any civilians found carrying weaponry with exile to Siberia (or death, had they actually killed anyone), and ordering the destruction of entire towns in which the alarm bell had been tolled (Roling, 1976: 150). With the colonial allocation of the continent of Africa finalized among the European powers by the turn of the 20th century, localized such conflicts abounded between native guerillas and European colonial forces, to the extreme detriment of the former in spite of their motivation and courage. In analyzing the 1898 British campaign at Omdurman, Sudan (under the leadership of General Sir Herbert Kitchener) which shattered the Mahdi 'army' of Abd'ullah al-Taashi, Katzenbach noted somewhat sardonically that native insurgents

“saw fit do die, with glory, with honor, en masse, and in vain” (Mack, 1975: 176). The native revolt against German rule in Tanganyika in 1905-1906 was savagely crushed by German colonial forces at a cost of 75,000 African natives, with a further 200,000 Africans dying during scorched-earth tactics as the counterinsurgency campaign concluded in 1907 (Zimmerman, 2006: 428, 441-442).

The ability of foreign powers to decisively crush native insurgencies began to falter, however, with the intransigence of Boer guerillas during the Second Boer War of 1899-1902 (which British forces nonetheless won), and became even less predictable with the Irish Rebellion of 1916-1921 (in which British forces accepted political defeat) (Mack, 1975: 176). In the latter case, civil war erupted in the Saorstát Éireann/Irish Free State created in the wake of British military withdrawal between pro-treatyite and rejectionist elements of Sinn Féin; a conflict in which the hard-core IRA insurgents who had successfully driven the British from the territory were decisively defeated by their former Irish allies (Regan, 2007: 208). Boyd, writing in 1922, notes that while much of the Irish public supported IRA guerilla tactics against British troops, those same tactics were deemed to be illegitimate when deployed against an indigenous Irish Army (Boyd, 1922: 89). Nationalist motivation was similarly denied insurgents during the 1946-1954 Hukbalahap rebellion in the Philippines when American forces stationed in the country were forbidden by the United States government to intervene in the conflict, leaving the indigenous Filipino army on its own to conduct counterinsurgency operations against a tenacious adversary (Lansdale, 1961: 3; Lapus, 1961: 18-20). Perhaps as a result, the Hukbalahap insurgency was essentially over by 1953, whereas native insurgencies continued against the British in nearby Malaya until 1960 (where final defeat of the

insurgency followed British political withdrawal) (Rahman, 1965: 659-661), and against the French and the Americans nearby Vietnam for the next twenty years (where both metropolitan powers eventually accepted defeat) (Gavin, 1968: 49-49; Karnow, 1983: 29, 36, 685).

Indeed, the antipathy that many indigenous populations have to the perception of alien control of their destinies is difficult to overestimate, even when the outsiders are of the same region and culture. Such unyielding antipathy may even extend to insurgents who are not directly of local stock. Peasants living in Guatemala's Zacapa region, Peru's Convencion Valley, and Bolivia's southeastern territories have demonstrated open hostility toward local guerilla groups composed of individuals not from that immediate area. Guevara noted a similar phenomenon during his operations in South American of the 1960s when peasants whom he found to be antipathetic toward his goals of national liberation eventually betrayed him to Bolivian authorities. For reasons such as this, Latin American guerillas of the era shifted their recruitment focus from the countryside to the urban areas in an effort to find a populace more interested in revolutionary change (Bender, 1972: 357).

This level of local antipathy appears to grow when the differences between local residents and outsiders are clearly apparent, as when they are from foreign cultures and societies. Arendt writes that insurgencies often form within occupied countries through restorative movements designed to restore lost liberties and privileges taken from indigenous peoples by external forces (Arendt, 1958: 34-40). Even when foreign occupations are ostensibly conducted in an effort to provide assistance to a suffering native population, they have long served to provide the motivation for armed resistance

on a nationalistic or religious basis. The Roman occupation of Palestine during 63 BC/BCE to 330 AD/CE, viewed by many in Rome as providing both security and advanced Roman culture to the inhabitants of the area, eventually led to vicious Jewish revolts against alien rule during 66-73 AD/CE and 132-135 AD/CE (Rapoport, 1984: 659-660).[26] More recently, the 1799 French intervention into Italian politics designed to emancipate the population from the quasi-feudal control of the Roman Catholic Church quickly led to a massacre of French-backed Italian politicians by the very peasants the intervention was supposed to uplift. Similar efforts by King Joseph of Spain during 1808 to implement an independent judiciary, freedom of the press, and abolish feudal privileges held by the aristocracy and the Roman Catholic Church led to a ferocious insurgency against his government by guerillas who viewed the king - a brother of French Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte - as little more than a French lackey (Luttwak, 2005: 27). The British government espoused similarly high motives during 1879 when it established, with the French, a system of 'dual control' over Egypt in an effort to bring that country into financial competence. Within three years, a native insurrection erupted against foreign control that was only brought under control by the landing of British troops; the subsequent 72-year British presence left behind radicalized elements of Egyptian society upon its departure in 1954 that continue to this day to oppose Westernized, secular practices (Carman, 1921: 51-52; Edelstein, 2004: 26, 77). The United States openly proclaimed idealist motives during the late 1890s when it encouraged an anti-Spanish insurrection in the Philippines, and eventually dispatched

[26] The quest for Jewish national independence continued into our own time; ironically enough, against the very British authorities who had taken control of Palestine during 1917-1918 with the stated mission of establishing a national homeland for the Jewish people (Segev, 1999: 43-50, 59, 92).

American troops to defeat the Spanish colonial authorities there. After the United States annexed the territory, however, a violent indigenous insurgency erupted against American rule that lasted for 14 years and required 120,000 American troops to quell – at the cost of the lives of more than 4,000 soldiers and over 200,000 Filipinos. Under the leadership of President Woodrow Wilson, the United States again dispatched troops abroad, this time to neighboring Mexico during April 1914 ostensibly to restore democracy to the country after General Victoriano Huerta deposed the elected government of President Francisco Madero. Faced with foreign occupation, however, Mexican politicians rallied around General Huerta's government, and the Mexican newspaper El Imparcial called upon the population to use all available measures to drive the American troops from Mexican soil, even at the cost of their very lives (Judis, 2004: 50-54).[27]

Even fairly benign military occupations can prove problematic for the affected civilian populations. Jurat Sir John Leale, a resident of the British Channel Islands during the German occupation of 1940 – 1945, noted that while no atrocities were committed by German troops during that period, the very presence of the occupying force was "a constant reminder of the hideous thing that has happened to you" (Leal, 1946: 215). Roberts writes that the most widespread French reaction to the German military occupation of the Second World War was humiliation and denial; anger only

[27] A more realist explanation for the invasion is related to national honor and concerns regarding German incursion. Just twelve days before the American operation, two American sailors were arrested in Tampico, Mexico by Huerta's forces, causing embarrassment to the Wilson Administration. The United States Consulate in Vera Cruz also received reports stating that a German warship would be landing a shipment of arms to Huerta's troops later that month, and American authorities were determined to prevent outside military interference in the Western Hemisphere. Although Huerta never officially recognized the American military occupation, he was compelled to resign his office three months later and take refuge in Spain (Yockelson, 1997: 214-216).

developed afterwards. He argues that the many varied resistance movements throughout Occupied Europe were not "the product of an intellectual revolt against Nazi metaphysics and Nazi sociology," but the result of "the intense disgust which overcomes the ordinary citizen when he sees foreign soldiers strolling about his streets as conquerors, secure in their conquest" (Roberts, 1945: 1-3).[28] Nor is military occupation always pleasant for the occupying powers. A 1940 German report, published two months into the occupation of France, noted that the "exemplary, amiable and helpful behavior of the German soldiers towards the population has aroused little sympathy." The unblinking, silent hostility was so prevalent in Paris that the city was christened "Stadt Ohne Blick" ('the city without regard') by German forces stationed there who found themselves forcefully ignored by the angry, humiliated Parisians (Jackson, 2001: 285).

Western military occupation of Islamic countries can be even more problematic, especially when that occupation is viewed as overwhelmingly Jewish or Christian. Nationalist leaders often point to Sura 5.51 of the Qu'ran as religious authority to oppose such an occupation: "Do not take the Jews and the Christians for friends; they are friends of each other; and whoever amongst you takes them for a friend, then surely he is one of them; surely Allah does not guide the unjust people" (Sura 5.51, The Holy Qu'ran). Following the initial American attacks against Taliban Afghanistan of October

[28] Some Frenchmen would subsequently recall that lesson when they faced insurgencies against French colonial authority during the post-war years. An unnamed French officer serving in 1959 Algeria referred to the motivation of the Việt Minh during the previous war in Indochina as being one of resistance to foreign domination, rather than simply serving on behalf of international Communism. "The Việt Minh who rose – and with what courage! – to assault our positions at Điện Biên Phủ was not thinking of the triumph of international Communism," he wrote, "but of 'kicking the foreigner out of the place where I belong'" (Guerre Revolutionnaire, Guerre Phychologique, ou Guerre 'Tout Court,' 1959: 99).

2001, al-Qa'eda spokesman Sulaiman Abu Ghaith invoked the concept of infidels sullying Islamic territory in general with the words, "the Arabian Peninsula is being defiled by the feet of those who came to occupy these lands, usurp these holy places, and plunder its resources" (Davis, 2007: 15).[29]

In formulating counterinsurgency campaigns, the industrialized world may be at a disadvantage in placing its reliance upon Western concepts of rationality; concepts that might indicate that weak, Third World adversaries will always be overcome by strong, advanced industrial states (Sullivan, 2007: 498). Western political systems are far more oriented toward rationalism (a highly subjective term) and measurable performance factors than are those of the Third World, and viewing the developing world through this mindset may lead to spurious conclusions regarding counterinsurgency efforts, especially those predicated upon use of economic factors and instruments of coercion to gain a desired response (Razi, 1990: 73-74). Third World societies often exhibit a higher level of tolerance for costs than do those in advanced, liberal countries, and this heightened ability to endure suffering may tend to offset the military strength of occupying powers as foreign military conflicts stretch into periods of years (Mueller, 1980; Sullivan, 2007: 498). During an evaluation of failed counterinsurgency campaigns, Mack noted that, in every case, insurgent success was predicated upon "the progressive attrition of their opponents' political capability to wage war" (Mack, 1975: 177). Rosen agreed, writing that a weak actor may compensate for a stronger opponent by displaying "a greater willingness to be harmed" (Rosen, 1972:

[29] The desire to cleanse one's country from foreign influence may also possess a certain amount of legitimacy under international law. Lackey, an academic specialist on the subject of just cause, writes that, in the quest to "throw the foreigners out of Vietnam, the North Vietnamese fought with just cause" (Lackey, 1989: 51).

169). Former Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird credits the ability of both the Việt Cộng and the North Vietnamese government to withstand the American military onslaught on the high priority they placed on expelling foreign troops from Vietnamese soil. "Victory meant everything to North Vietnam," Laird wrote, "and nothing to the Average American" (Laird, 2005: 35).[30]

Research conducted during 2004 by Edelstein into foreign military occupations of the period of 1815-2003 regarding their achievement of structured goals showed a stunted success rate of 29.16%, a mixed success/failure rate of 16.66%, and a failure rate of 54.16%;[31] a stalwart reminder of the difficulties involved in conducting successful occupations of foreign countries (Edelstein, 2004: 59-75, 84-88). Foreign military occupations can be successful, of course, with the two model cases being the postwar United States occupations of Germany and Japan. Little indigenous resistance was apparent in either case against occupation troops, and, over sixty years later, American forces still remain in both countries without insurgent activity coalescing against them. Edelstein, in evaluating those occupations, argues that several factors served to promote the physical presence of American troops. First, much of the national territory

[30] Nor must mass popular support exist for an insurgency to achieve victory. Edelstein notes that even a small, nationalistic minority population may offer enough resistance to successfully frustrate an occupying power and raise the costs for counterinsurgency operations to an unacceptable level (Edelstein, 2004: 58). Unless the application of military force has the ability to raise the costs for resistance beyond what insurgents (and the civilian population) are willing to pay, counterinsurgency operations are doomed to fail (Sullivan, 2007: 504). Schelling's writings on the value of military hard power may be prescient here. In Arms and Influence, published in 1966 during the early days of the Vietnam conflict, Schelling argues that a warring country with overwhelming military power may be able to punish its adversaries with the robust exercise of blunt military force to the point that no negotiations with them are necessary (Schelling, 1966: 1-35). While those concepts demonstrated merit during the conventional conflicts of the 20th century, several of the victors of the Second World War subsequently lost counterinsurgency campaigns against irregular forces in the Third World even though their ability to deploy massive amounts of military power remained unquestioned.

[31] Foreign occupations of Afghanistan, Bosnia, Iraq, and Kosovo, given their ongoing nature, were not rated during the course of this evaluation.

of both Germany and Japan had been devastated by war, and occupation forces were welcomed by crushed populations who were simply seeking survival strategies. Second, programs designed to eliminate the influence of the pre-occupation regime – be it National Socialists in Germany, or militarists in Japan – successfully served to pave the way for a new view of political interaction. Third, popular support was enhanced by co-opting some existing national institutions. For this reason, Emperor Shōwa Tennō (known in the West as Hirohito), was permitted to retain his position as Head of State even after the Japanese surrender. Fourth, Soviet expansion was perceived in both countries as a common threat that necessitated the continuing presence of American troops for national defense. Fifth, occupation forces adopted forms of indirect rule through the appointment or popular election of qualified, indigenous politicians.[32] Sixth, the occupations were 'multilateralized' by including troops from other foreign powers to reduce the perception of a national agenda on the part of the United States, and grant wider legitimacy to the occupation itself. Seventh, credible moves toward national independence and withdrawal of the foreign military occupation were openly discussed, conditioned on the continuing cooperation of the population with occupation authorities (Edelstein, 2004: 59-75, 84-88).[33]

Empirical evidence also suggests that civil conflicts in which foreign intervention has taken place also tend to last longer than those which remain purely domestic (Regan, 2002: 57, 72). This is reflected by concepts embodied in the external

[32] Efforts of this type may backfire, however, if those politicians as viewed as little more than lackeys or stooges of the occupation authorities.

[33] Feldman's previously-mentioned experience with the American occupation authority in Iraq reminds us, however, that concepts involved with post-war occupations of Germany and Japan are not necessarily valid when extrapolated to the developing world due to cultural differences (Feldman, 2004: 1).

enemy/internal cohesion thesis of Coser and Simmel, which is broadly reflective of the major successful insurgency campaigns of the 20th century. The first concept is that an external threat is a necessary if not sufficient condition for the emergence of an insurgency. Occupation by a foreign army can be viewed as a major external threat, not only to one's life, but to one's very cultural and religious identity, and the historical experience demonstrates that people are willing to take up arms against such a clearly defined existential threat. The second concept (which is closely related to the first) is that repression engaged in by occupation forces enhances, and may even create, nationalist unity from an otherwise fragmented population. Whatever internally divisive issues exist, the ancient concept of 'my enemy's enemy is my friend' remains eternally valid. The third concept is that occupation and repression by the occupying power will likely produce nationalist unity as long as a general consensus exists that the group as a whole is at risk, not just a specific part of it; if elements of society believe they can prosper by actively collaborating with the occupying power, unity is threatened and civil war may loom as a distinct possibility. The fourth concept is that resistance becomes more tenable when insurgents truly believe they will ultimately be victorious; likewise, surrender no longer becomes an option when capture by occupation authorities is likely to result in torture and/or death (it is notable that resistance movements against German forces in occupied Europe were often led by Communists, since they were well aware that surrender meant a sure, painful death). The fifth concept is that while occupation may be worse for some elements of society than for others (and nationalist unity is thus not unshakable), cohesion will be reinforced when collaboration is proscribed and sanctioned both socially and through insurgent activities (Mack, 1975: 182-183).

The lesson of recent history is harsh indeed regarding this final point, as evidenced by the social consequences of being labeled a collaborator in 1944 France (Mack, 1975: 182-183). While about 2,400 such individuals were killed by the Maquis prior to the August 1944 Liberation, approximately 9,000 were executed immediately afterwards during the course of l'epuration sauvage, most of whom never received benefit of a trial. Other estimates, by pro-collaborationist sources, claim a much darker figure of 100,000 dead (Burrin, 1996: 453; Jackson, 2001: 578). Under the subsequent Law on National Indignity, enacted upon December 26, 1944, collaboration was viewed as a type of low-grade treason, and tens of thousands of French citizens were arrested and tried under those legal concepts. Roughly 95,000 of those were eventually found guilty of acts of collaboration, and condemned to dégradation nationale, losing their basic political and civil rights (Elster, 2006: 326, 333). The following judicial purge passed sentences upon 124,613 additional French men and women, with approximately 50,000 of those submitted to dégradation nationale, over 40,000 imprisoned, and nearly 13,000 sentenced to death (Burrin, 1996: 453; Jackson, 2001: 577-580). Vigilante-style purges of collaborators continued well through the middle of 1945, with many of those executed accused of having been anti-resistance police officials. The sexual aspect of collaboration was also addressed, with between 10,000 and 30,000 French women accused of ‘horizontal collaboration’ having their heads shaved and their bodies painted with swastikas; some of these woman were subsequently executed. Extra-legal purges of this type were far from being isolated incidents, and were generally supported by entire communities of angry French citizenry (Jackson, 2001: 584).

Late converts to insurgency may also find themselves under close ideological scrutiny. Resistance attorneys in post-Second World War Denmark refused to consent to absolution for Danes who had only joined the resistance movement following the August 29, 1943 German assumption of direct control over the country, terming them to be among "the largest and most dangerous group of traitors" who were simply astute enough to "leave the sinking ship on August 29" (Elster, 2006: 332). In a similar vein, Nino notes the 'hypocrisy' of Argentines who only became advocates of punitive measures against the 1976-1983 military junta after it was overthrown in 1983. In post-Mussolini Italy, judges who had served under the former government were nonetheless responsible for levying death sentences against some 100 anti-resistance informers, leading to charges against themselves of opportunism. Following French Libération of August 1944, French citizens who suddenly professed loyalty to the resistance were scathingly dubbed 'Septembrists' by their neighbors, just as Algerians who joined the Front de Libération Nationale (FLN) following the Evian Agreement of March 1962 were termed 'Marchians' by theirs (Elster, 2006: 332-333). Interestingly enough, many of the latter were among the most vindictive in the liquidation of the Harki supporters of the former colonial regime (Hamoumou, 1993: 250; Meliani, 1993: 57).

While direct foreign occupation can clearly inspire resistance movements, indigenous governments perceived as being propped up by foreign interests may also find little ease with their disaffected populaces. Huth argues that such local governments often find it difficult to mobilize popular support, and require the military forces of the occupying power to remain in-country to protect them from their own populations (Huth, 2000: 101-102). In furtherance of the point, DeFronzo notes that

revolutions in 1959 Cuba, 1979 Nicaragua, and 1979 Iran were all, in part, reactions to great power intervention (DeFronzo, 1991: 3), and Razi writes that Islamic movements and political leaders who seek to end both direct and indirect foreign control over traditional Islamic states and return to an earlier idealized set of attitudes and institutes have long garnered wide emotional support in North Africa and the Middle East (Razi, 1990: 76).[34] The international terrorist organization of al-Qa'eda, although clearly not definable as an insurgent group, bases its anti-Western activities on the perception that repressive Arab regimes are maintained in power by American support, and views the post-1991 American military presence in Sa'udi Arabia as representing a defilement of holy Muslim land (Overview of the Enemy, 2004).

For native governments unduly relying upon great power support, withdrawal of that support can, ironically enough, be fatal in itself. DeFronzo writes that the Batista regime collapsed in 1959 Cuba only after the United States terminated military aid, the administration of Shah Moḥammad Reẓā Pahlavī began to totter after the United States insisted he relax restrictions on political expression during 1977, and Anastasio Somoza lost his grip on power in Nicaragua in 1979 after the United States withdrew its political and military support from his dictatorial government (Defronzo, 1991: 170, 203, 269). In addition, the collapse of Communist regimes in 1989 Central Europe – with the exception of Poland – all occurred only after the Soviet Union withdrew promises of political and military support (Opp, Voss, and Gern, 1993; Opp, 1994; Weede and Muller, 1998: 55).

[34] Former Syrian President Ḥāfiẓ al-Asad, a member of the minority Shia' Alawite sect, successfully governed the Sunni-majority Syrian state by encouraging the perception of himself as the only Arab leader capable of standing up to both Israel and the United States and resurrecting some measure of national dignity, not just for the Syrians, but for the Arab people in general (Razi, 1990: 83).

D. Motivations for Insurgencies Confronting Foreign Occupation

The academic literature regarding irregular conflict has shown insurgencies against foreign control to be motivated by one or more of several social/political issues, including local alignment with international philosophies, the impact of modernization upon developing countries, the presence of exploitable resources, perceptions of regime illegitimacy (involving issues of regime disregard for human rights and basic notions of inequality), and nationalist and/or secessionist strivings. Each of these motivations may be exacerbated by the physical presence of foreign occupation troops.

The unexpected onset of active insurgent operations in many countries has historically been linked to external philosophies; "insidious elements" fanning the flames of rebellion "in almost all developing nations throughout the world" as stated by a 1966 International Police Academy training manual issued by the Agency for International Development (The Police and Internal Security, 1966: I-4, L-1). During the Cold War, that external philosophy was typically labeled as 'International Communism,' and the threat implied by that concept tended to obviate the importance of local social concerns on the part of the affected population (Shafer, 1988: 59-60). In more recent times, a similar concept has coalesced with rebuilding of an international Islamic khalifate taking the place of international Communism as the hidden hand behind insurgencies across the Muslim world. Within that khalifate, writes Gordon, "Sharia rule will be established, Israel will be destroyed, oil prices will skyrocket, and the United States will recoil in humiliation and possibly even collapse" (Gordon, 2007: 58). Gordon concedes, however, that the inflammatory rhetoric of such former Bush Administration officials as David Frum and Richard Perle (who argue that the only possible outcomes in the

General War on Terrorism are either victory or holocaust (Frum and Perle, 2003) may lead the United States into a series of wars, abuses, and over-reactions that are more likely to perpetuate terrorism than defeat it (Gordon, 2007: 58-60). Such interventionist policies by foreign powers may also inadvertently trigger the very Islamic restoration movements those powers sought to prevent (Dekmejian 1980, 1985; Lewis 1985).

Many theorists place the blame for insurgent activities on the impact of modernization upon developing countries (Kecskemeti, 1967: 13; The Police and Internal Security, 1966: I-4, L-1). Henderson and Singer write that "tensions related to the challenges of state-building and nation-building comprise the 'taproot of insurgency' in post-colonial states" (Henderson and Singer (2000: 278). This may occur as a lessening of distance between social classes leads to political instability (Durkheim, 1951; Brinto, 1965; Johnson, 1982; Razi, 1990: 89). Rapid economic growth has been said to destabilize traditional rural social systems (Huntington, 1968; Scott, 1976), while frustrations may arise from the failure of economic modernization to bring about unrealistic expectations on the part of the population (Gurr, 1970; Fearon and Laitin, 2003: 78).[35] Islamic countries may be even more prone to instability as a result of modernization, given that Islam established both a religious faith and an idealized state. Muslims who view Mohammad's 624 CE/AD city-state of Medina as the exemplar of religious purity may feel an obligation to revolt against an existing regime perceived to be corrupted by Western philosophies, materialism, and secularism. This feeling of obligation may be increased by the perception of direct or indirect alien rule, and lead to

[35] Fearon and Laitin qualify these conjectures, however, by noting that their research failed to find any strong evidence of causality between the onset of modernization and an increase in ethnic strife (Fearon and Laitin, 2003: 82).

a violent restoration movement designed to return to an earlier idealized set of attitudes free of foreign influence (Dekmejian, 1980, 1985; Lewis, 1985). This was clearly the case in Iranian society prior to the Islamic revolution (Razi, 1990: 76-77).

An abundance of extractable resources may unwittingly stimulate insurgency, given that such abundance is positively associated with low economic growth, rent-seeking, government corruption, and a deterioration of government institutions. According to the Scarce Resource Wars Hypothesis, peoples and/or states will engage in conflict to secure resources necessary for their existence, with the bitterest fighting reserved for the scarcest resources (Brown, 1977; Bennett, 1991; Renner, 1996; Suliman, 1998; Homer-Dixon, 1999). Conversely, advocates of the Abundant Resources Hypothesis argue that the revenues available from such resources represent a powerful goal for both centralized and local control, increasing the risk of greed-driven conflicts while providing funding for both government and insurgent weaponry (Le Billon, 1997; Keen, 1998; Collier, 2000; Fairhead, 2000; Le Billon, 2001b: 564-565). The viability of such resources can also provide opportunity in available funding for guerilla recruiting and provisioning, and serve to strengthen group identities (Lujala, Gleditsch, and Gilmore, 2005: 540).[36] Since local control of such resources would strongly benefit a more tightly-defined population, nationalist movements are generally led by those individuals and groupings whose personal and collective destinies are linked to the

[36] Much of Nigerian oil reserves lie in the eastern part of the country dominated by the Igbo tribe, and a rapid growth in the value of crude oil that took place during the 1960s, coupled with efforts by the central government to limit Igbo control over the resource, led to a bitter, and ultimately unsuccessful, secessionist war on the part of the Igbos to establish the independent state of Biafra (Nafziger and Richter, 1976: 103-104). Such a phenomenon is not limited to the Third World; Scottish nationalism was stimulated during the latter part of the 20th century with the discovery of North Sea oil (Lujala, Gleditsch, and Gilmore, 2005: 540).

complete removal of alien political and economic domination (Nafziger and Richter, 1976: 93).

Perceptions of illegitimate rule, especially when indigenous rulers are widely viewed as lackeys for foreign powers, can also trigger insurgent movements. Razi defines legitimacy as "the extent to which the relevant portion of the population perceives that the regime is behaving" (Razi, 1987: 461-462), and writes that when the "articulate members" of a population are generally satisfied with their government's approach to issues of identity, participation, distribution, equality, and sovereignty within the context of their own culture (which may not necessarily correspond to Western norms), "there is no crisis of legitimacy" (Razi, 1990: 70). Indeed, the general perception of a government's legitimacy has been argued to have direct significance to political stability, especially within the Third World (Binder, 1962, 1971; Pye, 1971; Hudson, 1977; Bendix, 1978; McLellan, 1983), and that perception can serve to either inspire or doom an insurgency (Razi, 1990: 71).[37] While external actors may successfully question legitimacy, Latham writes that only indigenous actors can provide it (Latham, 2006: 40), and research conducted by Weede and Muller during 1998 found that regimes dependent upon great power support tend to lose popular legitimacy (Weede and Muller, 1998: 54). The government of 1960s South Vietnam was viewed by many Vietnamese as being corrupt and overly reliant upon the United States to the point that even segments of the population who were hostile to the Communists lost interest in supporting it, especially those who envisioned a united Vietnamese state

[37] Guevara once presciently noted that, "where a government . . . maintains at least an appearance of constitutional legality, the guerilla outbreak cannot be promoted" (Guevara, 1969: 2).

encompassing both northern and southern political entities (Berger, 2003: 440). Weede and Muller write that the Chinese capitulation to Japanese aggression during the 1930s was perceived by some Chinese as collaboration, and undermined the patriotic credentials of the Chinese Nationalist regime (Weede and Muller, 1998: 54-55). During the 1990s, the FLN government of Algeria found itself contending with insurgents who claimed to be fighting an illegitimate regime of *hizb fransa*; the Party of France; a stunning irony given that the FLN had fought a vicious, eight year conflict during 1954-1962 against French colonial control of Algeria (McDougall, 2005: 127).

Ethnic nationalism can be even more potent than the mere perception of foreign control, since it embodies the feelings and behaviors of a grouping of people within existing states that view themselves as having a unique, terminal identity and loyalty and who seek a distinct, independent, indigenous statehood for that grouping. While modern nationalism is traced to the Europe of the eighteenth century, it bloomed in the European colonial territories during the post-Second World War era; perhaps unwitting transferred to the Third World through the aegis of European imperialism itself (Razi, 1990: 81-83). Within those territories, the primary goal of modern nationalism was to terminate foreign domination and install indigenous rulers to lead social and economic advancement. In the Middle East, the relationship between religion and nationalism was and remains curvilinear and complex: while Islam has been of a major contributing factor in the development of Arab, Iranian, Turkish, and Palestinian identity, religious differences in multi-confessional states like Lebanon have drastically hindered the emergence of truly nationalist identities (Binder 1966; Azar and Marlin 1987). Since many of the boundaries in the region were arbitrarily drawn by European interests, and

local rulers such as Nuri al-Said of Iraq, Shah Moḥammad Reẓā Pahlavī of Iran, and the various sheikhdoms of the Persian Gulf often viewed as little more than proxies for continued Western rule, nationalist strivings in the Middle East also reflect significant crises of dignity, self-worth, honor, and self-esteem (Razi, 1990: 81-83).

Theories of ethnic nationalism are often classified as either primordialism or constructivism, with compelling arguments to be made for both. Primordialist theory views ethnic identity as a compilation of unique features relating to culture, tradition, history, physical traits, language, and religion formed around extended family relationships, with unique, unchangeable features that are consistently distributed and provide a subjectively-held sense of personal identity within a larger community. Such identify formation may take centuries to coalesce, and results in long-term, enduring boundaries around specific groups within society that are resistant to political change and can be 'reawakened' after long periods of dormancy (Rabushka and Shepsle, 1972; Horowitz, 1985; Smith, 1986; Ignatieff, 1993; Moynihan, 1994; Huntington, 1996; Nasr, 2000: 171-172; Fearon and Laitin, 2003; Hale, 2004: 459-460).[38] In contrast, constructivist theory views modernization and strong state policies essentially forming

[38] Primordialism may be present when regional nationalism is linked to a common minority language, as is the case in Quebec, Wales, the French provinces of Brittany, Alsace, Corsica, and Occitania, Iranian Azerbaijan, and Moldovan Transdniestria; all of which have a minority language spoken by an element of the population (Laitin, 2001: 841-842; Orson, 2002: 64-65, 76, 79; LaPonce, 2004: 19; Safran, 2004: 2-3; Dragojevic, 2005: 61, 63-64; Sorens, 2005: 307, 309). Primordialism may also be found when secessionism is fueled by the concept (or mythology) of a deeply-shared history (Muir, 1917: 48-49; Coakley, 2004: 534, 546-548), and appears to reside within certain distinct areas; notably within the developing world where political parties in the pluralist societies of Asia, Africa, and the Caribbean tend to be organized along ethnic lines (Horowitz, 1985; Reynal-Querol, 2002: 31-32). Primordial religious issues may explain ethnic conflict and secessionism/irredentism in areas such as Northern Ireland, Sri Lanka, and Cyprus (Reynal-Querol, 2002: 31-32, 43-44; Fox, 2003: 104, 106; Orjuela, 2003: 195-196; Richmond, 2004: 193; Sorens, 2005: 308 footnote). Primordialism's detractors, which include such eminent scholars as Ajami, Walt, Barber, and Fox, often concentrate on Huntington's thesis of primordial civilizations in which civilizations, not states, are the primary actors in international relations (Barber, 1997: 67-70; Walt, 1997: 187; Fox, 2002: 422-434; Ajami, 2003: 3, 5-6, 7-9).

ethnic-based groups where no real group consciousness previously existed. Some constructivist scholars contend that such identities are never really permanent and may be altered under certain circumstances through 'identity-switching' (with individuals assuming differing identities in varying social situations), while others claim that 'identity-switching' is simply a matter of emphasizing different facets of one's personality in response to specific situational changes (Hale, 2004: 460-463, 480). Constructivist scholars also argue that two causal factors of economic competition and political opportunity often lead to ethnic mobilization along opportunistic lines when economic opportunities in a time of scarcity are granted on the basis of identity (Nasr, 2000: 171-172).[39]

The perception of alien rule can also arise in societies in which a country's social structure is characterized by the subordination of certain ethnic groups to others. In these situations, ethnic identity is often reinforced and ethnic solidarity intensified among both the ruling class and the subordinates (Blanton, Mason, and Athow, 2001: 475-476). Long-term resentment by the underclasses against the existing class structure may lead to ethno-communal protests and movements of political separatism, as evidenced by the secessionist strivings of India's Naga tribesmen, Indonesia's

[39] Constructivism may be present in such varied areas as Angola's Cabinda enclave, Congo/Brazzaville's Katanga province, Indonesian Aceh and West Papua, Papua New Guinea's Bougainville province, Moroccan Western Sahara, Nigerian Biafra, and Southern Sudan, since all those insurgencies have taken place in regions wishing to locally retain the revenue from abundant natural resources (Ross, 2004b: 343-344). Constructivism may also explain the impact of geographical non-contiguity upon successful secessionist movements in East Pakistan/Bangladesh and Iceland and secessionist strivings in Angola's oil-rich Cabinda province[39] and the Danish Faroe Islands, since geographical separation may lead a region to rely more upon its own resources rather than those of the central government (Ross, 2004b: 343; Sorens, 2005: 305, 319, 324). Scholars such as Brass, Gurr, and Hodsbawm also claim a constructivist, not a primordialist, explanation for secessionist issues relating to minority languages, arguing that economic competition is actually at the root of significant language-based conflict (Coakley, 2004: 544; Safran, 2004: 2-3; Sorens, 2005: 321-322).

Acehnese, Angola's Ovimbundu peoples, Myanmar's Karen tribesmen, the Basques of Spain and France, the Kurds of Southwest Asia, and the Saharan peoples represented by the POLISARIO Front in northwest Africa (Dominguez, 1986: 807-808). Azam argues that ethnicity-related conflicts are most prevalent in Africa, however, and are exacerbated as ethno-linguistic fractionalization decreases and countries are divided between only two or three major ethnic groups (Collier and Hoeffler, 1998; Azam, 2002: 133; Collier and Hoeffler, 2002).[40] Hechter's theory of 'internal colonialism' may be relevant here, as it determines secessionism to be the result of exploitive, central government–provincial periphery relationships that rely upon culturally-based divisions of labor to withhold choice positions in the economic, social, and political hierarchy for members of the core community, leaving provincials in a quasi-colonial status (Hechter, 1975: 20-22). The theory has clear limitations, however, and offers little explanatory value for highly-developed, economically-privileged territories such as the Basque regions of Spain which nonetheless maintain long-term secessionist movements (Zariski, 1989: 256-257; Sorens, 2005: 320).

An extreme version of minority subjugation to alien control took place during the National Socialist (Nazi) German military occupation of Poland and Byelorussia during

[40] Ethnic diversity does not necessary lead to instability, however. Fearon and Laitin argue that even though insurgents may mobilize in poor countries along ethnic lines, civil conflicts in the post-Second World War period have "structural roots" as a result of an international system "dominated by fragile states with limited administrative control of their peripheries" (Fearon and Laitin, 2003: 88). This is borne out in ethnically diverse Latin America, where few of the many insurgencies that have wracked the continent since 1945 have been linked to ethno-communal grievances. While this does not mean that racial and ethnic discrimination does not exist in those regions, it may indicate that adequate procedures for ethnic subordination and incorporation have been successfully implemented. As a result, Latin American insurgencies tend to threaten the political regime in power rather than the basic integrity of the state (Dominguez, 1986: 808-809). In addition, criminal activity may occasionally masquerade as ethnic conflict, with an alliance of 'dropouts' from differing social groups driving violence in 1990s Sierra Leone (Abd'ullah and Muana, 1998), and antagonisms among such groups as the 'Cobras, 'Ninjas,', and 'Scorpios' leading to widespread social unrest in Congo-Brazzaville (Azam, 2002: 135).

1939-1945 in which Jewish people resident in those countries were imprisoned and ultimately murdered during the course of the Holocaust. While many Jews believed that by entering ghettos and abiding by the racial policies of the Nazi occupiers they could survive the occupation, others soon began to understand that Germany's 'Final Solution' of its perceived 'Jewish problem' meant the ultimate destruction of European Jewry. This latter viewpoint motivated Aron, Asael, Tuvia, and Zisel Bielski, four brothers of a Byelorussian Jewish family, to organize an insurgent group known as the 'Bielski Otrijad' during early 1942 that loosely cooperated with other Soviet partisan groups against both the German occupiers and their Polish and Byelorussian collaborators. Led by Tuvia Bielski, the organization reached a peak of roughly 1,200 members, most of whom were women and children, with no more than 150 men serving as armed guerillas at any one time. Since Tuvia's personal agenda concentrated upon surviving the war and rescuing fellow Jews, armed actions against German troops and indigenous collaborators became strictly secondary, although the Bielski practice of killing entire families of Byelorussians and Poles known to be assisting German authorities in the identification and extermination of Jews would be difficult to defend had not the existential crisis of the Holocaust been ongoing. In addition, the Bielski Otrijad supported itself in the manner of most other insurgent groups through taking weapons, ammunition, and food, often by force, from the indigenous population. Even so, it would be difficult to fault the Bielski brothers from organizing the otrijad given that compliance with the governing authorities would have led to their own deaths; indeed, both of Tuvia's parents, two of his brothers, his ex-wife, and his (then) current wife went to their deaths at the hands of German authorities and their local collaborators during

the course of the bitter conflict (Tec, 1993: 27, 30-39, 48-49, 65, 73, 77-79, 92-93, 204-205).[41]

Western powers battling indigenous insurgent forces in the Third World have long appeared to misunderstand the dynamics of nationalism, and sought to delegitimize local insurgencies as the puppets of foreign powers or international philosophies. During the 1950s and 1960s, Máo Zédōng's theories of revolution were viewed as the controlling force behind many Third World insurgencies, with guerillas from Southeast Asia to North Africa derided as either "the duped and bamboozled" or criminals covering their activities with the fig leaf of social reform, rather than credible political contenders to existing governing elites (Shafer, 1988: 58-60, 64, 77). Soustelle, writing in 1950 about the conflict in French Indochina, argued that the battle was not between French forces and nationalist insurgents, but the result of Soviet efforts at to dominate Asia through the use of proxy guerilla organizations, adding that if the French were defeated in Indochina, Communist insurgents would soon take power in both Malaya and the Philippines (Soustelle, 1950: 65-66). French newspapers exposing allegations of official torture during the Algerian conflict were quickly dismissed as tools of Communist propaganda; other newspapers, in their reluctance to appear unpatriotic, unwittingly misled the public regarding the actual nature of Algerian nationalism as they simplistically portrayed FLN insurgents as mere outlaws (Harrison,

[41] I conducted personal research with Dr. Zane Bell, first cousin, once removed to Tuvia Bielski (when Bell's father emigrated from Byelorussia to the United States during 1923, immigration officials at Ellis Island changed his surname from Bielski to Bell), during the preparation of this dissertation. Bell stated that his uncle Yudl, who also served with the Bielski Otrijad, admitted that most of the Bielski guerillas had little or no military training and often either fired their weapons blindly or simply ran away from encounters with German troops. This seeming lack of military discipline may have tended to fortify Tuvia's emphasis on rescuing Jews from extermination rather than actively engaging German forces, and served to account for the organization's extremely low attrition rate of only five percent; far below the often-quoted 40% attrition rate for Soviet partisan groups at large (Tec, 1993: 204-205, 208-209).

1964: 283). In Vietnam of the 1960s, NLF guerillas were typically viewed by the United States government as simply representing a mindless proxy army for North Vietnam and the forces of international Communism Beijing (Thee, 1976: 119, 121),[42] and President Lyndon Johnson dismissed the reality of Vietnamese nationalism when he stated during April 1965 that "the deepening shadow of Communist China" was the real American adversary in Vietnam (Address at Johns Hopkins University, April 7, 1965, Undated: 730).[43] In a like manner, Iraqi nationalist outrage against United States-led military occupation is currently being explained as either Iranian meddling or efforts by international terrorists to re-establish the old Islamic Khalifate (Davis and Perry, 2007: 1-2; McCain, 2007: 20); self-serving explanations that seek to hide the fact that the Iraqi insurgency is driven by nationalist feeling dedicated to ridding the country of foreign occupiers (In Their Own Words: Reading the Iraqi Insurgency, 2006: 11-12). Failure to recognize the nature of such nationalism can rebound against occupation authorities long after the conflict has ended, as frustrated nationalists seek to cleanse local culture entirely of all foreign accretions, leaving intact only elements considered to be entirely indigenous (Schroder and Harvey, 1963; Terhune, 1965: 278, 285).[44]

[42] Fall, while acknowledging the American view that the Việt Cộng represented a "contrived political mechanism with no indigenous roots," wrote (perhaps, somewhat tongue-in-cheek) that, having already suffered an estimated 282,000 casualties by 1966, the NLF insurgents "fight rather well for what must be a vast mass of remote-controlled and force-drafted recruits" (Fall, 1966: 14).

[43] This line of thinking unwittingly led the Chinese government to become even more supportive of the NLF resistance (Thee, 1976: 124-125). Ironically enough, nationalist agendas on the part of both Vietnam and China led to military clashes between the two Communist powers during the late 1970s and early 1980s; shattering the argument that Vietnam was simply a proxy for the expansion of Chinese Communism (Gordon, 1986: 66-67).

[44] During the Irish Civil War, some Irish nationalists called for setting the clocks back 25 minutes to avoid being on 'English Time' (Canby, 1919: 36), and the 1922 Constitution of the Irish Free State specified Gaeilge as the national language, despite the fact that only about 10% of the Irish population spoke Gaeilge easily while well over 99% were well-versed in English (Gwynn, 1924: 195).

E. The Impact of Great Power/United Nations/Political Bloc Intervention

Foreign colonial control of large areas of Asia and Africa, accepted internationally as legitimate during the early part of the 20th century, came under assault in the post-1945 world as revised concepts of international law were being espoused by the newly-formed United Nations.[45] When the United Nations Charter entered into force on October 24, 1945, it did so with a written call for self-determination in Articles 1, 55, 73, and 76 (United Nations Charter, 1945); a call which resounded throughout the developing world.[46] These concepts were heightened dramatically with the passage of United Nations General Assembly Resolution #1514, adopted on December 14, 1960, that proclaimed "the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations," and declaring colonialism to constitute both "a denial of fundamental human rights" and an "impediment to the promotion of world peace and co-operation." The resolution also called for the cessation of "all armed action or repressive measures . . . directed against dependent peoples" and for the "transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories . . . without any conditions or reservations . . . in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom" (United Nations General Assembly Resolution #1514, 1960). Through the strength of this resolution, the international community condemned the retention of

---

[45] Verdross, an authority on international law, subsequently characterized the United Nations Charter as assuming "the character of basic law for the whole international community" (Verdross, 1954: 347-348).

[46] Article 73 specifically referred to colonial possessions as "territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government" and reminded the administering powers that "the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount," while Article 76 referred to the administration of former Japanese and Italian colonies under international trusteeship as being designed for "their progressive development towards self-government or independence" (United Nations Charter, 1945).

colonial territories under international law, and related foreign counterinsurgency operations to the realm of human rights violations.

In addition, the pre-war multi-polar balance of power centered in Europe that accepted the legitimacy of colonial empires had been replaced by a nuclear-armed, bi-polar arrangement that offered the possibility of real-time, system-wide deadly responses to provocations, with the United States and the Soviet Union competing for dominance throughout not only Europe but within the developing world itself (Saperstein, 1991: 195; Westad, 1992: 455-462). This competition began before the Second World War had even ended, with concerns about Soviet Communist encroachment leading American officials to question the viability and basic legitimacy of European colonial control over vast regions of Asia and Africa in the post-war world. As early as March 1945, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt was stating his opposition to the return of French colonial rule to Indochina and calling for an international trusteeship to replace the French presence following the war's conclusion. While this position was temporarily shelved in the wake of a hurriedly-arranged meeting between the president and Forces Françaises de l'Intérieur resistance leader Charles de Gaulle, it took Harry Truman's ascension to the presidency following President Roosevelt's death in April 1945 to finally remove the spectre of American opposition to continuing French authority in Indochina (Tonnesson, 1985: 11).[47] At the same time, American

[47] While President Truman was more supportive of French interests in Indochina than had been his predecessor, concerns that a ruinous war in the territory might turn the population of metropolitan France toward Communism led his administration to threaten to take the matter to the United Nations unless French officials began offering more generous terms to Hồ Chí Minh. This threat was never carried out due to fears of further destabilizing the French position in Southeast Asia, and French counterinsurgency measures continued unhindered by United Nations' oversight (Tonnesson, 1985: 17-18).

suggestions to British Prime Minister Sir Winston Churchill that the British Crown Colony of Hong Kong be transferred to Chinese sovereignty in order to bolster the nationalist credentials of the Kuomintang Party government led Sir Winston to angrily reply, "Hong Kong will be eliminated from the British Empire over my dead body" (Hurley, 1945).

During the post-war period, both the Soviet Union and the United States supported a United Nations Security Council seizure of the Dutch counterinsurgency campaigns in the Netherlands East Indies which, by 1949, had eviscerated the Dutch political position there (United Nations Security Council Resolutions, 1947-1949).[48] Both super-powers also competed to woo the Jewish people through timely recognition of the State of Israel: four days after the United States granted de-facto recognition of the Jewish state at 6:11 PM on May 14, 1948 (eleven minutes after Israel's midnight declaration, Israel-time) (Ross, 1948: 1), the Soviet Union trumped the American initiative with de-jure recognition on May 18, 1948 (Sovetsko-Izrail'skie Otnosheniia: Sbornik Dokumentov, 1948 Mai 1949, 2000: 304). During October 1956, both super-powers implicitly cooperated to bring unrelenting political and economic pressure against the British and French governments to force them to abandon military operations against Egypt; operations widely viewed as colonial-style politics (Aldrich, 1967: 547, 552). Both super-powers subsequently sought to establish their own

[48] Following continuing counterinsurgency operations conducted during January 1949 by a desperate Dutch government in the face of Security Council objections, the United States government cancelled all financial aid designed to assist Dutch efforts in the Netherlands East Indies. Pressure also mounted in Congress for the further cancellation of all Marshall Plan aid to the Netherlands, itself; aid that had thus far transferred $1,000,000,000 into the ravaged, post-war Netherlands economy. Given that the Netherlands government had already spent nearly $500,000,000 on its military campaigns in the East Indies, such a devastating financial scenario served to make a continuation of its 'police actions' there both politically and financially untenable (Collins, 1950: 173-176; Friend, 2003: 37-38).

presence in the developing world following the withdrawal of the former colonial powers (Miller, 1970; Kramer, Helmut and Bauer, Helfried, 1972), and both superpowers – along with the United Nations – selectively supported both nationalist insurgencies as well as state actors fighting those insurgencies. British Prime Minister Harold MacMillan's historic 'Winds of Change' speech delivered in Cape Town, South Africa during February 1960 made it clear that even the United Kingdom itself, which, prior to 1947, had controlled a quarter of the world through various flexible forms of metropolitan control, was no longer able to support continuing colonial control of the developing world and could not longer be counted upon as a political ally by the remaining colonial powers (Myers, 2000: 556, 563-564).[49]

This bi-polar political and military competition legitimated the existence and heightened the resolve of post-Second World War nationalism (Westad, 1992); a resolve which continues today to make insurgencies built upon nationalism virtually impossible to defeat. Westad, in analyzing insurgencies during the period of 1945-1992, writes that the post-war bi-polar international system directly impacted the chances for insurgent success; in many cases, enhancing the potential for the onset of insurgency by making it impossible for established regimes to mobilize international support (Westad, 1992: 455-462). Hourani agrees, noting that France and the United Kingdom, weakened by six years of global conflict, soon realized that the perceived

[49] "In the 20th century, and especially since the end of the war, the processes that gave birth to the nation states have been repeated all over the world . . Fifteen years ago this movement spread through Asia . . Today the same thing is happening in Africa, and the most striking of all the impressions I have formed since I left London a month ago is the strength of this African national consciousness. In different places it takes different forms, but it is happening everywhere. The wind of change is blowing through this continent, and whether we like it or not, this growth of national consciousness is a political fact. We must all accept is as a fact, and our national policies must take account of it" (Myers, 2000: 564-565).

interests of the Soviet Union and the United States to be taken into account everywhere, with European reliance upon American financial aid giving the United States a unique ability to wield great pressure upon European policies. Hourani adds that nationalist expectations in the developing world were heightened by American strategic interest in colonial territories, and determined that co-optation of that interest might grant to them important external sympathies for their anti-colonial campaigns (Hourani, 1991: 354-355, 364, 368).

F. Summary

Nearly 64 years after the Second World War came to an end, it still remains unclear whether Western militaries understand what they are up against when attempting to reduce indigenous insurgencies in foreign countries. It has been demonstrated in campaigns conducted across the developing world that the heavy deployment of military hard power that has previously decimated conventional opponents will not always bring about decisive victories against shadowy, locally-supported guerillas who are united in the determination that the outsider must go (Maxwell, 1976: 250-260; Mandelbaum, 1991/1992: 165-167-169, 173-174; Claessen, 2007: 98-102). The outcomes of nearly all such insurgencies are essentially Pyrrhic in any case, since the civilian population inevitably pays the greatest price in blood and treasure (Cairns, 1997: 17; The Global Menace of Local Strife, 2003: 23); a price that is again paid by indigenous collaborators once foreign powers withdraw their forces (Mack, 1975: 182-183; Burrin, 1996: 453; Jackson, 2001: 578; Elster, 2006: 326, 333).

Ethnic nationalism appears to provide a powerful motivation for indigenous peoples to expel elements of foreign control from their midst, be they Acehnese, Algerian, Corsican, Irish, Iraqi, Palestinian, or Vietnamese. While constructivist nationalism may offer opportunities for co-optation by foreign powers (480; Nasr, 2000: 171-172; Hale, 2004: 460-463), primordial nationalists often seem to be unshakable in their determination for indigenous rule at virtually any cost (Rabushka and Shepsle, 1972; Horowitz, 1985; Smith, 1986; Ignatieff, 1993; Moynihan, 1994; Huntington, 1996; Nasr, 2000: 171-172; Fearon and Laitin, 2003; Hale, 2004: 459-460). As conflicts extend into years and even decades, domestic exhaustion within occupying powers and impatience throughout the international community can often force foreign occupation authorities to relinquish any realistic thoughts of victory and seek to effect little more than face-saving withdrawals from bitter, unwinnable campaigns.

In the next chapter, we will discuss theories of insurgency that seek to define the vague, flexible nature of insurgent activity and its conflict-winning energy and motivation. We will also discuss the two primary strategies of counterinsurgency, and the impact they have had against these devolved guerilla movements over the past six decades. The record of counterinsurgency campaigns in the post-Second World War period will come under evaluation as it is compared with the outcomes of pre-1945 campaigns. Finally, we will offer some hypotheses regarding the key factors of counterinsurgent failure and the actual, uncertain nature of victory for a foreign power.

CHAPTER II: INSURGENCY THEORY AND COUNTERINSURGENT STRATEGY

A. Introduction

Over the past one hundred years, a number of political scholars have developed basic theories of insurgency, including Colonel Thomas E. Lawrence, Major General Orde Wingate, William E. D. Allen, Máo Zédōng, Hồ Chí Minh, Võ Nguyên Giáp, and Josip Broz Tito. Lawrence's tactics were based upon the concepts of operating within essentially passively-supportive populations and maintaining cohesion within insurgent groups; he also identified an insurgency's lack of regimented substance as its strongest asset, since it could not be easily defined and destroyed (Lawrence, 1935: 153-154; Garnett, ed., 1951: 99; Johnson, 1962a: 649; Desai and Eckstein, 1990: 443, 461). Wingate followed Lawrence's thoughts on passive support, stressing that a population well-penetrated by guerillas would deny occupation forces the ability to isolate the insurgency (Sykes, 1959: 324). Máo emphasized a more active form of support, writing that only close cooperation between insurgents and the population would succeed in wearing down occupation forces during extended campaigns (Johnson, 1962a: 655; Suyin, 1972: 394-395; Mack, 1975: 177). Hồ further developed Máo's ideas, determining the active support of the peasantry to be particularly vital in dislodging foreign occupiers (Duiker, 2000: 132, 137, 181), while Giáp included within this evolving theoretical framework the necessity of creating a 'psychological base' (whether nationalism or Communism) that could bond the indigenous peoples together with the goals of the insurgency (MacDonald, 1993: 82-83, 99-100). In contrast, Allen found favorable geography to be the most important element in constructing a viable insurgency (Allen, 1943: 19), while Tito dismissed geography and downplayed bonding

with the population in favor of studious political work and the steadfast nature of the fighting leadership (Dedijer, 1951: 341-342).

A number of powerful industrialized states sought to crush such insurgencies during the post-1945 period, and it was widely understood that no insurgency could be truly defeated without separating the guerillas from their popular recruiting/support pool. To accomplish that goal, two major counterinsurgency strategies were developed and placed into practice: the social welfare approach which attempts to draw the affected population away from the insurgency by providing it with heightened social programs, and the cost-benefit approach which uses broad measures of coercion to frighten affected elements of the population from serving as an insurgent recruitment/support pool (Leites and Wolf, 1966: 19, 155-156, 158, 228; Shultz, 1978a: 109-110; Shafer, 1988: 73). During the course of my review, I found both strategies to be essentially ineffective when the occupying powers involved were confronted with robust international hostility.

I argue that heightened levels of United Nations and great power condemnation of foreign counterinsurgency campaigns conducted during the period following the Second World War period led to the subsequent collapse of those campaigns. I further contend that neither the social welfare nor the cost-benefit approach to counterinsurgency has been significant in the outcomes of those campaigns. To test these arguments, I have developed three hypotheses that investigate four separate case studies representing various levels of United Nations/great power opposition along with both counterinsurgency strategies.

B. Theories of Asymmetrical Warfare

Insurgencies are often linked with political revolution, although the two concepts may be quite distinct. While banditry, labor strife, lynchings, and political rioting for racial/anti-foreign issues have not been historically uncommon in the United States, they were more representative of a people somewhat prone to violence than examples of true revolutionary activity. Zagorin notes that revolutionary movements are more commonly discussed within theories of modernization (Zagorin, 1973: 46),[50] and Huntington defines a revolution as a "rapid, fundamental and violent domestic change in the dominant values and myths of society, in its political institutions, social structure, leadership, government, activity, and policies" (Huntington, 1968: 264). Johnson's typology of revolutions bases revolutionary events upon four basic criteria: revolutionary targets (government, regime, society), identity of revolutionaries (elites, masses, or both), ultimate goals (reformist, nation-building, eschatological, etc.), and nature of activity (spontaneous or calculated). From those criteria, he defines revolutionary activities as being (1) jacquerie; spontaneous peasant outbreaks that appeal to traditional authorities for redress of grievances, (2) millenarian; a search for a totally new order to be effected by supernatural forces, (3) anarchistic; a reaction against change or modernization, seeking to reinstitute an idealized former order, (4) Jacobin-Communist (which is also the rarest), (5) conspiratorial coups d'état; an attempt by a small elite to introduce social change by violence, and (6) militarized mass

[50] During the early 1960s, General Maxwell Taylor warned that "symptoms of subversive insurgency . . . are found in virtually every developing country in the world" (Kecskemeti, 1967: 13). An International Police Academy training manual issued by the Agency for International Development during 1966 claimed that "the seeds of potential unrest are sown whenever an undeveloped society comes into contact with a more highly developed country," further noting that "the strategy of subversive aggression is based on transforming passive unrest into active insurgency" (The Police and Internal Security, 1966: I-4, L-1).

insurrection; a 20th century creation further defined as a people's war or guerrilla insurgency led by a dedicated elite inspired by nationalistic or social ideologies (Johnson, 1964). While this typology is fairly extensive, it does not cover all types of revolutions but simply provides a format for the basic nature of a given revolutionary event (Zagorin, 1973: 51).

Karl Philipp Gottlieb von Clausewitz, the master conflict theoretician of the 19th century, wrote that a successful insurgency required five distinct characteristics: (1) the war must be carried out in the country's interior, (2) the war cannot hinge on any one single battle, (3) the threat of war must be extended over a considerable area, (4) the countryside must be irregular and essentially inaccessible, and (5) the insurgency must have popular support. Key among those elements was the necessity of support, or at least acceptance, of the insurgency from the population at large (Clausewitz, 1984 [1832]: Chapter 26). Insurgency theorists such as Lawrence, Wingate, Allen, Tito, Máo, Hồ, and Giáp continued to build upon these strategies during the first half of the 20th century, with devastating effects for occupation forces. The writings and recorded thoughts of theorists such as these can offer insight into successful insurgent strategies.

Lawrence, the British liaison officer (and noted Arabist) who successfully led Arab guerillas to defeat Turkish occupation forces in Arabia during the First World War, wrote that a viable rebellion could be conducted with two percent of the population active and ninety-eight percent passively sympathetic (Desai and Eckstein, 1990: 443, 461).[51] Lawrence viewed his Arab guerilla force's lack of definable substance as being

[51] Scholars such as Cross and Laqueur agree that the general population need only be passive in order to provide sufficient viability for insurgency (Cross, 1964: 35; Laqueur, 1998: 401).

its greatest virtue; while "armies were like plants," he wrote, "we might be a vapour, blowing where we listed" (Garnett, ed., 1951: 99). He also understood the importance of cohesion and unity within insurgent groups, but was forced by the fragmented nature of the tribal peoples of the Arabian Peninsula to build his Arab irregular force around Faisal bin Al Hussein Bin Ali El-Hashemi, the third son of Sayyid Hussein bin Ali, Sharif of Mecca; a limited but effective platform on which to construct an Arab nationalism defined primarily by its centuries-old hated of Turkish occupation (Johnson, 1962a: 649).[52]

Wingate, the British officer credited with initiating tactics for the Jewish Haganah in its 'Gideon Force' operations in the British Mandate of Palestine during the 1930s (tactics that continue to be followed and evaluated by Tzva HaHagana LeYisra'el[53] to this day), subsequently led Ethiopian irregular forces to defeat Italian authority in Ethiopia during 1941. Wingate closely followed Lawrence's emphasis upon popular support, placing it above all else when conducting guerilla activities against regular armed forces. In his personal evaluation of Gideon Force, Wingate wrote that "given

[52] Any realistic structure of extra-tribal loyalty and identity remained elusive and, on one occasion, a member of the Howaytat murdered a member of another tribe. An 'eye for an eye' was called for, but if a member of the offended tribe carried out the punishment, any semblance of unity would be lost. To mitigate the crisis, Lawrence himself shot the man, and insurgent unity, such as it was, lived on for another day (Lawrence, 1935: 153-154). Lawrence was far more than simply a local guerilla leader, however, and a reading of his letters confirms the value of British recognition of the Arab Rebellion in general and British military support to its endeavors in specific. In a letter written to General Sir Gilbert Clayton, head of British Intelligence in Egypt, on October 24, 1917, Lawrence requests machine guns from the Indian Army and reminds Sir Gilbert that he is expecting a shipment of armored cars to be delivered on the HMS *Hardinge*; he also speaks of coordinating the activities of his Arab irregulars with British forces in the region (Brown, 1988: 118, 127, 131-132). Given that at the onset of the First World War, the Ottoman Turks had held much of Arabia for nearly 400 years and had recently strengthened their hold on the area with the construction of the Hejaz Railway, it is questionable how effective the fragmented Arab insurgency would have been had not the British government determined to support it (Kinross, 1977: 229-230, 566-567)

[53] The Hebrew translation of *Israel Defense Forces*.

the population favourable to penetration, a thousand resolute and well-armed men can paralyze . . . the operations of a hundred thousand" (Sykes, 1959: 324).

Máo, the classic Asian insurgency theorist who led Chinese Communist guerillas against both Nationalist Chinese government forces and Japanese occupation troops during 1927 – 1949, based his guerilla strategy on a somewhat egalitarian perception of unity between the Chinese people and the insurgency. Phrases such as "trust in the masses; rely on the masses," and "the masses are the real heroes" that so punctuated his writings are indicative of this concept (Oksenberg, 1977: 84). Of his 'seven steps' for guerilla warfare,' arousing and organizing the people and achieving internal unification were among the most prominent (MacDonald, 1993: 81). Indeed, a reading of Máo's 1927 Report on an Investigation of the Peasant Movement in Hunan might lead one to conclude that political power might be attainable simply through widespread peasant uprisings. Not surprisingly, the 'Chinese Way' - positing a leading role for the peasantry through the creation of rural military bases supported by the population - has, since 1949, served as the exemplar adapted by many insurgency movements as the basis for resistance (Oksenberg, 1977: 119, 139).[54]

Hồ, the ardent Vietnamese revolutionary who inspired guerilla operations against the foreign occupations of Japan, France, and the United States (and eventually served as the first President of the Democratic Republic of Việt Nam), clearly understood the

[54] Máo's classic insurgency theory utilizes an analogy of a native population forming a 'sea' in which both insurgent 'fish' and occupation force 'fishermen' operate; while the insurgent 'fish' survive and prosper as long as they remain in the 'deep water' of strong popular support, the occupation forces (in the role of fishermen or divers) are forced to utilize artificial measures to survive in the basically unfriendly 'sea' (Mack, 1975: 177). Appropriately, Japanese forces operating in North China during the 1930s termed some of their counterinsurgency operations conducted against Máo's guerillas 'draining the water' (Johnson, 1962a: 656), and a commonly-used concept in successive insurgencies in Southeast Asia, North Africa, and the Middle East has been the need to 'drain the swamps' in order to terminate the insurgent base.

need for unified popular support. In The Revolutionary Path, a pamphlet published during the 1920s that provided an introduction to Marxism-Leninism and its relevance to the Vietnamese people, Hồ noted that the support of the peasantry would be a crucial prerequisite for victory over French authorities. A few years later, in an article entitled The Party's Military Work Among the Peasants, Hồ wrote that successful proletariat revolution would not be possible in rural and semi-rural countries without the active (as opposed to passively sympathetic) support of the peasantry. This field of thought was unique at the time, since rival Vietnamese nationalist leaders and philosophers had shown little interest in the role of the uneducated rural masses (Duiker, 2000: 132, 137, 181). In the end, Hồ's vision of a united uprising by the rural masses predominated to decimate French control in Indochina and, subsequently, that of the United States.[55]

Giáp, the brilliant Vietnamese military strategist (and close friend of Hồ) who eventually served as the commander of the People's Army of Việt Nam, closely followed Máo's theories of revolutionary warfare while incorporating several concepts of his own. Among those additional concepts was the necessity of creating a 'psychological base for the people,' whether nationalism or Communism, to bond the indigenous population together with the ultimate goals of the insurgent leadership (MacDonald, 1993: 82-83, 99-100). He succeeded to the point that Jacques Phillipe Leclerc, initial Commander of French Union Forces in Indochina, would say, "This is not a fight against an army, it is a fight against a whole nation" (MacDonald, 1993: 67).[56]

[55] Guevara, writing during the 1960s, also stressed the necessity for gaining active popular support, not just passive acquiescence on the Lawrence model, to insure insurgent survivability (Guevara, 1969: 50).

[56] Writer Bernard Fall agreed, writing that, while the French were viewed as alien, the Communist-led Việt Minh could depend up "the instinctive support of the native population" (Johnson, 1962a: 652).

Not everyone agreed with the basic foundation concepts developed by von Clausewitz and Lawrence. Allen, a British Foreign Service Office conducting a wartime evaluation of Gideon Force, found Wingate's use of Lawrence's concepts to be outdated, and determined a rugged geography which impeded the movements of conventional forces and provided ready cover and concealment for guerillas to be the chief prerequisite for successful insurgent operations. Under those concepts, he found the Arabian Desert to be particularly unsuited to guerilla operations, and Lawrence's successful campaigns there to have been achievable only in the absence of modern reconnaissance and attack aircraft (Allen, 1943: 19).[57] Tito, who led the Yugoslav partisan movement[58] against German occupation during the Second World War (and subsequently served as the first Prime Minister of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia), tended to downplay the necessity of seeking popular support (although he understood the necessity of understanding the attitudes of the popular masses) and primarily credited his successful campaigns to studious political work and the steadfast

---

[57] Allen's theories regarding air reconnaissance appeared to have little validity in the subsequent colonial conflict in French Indochina, with the Việt Minh's extensive use of ground camouflage frustrating French aerial reconnaissance efforts (Fall, 1961: 60). Tito also took issue with Allen, finding geography to be of relative unimportance in conducting guerilla operations (Dedijer, 1951: 341-342). Niccolò Machiavelli placed strong importance upon geography, however, writing that soldiers must "become familiar with the terrain: how mountains rise, how the valleys open out and plains spread out, as well as with the characteristics of rivers and swamps" (Machiavelli, 1517/1988: 52-53). Gates and Buhaug display a similar understanding of terrain issues, writing that some of the greatest blunders made by military commanders over the past 200 years (General Baron Levon Bennigsen at Friedland in 1807, Major General George McClellan at Antietem in 1862, General Ludwig Benedek at Könnigratz in 1866, and Lieutenant General Mark Clark at Rapido in 1944) were the result of ignoring the implications of geography (Buhaug and Gates, 2002: 418). While Machiavelli was speaking in terms of conventional warfare instead of counterinsurgency campaigns (as were Buhaug and Gates), geographical location in relation to exploitable natural resources is clearly a major factor in insurgency viability, and difficult terrain can slow down the progress of virtually any army (Brown, 1977; Bennett, 1991; Collier, 2000; Fairhead, 2000; Keen, 1998; Le Billon, 1997, 2001b: 564-565; Renner, 1996; Suliman, 1998; Homer-Dixon, 1999).

[58] Not to be confused with the Serb-dominated Chetnik movement, led by Dragoljub Mihailović.

nature of the fighting leadership, believing that if these factors were correctly carried out, the population would fight to the last man (Dedijer, 1951: 341-342).

Insurgent groups faced with a limited base of support from within the population may find it necessary to scale back operations to prevent themselves from being overwhelmed by robust government counterinsurgency measures. The fragility of the support base for such guerilla groups as the Cellules Communistes Combattantes (CCC) in Belgium, Action Directe (AD) in France, Rote Armee Fraktion (RAF) in Germany, and Brigate Rosse (BR) in Italy restricted their efforts to implement viable insurgencies during the 1970s and 1980s. Robust counterinsurgency efforts conducted by the affected governments thus had popular support to hobble these organizations, and all four terror groups had been either eliminated or disbanded by the early 1990s. Conversely, populations who have been antagonized by ongoing government counterinsurgency measures and neglect of their own perceived interests may provide a fertile ground for insurgent groups to capitalize upon, enabling organizations such as Hizb'ullah in Southern Lebanon and Harakat al-Muqāwama al-Islāmiyya (HAMAS) in Gaza and Judea/Samaria to gain a groundswell of popular support by providing vital social services and resisting oppressive government policies. In such situations, more intrusive government counterinsurgency operations often unwittingly serve to increase popular support for insurgents (Siqueira and Sandler, 2006: 879-880).

C. Strategies of Counterinsurgency

Counterinsurgency measures conducted against insurgencies such as these by foreign forces enjoyed wide success prior to the advent of the Second World War. An examination of the COW Extra-State Dataset for conflicts taking place during 1816-1945

demonstrates that foreign intervening powers were successful in overcoming insurgent challenges in 78 out of 91 conflicts, for a success rate of 85.71% (Sarkees, 2000: 123-144).[59] As a result, the major powers of the 1930s had every reason to believe that military efforts to maintain their sway within the developing world would continue to find success in the post-1945 period as well, and typically relied upon one of two somewhat contradictory schools of thought – social welfare or cost-benefit – to accomplish that goal (Shultz, 1978a: 109-110).

Social Welfare Approach

During the post-Second World War period, a great deal of enthusiasm came about among American international relations scholars regarding the means by which Western realist wisdom could be utilized to benefit the emerging post-colonial Third World. The result was modernization theory, the child of the Behavioralist Revolution and the 'first wave' of the rational-scientific (positivist) quest of international relations concepts which sought to apply the experiences of Western industrialized society to developing countries beset with issues involving poverty, unemployment, and ideological struggle. Modernization theory was driven by the twin concepts of Western capitalist order and individualist choice, although it was more readily identified by its condescending ethnocentrism and patronizing exasperation with native customs and religious observances.[60] Essentially a celebration of Western modernity and rationality, the theory's concepts were apparently thought to be fully transportable to the diverse

[59] That success rate included British victories in 19 of 20 conflicts, Dutch victories in two out of three conflicts, and France winning all 15 of her military interventions (Sarkees, 2000: 123-144).

[60] Indeed, it was thought that ethnic loyalties and 'primordial sentiments' would eventually just fade away, replaced by a more rational identity formation based upon loyalty to the state (Berger, 2003: 431-432).

societies of the Third World regardless of existing historical, cultural, or religious differences, and able to fully resolve chronic problems that had beset those peoples for centuries (George, 1994: 94-100). Such rejuvenated societies would then form a bulwark to contain the spread of Communism within post-Second World War Africa and Asia, operating on a more scientifically-grounded level than was found in the populist hysteria of the McCarthy era. Enthusiasm for the potential of modernization theory was heightened with the 1954 establishment of the Social Science Research Council's Committee on Comparative Politics, which, through the efforts of such notable founding members as Gabriel Almond, Taylor Cole, George Kahin, Roy Macridis, Guy Pauker, and Lucian Pye, provided a platform for promoting theoretical applications. Importantly for the period, Pye, Pauker, and Kahin had conducted most of their research on Southeast Asia, and, as time progressed, many academics under their mentorship went on to take up full-time positions with various government agencies where the imperatives of Cold War politics began to influence their work (Berger, 2003: 427, 429).

A major thrust of modernization theory was that the progress of developing societies could be dramatically accelerated by replacing the grinding fatalism of Third World societies with the rationality of Western values of discipline, respect for achieved status, social mobility, and human empathy (Latham, 2006: 32-33). In this light, the legacy of colonialism was seen in a more positive light, since "the more backward of the races at least had the ability to imitate" (Mazrui, 1968: 76). Within the United States, modernization theory was closely associated with the Presidential administration of John F. Kennedy and the optimism of the early 1960s (Shultz, 1978a: 110). Social welfare strategies, a natural offspring of modernization theory, suggested that

insurgencies flourished in countries governed through poor leadership and under-administration, and proposed counterinsurgency policies that centered upon developing strong, responsive, law-abiding, corruption-free governments that addressed broadly-based issues of distribution, racial, and community problems (Shafer, 1988: 62-63). This approach assumed that pure preference was the rationale behind popular support for insurgent movements, and determined that such a preference could be redirected through a properly robust exercise of government authority and control (Shultz, 1978a: 110).[61] As such, it conformed well with modernization theory's concepts of 'constructive counterinsurgency' that involved school and hospital construction, the extension of road and communications networks, and such counterinsurgency tactics as security rewards programs, border sealing, and population resettlement; the latter being an extremely controversial measure (Campbell, 1968: 140-141, 153-154, 156, 160-161; Berger, 2003: 426; Sepp, 2005: 10-11; Celeski, 2006: 55; Clark, 2006: 8). The commonality shared among these programs involved a concerted attempt to protect the population from intimidation by the insurgents while offering incentives to encourage popular support of the indigenous government established by the foreign power.

Policies reflecting the social welfare approach led the United Kingdom to victory during its Malayan campaign of 1948-1960, and many military scholars now consider the British to be the final authority regarding this strategy and its bid to win the 'hearts

[61] Social welfare strategies may possess spurious concepts, viewing, as they do, more intrusive government as better government. First, the centralization envisioned through this approach may be resented by village elites who have long maintained wide autonomy over their regional fiefdoms. Second, traditional village mores may be shattered by a more invasive government employing policies of cultural homogenization designed to construct a singular national identity. Insurgent groups promising support for the status quo may thus find endorsement in both cases, especially when government authority is difficult to project (Shafer, 1988: 64-66, 69-70).[61] The actual willingness and ability of governments to truly engage the population in this manner is also questionable, since the reforms required to undercut the insurgency may require ruling elites to relinquish their own hold on power (Shafer, 1988: 64-66, 69-70).

and minds' of an occupied people (Pye, 1956: 102-103). Given the success of social welfare polices in Malaya, the same strategy subsequently typified the initial American campaign in South Vietnam during the Kennedy Administration and throughout the remainder of President Lyndon Johnson's first term in 1964 (Shultz, 1978A: 110). On the face of it, the social welfare strategy should have been a good choice for those campaigns since both British and American occupiers appeared to be confronting Máoist-style guerillas claiming to represent oppressed populations, and popularly-supported indigenous governments such as the one which took power in Malaya during 1957 possess limited vulnerabilities for exploitation by Máoist ideologues (MacGillivray, 1958: 161; Biddle, 2006: 5-8). American efforts to construct a similar regime in South Vietnam faltered, however, as political unrest following the assassination of South Vietnamese President Ngô Đình Diệm made it difficult to establish a viable replacement government there that was not viewed by the nationalist Vietnamese as a neo-colonial puppet (Hoopes, 1970: 606; Shultz, 1978a: 110).

Cost-Benefit Approach

During the French campaign in Algeria (1954-1962), French General André Beaufre sought to prove that the achievement of psychological and moral disintegration of one's adversary would lead to victory, since all warfare represented a clash of two opposing wills (Beaufre, 1965: 22-24). Formulating tactics based upon these concepts, he successfully defeated FLN guerillas in the Constantine East area by combining ruthless military activities with intensive psychological warfare (Horne, 1979: 166). Charles Wolf of the RAND Corporation was intrigued by these concepts and, in the wake of Diệm's assassination, followed up on Beaufre's ideas by introducing elements

of economics and game theory (subsequently known as 'rational choice theory') into the social welfare theoretical base to allow more flexibility in confronting insurgencies (Berger, 2003: 426). These concepts, shifting from earlier notions of 'constructive counterinsurgency' to ideas of 'coercive counterinsurgency,' were subsequently developed by Wolf, in concert with his colleague, Nathan Leites, into the suppressive, or cost-benefit, approach that focused entirely upon the demand side of the issue: the receptivity of the environment for insurgency. In so doing, the two men argued that social welfare counterinsurgents were ignoring the value of firm applications of military force and coercion in counterinsurgency operations, and described confrontations between governments and insurgencies as being little more than contests in the effective management of coercion; contests that governments, possessing more robust capacities in resource management and population control, would be likely to win (Leites and Wolf, 1966: 19, 155-156, 158, 228; Shafer, 1988: 71, 73).[62]

This approach operates on several assumptions: (1) that coercion and force can be used to control and/or modify collective social behavior, (2) that the population, individually and collectively, behaves as rational actors, calculating costs and benefits, (3) that insurgents rely upon coercion and force to effect societal compliance, and (4)

[62] Scholars hold differing positions regarding the impact of official coercion against opposition movements. Buss argues that high levels of coercion can indeed inhibit aggression in individuals, and that the robust usage of coercion may successfully crush anti-regime activities in their infancy (Buss, 1961: 57-59). Muller and Seligson further contend that the initial spike in popular violence in response to the onset of government coercion is unlikely to become regime-threatening, and that long-term rebellion will be more difficult to organize (Muller and Seligson, 1987: 444-445). Although Blanton, Mason, and Athow tend to agree with that assessment, they add that coercive strategies may lead to more militant opposition in the future (Blanton, Mason, and Athow, 2001: 485), and Galtung suggests that coercive sanctions often increase rather than decrease group resistance (Galtung, 1967: 378-416). Gurr notes that "force threatens and angers men, especially if they believe it to be illicit" and that "angered, they want to retaliate" (Gurr, 1970: 232), and Ekstein writes that, for societies with a potential for political violence, official coercion may intensify the very instability it seeks to dissuade (Ekstein, 1970).

that counterinsurgency strategy will be successful only if government coercion is more painful than that applied by the insurgency (Shultz, 1978a: 110, 122).[63] Proponents of this approach (e.g., Pauker 1959; Huntington 1968) tend to define insurgencies in terms of inputs and outputs, with insurgent inputs of recruits, supplies, and intelligence information converted into the outputs of population conversion and attacks against both occupation forces and collaborators. To counter this cycle, the government must (a) raise the costs to the insurgency of obtaining those inputs and/or reduce the inputs gained for a specific cost, with the ultimate goal being input denial, (b) reduce the efficiency of the insurgency's production process by which it converts inputs to outputs, (c) reduce the effect of those outputs on both the population and the government, and/or increase the ability of both entities to absorb those outputs (Shultz, 1978a: 110-111).[64] Not surprisingly, counterinsurgency tactics related to the cost-benefit approach include 'Search and Destroy,' population resettlement, attacks on insurgent sanctuaries

[63] Cost-benefit strategies may suffer from basic analytical flaws. Scott finds an integral subjective bias through the assumption of Western-style rationality and goal-seeking on the part of affected populations (Scott, 1958: 9-10, 13), and Shultz argues inherent ethnocentrist elements fail to take into account emotional factors unique to non-Western societies (Shultz, 1978a: 114-115). Shafer questions the assumption of insurgents being foreign-inspired and dependent upon coercion for popular support, since that appears to be contrary to the writings of such insurgency theorists as Máo, Giáp, Che Guevara, and Régis Debray (Shultz, 1978a: 76; Shafer, 1988: 73). In addition, the implied assumption of the legitimacy of established governments, the illegitimacy of rebellion, and the passive, apolitical nature of the peasantry do not appear to reflect the long-term stamina of insurgencies in Algeria, Vietnam, Western Sahara, or East Timor (Leites and Wolf, 1966: 233; Talbott, 1980: 246-247; Karnow, 1983: 29, 36, 685; Shafer, 1988: 73; Sala, 1997: 453; Mohsen-Finan, 2002: 5-6; Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 9-18).

[64] These strategies may not be viable when applied to existing insurgencies, however. Research conducted by Johnson and Armstrong regarding insurgencies across Europe, China, and Russia found that foreign occupations which relied heavily upon coercion frequently stimulated popular resistance movements (Johnson, 1962b; Armstrong, 1964a, 1964b); findings supported by Thompson's studies in Malaya and Vietnam (Thompson, 1966). Lynn argues that qualitative violence used by government forces against guerillas operating within civilian populations often engenders heightened insurgencies (Lynn, 2005: 23-24, 27), and Kilcullen blames burgeoning insurgencies in Afghanistan and Iraq to the injudicious use of firepower by American forces (Kilcullen, 2006: 103); Marighela adds that government coercive retaliation for guerilla attacks invariably heightens popular support for insurgency (Crenshaw, 1981: 387).

in neighboring countries, and focused terminations of insurgent infrastructure.[65] The commonalities shared among these programs involve a concerted attempt to frighten affected populations from supporting or even associating with suspected guerillas, and these basic concepts and assumptions have since formed the basis for significant work on civil war occurrence and termination by scholars such as Azam, Collier, Doyal, Fett, Hirshleifer, Hoeffler, Mason, and Sambanis (Shultz, 1978a: 110-111; Valentino, Huth, and Balch-Lindsay, 2004: 385-386).

As is the case with the social welfare approach, certain types of insurgencies may respond better than others to coercive campaigns. Given the entrenched identity groups produced by primordial nationalism, the foreign powers listed on the post-1945 portion of the COW Extra-State Dataset which utilized coercion to counter intensely nationalist insurgencies may have acted rationally, since 'hearts and minds' strategies would have been unlikely to convince such xenophobia groupings to moderate their antagonism to foreign intrusion (Biddle, 2006: 5-8). The cost-benefit approach as employed by the Soviets (and, later, the Americans) in Afghanistan and the Americans in Iraq would also appear to have been logical strategies, since it was unlikely that either indigenous population would ever welcome a long-term presence from foreign occupiers, no matter how gentle that occupation. In the case of the Soviets, however, that strategy only postponed the inevitable, since the besieged Afghan government of

[65] Population resettlement is a case in point, as its use with the cost-benefit strategy carries implications of punishment, rather than opportunity, for affected populations. The tactic has often unwittingly served to further alienate the peasantry from the government, as was the case in British Kenya, French Algeria, Portuguese Africa, the American involvement in Vietnam, and Ian Smith's government in the Rhodesian statelet (Fall, 1963: 378; Bender, 1972: 336-349, 356; Tho, 1977: 14; Preston, 2004: 72-75, 77; Elkins, 2005a: B9-B10; 2005b; Latham, 2006: 35, 37). For that reason, South Vietnamese Colonel Phạm Ngọc Thảo, overseer of the Strategic Hamlet Program and a covert North Vietnamese intelligence officer, strongly promoted the program because he believed it would undermine the position of the Saigon regime in the rural areas of the country (Berman, 2007: 148-149).

Dr. Najib'ullah Ahmadzai collapsed within a few years of Soviet withdrawal (The World Factbook, 2007: 4); an outcome that may eventually be repeated in both Afghanistan and Iraq following the termination of the American military commitment.

D. General Failure of Foreign Counterinsurgency Measures Since 1945

Despite the counterinsurgency strategy employed by foreign powers since 1945, the common factor has been failure regardless of the resources deployed against the insurgencies or the length of time committed to the campaigns. This is graphically illustrated by the COW Extra-State Dataset for the period of 1945-1997 which finds foreign powers losing 12 of the 17 conflicts engaged in for a success rate of only 29.41%; a staggering drop of 56.30 percentage points in their war-winning capabilities over the previous period. Hechter writes that the perception of state weakness increases the chance that nationalist groups will engage in violence to exploit the state's vulnerabilities, and the weakened Europe that emerged from the Second World War period was clearly open to challenge in the colonial sphere (Hechter, 1995: 64). In Southeast Asia, European control was shaken by Japanese defeat of the colonial powers resident there, and Japanese initiatives to grant measures of independence to Vietnam and Indonesia placed returning French and Dutch colonial forces in the unenviable position of attempting to overthrow popularly-supported indigenous administrations (Fryer and Jackson, 1977: 64, 66; Tonnesson, 1985: 10-12). In North Africa and the Middle East, the 1947-1948 creation of the State of Israel provided a focus for a general, unifying Arab movement against foreign control that was driven by the populist nationalism of Egyptian President Gamāl 'Abd an-Nāṣir (Adams, 1988: 561-562, 564-566). In sub-Saharan Africa, indigenous African nationalism became

defined as a modern-day political movement at the Fifth Pan-African Congress of 1945 when it moved from simply extolling the greatness of the ancient civilizations of Egypt and Ethiopia to issuing specific demands for decolonization and indigenous self-government (Mazrui, 1982: 26; Mboukou, 1983, 280-281).

Meanwhile, the United Nations was collectively and the Soviet Union and the United States were individually able to bring tremendous diplomatic and military power to bear against foreign counterinsurgency campaigns with which they disagreed. Revised concepts of international law espoused by the newly-formed United Nations (previously mentioned in Chapter One) no longer recognized the legitimacy of non-indigenous rule in the post-1945 developing world, and increasingly viewed foreign counterinsurgency measures as efforts by advanced countries to brutally crush the nationalist goals of native peoples. These efforts were further complicated by the emerging bi-polar competition between the United States and the Soviet Union in which both super-powers were selectively supporting both nationalist insurgencies and state actors fighting those insurgencies with the goal of supplanting the authority of the former colonial powers with spheres of influence of their own (Miller, 1970; Kramer, Helmut and Bauer, Helfried, 1972). By 1960, most of the remaining colonial dependencies resided in Africa, where Belgium, France, Portugal, white-ruled South Africa, Spain, and the United Kingdom continued to maintain control of large swaths of territory. British Prime Minister Harold MacMillan's 'Winds of Change' speech of February 1960 sounded the death knell for most of the remaining pockets of European colonial control in Africa (Myers, 2000: 556-563-564), however, and by the time of Ian Smith's 1965 Unilateral Declaration of Independence for Southern Rhodesia, British and French colonial

withdrawal had allowed for the formation of an unyielding spirit of African nationalist pressure against remaining white minority-rule intransigence, not only within Rhodesia, but in the Portuguese territories and the Republic of South Africa itself. This pressure from a wide grouping of newly-independent African states ensured that sanctions remained in effect against Rhodesia, the activities of indigenous insurgencies in Rhodesia and throughout Portuguese Africa were strengthened, and the trend of diplomatic sanctions against apartheid South Africa was heightened; a combination that eventually spelled the end of white minority rule in throughout the continent (Mazrui, 1982: 28).

As foreign counterinsurgency campaigns conducted in the Third World during this period were coming under increasing international pressure, both the social welfare and the cost-benefit approaches were found to possess serious limitations in reducing insurgencies. Social welfare strategies were subject to inconsistencies and contradictions; succeeding when employed by the United Kingdom against the Malayan Races Liberation Army in Malaya (Pye, 1956), floundering when used by American troops against the Việt Cộng in pre-1965 South Vietnam (Hoopes, 1970: 606; Shultz, 1978a: 110), and failing to prevent continuing unrest when attempted by Moroccan authorities in Western Sahara after 1991 (Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 9-18). Coercive strategies associated with the cost-benefit approach which had previously achieved broad success throughout Asia and Africa (Montagne, 1947: 42; Gordge, 1949: 133-136; Crawford, 2003: 18) also began to exhibit inconsistencies across the board; succeeding when employed by the French in Madagascar against the Movement Démocratique de la Rénovation Malgache (MDRM) (Tronchon, 1986; Cole and

Middleton, 2001: 10), the Chinese against the Chushi Gangdrug in Tibet (Chen, 2006: 54, 61-62, 71, 77-80; Goldstein, 2006: 150; McGranahan, 2006: 109-111, 113-118, 121, 124, 127-128), and the British against the Mau Mau in Kenya (Elkins, 2000: 29), and resulting in failure when utilized by the French against the Việt Minh in Indochina (Katzenbach, 1952: 211), Habib Bourguiba's Neo-Destour Party in Tunisia (Hunson, 1977: 223, 380), the Armée de Libération Nationale in Morocco (Halstead, 1969: 97), the FLN in Algeria (Talbott, 1980: 72-73), and the L'Union des populations du Cameroun in Cameroun (Howe, 1966: 255-260), and by the Portuguese against the Frente Nacional de Libertação de Angola (FNLA), the Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola (MPLA), the União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola (UNITA) in Angola, the Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde in Guinea-Bissau (PAIGC), and FRELIMO in Mozambique (Chabal, 1981: 83; Marcum, 1978: 177).[66]

Given that a common link among four of the five successful counterinsurgency programs listed in the COW Extra-State Dataset was the lack of either United Nations or

[66] Neither has early success with the cost-benefit strategy always led to long-term pacification. Although the United States used the strategy with some success against the Việt Cộng in South Vietnam during the late 1960s (with programs such as the Phoenix program of focused terminations and attacks against insurgent sanctuaries in neighboring countries (Hoopes, 1970: 606; Andrade and Willbanks, 2006: 18-21)), American efforts to disengage from the unending conflict led to the signing of a controversial agreement with the North Vietnamese government during 1973 which legitimated the political presence of the Việt Cộng in South Vietnam and set the stage for the collapse of the South Vietnamese statelet less than 15 months later (Karnow, 1983: 29, 36, 685; Tonnesson, 1985: 27). After seizing East Timor in 1975, the Indonesian government's use of the cost-benefit strategy over a period of several years allowed it to decimate the Forças Armadas da Libertação Nacional de Timor-Leste (Falintil) insurgency there by the early 1980s (Liddle, 1992: 66). Continuing nationalist unrest throughout the 1980s and 1990s eventually led the war-weary Indonesian government to withdraw from the territory, however, and recognize a Falintil government there in 2002 (Sala, 1997: 453; Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 23, 28; Philpott, 2007: 14). In Western Sahara, Moroccan cost-benefit measures conducted over a period of 16 years eventually brought POLISARIO insurgents to negotiations during 1991, but have been unable to quell unrest and repressed nationalism in the territory to this day (Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 6, 9-18).

great power opposition, I argue that partial explanation for the decline in performance by foreign counterinsurgency forces may be found the altered nature of the post-1945 bi-polar balance of power that encouraged insurgency and condemned foreign control of indigenous territories within the developing world (Gordge, 1949: 133, 136-138; Talbot, 1949: 323-324; Komer, 1972: 6; Campbell, 1968: 140-141, 153-154, 156, 160-161; United Nations General Assembly/Security Council Resolutions, 1946-2008).[67] I also argue that the choice of counterinsurgency strategies has been essentially insignificant to the outcomes of the conflicts. I will qualitatively investigate these arguments by evaluating a series of foreign counterinsurgency campaigns contained with the COW Extra-State Data set to determine if unsuccessful campaigns have been the focus of significant United Nations and/or great power pressure; pressure that either implicitly or explicitly granted heightened legitimacy to nationalist insurgent forces. Drawn from the discussion above, three hypotheses are defined and subsequently will be empirically evaluated in the remaining chapters (see Appendix VII).

Hypothesis #1: *The higher the level of United Nations condemnation of foreign counterinsurgency measures, the less successful will be those measures.* Cases will be chosen on the basis of the combined number of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions pertaining to the insurgency, and success or failure will be judged on the basis of COW Extra-State Dataset determinations.

[67] Those four counterinsurgency campaigns include the United Kingdom's campaign against the Malayan Races Liberation Army in Malaya (1948-1957), India's campaign against the Razakars in Hyderabad (1948), France's campaign against the MDRM in Madagascar (1947-1948), and the PRC's campaign against indigenous forces in Tibet (1950-1951). While the Chinese government subsequently encountered international opposition to its 1959-1974 operations against Chushi Gangdrug insurgents in the region, the nature of that opposition was too weak and unfocused to seriously question Chinese control of the territory (Kramer, 2006: 6-7, 10-11, 13; United Nations General Assembly Resolutions #1353, #1723, and #2079).

Hypothesis #2: *The higher the level of great power recognition and support of the legitimacy of an insurgency, the less successful will be foreign counterinsurgency measures.* International recognition will be determined through primary and secondary sources of insurgency recognition, and success or failure will be judged on the basis of COW Extra-State Dataset determinations.

Hypothesis #3: *The employment of either the Social Welfare or the Cost-Benefit approach to counterinsurgency operations will not be significant in determining success in such operations.* The nature of the strategy utilized will be determined on the basis of primary and secondary sources detailing counterinsurgency practices, and success or failure will be judged on the basis of COW Extra-State Dataset determinations.

E. Methodology for Hypotheses Testing

To empirically evaluate these hypotheses, I have selected four case studies out of the 17 insurgencies contained within the COW Extra-State Dataset through a Most Different Systems design/Method of Agreement (Mill, 1888, pp. 278-283),[68] choosing the two cases with the highest amount of United Nations resolutions, a case with the medium amount of United Nations resolutions, and one of the four cases with no United Nations involvement at all. These cases will then be studied in an effort to determine the actual impact of United Nations pressure and great power opposition against each

[68] The Most Different Systems design assumes that the phenomenon being explained resides at a sub-systemic level, and attempts to deter whether relationships among variables hold up across varied locations. Unlike the Most Similar Systems design which may identify several possible causes but can eliminate none, the basic logic of the Most Different Systems design is falsification; seeking to eliminate possible causes for observed phenomena rather than finding positive relationships (Popper, 1959). In addition, while the Most Similar Systems design often focuses upon states as a unit of analysis, the Most Different Systems design tends to focus upon relationships among variables that exist across a range of very different states (Peters, 1998: 36-41).

of the foreign counterinsurgency campaigns. Finally, an evaluation will be conducted to determine the actual nature of the counterinsurgency strategy utilized by each intervening power, and whether any pattern can be determined among them.

F. Summary

Although differences are apparent among many of the better-known insurgency theorists of the 20th century regarding the relative importance of terrain, political philosophy, and insurgency structure upon insurgent success (Allen, 1943: 19; Dedijer, 1951: 341-342; MacDonald, 1993: 82-83, 99-100), broad support exists within the academic literature for the necessity of gaining the support, or at least the acquiescence, of the affected population in order to defeat foreign occupation and/or control (Lawrence, 1935: 153-154; Garnett, ed., 1951: 99; Sykes, 1959: 324; Johnson, 1962a: 649; Suyin, 1972: 394-395; Mack, 1975: 177; Desai and Eckstein, 1990: 443, 461). Gaining consensus regarding counterinsurgency strategies is somewhat more complex, since both the social welfare and the cost-benefit approaches have their proponents and have encountered success and failure during the past sixty years (Leites and Wolf, 1966: 19, 155-156, 158, 228; Shultz, 1978a: 109-110; Shafer, 1988: 73). Regardless of the strategy employed, the lessons of post-Second World War independence movements in the developing world were bitterly learned by foreign powers attempting to quell indigenous insurgencies in the region, however, with victories credited to insurgent movements rising from 14.29% in the pre-1945 period to 70.59% in the post-war era (Sarkees, 2000: 123-144).

I argue that partial explanation for this steep decline in counterinsurgency performance can be found in the altered international world order that came into place

following the Second World War, with the former multi-polar balance of power replaced by a bi-polar arrangement which competed for dominance in the developing world; a situation further complicated by the newly-formed international body of the United Nations seeking to determine political legitimacy in international affairs (Miller, 1970; Kramer, Helmut and Bauer, Helfried, 1972). I further argue that the choice of counterinsurgency strategies is basically insignificant regarding conflict outcomes. I have prepared three hypotheses to evaluate these arguments. In Chapter III, I briefly evaluate the 17 foreign counterinsurgency campaigns carried out during the post-war era, followed by in-depth evaluations conducted in Chapter IV of four of these campaigns chosen to represent a variety of international pressure and counterinsurgency approaches.

CHAPTER III: SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE ACROSS 17 INSURGENCIES

A. Introduction

Empirical evidence contained within the COW Extra-State Dataset demonstrates that rebellions conducted against foreign occupation were significantly more likely to succeed during the post-1945 era than they were at any other period within the dataset, regardless of the counterinsurgency strategy employed (Sarkees, 2000: 123-144). I argue that opposition to those counterinsurgency efforts both from great powers seeking political advantage and from an activist United Nations rejuvenated by the membership of former colonial states provides explanation to this phenomenon, since that combination of international pressure reduced the maneuvering room of foreign powers, motivated insurgent movements, and rendered foreign control of the developing world untenable (Appendices II and III, Miller, 1970; Kramer, Helmut and Bauer, Helfried, 1972; Hechter, 1995: 64). I further argue that these foreign counterinsurgency campaigns tended to fail regardless of the strategy employed (Appendix IV).

In this chapter, I examine concepts that are common across these varied campaigns in an effort to isolate variables which led to success or failure (Peters, 1998: 36-41). I then seek to determine the extent to which those concepts provide support to my three hypotheses. Finally, I prepare for in-depth case analyses in Chapter IV.

B. Operationalization of Concepts

For the purposes of this dissertation, the independent variable of United Nations opposition (Hypothesis #1) has been operationalized through data contained in websites affiliated with the United Nations Documentation Centre, New York, New York which provide a record of all General Assembly and Security Council resolutions issued

since 1946. By entering the name of a given territory as a search term, the resolutions involving that territory are revealed, and the number of those resolutions are then added together to yield a quantitative measure of United Nations concern.[69] The independent variable of great power opposition (Hypothesis #2) has been operationalized by verbiage found in the academic literature detailing insurgent recognition and support by countries and regional power-blocs. This variable can be operationalized through state condemnations of foreign counterinsurgency measures, official recognition of insurgent movements, and/or evidence of military support to guerilla organizations.[70] The independent variable of counterinsurgency strategy (Hypothesis #3) has been more difficult to operationalize since a certain amount of ambiguity often exists when defining strategies and few governments are willing to admit they conduct coercive campaigns. As a result, I have used sources within the academic literature to gain insight, wherever possible, into the type of strategies employed in these campaigns. When such sourcing was not available, I evaluated information relating to the exact nature of military operations, with heightened levels of physical destruction and civilian casualties

[69] While the tone of these resolutions varied from expressions of concern to outright condemnation, they all indicated United Nations interest and implicitly questioned the legitimacy of the occupying power. It is instructive to note that, during the course of my evaluation, I found no United Nations resolutions that supported the maintenance of the status quo regarding the occupying powers in these territories or granted support to the continuance of that occupation.

[70] In some cases, the exact point of condemnation or recognition is very clear. During the course of a conference on North African Affairs held in Cairo during February 15-24, 1947, the newly-formed Jāmi ‘at ad-Duwal al-‘Arabiyya issued a declaration calling for the abolition of the French protectorates in Morocco and Tunisia and the independence of Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia; a stunning denouncement of French authority and legitimacy in North Africa that quickly reverberated throughout the region (Cowan, 1951: 350-351, 363). On January 18, 1950, the government of the newly-formed PRC formally recognized Hồ Chí Minh’s administration as the legitimate authority in Vietnam; the Soviet Union followed suit twelve days later on January 30, 1950 (Tonnesson, 1985: 18). Significant military support subsequently provided to the Việt Minh by the Chinese government allowed the insurgent movement to take control of the Chinese frontier by October of that year (capturing roughly six thousand French troops in the process), and destroy any remaining French pretentions for achieving victory in the conflict (Karnow, 1983: 184-185).

employed being indicative of the cost-benefit approach.[71] Further insight was available in reports of high civilian casualty rates, and in determinations of just war.[72] Cases in which the strategy was not clearly defined are listed as Strategy Unclear, while cases in which both approaches were utilized are listed as Mixture of Both (Appendix IV). The dependent variable of victory or defeat for foreign counterinsurgency forces has, for all three hypotheses, been operationalized through data contained within the COW Extra-State Dataset for the period of 1945-1997 (Sarkees, 2000: 123-144).[73]

C. General Indications Regarding Insurgency Evaluations

United Nations opposition to foreign counterinsurgency campaigns appears to dramatically embolden guerilla movements and destabilize foreign military occupation

[71] Few scholars would dispute the overall social welfare nature of the 1948-1960 British campaign in Malaya (Pye, 1956: 102-103), and the American campaign in South Vietnam through 1964 is often described in the academic literature as similarly following the social welfare model (Latham, 2000: 14-15, 58-59, 68). In contrast, France's 1947-1948 campaign in Madagascar has been described by Cole and Middleton as representing one of the bloodiest episodes of state repression in African colonial history, and would clearly represent a cost-benefit approach to counterinsurgency (Cole and Middleton, 2001: 10). Lieutenant General Thomas Metz also appeared to deny employing a social welfare approach in Iraq during late July 2004 when he stated that he didn't use the concept of winning hearts and minds to represent "one of the metrics of success" in that campaign (Christenson, 2004: 1; Krepinevich, 2005: 101). Operation 'Phantom Fury,' conducted by American troops against insurgents in Fallujah during November of that year, resulted in 18,000 of the city's 39,000 buildings being damaged or destroyed and over 1,000 civilians killed (Kahl, 2007: 30-31), a scale of destruction further suggestive of a coercive cost-benefit campaign (Hills, 2006: 623-639).

[72] An estimated 87,000 Tibetans died during the course of Chinese counterinsurgency operations conducted during the 18 month period following the Tibetan uprising of March 1959. Given that the total strength of the Chushi Gangdrug insurgency had approximated only 5,000 guerillas during June 1958, this casualty listing appears to include a high percentage of civilians and is indicative of a cost-benefit campaign (McGranahan, 2006: 109-111, 113-114, 119-120). Excessive firepower was also characteristic of American/South Vietnamese counterinsurgency operations of the 1960s to the point that O'Brien, an authority on the conduct of just war, writes that "the principles of proportion and discrimination were violated sufficiently by the abuse of firepower so as to leave a record of violations of the basic principles of the jus in bello on a very large number of occasions"; a clear indication of a coercive cost-benefit approach (O'Brien, William, 1981: 101).

[73] This dataset provides a listing of indices for the 17 extra-state conflicts which occurred during that period for which at least one thousand deaths occurred during a calendar year. In section Q of the dataset, the number one is listed for an insurgent victory, while the number two reflects a victory for the foreign power (Sarkees, 2000: 123-144).

and political control. Of the 17 cases listed within the COW Extra-State Dataset for the period of 1945-1997, twelve engendered United Nations pressure in the form of accusatory or condemnatory resolutions issued by either the General Assembly or the Security Council (United Nations General Assembly/Security Council Resolutions, 1946-2008). Of those twelve cases, only the Indonesian campaign in East Timor is listed in the COW dataset as a victory for the occupying power, demonstrating that United Nations opposition coincides with the defeat of foreign counterinsurgency operations over 91% of the time (Sarkees, 2000: 123-144).[74] At the same time, four of the five remaining cases which encountered no United Nations pressure at all resulted in victories for the occupying powers, for a success rate of 80% (Appendix II). Evaluated through a correlation coefficient, these combined results yield a 72% negative

[74] The claim by the COW Extra-State Dataset of an Indonesian victory in East Timor as of 1977 is questionable. From the time of the Indonesian invasion of 1975 through the late 1970s, Forças Armadas da Libertação Nacional de Timor-Leste (Falintil) was judged by Salla to be in control of most of the territory's interior and held the loyalties of the majority of its population (Salla, 1997: 453). Liddle writes that only by the early 1980s had Angkatan Bersenjata Republik Indonesia's cost-benefit measures successfully eliminated Falintil as a serious threat to the integrity of the Indonesian state (Liddle, 1992: 66), and Philpott reminds us that residual Falintil opposition continued until the occupation ended in 2002 with the Indonesian withdrawal of its sovereignty from the territory (Philpott, 2007: 1, 4, 8). Since the Indonesian government no longer maintains any pretentions of sovereignty in East Timor, I would now judge this campaign to represent a defeat for Indonesia. Having said that, the dataset also lists the questionable claims of a British defeat in Kenya as of 1956 and a Moroccan defeat in Western Sahara as of 1983. In fact, the United Kingdom had essentially defeated the Mau Mau insurgency in Kenya by 1956 with the capture of Mau Mau leader Dedan Kimathi, and continued to maintain sovereignty within the territory through 1963 when independence was conferred upon an indigenous administration which was decidedly anti-Mau Mau (Nissimi, 2006: 8, 9; Anderson, 2005: 3). Since the Mau Mau themselves were unable to seize power from the British colonial government, I would judge this campaign to represent a *qualified* victory for the United Kingdom. The situation in Western Sahara is far more clear. While POLISARIO had indeed placed Moroccan forces into a virtual state of siege by the late 1970s, subsequent United States and French military support of the Moroccan position (coupled with a fading of United Nations interest) allowed L'Armée royale du Maroc to stabilize its position by the early 1980s, and force POLISARIO to accept a ceasefire by 1991 that has allowed the Moroccan government to maintain de-facto sovereignty over the territory ever since (Campbell, 2003: 47-48; Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 6; United Nations General Assembly/Security Council Resolutions, 1975-2008). Since the Moroccan government continues to exercise sovereignty in Western Sahara, I would judge this campaign to represent a clear victory for Morocco. Even so, I accede to the results offered by the COW dataset in all three cases for reasons of consistency.

correlation between the application of United Nations pressure and occupation power victory, and provide significant empirical support for Hypothesis #1 (Appendix VIII).

Such international pressure appears to have been an important factor in the diplomatic isolation of the Netherlands' counterinsurgency efforts in the Netherlands East Indies (United Nations Security Council Resolutions, 1947-1949), Portuguese campaigns in Angola, Guinea-Bissau, and Mozambique (United Nations Security Council Resolutions, 1961-1972; United Nations General Assembly Resolutions, 1961-1974; Chabal, 1981: 99), and South African military operations in Namibia (United Nations General Assembly Resolutions, 1947-1990; United Nations Security Council Resolutions, 1968-1989; Albright, 1994: 42; O'Sullivan, 2005: 111); it also prompted early French withdrawal from the Moroccan and Tunisian protectorates (Soustelle, 1956: 119-120; Gershovich, 2004: 143), and served to hamper French moves to retain the all-important territory of Algeria (United Nations General Assembly Resolutions, 1952-1961). While Moroccan authorities were eventually able to mitigate United Nations pressure over the status of Western Sahara by effectively dividing the African and Arab elements of the United Nations General Assembly into adversarial camps (United Nations Security Council Resolutions, 1976-1987), the apparent indifference of the United Nations to counterinsurgency campaigns conducted by the Chinese in Tibet, the French in Cameroun, Indochina, and Madagascar, the British in Kenya and Malaya, and the Indonesians in East Timor (after 1982) allowed those governments to conduct extensive campaigns without significant international oversight (United Nations General Assembly/Security Council Resolutions, 1946-1971).

The impact of United Nations pressure as an independent variable can be clearly seen in two of these cases in particular: the Indonesian campaign in East Timor, and the Moroccan campaign in Western Sahara. Indonesia's 1975 invasion of Portuguese East Timor and its campaign against Falintil were countered by two Security Council resolutions issued during 1975-1976 and eight General Assembly resolutions issued during 1975-1982 calling for full Indonesian military withdrawal (United Nations Security Council Resolutions #384 and #389, 1975-1976; United Nations General Assembly Resolutions #3485, #31/53, #32/34, #33/39, #34/40, #35/27, #36/50, and #37/30, 1975-1982). While Falintil's fortunes soared through the late 1970s under this strong United Nations support (Salla, 1997: 453), the subsequent fading of United Nations pressure allowed the Indonesian government to conduct an unfettered coercive campaign that virtually annihilated the insurgent group by the early 1980s (Philpott, 2007: 6, 10; Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 23, 28). Strong United Nations opposition also initially battered Morocco's 1976 invasion of the former Spanish Sahara with three pre-emptive Security Council resolutions issued during 1975 and seven General Assembly resolutions issued during 1975-1980 calling for Moroccan withdrawal and eventually supporting the POLISARIO insurgents (United Nations General Assembly Resolutions #3458, #31/32, #31/45, #32/22, #33/31 #34/37 and #35/19, 1975-1980; United Nations Security Council Resolutions #377, #379, and #380, 1975). With such robust support, POLISARIO was invigorated to place Moroccan garrisons in the territory into a virtual state of siege by the late 1970s (Solarz, 1979/1980: 281, 284-285; Zunes, 1995: 31-35), only to be thrown onto the defensive during the 1980s as United Nations interest waned (Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 6; Campbell, 2003: 47-48). By 1991, POLISARIO

was forced to accept a ceasefire – ironically enough, under United Nations auspices - that granted Morocco de-facto sovereignty over the territory (United Nations Security Council Resolutions #658 and #690, 1990-1991; Campbell, 2003: 47-48).

Great power opposition to foreign counterinsurgency operations has had an impact similar to that of United Nations pressure, serving to undermine foreign control of territories within the developing world by granting political and military support to indigenous independence movements. Of the 17 cases under evaluation, nine provoked opposition from great powers or from region power-blocs, and all nine are listed in the dataset as defeats for the occupying powers; a 100% rate of failure. Five of the remaining eight cases which attracted no such opposition are listed within the dataset as victories for the occupying powers, for a success rate of 62.5% (Appendix III). While these results are not as robust as those regarding United Nations opposition, they still provide empirical support for Hypothesis #2.

The impact of opposition to foreign counterinsurgency operations by great powers and regional power-blocs has resonated throughout the developing world for well over sixty years. Condemnations of French authority in Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia by Jāmi ʻat ad-Duwal al-ʻArabiyya and Egyptian President Gamāl ʻAbd an-Nāṣir during the post-Second World War era encouraged native rebellions and led to over a decade of no-holds-barred conflict that shattered the façade of French legitimacy in the region. As French authority waned, an indigenous Arab nationalism arose that had no place for French colonial control (and rejected the direct French citizenship granted Algerian natives), and which eventually defeated the political resolve to maintain French sovereignty across North Africa (Behr, 1958: 280; Soustelle, 1956: 123-124; Hudson,

1977: 354-355; Talbott, 1980: 72-73). Subsequent Soviet military support delivered to indigenous guerillas in Portuguese Africa during the 1960s and early 1970s heightened de-facto insurgent control of Portuguese colonial territory, while Soviet surface-to-air missiles decisively reduced the ability of the Forca Aerea Portuguesa (Portuguese Air Force) to provide close support to counterinsurgency operations, especially in Guinea-Bissau (Chabal, 1981: 75, 80-83, 91, 95-97).[75] The crumbling military situation eventually led a grouping of disillusioned Portuguese military officers under the aegis of Movimento das Forças Armadas to launch a coup d'etat against the repressive Portuguese government that resulted in Portuguese colonial withdrawal from Africa. During the 1970s and 1980s, the Soviets moved against South African control of Namibia by delivering military support to indigenous insurgents and landing Cuban ground combat troops to provide leadership and direction to them. These activities placed South African forces on the defensive throughout the region and eventually dealt a decisive defeat to South African forces in the territory during May 1988, forcing the South African government to abruptly provide terms for Namibian independence that soon rebounded politically within South Africa itself (O'Sullivan, 2005: 111). United States support of the Chushi Gangdrug insurgency in mid-1950s Tibet engendered a different outcome, however. While American resources might have, at the time, seemed to portend an end to Chinese control of the territory, the limited, covert nature of that support provided no real legitimacy for the insurgency, and served as little more than a distraction for Chinese military forces. The termination of that limited amount of

[75] Not surprisingly, uncontested PAIGC control of extensive swaths of territory in Guinea-Bissau led the insurgent group to declare independence for the territory on September 24, 1973. While the Portuguese government deliberately ignored that proclamation for nearly a year, it still represented a devastating blow to Portuguese national prestige (Mendy, 2003: 57; The World Factbook, 2007: 245).

American support following the establishment of heightened Sino-American relations in 1971 left the Chushi Gangdrug in an politically and militarily untenable situation that led to the collapse of the insurgency three years later (Goldstein, 2006: 150; Kramer, 2006: 6-7, 10-11, 13).

This great power opposition can similarly be tracked as an independent variable with the French campaign in Indochina and the Moroccan campaign in Western Sahara. After French forces returned to Indochina in September 1945, they fought an uphill battle against Hồ Chí Minh's Việt Minh guerillas with varying degrees of success for nearly five years in an attempt to consolidate French authority over the region. After the Soviet Union and the PRC granted recognition to Hồ's administration during January 1950, however, 60,000 resupplied and highly-motivated Việt Minh troops quickly went on the offensive, and within nine months had taken Dongkhe, Caobang, Langsom, Laokay, and Thai Nguyen, seized control of the Chinese frontier, and essentially terminated any chance for a French victory in the theatre (Katzenbach, 1952: 190; Karnow, 1983: 184-185; Tonnesson, 1985: 11-12, 18). Following Morocco's 1975 invasion of the former Spanish Sahara, the regional power-blocs of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) offered direct support to POLISARIO insurgents even as they condemned the Moroccan occupation. POLISARIO fortunes rose with such strong regional backing, only to slump as the Moroccan government subsequently used the country's unique position as both an Arab and an African state to successfully counter OAU and NAM denunciations with support for its territorial claims from Jāmi 'at ad-Duwal al-'Arabiyya and the Islamic Conference (Solarz, 1979/1980: 281, 284-285; Zunes, 1995: 23, 31-35).

Both the social welfare and the cost-benefit approaches to counterinsurgency were employed by foreign governments seeking to destroy insurgencies within the developing world during the post-Second World War period. My final determinations of the 17 cases under evaluation found seven aligned most closely with the cost-benefit approach, six involving a mixture of the two, two indeterminate, and two reflecting the social welfare approach (Appendix IV). Of the seven campaigns utilizing cost-benefit strategies, three were successful, for a success rate of 48.8%. Both of the campaigns utilizing social welfare strategies achieved success, for a success rate of 100%. The remaining six campaigns that utilized a mixture of the two approaches all resulted in failure, as did the two campaigns in which the strategy was indeterminate. While these results do appear to give the advantage to the social welfare approach, it must be remembered that three campaigns which clearly utilized coercive counterinsurgency strategies on the model of the cost-benefit approach - France's campaign in 1947-1948 Madagascar, Indonesia's 1975-1977 campaign in East Timor, and China in 1950-1951 Tibet - also achieved victory, and these combined results provide a limited amount of support for Hypothesis #3 (Appendix I).

D. Selection of Case Studies

In all cases, foreign counterinsurgency campaigns tended to stumble in the face of opposition from either the United Nations or great powers, and succeed where such opposition was not employed (Appendices I, II, and III). Further evidence to support this concept can be found in the COW Extra-State Dataset in which four of the five victories credited to foreign powers during 1946-1997 occurred in the total absence of international pressure (Sarkees, 2000: 123-144; United Nations General

Assembly/Security Council Resolutions, 1946-2008; Gordge, 1949: 133, 136-138; Talbot, 1949: 325-327; Campbell, 1968: 140-141, 153-154, 156, 160-161; Chen, 2006: 56). To test my argument in depth, I have selected four cases from the total of 17 found in the post-1945 COW Extra-State Dataset to serve as exemplars for the impact of United Nations pressure upon foreign counterinsurgency operations. Those include the South African campaign in Namibia and the Moroccan campaign in Western Sahara serving to represent the highest levels of United Nations involvement, the Chinese campaign(s) in Tibet serving as the mid-point,[76] and the British campaign in Malaya serving to represent the total lack of United Nations interest (Appendix V).

E. Summary

Of the 17 insurgencies covered by the COW Extra-State Dataset, only the French campaign in Madagascar, the Indian campaign in Hyderabad, the initial Chinese annexation of Tibet, and the British campaign in Malaya were conducted without interference from the United Nations, regional power-blocs, or great powers (United Nations General Assembly/Security Council Resolutions, 1946-2008), and all four campaigns resulted in clear victories for the intervening powers. Meanwhile, insurgencies prospered in East Timor and Western Sahara while United Nations support was forthcoming and faced defeat when that support was terminated (United Nations General Assembly Resolutions, 1975-2008; Solarz, 1979/1980: 281, 284-285; Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 6; Campbell, 2003: 47-48), and insurgent fortunes in both French Indochina and Western Sahara prospered most notably while receiving great

[76] This campaign includes both China's initial 1950-1951 annexation of Tibet as well as China's 1959-1974 counterinsurgency campaign against the Chushi Gangdrug.

power support. Counterinsurgency strategies varied across the five countries credited by the COW Extra-State Dataset with victories, with China, France, and Indonesia employing the cost-benefit strategy, and India and the United Kingdom utilizing the social welfare approach. In all cases, these outcomes appear to provide empirical support for all three of my hypotheses (Appendices I, II, III, and IV).

In Chapter IV, the four case studies previously selected will be evaluated in detail to determine exactly how elements of international opposition and counterinsurgency strategies combine to lead foreign powers to either victory or defeat. A final evaluation of this study will then be provide in Chapter Five, along with suggestions for future evaluations.

CHAPTER IV: CASE STUDIES

A. Introduction

As mentioned in Chapter Three, a brief evaluation of the 17 cases listed within the COW Extra-State Dataset for the period of 1945-1997 showed that foreign counterinsurgency campaigns faltered when confronted with opposition from either the United Nations or great powers/power blocs and succeeded when such opposition was not present. Of the five cases that are categorized as victories for the foreign intervening power, only the Indonesian campaign in East Timor encountered any United Nations opposition, and Falintil insurgents' initial successes there withered away as United Nations interest waned. Likewise, all but one of the twelve cases categorized as defeats encountered United Nations opposition, and the single case that did not – French counterinsurgency operations in Indochina – collapsed under massive Chinese and Soviet military support to Việt Minh guerillas (Appendices I, II, and III; Sarkees, 2000: 123-144; United Nations General Assembly/Security Council Resolutions, 1946-2008; Gordge, 1949: 133, 136-138; Talbot, 1949: 325-327; Campbell, 1968: 140-141, 153-154, 156, 160-161; Chen, 2006: 56). A correlation coefficient constructed to compare these results yields a 72% negative correlation between the application of United Nations pressure and occupation power victory, providing significant empirical support for Hypothesis #1 (Appendix VIII).

To test my argument in depth, I have selected four of these 17 cases to serve as exemplars for the impact of United Nations and/or great power/power bloc pressure upon foreign counterinsurgency campaigns. In order to gain a fairly broad perspective, I selected the two cases with the highest levels of United Nations involvement (the South

African campaign in Namibia and the Moroccan campaign in Western Sahara), the case at the midpoint of United Nations interest (the Chinese campaign(s) in Tibet), and one of the five cases that received no United Nations resolutions at all (the British campaign in Malaya). These four cases were then evaluated in detail to determine the nature of the counterinsurgency strategies and the manner in which United Nations and/or great power/power bloc opposition impacted overall counterinsurgency efforts (Appendix V).[77]

These four case studies provide an interesting window into understanding the impact of United Nations/Great Power sanctions. South Africa's presence in Namibia came under international scrutiny during the first year of United Nations operations, and, by the late 1960s, South African counterinsurgency strategies being deployed in the territory against a determined, nationalist guerilla movement were facing widespread international denunciations that hobbled those strategies for the remainder of the conflict there (United Nations General Assembly/Security Council Resolutions, 1947-1990). Soviet and Cuban support for the Namibian insurgency was also an important

[77] Both United Nations and great power/power bloc opposition to foreign counterinsurgency operations often manifested itself as direct material support to insurgent groups. In at least five cases (Indochina, Algeria, Portuguese Africa, Namibia, and Western Sahara), members of the General Assembly offered their national territory as safe havens and training grounds for insurgent groups (Tonnesson, 1985: 18; Karnow, 1983: 183-184; Sepp, 2005: 11; Celeski, 2006: 55; United Nations Security Council Resolutions #273, #275, #289, #290, #294, #295, #302, #312, #321, #385, #387, #393, #428, #447, #454, #466, #475, #545, #546, #577, #602, and #606; Zunes, 1995: 26) and, in at least three cases (Indochina, Portuguese Africa, and Namibia), great power opposition manifested itself through training programs and military equipment delivered directly to guerillas (Tonnesson, 1985: 18; Karnow, 1983: 183-184; Chabal, 1981: 75, 80-83, 91, 95-97; Zunes, 1995: 31-35). Even when great power/power bloc opposition did not directly involve such support, it could still be devastating, however. When American officials directly threatened the Dutch government during early 1949 with curtailment of all United States Marshall Plan should Soekarno's indigenous government fail to secure an independent Indonesia, the viability of further Dutch counterinsurgency efforts collapsed (Collis, 1950: 173-176; Friend, 2003: 37-38). In a different manner, condemnations of French authority in Algeria by Jāmi 'at ad-Duwal al-'Arabiyya during 1947 shattered the façade of French legitimacy in the territory by encouraging Algerians to view themselves as Muslim Arabs instead of French citizens and severed the emotional link French authorities had spent nearly 120 years constructing (Behr, 1958: 280; Soustelle, 1956: 123-124; Hudson, 1977: 354-355; Talbott, 1980: 72-73).

factor in the eventual South African defeat, since, by the mid-1980s, South African forces faced the possibility of being militarily overwhelmed by battle-hardened Cuban troops (Albright, 1994: 42) . Moroccan efforts to annex Western Sahara during the mid-1970s initially floundered against a robust, nationalist insurgency and were further stunted by strong United Nations denunciations of Morocco's counterinsurgency campaign (United Nations General Assembly Resolutions, 1974-2008). Only after utilizing Morocco's unique status as both an Arab and an African state was the Moroccan government able to successfully divide the General Assembly among its Arab and African blocs during the early 1980s; it removed a potential threat from the Security Council by co-opting France and the United States in its endeavors. In a like manner, Moroccan authorities were able to counter denunciations from the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) with support from Jāmi 'at ad-Duwal al-'Arabiyya and the Islamic Conference (United Nations General Assembly Resolution #34/37, 1979; Zunes, 1995: 23). With the United Nations and regional power-blocs effectively sidelined, Moroccan authorities were able to contain the guerilla movement and successfully establish its authority in the territory; albeit, amid continuing popular unrest resulting from over thirty years of harsh military occupation (United Nations Security Council Resolutions, 1991-2008; Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 6; Zunes, 1995: 23). China's initial military operations conducted in Tibet during 1950-1951 encountered no United Nations or great power opposition as Chinese authority was quickly reestablished in the territory against a placid, fatalistic local population (Sheng, 2006: 15-16, 18-19, 22-23, 31-32). Following the onset of Tibetan rebellion in March 1959, three vaguely-worded General Assembly declarations and a covert, poorly-

defined American campaign of support to the Chushi Gangdrug guerillas failed to significantly impact Chinese counterinsurgency measures due to the questionable nationalism of the guerillas and the lack of any official goal for an independent Tibet on the part of either the United Nations or the United States (United Nations General Assembly Resolutions #1353, #1723, and #2079, 1959, 1961, and 1965; McGranahan, 2006: 121-124, 127-128). In post-Second World War Malaya, a Communist-inspired insurgency failed to triumph over British colonial forces due to its inability to inspire overt great power support that might have found voice in the Security Council, or even the support of minor powers that could have supported the insurgent's cause in the General Assembly. With British authorities thus spared any opposition from the United Nations and Chinese support limited to the general goal of spreading Communism across the developing world, the Malayan Communist Party was forced to abandon its goals during 1958 and accede to a British-brokered, Malay-dominated Malayan state (United Nations General Assembly/Security Council Resolutions, 1948-1960; Newsinger, 2002: 57-58).

There is also considerable evidence that governments sponsoring these counterinsurgency campaigns held significant concerns regarding the threat of international opposition. This was clearly the case among three of the four case studies undertaken in this chapter. As insurgency flared in Malaya during 1948, British authorities, possibly fearing a Security Council seizure of the issue along the lines of the Council's on-going seizure of the insurgency in the Netherlands East Indies (United Nations Security Council Resolutions #27, #30, #31, #32, #35, #36, #40, #41, #55, #63, #64, #65, and #67, 1946-1949), conducted a concerted campaign to present the insurgency to the world as a Soviet/Chinese-sponsored program designed to

overwhelm the developing countries of Southeast Asia (NAA A452/2, 1968: 3). The British government also liberally invoked the spectre of the "well-known international Communist ménage" to obtain "sympathy and support from American public opinion in our praiseworthy struggle" and avoid the perception of their counterinsurgency campaign as simply being of "a bad colonial power coping with rebellions" (Watson, 1949). The Portuguese ambassador to the United States followed suit in 1961, quickly interpreting the initial insurgent attack against Portuguese authorities in Luanda, Angola of February 4, 1961 as "part of the Communist assault on the Portuguese position . . . with the aim of weakening the Western position and provoking a situation which might be propitious for the intervention of the forces of international Communism," adding that "it would be of the utmost interest to the free world that public opinion in the United States should become aware of the Communist conspiracy now in action against Portugal" (Ribeiro, 2002: 168; NA, SDCF, 1960-1963).[78] When the Liberian delegate to the United Nations subsequently requested, on February 20, 1961, an urgent meeting of the Security council to discuss the situation in Angola, the Portuguese government pressured its North Atlantic Treaty Organization partners in the Security Council to deny the request, possibly fearing a Security Council seizure of the issue of Portugal's African empire (NA, SDCF, 1960-1963).[79] The flood of United Nations condemnations against

[78] The ambassador had reason to worry about the American response. Less than two months earlier, President-elect John Kennedy had described Portuguese rule in Africa as "intolerable," adding that "silence on issues affecting Portuguese Africa is a liability far out-weighing any short-term strategic considerations" (Arquivo Histórico Diplomático, 1960).

[79] The Security Council did in fact meet regarding the issue during March 10-14, 1961. One day later, Angolan insurgents struck Portuguese populations in northern Angola, killing at least 200 Portuguese nationals; an incident directly linked by Portuguese authorities to the Security Council meeting (NA, SDCF, 1960-1963). Clearly, the Portuguese took United Nations pressure seriously and fought to circumvent it.

South African control of Namibia that came about during the 1960s and 1970s also led that government to define its counterinsurgency operations as an extension of its basic anti-Communist position in southern Africa (Horton, 1999: Occasional Paper #27); a position that, at least temporarily, appears to have led France, the United Kingdom, and the United States to reject a mandatory United Nations arms embargo against the apartheid state (United Nations General Assembly Resolution #3411, 1975). Mounting international isolation subsequently led South African authorities to develop nuclear weapons in a vain attempt to encourage Western governments to offer security guarantees to the besieged country to ensure that the weapons were never used, however (Albright, 1994: 37-42). Only in China does it appear that the government had little regard for the threat of international pressure from the United Nations and great powers.[80]

United Nations/great power denunciation of imperial interventions appears to have been a primary driver of counterinsurgency failure in the post Second World War era. Alternative explanations do not consistently account for outcomes in the four cases reviewed in this chapter. Neither the varied geographical locations of the conflicts (Northwest Africa, Southwest Africa, Central Asia, and Southeast Asia) nor the fact that three of the four counterinsurgency campaigns were conducted in territories contiguous to the intervening state appeared to have any significant impact upon the outcomes of

[80] The hesitant manner with which this pressure was applied may account for that seeming lack of concern. While the General Assembly issued three resolutions critical of Chinese counterinsurgency operations during 1959, 1961, and 1965, none of the resolutions specifically mentioned China by name, and the Security Council kept its silence throughout the period (the failure of the United Nations to grant membership to the PRC also assured that any such resolutions would be viewed with little more than contempt by the Chinese government) (Grunfeld, 1996: 180). In addition, while the United States, Nepal, and India conspired to deploy an insurgency against Chinese rule in Tibet, the limited number of guerillas involved and the lack of any realistic goals to guide their activities ensured that the Chinese government would view them as little more than a nuisance (Goldstein, 2006: 150; Grunfeld, 1996: 180).

the conflicts (South Africa's campaign in neighboring, contiguous Namibia failed, while the United Kingdom's campaign in Malaya – over 6,550 air miles distant – succeeded).

No common factor could be found among the four cases in ethnicity (with Arabs and Berbers in Western Sahara, Black African tribesmen in Namibia, the homogeneous Tibetans of the High Asian Plateau, and the multi-ethnicity of Malaya in which the ethnic Chinese staffed the insurgency), nor did any commonality in religious practice (with Sunni Islam in Western Sahara, Christianity (primarily of the Lutheran denomination) in Namibia, Tibetan Buddhism in Tibet, and a patchwork of Sunni Islam, Buddhism, Christianity, and Hinduism in Malaya) exist to offer any explanatory value. The choice of counterinsurgency strategy also appears to lack significance, since both the cost-benefit and social welfare approaches led to victory for China and the United Kingdom respectively, South Africa encountered defeat with its cost-benefit approach, and Morocco's apparent blending of the two approaches has resulted in continuing unrest in Western Sahara.

B. South Africa, and Defeat in Namibia (1966-1988)

European colonialism was first introduced into Southwest Africa (today known as Namibia) by Germany during 1884. Following German defeat in the First World War, the territory became a Class 'C' League of Nations Mandate on December 17, 1920, administered by the neighboring Union of South Africa (United Nations General Assembly Resolution #937, 1955). During the post-Second World War wave of decolonization, the South African government (subsequently restyled during 1961 as the Republic of South Africa) introduced repressive apartheid measures into its internal policies as well as in its governance of Southwest Africa, and sought to incorporate the

territory into South Africa itself (O'Sullivan, 2005: 111). That incorporation was denied during the First Session of the General Assembly on December 14, 1946, with the recommendation that the mandated territory be placed under the international trustee system under the aegis of the United Nations Charter, Chapter XII (United Nations Charter, 1945; United Nations General Assembly Resolution #65, 1946). Over the next 44 years, at least 150 increasingly harsh resolutions would be issued by the General Assembly, with only the years of 1952 and 1964 passing with no such resolutions regarding the territory handed down (United Nations General Assembly Resolutions, 1947-1990).[81]

Modern African nationalism began gaining prominence during that time period, primarily among Namibian migrant workers employed in South Africa. During 1957, a group of these Namibians formed the Ovamboland People's Congress (OPC), with the stated goal of improving conditions for Namibian workers. A political agenda was also developed for the organization, partly due to personal contacts with South African members of the African National Congress (ANC), and in 1959, the Ovamboland People's Organization (OPO) was established to incorporate that agenda. One year later, OPO was renamed the South-West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), and

[81] That listing of General Assembly resolutions included #141, #227, #337, #338, #449, #570, #749, #844, #851, #852, #904, #934, #935, #936, #937, #938, #939, #940, #941, #942, #1047, #1054, #1055, #1056, #1057, #1058, #1059, #1060, #1061, #1138, #1139, #1140, #1141, #1142, #1143, #1243, #1244, #1245, #1246, #1247, #1333, #1356, #1359, #1361, #1362, #1563, #1564, #1565, #1566, #1567, #1568, #1593, #1596, #1702, #1703, #1704, #1705, #1804, #1805, #1806, #1899, #1900, #1901, #1979, #2074, #2075, #2076, #2145, #2146, #2235, #2236, #2288, #2324, #2325, #2349, #2403, #2404, #2425, #2498, #2517, #2518, #2554, #2678, #2679, #2680, #2703, #2871, #2872, #2873, #2979, #3030, #3031, #3111, #3112, #3117, #3295, #3296, #3299, #3398, #3399, #3400, #31/152, #31/153, #32/9, #32/35, #32/41, #33/40, #33/182, #33/206, #34/41, #34/92, #34/174, #35/28, #35/227, #36/51, #36/121, #37/31, #37/233, #38/36, #38/50, #39/42, #39/50, #41/14, #41/39, #41/39[A], #41/39[B], #41/39[C], #41/39[D], #41/39[E], #41/123, #42/14, #42/14[A], #42/14[B], #42/14[C], #42/14[D], #42/14[E], #42/74, #43/26, #43/26[A], #43/26[B], #43/26[C], #43/26[D], #43/26[E], #43/26, #43/134, #44/84, #44/143, #44/243, #44/243[A], and #44/243[B] (United Nations General Assembly/Security Council Resolutions, 1946-1990).

specifically dedicated to the establishment of an independent Namibian state. SWAPO stressed the use of peaceful methods for the attainment of that goal, and soon sought to encourage the International Court of Justice (ICJ) to render a legal opinion on the validity of South Africa's League of Nations Mandate (Moroney, ed., 1989: 383). The General Assembly also sought to raise the pressure on the South African government with the issuance of Resolution #2074 on December 17, 1965, terming South African racial policies practiced in South West Africa to constitute a crime against humanity (United Nations General Assembly Resolution #2074, 1965). Even with pressure of this magnitude from the General Assembly, however, the IJC refused to rule on the question of South Africa's mandate. With no clear legal recourse under international law, SWAPO leaders soon determined that an armed struggle remained the only option, and the first armed clash between SWAPO guerillas and South African authorities took place during August and September 1966. South African forces responded by detaining a number of SWAPO leaders inside Namibia, and, after subjecting them to acts of torture, sentenced them to lengthy prison terms (Moroney, 1989: 383). Given the nature of the South African response both at the time and subsequently throughout this conflict, South African counterinsurgency measures appear to have best approximated the cost-benefit approach. Within that approach were South African policies of racial exclusion that involved the large-scale removal of natives from ancestral areas into 'self-governing homelands' (reminiscent of population resettlement policies that had previously been successful only in Malaya), and eventually included attacks against insurgent sanctuaries in neighboring countries that drew a host of United Nations condemnations (United Nations General Assembly Resolutions, 1966-1990).

The General Assembly quickly responded to the outbreak of conflict with the issuance of Resolution #2145 on October 27, 1966, accusing the South African government of maladministration in the territory, and declaring Southwest Africa to be a direct responsibility of the United Nations (United Nations General Assembly Resolution #2145, 1966). The Security Council demonstrated far more restraint regarding the issue, waiting nearly 15 months before addressing the issues raised in General Assembly Resolution #2145. It finally did so on January 25, 1968 with the issuance of Security Council Resolution #245, which declared that, in line with General Assembly Resolution #2145, South West Africa would henceforth become the responsibility of the United Nations (United Nations Security Council Resolution #245, 1968). Security Council Resolution #246 quickly followed on March 14, 1968, condemning South Africa for not having already transferred the nature of its mandate upon the territory (United Nations Security Council Resolution #246, 1968). Both of these resolutions were issued unanimously, giving the impression that Security Council members felt the need to present a united front on the issue. During the next 21 years, at least 37 additional Security Council resolutions would add their weight to the continuing barrage of General Assembly resolutions which gradually chipped away at South African legitimacy in South West Africa (United Nations Security Council Resolutions, 1968-1989). Many of those resolutions included abstentions from important world powers, however, those abstentions may have served to convince the South African government that significant maneuvering room still continued to exist, especially within the foreign policies of the United States, for conducting robust counterinsurgency operations against SWAPO insurgents.

Meanwhile, the General Assembly continued to lead the way in isolating South Africa from the world community. On December 16, 1968, General Assembly Resolution #2403 was issued, referring to the territory for the first time as 'Namibia' (after the territory's Namib Desert), and recognizing the legitimacy of indigenous insurgency against South African rule, although no direct references to SWAPO itself were made (United Nations General Assembly Resolution #2403, 1968). Although the Security Council followed the new verbiage of 'Namibia' on March 20, 1969 with the issuance of Resolution #264, this resolution did not include verbiage legitimizing insurgency, and was passed with two important abstentions: France and the United Kingdom (United Nations Security Council Resolution #264, 1969). By August 12, 1969, the Security Council had joined the General Assembly in recognizing the legitimacy of the insurgency, however, with the issuance of Resolution #369 (again, with no direct references to SWAPO itself), albeit with four abstentions: Finland, France, the United Kingdom, and the United States (United Nations Security Council Resolution #269, 1969). Within the short space of three years, the activities of armed insurgents against South African authorities had been judged by the full weight of the United Nations to be legitimate. This verbiage was subsequently toned down in Security Council Resolution #276, issued on January 30, 1970 that, while condemning the South African government, deleted verbiage recognizing insurgent legitimacy. Perhaps due to this more moderate phraseology, the United States did not abstain from supporting the resolution, although both France and the United Kingdom continued to withhold their support (United Nations Security Council Resolution #276, 1970). Two further resolutions were issued by the Security Council during 1970: Resolution #283 and

Resolution #284. Resolution #283, while continuing to delete phraseology recognizing insurgent legitimacy, called upon member states to further isolate South African-ruled Namibia, while Resolution #284 called upon the ICJ to render an advisory opinion regarding the legal consequences of South Africa's continuing occupation of the territory. Once again, the United States did not abstain, although France and the United Kingdom abstained from Resolution #283, and the Soviet Union joined with the United Kingdom to abstain from Resolution #284 (United Nations Security Council Resolutions #283 and #284, 1970).

By June 21, 1971, the ICJ had complied with the wishes of the Security Council, issuing an advisory opinion that found Security Council Resolution #245 to be legally binding in its termination of the former League of Nations mandate, and determining that South Africa was now occupying Namibia without title. It thus followed that member states of the United Nations were under obligation to abstain from entering into treaty relationships conducted by the government of South Africa on behalf of Namibia (Legal Consequences for States of the Continuing Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South-West Africa) Notwithstanding Security Council 276 (1970), 1971). The Security Council's immediate reaction to the advisory opinion of the ICJ was somewhat muted, however (a somewhat surprising outcome given that the Security Council had itself requested the ruling), with Resolution #300, issued unanimously on October 12, 1971, calling upon the South African military to respect the sovereignty of Zambia (United Nations Security Council Resolution #300, 1971). Four more Security Council resolutions were handed down during 1972: Resolution #309, issued unanimously on February 4, 1972 and somewhat vaguely calling upon the Secretary-General of the

United Nations to initiate contacts across the breadth of Namibia in an effort to allow the native peoples to exercise self-determination and independence, Resolution #310, also issued on February 4, 1972 and castigating the South African government for failing to abide by existing United Nations resolutions (with France and the United Kingdom abstaining), Resolution #319, issued unanimously on August 1, 1972 and noting with appreciation efforts conducted by the Secretary-General in implementing Resolution #309, and Resolution #323, issued on December 6, 1972, noting that the results of the Secretary-General's efforts provided evidence that an "overwhelming majority" of Namibians consulted were in favor of the withdrawal of the South African administration (with the Soviet Union abstaining, and the People's Republic of China not participating) (United Nations Security Council Resolutions #309, #310, #319, and #323, 1972). A further resolution was handed down by the Security Council during 1973 further reflecting upon the Secretary-General's consultative efforts; Resolution #342, issued unanimously on December 11, 1973, asking the Secretary-General to keep the Security Council fully informed of future developments regarding Namibia (United Nations Security Council Resolution #342, 1973).

Meanwhile, the General Assembly continued to issue damning resolutions against continuing South African occupation of Namibia, going far beyond what the Security Council was willing to state. By December 12, 1973, General Assembly Resolution #3111 had gone beyond legitimizing insurgent activities to "noting with satisfaction" SWAPO's progress toward the goal of "national liberation" and recognizing the insurgent group as the "authentic representative of the Namibian people" (United Nations General Assembly Resolution #3111, 1973; O'Sullivan, 2005: 111). This was a

major statement of support for SWAPO political legitimacy that would never be reflected in Security Council resolutions regarding South African-administered Namibia. Indeed, nothing else was heard from the Security Council until December 17, 1974 when Resolution #366, passed unanimously, demanded that the South African government take steps to transfer political power in Namibia to a native government under the aegis of the United Nations (United Nations Security Council Resolution #366, 1974).

Meanwhile, South African political fortunes in Namibia were strongly impacted by the April 1974 collapse of the repressive Portuguese government and its replacement by a liberal administration in Lisbon dedicated to terminating Portugal's centuries-old colonial presence in Africa (Chabal, 1981: 99). In line with that political agenda, Angola, the northern neighbor to Southwest Africa, was scheduled to be granted independence on November 11, 1975 (Mendy, 2003: 57). No clear indigenous successor government had been formed in Angola, however, and fighting broke out during the fall of 1975 among the rival groups of FNLA, MPLA, and UNITA that would continue unabated until 2002 (The World Factbook, 2007: 18). The openly Marxist MPLA was soon receiving significant military deliveries from the Soviet Union through a Soviet military airlift, which was soon enhanced by the intervention of Cuban combat troops equipped by the Soviet government (Kissinger, 1999: 907-909). The South African government feared that a victory by the Marxist MPLA would result in political and military support to SWAPO, and began offering support to both FNLA and UNITA while also launching its own military attacks into MPLA-controlled areas of Angola (Moroney, ed., 1989: 384). South African authorities additionally counted on United States bi-polar Cold War policies to ensure the survival of South African apartheid over

the loss of the region's important strategic resources to pro-Soviet forces. In line with these concepts, the South African government sought to define its counterinsurgency campaigns as an extension of its basic anti-Communist position in southern Africa; especially 'Soviet-style Communism' as found within the MPLA (Horton, 1999: Occasional Paper #27).[82] Evidence that those tactics were taken seriously by the great powers is suggested by Security Council silence on the issue of Namibia during 1975; a silence which contrasted dramatically with the outrage of the General Assembly which issued, on December 10, 1975, General Assembly Resolution #3411, noting "with regret" that France, the United Kingdom, and the United States "through abuse of their veto," had prevented the Security Council from establishing a mandatory arms embargo against South Africa, and condemning France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States for implicitly encouraging "inhuman" South African policies through pursuance of their economic interests in the area (United Nations General Assembly Resolution #3411, 1975).

By 1976, however, the Security Council was reacting to the General Assembly challenge, unanimously issuing Resolution #385 on January 30, 1976 to castigate the South African government for its continuing occupation of Namibia, Resolution #387 on March 31, 1976 (with abstentions by France, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States, and the PRC not participating) to condemn South African use of Namibia as a military platform for attacks against Angola, and Resolution #393 on July 30, 1976 (with an abstention by the United States) to condemn South African attacks against

[82] By 1968, South Africa's Suppression of Communism Act of 1950 had been extended throughout Namibia (United Nations General Assembly Resolution #2404, 1968).

Zambia. Resolution #393 was arguably the most important, since it again recognized the legitimacy of the Namibian insurgency (while declining to refer to SWAPO by name) and commended such 'front-line' states as Zambia for providing material support to the Namibian guerillas (United Nations Security Council Resolutions #385, #387, and #393, 1976).

While these resolutions may have motivated both SWAPO and Angolan forces in their efforts against South African incursions, direct Cuban military support under the aegis of the Soviet Union was vital in enabling the MPLA to drive the South African military back across the Namibian border by the end of March 1976, and allow the Angolan government to begin providing SWAPO with sanctuaries for its growing campaign against South African rule (Moroney, ed., 1989: 384). This combination of widespread United Nations condemnation and increasing Soviet/Cuban pressure soon led to heightened South African isolation and garrison state desperation that was reflected in ominous political/military policies: the development of nuclear weapons with which to both prevent great power intervention and, at the same time, co-opt its support. These activities were conducted at the country's Valindaba Y-Plant, commissioned in 1974, which, by 1977, had produced a fission device on the model of the weapon which devastated Hiroshima, Japan on August 6, 1945. Eventually, four such devices would be completed (to be delivered by modified Blackburn Buccaneer strike aircraft), and it was hoped by South African authorities that the appearance of credibility in nuclear deterrence would encourage Western governments to take actions in support of South Africa's apartheid system to ensure that those weapons were never used. As such, these activities were implicitly designed to quietly come to the attention of the great

powers, and, by the summer of 1977, their existence had been confirmed by the Soviet KGB, which, despite the confrontation of the Cold War, alerted the United States government.[83] To deter this perceived threat to world peace (and to the Soviet position in southern Africa), the Soviet government proposed a pre-emptive air strike against the Valindaba installation; a proposal rejected by the United States, and thus never carried out by the Soviet military (Albright, 1994: 37-42).

While the United States determined to prevent a military strike against South African facilities, the subsequent response of the Security Council may have surprised the South African government, since, far from offering support to the South African security dilemma, Resolution #418, issued on November 4, 1977, noted that the Security Council was "gravely concerned that South Africa is at the threshold of producing nuclear weapons," warned member states not to provide assistance to such a program, and enacted the long-awaited "mandatory arms embargo" against the South African government (United Nations Security Council Resolution #418, 1977). The fact that this resolution, with its accompanying mandatory arms embargo, passed unanimously appears to have reflected an unwillingness by the permanent members of the Security Council (which then comprised all of the declared nuclear weapons powers) to extend the nuclear monopoly beyond themselves, especially within such an unstable region. General Assembly Resolution #32/105, issued December 14, 1977, further condemned the "continuing collaboration by certain governments" in enabling the South African government to pursue nuclear development; the State of Israel may have

[83] The KGB had a covert intelligence source for such information in the form of Commodore Dieter Gerhardt, commander of the South African naval base at Simonstown. He was eventually detected by South African security services, and arrested during 1982 (Albright, David, 1994: 42).

been alluded to within that context, since the resolution had, in the previous section, demanded the Israeli government terminate all collaboration with South Africa in "the military and nuclear fields" (United Nations General Assembly Resolution #32/105, 1977). On May 6, 1978, United States reluctance to legitimize insurgency came to an end with the unanimous issuance of Security Council Resolution #428, decrying South African penetration of Angolan territory, legitimizing the Namibian insurgency (although SWAPO was still not mentioned by name), and commending the Angolan government for supporting the guerillas (United Nations Security Council Resolution #428, 1978).[84] Later that year, Security Council Resolution #431, issued on July 27, 1978 (with abstentions by Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union), called for the Secretary-General to appoint a special representative for Namibia to prepare the territory for independence (United Nations Security Council Resolution #431, 1978). Security Council Resolution #432, issued unanimously the same day, called for the political integration of the South African territory of Walvis Bay into Namibia (United Nations Security Council Resolution #432, 1978). Security Council Resolution #435, issued on September 29, 1978 (with abstentions by Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union), provided direct references to SWAPO as it determined to establish a United Nations Transition Assistance Group to further the goal of Namibian independence (United Nations Security Council Resolution #435, 1978), and Security Council Resolution #439, issued on November 13, 1978 with abstentions by Canada, France, Germany, the United Kingdom, and the United States, condemned South African plans to proceed with unrecognized territorial elections

[84] The United State's reluctance to formally legitimize insurgent activity might have resulted from the American failure to destroy the Việt Cộng insurgency in South Vietnam just a few years earlier.

(United Nations Security Council Resolution #439, 1978).[85] These resolutions, which legitimized the insurgency, called for an independent Namibian state which would include the long-held South African territory of Walvis Bay, and refused recognition to South African-sponsored elections for Namibia were devastating for South African policy-makers, especially since the United States abstained from voting on only the relatively minor issue of territorial elections (Moroney, ed., 1989: 386-387).

The scale of the fighting increased during the late 1970s, and by 1979, 60,000 South African troops were stationed in Namibia, supported by seven major air bases along with the large existing naval base at the South African enclave of Walvis Bay (Moroney, ed., 1989: 384-386). Further Security Council resolutions were issued during 1979 and 1980, with Resolution #447 (issued on March 28, 1979), Resolution #454 (issued on November 2, 1979), and Resolution #475 (issued June 27, 1980) condemning South African military forces for violating Angolan sovereignty. All three resolutions passed with abstentions by France, the United Kingdom, and the United States (United Nations Security Council Resolutions #447, #454, and #475, 1979-1980), however, perhaps suggestive of continuing Cold War concerns by Western great powers of Soviet dominance in the region (Horton, 1999: Occasional Paper #27). Interestingly enough, Security Council Resolution #466, issued on April 11, 1980 and condemning South African military violation of Zambian sovereignty passed unanimously; perhaps since Zambia was not viewed in the West as a Soviet client state along the lines of Angola (United Nations Security Council Resolution #466, 1980).

[85] Interestingly enough, Security Council Resolution #435 would eventually serve as the legal basis for the implementation plan for Namibian independence (Moroney, ed., 1989: 386-387).

South African troop commitments to counterinsurgency operations in Namibia and Angola continued to increase during the 1980s, with military and paramilitary forces estimated at around 100,000 by the latter part of the decade; approximately 9,000 of which were essentially stationed in southern Angola (Moroney, ed., 1989: 384-386). By the mid-1980s, however, heightened Soviet support for both Angola and SWAPO was reflected by the presence of about 50,000 Cuban troops in Angola battling both South African troops and their Angolan surrogates. Albright quotes an unnamed South African official in stating that only the relative restraint displayed by the Soviet Union prevented Cuban troops in Angola from overwhelming the South African position there during that time period (Albright, 1994: 42), and the Security Council perhaps presciently exhibited more restraint regarding South African counterinsurgency campaigns against SWAPO during that strained period, with no resolutions issued regarding the matter at all during 1981 and 1982, and none of the four issued during 1983-1984 –Resolution #532 (issued unanimously on May 31, 1982), Resolution #539 (issued on October 28, 1982 with the United States abstaining), Resolution #545 (issued on December 20, 1983 with the United States abstaining), and Resolution #546 (issued on January 6, 1984 with the United Kingdom and the United States abstaining) – reiterating the 1978 legitimization of the SWAPO insurgency. While both Resolutions #532 and #539 condemned continuing South African occupation of Namibia (with Resolution #539 using harsher language), Resolutions #545 and #546 again condemned South African operations in Angola; something the United States (and, typically, the United Kingdom) was still prepared to abstain from supporting (United Nations Security Council Resolutions #532, #539, and #545, 1983).

By the mid-1980s, however, Security Council activities may have begun to reflect increasing American and British acceptance of the futility of the South African struggle with both MPLA and SWAPO, since only one of five Security Council resolutions (Resolution #566, issued on June 19, 1985, again reflecting the legitimacy of the Namibian insurgency while deleting direct references to SWAPO) handed down during 1985 passed with United States and United Kingdom abstentions. Resolutions #567 (issued unanimously on June 20, 1985), #571 (issued unanimously on September 20, 1985), #574 (issued unanimously on October 7, 1985), and #577 (issued unanimously on December 6, 1985) all decried South African military violations of Angolan sovereignty, with Resolution #574 reaffirming the right of the People's Republic of Angola to take necessary measures to defend itself against South African forces, and Resolution #577 commending the Angolan government for its support of the Namibian insurgency (United Nations Security Council Resolutions #566, #567, #571, #574, and #577, 1985).

The perception of South African military successes during 1986 and 1987 (during which time, the South African government claimed the virtual destruction of SWAPO), combined with reports that SWAPO guerillas, in targeting white farming areas, were now engaging in activities more readily defined as terrorism, may have briefly altered United States perceptions of the conflict, however (Moroney, 1989: 384-386), since no Security Council resolutions regarding Namibia were handed down during 1986, and Resolution #601, issued on October 30, 1987 and welcoming the readiness of SWAPO representatives to arrange a cease-fire, was abstained to by the United States (United Nations Security Council Resolution #601, 1987). Resolutions #602 (issued November

25, 1987) and Resolution #606 (issued December 23, 1987), both of which condemned South African military intrusion into Angolan territory (albeit, on more moderate terms than found in past resolutions), were passed unanimously, however (United Nations Security Council Resolutions #602 and #606, 1987).

Regardless of South African claims of the destruction of SWAPO as a functioning entity, the insurgent group continued to deploy an estimated 9,000 – 10,000 guerillas armed with Soviet-bloc weapons in northern Namibia and southern Angola during 1988 (Moroney, ed., 1989: 384-386). During May of that year, the façade of South African military prowess was roundly shattered by a defeat at the hands of the Cuban military at Cuito Cuanavale, Angola; a defeat which ended South African aspirations of a military settlement of the Namibia/Angola issue on grounds favorable to South Africa (O'Sullivan, 2005: 111). Nine rounds of international talks between government representatives of Angola, Cuba, South Africa, and the United States were initiated later that month and lasted until November of that year, setting the stage for the full withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola and a South African pledge of full independence for Namibia through the implementation of Security Council Resolution #435 (Moroney, ed., 1989: 386-387). To effect those decolonization efforts, the United Nations Transitional Assistance Group (UNTAG) established an interim administration in Namibia during 1989 to provide peacekeeping operations within the territory while Security Council Resolution #435 was implemented (further defined in Security Council Resolutions #629 and #632, issued on January 16, 1989 and February 16, 1989 respectively (United Nations Security Council Resolutions #629 and #632, 1989)), repatriate 40,000 exiles, and provide adequate security for elections held there later that

year (O'Sullivan, 2005: 111). Two final Security Council resolutions reflected South African desperation to salvage something during this transition process from the decades-long counterinsurgency program: Resolution #640, issued unanimously on August 29, 1989 and demanding the disbandment of pro-South African Namibian militias and commando units allegedly being utilized to intimidate the native population, and Resolution #643, issued unanimously on October 31, 1989 and demanding full South African compliance with Security Council Resolutions #435, #632, and #640 (United Nations Security Council Resolutions #640 and #643, 1989). Once the election results were verified, UNTAG personnel departed Southwest Africa and the South African mandate of Southwest Africa received formal independence as the Republic of Namibia on March 21, 1990 under a SWAPO-led government, an outcome that underlined the ultimate futility of the 22 year conflict for South Africa (The World Factbook, 2007: 399-400). Just over four years later, white minority rule in South Africa itself faded into history; possibly hastened along by African nationalism heightened by the long-term conflict in the region (The World Factbook, 2007: 525- 526).

In retrospect, it is fairly clear that, by the mid-1970s, white minority rule in Africa was truly passé against robust sub-Saharan African nationalism. With African military prowess successfully terminating Portuguese rule in Angola, Portuguese Guinea, and Mozambique and, subsequently, white minority-rule in the Rhodesian statelet, the time of reckoning had come for colonial rule in Southwest Africa and white minority rule in South Africa itself. Increasing United Nations pressure successfully served to isolate internationally the South African administration of Namibia, empower Namibian nationalism and serve as the focus for Pan-African nationalism, and heighten

indigenous repugnance of foreign domination, leaving the South African government to do little more than conduct a holding action in the territory while fighting a native insurgency confident of its ultimate victory. Great power intervention in the form of Soviet support and Cuban client troops may have been more decisive in actually defeating South African counterinsurgency efforts, however; especially in the face of American political inability to adequately embrace South African racial policies in the territory and accept the possibility of South African nuclear weapons deployment (United Nations Security Council Resolution #418, 1977).

C. Morocco, and Defeat in Western Sahara (1975-1983)

Spain's overall political presence in northwest Africa was approaching its 500th anniversary during the late 1960s, when an intermittent, low-level indigenous insurgency against Spanish rule broke out during 1967 in Spanish Sahara, a phosphate-rich region fronting along the Atlantic Ocean and sandwiched between Morocco and Mauritania. By 1973, this insurgency had been consolidated and enlarged by the POLISARIO Front into a viable challenge for Spanish colonial authorities (Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 5-6). The previous twenty years of European experience in reducing insurgencies within their African domains was not heartening, and, after spending nearly two years attempting to resolve the conflict with POLISARIO on terms favorable to Spanish interests, the Spanish government abruptly announced on May 23, 1975 that it would soon abandon the struggle and withdraw its sovereignty from the territory (Marks, 1976: 3-4).

Morocco had earlier made a somewhat unstructured formal claim to Spanish Sahara within the context of the United Nations on November 20, 1958 when, in a

communiqué to the Secretary-General, the Moroccan government stated a "claim [to] certain African territories at present under Spanish control as an integral part of Moroccan national territory" (Western Sahara: Advisory Opinion of 16 October 1975, 1975: 17). That claim was further defined and reiterated on October 12, 1961, during the Fourth Committee of the General Assembly, when the Moroccan representative, in countering Spanish plans to submit information on the territory, stated that "those cities and regions [of Spanish Sahara] formed an integral part of Morocco and the statutes at present governing them were contrary to international law and incompatible with the territorial sovereignty and integrity of Morocco" (Western Sahara: Advisory Opinion of 16 October 1975, 1975: 17). While that claim continued to be pressed by the Moroccan government within the General Assembly until 1966, it lay dormant there for an eight year period until it was reinstated on September 23, 1974 in an unsuccessful attempt to detach the issue from the decolonization proceedings carried on by the United Nations. The Mauritanian government had launched a similar claim to the General Assembly during 1960, shortly after Mauritania became a member of the United Nations, with a statement that Western Sahara was a part of its national territory. Unlike the Moroccan position, the Mauritanian government qualified the statement by agreeing to acquiesce with the will of the territorial population, and did not press a direct legal claim to the territory. The Spanish announcement of May 23, 1975 quickly brought these rival claims into sharp focus within the General Assembly, however, and the government of Algeria was among the most vocal in supporting complete independence for the restive Spanish colony (Western Sahara: Advisory Opinion of 16 October 1975, 1975: 18, 22).

Algeria was not alone in its concerns regarding the future of the territory. By December 13, 1974, the matter had been seized by the General Assembly, which issued Resolution #3292, calling for the ICJ to deliver an advisory opinion regarding the territory of Spanish Sahara, addressing such issues as terra nullius (whether or not the territory was actually peopled by an indigenous population), the legality of Morocco's historic claim to the territory as stated in various documents and treaties, and the legitimacy of any overlapping Mauritanian territorial claims. The thrust of the resolution appeared to favor independence for the territory since it contained references to the ground-breaking General Assembly Resolution #1514, and issued a request for the "Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to keep the situation in the Territory under review" (United Nations General Assembly Resolution #3292, 1974).

The ICJ accepted the request, delivering its advisory opinion on October 16, 1975. In that opinion, it was determined that, at the time of the Spanish conquest, the territory was not terra nullius, since it was peopled and occupied. The claims of the governments of Morocco and Mauritania were found to be difficult to uphold, since no clear evidence was found that the tribal leaders of Western Sahara had ever effectively recognized the authority of either of those entities in the manner of offering obeisance, paying taxes, or contributing troops for the common defense. The court noted, however, that even though neither state had ever exercised any viable territorial sovereignty over the territory, the possibility still existed that the Sultan of Morocco may have exercised authority over some of the Western Saharan tribes at various periods of

time. Perhaps most damaging to the legality of the Moroccan claim was, however, the decision by the court that none of the historical documents and treaties (including the Treaty of Marrakesh of 1967, the Hispano-Moroccan Treaty of Commerce and Navigation of 20 November 1861, a treaty with the United States of 1836, a treaty with the United Kingdom of 1856 dealing with the safety of mariners, the Treaty of Tetuan of 1860, Anglo-Moroccan Agreement of 13 March 1895, and the Franco-German exchange of letters of 4 November 1911) presented by the Moroccan government as evidence of its legal claim to the territory established official international recognition of Moroccan sovereignty over Western Sahara, although indications of recognition of Moroccan authority or influence over some nomads in the territory could again be construed from documents relating to shipwrecked sailors (Western Sahara: Advisory Opinion of 16 October 1975, 1975: 4, 29-31, 39-54).

A similar line of reasoning was applied to the more vaguely-defined Mauritanian claim. The Mauritanian position was much weaker, since Mauritania, as a modern political entity, had not existed prior to French colonization, and, as a result, the Mauritanian claim appeared to fare somewhat worse than did the claim of Morocco. Much of the phraseology supporting Mauritanian claims appeared to rest simply upon the nomadic character of the peoples of Western Sahara, who did indeed, from time to time, move across political frontiers. While the court acknowledged such nomadic behavior and found that basic 'rights relating to the land' had formerly existed between Western Sahara and the 'Mauritanian entity' that constituted legal ties between the two territories, such ties were not judged to constitute viable evidence of Mauritanian sovereignty, a central allegiance of tribes, or even of 'simply inclusion' within the same

political entity (Western Sahara: Advisory Opinion of 16 October 1975, 1975: 47-48, 53-55, 56-57, 60).

The court closed its advisory opinion by stating that no evidence of territorial sovereignty between either Morocco or Mauritania and Western Sahara had been found which would affect the application of General Assembly Resolution #1514 and grant self-determination for the peoples of the territory (Western Sahara: Advisory Opinion of 16 October 1975, 1975: 60). Stymied by the legal process, both Morocco and Mauritania prevailed directly upon Spain to divide the territory between them before withdrawing Spanish sovereignty (Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 19), even as the United States, viewing Morocco as a staunch Cold War ally and one of the few Arab states willing to play an important role in an American-brokered Middle East peace process, moved to grant strong diplomatic support to the Moroccan territorial claim (Campbell, 2003: 38).[86] To further enforce that claim, the Moroccan government launched a 'Green March' of 350,000 Moroccan 'volunteers' who entered the territory on November 6, 1975 to seize it for Morocco. The entry of the massive number of Moroccans shattered any optimism remaining among the Sahrawi peoples from the issuance of the ICJ advisory opinion, and most of them, led by elements of POLISARIO, fled across the small Algerian frontier to seek refuge in Tindouf, Algeria, leaving remnants of the population behind in Al 'Ayun to protest the invasion (Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 5-6).

[86] The Moroccan government, widely viewed internationally as the model of a stable, moderate Arab regime, successfully portrayed POLISARIO as a leftist-dominated organization under the control of Algeria. Since that time, Moroccan officials have variously described POLISARIO as being a movement of Cuban mercenaries, Iranian-backed revolutionaries, allies of such Palestinian terrorists as Ahmed Jibril, and – most recently – al-Qa'eda (Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 19). The fact that Algeria and Libya were both supporting POLISARIO may have also served to heighten American concerns, given that both states – especially the latter – were widely viewed in the United States as being politically radical.

Meanwhile, the Spanish government, even as it stated its willingness to withdraw from the territory, emphasized the unique character of the Western Saharan peoples and denied their cultural inclusion within either of the neighboring states (Western Sahara: Advisory Opinion of 16 October 1975, 1975: 54). Facing a de-facto fait accompli from Morocco and political pressure from the United States, however, the Spanish government, led by the dying Francisco Paulino Hermenegildo Teódulo Franco y Bahamonde, shelved its plans to hold a territorial referendum and, without consulting the Saharan people, signed the Madrid Accords eight days later on November 14, 1975. Those accords provided for the participation by deputy governors, nominated by the governments of Morocco and Mauritania, in the governance of the territory pending the Spanish withdrawal of sovereignty. Even though verbiage contained within this document stated that the views of the Saharan population would be respected, it was viewed by both Moroccan and Mauritanian officials as little more than an agreement for partition (Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 5-6).

Fearing an imminent annexation of Western Sahara by Morocco and Mauritania, the Security Council responded quickly, issuing Resolution #377 by consensus on October 22, 1975 which appealed to the parties concerned to demonstrate restraint, and Resolution #379 by consensus on November 2, 1975 which asked Moroccan King Hassan II to forgo the Green March. When the Moroccan government ignored these resolutions and set the Green March into effect four days later on November 6, 1975, the Security Council responded that same day by issuing Resolution #380 by consensus, 'deploring' the conducting of the Green March and calling for the withdrawal of all Moroccan personnel from the territory of Western Sahara (United Nations Security

Council Resolutions #377, #379, and #380, 1975). Meanwhile, the General Assembly continued to express optimism with Resolution #3458, issued on December 10, 1975, reaffirming the right of the Sahrawi people to self-determination and requesting the parties to the Madrid Accords to ensure respect for Sahrawi aspirations (United Nations General Assembly Resolution #3458, 1975).

The governments of Morocco and Mauritania continued to press ahead with partition and annexation, however, settling the nature of that partition on February 27, 1976; on the very day that POLISARIO declared the independence of the Sahrawi Arab Democratic Republic. The population of Spanish Sahara was estimated at that time to number less than 100,000, of which an estimated 68,000 were refugees living abroad or within the peripheries of the territory, many as a result of the 'Green March' of November 1975. Although the POLISARIO Front, now fielding roughly 5,000-7,000 troops, was widely believed to have the support of much of this population, a large-scale military invasion mounted that spring by both Moroccan and Mauritanian troops forced POLISARIO to seek refuge along the small Algerian frontier adjacent to the refugee center in Tindouf as the former Spanish Sahara was politically divided between its two larger neighbors (Mercer, 1976: 504-507).

The Security Council, faced with this apparent disregard by both Morocco and Mauritania for any realistic Sahrawi self-determination, exhibited a somewhat surprising silence and declined to hand down any further resolutions regarding the matter for nearly 13 years (United Nations Security Council Resolutions, 1976-1987). The issue of Western Sahara was also a contentious matter for General Assembly, given that both Mauritanian and Morocco were post-colonial, indigenously-ruled African states claiming

to be addressing an injustice wrought against them by 15th century Spanish colonialism (Western Sahara: Advisory Opinion of 16 October 1975, 1975: 4, 29-31, 39-57, 60). General Assembly resolutions issued regarding Western Sahara during 1976, 1977, and 1978 thus castigated neither Morocco nor Mauritania for their invasion and annexation of the territory but simply continued to express the hope that the national aspirations of the Sahrawi peoples would eventually be taken into account (United Nations General Assembly Resolutions #31/32, #31/45, #32/22, and #33/31, 1976-1978). Western Sahara was also a difficult issue to resolve for other Third World-dominated international organizations, such as the OAU and NAM, to resolve, and the Moroccan government sought to exploit this lack of Third World unity for Western Saharan independence by describing POLISARIO as a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Algerian regime, designed to advance Algeria's radical agenda (Solarz, 1979/1980: 281, 285).

In conducting its subsequent counterinsurgency mission, L'Armée royale du Maroc appears to have used the 'cost-benefit' approach, involving the systematic torture of political prisoners and violently repressive military campaigns designed to rid the territory of nationalist sentiment (Smith, 1987: 145). American military aid to Morocco also served to reduce Algerian military ascendancy in the region, leading the Moroccan government to threaten to violate the Algerian frontier and attack Sahrawi refugee camps in Tindouf (Zunes, 1995: 26).[87] In contrast, the POLISARIO has, over the years, made defined efforts to avoid civilian casualties by targeting only Moroccan troops;

[87] Incursions into Mauritanian territory were routine until the Moroccan military moved to a more defensive strategy during 1982 (Zunes, 1995: 26).

efforts that eventually garnered wide international support for the independence movement (Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 6). As the Moroccan/Mauritanian occupation set in, POLISARIO began to receive military support from both Algeria and Libya, and by August 1979 the insurgent group had succeeded to forcing Mauritania to relinquish any formal claims to the former colony. Although Morocco quickly extended its formal territorial claim to include the entirety of the former Spanish Sahara, Moroccan forces had themselves, by that time, been forced out of all but a miniscule portion of Saharan territory that was centered, in typical colonial fashion, within the urban enclaves. Inside those besieged towns, some 50,000 Moroccan troops attempted to enforce the Moroccan claim of sovereignty over the entire territory while being continuously harried by an estimated 12,000–15,000 full-time POLISARIO guerillas (Solarz, 1979/1980: 281, 284-285).

The steadfastness of POLISARIO did not go unnoticed internationally. Solarz, in testifying before Congress during 1979, noted that evaluations conducted by area specialists, journalists, and veteran observers of African liberation movements that included spending time with POLISARIO units and in Sahrawi refugee camps contended that the POLISARIO had, by the late 1970s, managed to create a viable nationalist conscience (as opposed to mere tribalism) within the Sahrawi people along with a remarkable degree of independent organizational competence (U. S. Policy and the Conflict in Western Sahara, 1979). Solarz quotes a leading (and un-named) Spanish official with extensive experience in Western Sahara who summed up POLISARIO activities within the Sahrawi peoples by stating that “POLISARIO has created a nation” (Solarz, 1979/1980: 286). POLISARIO’s efforts at nation-building led

the OAU, at its annual summit held in Monrovia, Liberia during July 17-20, 1979, to call for a ceasefire and a territorial referendum in Western Sahara by a vote of 33 to two, with eight abstentions. The subsequent NAM Conference in Havana, Cuba endorsed the OAU resolution, and condemned Morocco for its annexation of the former Mauritanian claim. By the end of 1979, a total of 32 countries (most of which were in Africa, but also included Mexico) had recognized the POLISARIO as the legitimate authority in Western Sahara (Solarz, 1979/1980: 281, 285). The General Assembly eventually reflected this sea-change in Resolution #34/37, issued on November 21, 1979, which noted the actions by the OAU and NAM "with satisfaction" and, for the first time, 'deploring' the situation "resulting from the continuing occupation of Western Sahara by Morocco and the extension of that occupation to the territory recently evacuated by Mauritania" (United Nations General Assembly Resolution #34/37, 1979). One year later, on November 11, 1980, Resolution #35/19 reiterated these concerns and recognized the legitimacy of the anti-Moroccan insurgency, while declining to name POLISARIO directly (United Nations General Assembly Resolution #35/19, 1980).

As a result, the fortunes of POLISARIO appeared to be on the rise during that time period, and the COW Extra-State Dataset defines, with some validity, the status of the insurgency in Western Sahara as late as 1983 as representing a victory for the insurgents (Sarkees, 2000: 123-144). Efforts were made by Moroccan officials to portray POLISARIO as representing the forefront of Communist encroachment in Northwest Africa, however, and the administration of President Jimmy Carter, shaken by the fall of Iranian Shah Reza Pahlavi, agreed to supply military and financial aid for L'Armée royale du Maroc during October 1979 in the form of Bell AH-1 Cobra helicopter

gunships and North American Rockwell OV-10 Bronco attack aircraft (Solarz, 1979/1980: 287-288, 296).[88] The United States, France, and Sa'udi Arabia dramatically increased their support of the Moroccan position over the next few years with counterinsurgency training; training further enhanced with technical assistance that enabled Moroccan authorities to construct an 800 mile sand-wall that isolated 80% of the territory from penetration by POLISARIO. This vital assistance revived Morocco's declining fortunes, and allowed L'Armée royale du Maroc to secure its position in the territory (Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 6). The Moroccan government was also skillful diplomatically in playing a unique hand in the developing world as both an African state and an Arab state; while the OAU backed Sahrawi self-determination and allowed POLISARIO membership in the regional body (leading Morocco to withdraw its own membership in retaliation) (Campbell, 2003: 47), the major influence wielded by King Hassan II in both Jāmi 'at ad-Duwal al-'Arabiyya and the Islamic Conference kept Algerian officials from even placing the issue before either organization (Zunes, 1995: 23).[89] Among international Arab organizations, only the Arab Steadfastness Front (a grouping of hard-line Arab states opposed to American-sponsored peace negotiations with Israel) formally endorsed the POLISARIO cause, and that endorsement amounted to little more than rhetoric (Zunes, 1995: 23). This diplomatic push appears to have yielded important results for the Moroccan position in Western Sahara, since the nature

[88] In fact, POLISARIO was the only major liberation movement in Africa not to request or receive direct Soviet, Chinese, or Cuban military assistance (Solarz, 1979/1980: 287).

[89] On January 8, 1999, Esmat Abdul Meguid, Secretary-General of the Jāmi 'at ad-Duwal al-'Arabiyya, put the issue to rest by stating that the organization supported Morocco's territorial integrity in the Sahara issue (Arab League Supports Morocco's Territorial Integrity, 1999: 1).

of the General Assembly resolutions underwent a definable change during the latter part of 1981. Harsh condemnations of Moroccan activities in Western Sahara and legitimization of POLISARIO activities within the territory were now replaced with appeals for a territorial referendum; verbiage that would set the tone for all future General Assembly resolutions (numbering at least 46 through the year 2008) regarding Western Sahara (United Nations General Assembly Resolutions, 1982-2008).[90]

Even with these enhancements to the Moroccan political and military position in Western Sahara, a military stalemate set in between L'Armée royale du Maroc and POLISARIO during the late 1980s with the POLISARIO in loose control of a small 'liberated zone' outside the sand-wall, and 180,000 Sahrawi refugees living in Algeria (Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 6). During late 1988, however, anti-government rioting erupted in neighboring Algeria that included an attack upon POLISARIO headquarters in Algiers by Algerian activists resentful of the costs of supporting the Sahrawi cause. A subsequent win by the radical Front Islamique du Salut during the initial round of elections in December 1991 led Algerian officials to suspend an upcoming second round of voting which would have likely discharged the long-ruling FLN party from power. The combination of these events served to distract the Algerian government from the conflict in Western Sahara and reduced leverage for POLISARIO operations. The assumption in diplomatic circles that King Hassan II would lose his throne should he concede defeat to POLISARIO also significantly raised the stakes both for the

[90] That listing of resolutions included #36/46, #37/28, #38/40, #39/40, #40/50, #41/16, #42/78, #43/33, #44/88, #45/21, #46/67, #47/25, #48/49, #48/250, ##48/250[A], #48/250[B], #49/44, #49/247, #50/36, #50/36, #51/143, #52/228[A], #52/228[B], #52/75, #53/64, #53/18[A], #53/18[B], #54/87, #54/268, #55/141, #55/262, #56/69, #56/298, #57/135, #57/309, #57/331, #58/109, #58/309, #59/131, #59/308, #60/114, #60/280, #61/125, #61/290, #62/116, and #63/105 (United Nations General Assembly/Security Council Resolutions, 1981-2008).

Moroccan government and for its American, French, and Persian Gulf supporters, and granted heightened maneuvering room for L'Armée royale du Maroc in its counterinsurgency operations (Zunes, 1995: 31-35).[91]

These events were reflected in activities by the Security Council, which, following a period of dormancy regarding the Moroccan occupation of Western Sahara of nearly 13 years, again took up the matter of Western Sahara on September 20, 1988 with the issuance of Resolution #621 (United Nations Security Council Resolution #621, 1988). Both that resolution and Resolution #658, issued on June 27, 1990, refrained from any condemnations of Moroccan counterinsurgency operations or legitimization of POLISARIO operations, and simply pressed the goal of a territory referendum; an effort that culminated with the issuance of Resolution #690 on April 29, 1991, authorizing the formation of Mission des Nations unies pour l'Organisation d'un Référendum au Sahara Occidental (MINURSO) to take necessary steps to hold such a referendum (United Nations Security Council Resolutions #658 and #690, 1990-1991). A cease-fire between L'Armée royale du Maroc and POLISARIO was finally concluded on September 6, 1991 in an effort to end the violence, and MINURSO was given the task of both monitoring the ceasefire and identifying eligible participants for a referendum. The 'eligibility question' has been continually shelved ever since, however, due to the Moroccan position that only current territorial residents must be allowed to participate; a population that includes Moroccan citizens who participated in the 1975 Green March and their descendants, but excludes the significant Sahrawi Diaspora exiled in Algerian

[91] King Hassan II, ever the flexible politician, continued to play to his American supporters during this period by sending troops to fight along those of the United States during the Gulf War of January-February 1991, despite the deep unpopularity of that move with the Moroccan people (Campbell, 2003: 38).

refugee camps, the greater Maghreb, and Europe. Such a position would virtually insure a vote for continued Moroccan rule, and is thus totally unacceptable to POLISARIO (Campbell, 2003: 47-48). By 1996, Amnesty International was charging that MINURSO was essentially following the dictates of the Moroccan government, and, in doing so, was a "silent witness to blatant human rights violations" (Amnesty International, 1996: 12). Even so, a series of at least 83 additional resolutions by both the General Assembly and the Security Council would be issued during 1991-2008, calling for a referendum which would never be held while Morocco further secured its grip on Western Sahara and tens of thousands of Sahrawi people languished in refugee camps (United Nations General Assembly/Security Council Resolutions, 1991-2008).[92]

A brief Intifada erupted during September-October 1999, followed by sporadic demonstrations that continued throughout the territory for the next six years; unrest that has required the long-term stationing of 120,000 troops to sustain Moroccan authority within the territory and protect the 200,000 Moroccan settlers moved there by the Moroccan government (currently outnumbering native Sahrawis by roughly two to one) to insure the defeat of any possible referendum on Saharan independence. Although official Sahrawi representation within Morocco is currently conducted primarily through the Consultative Council for Saharan Affairs (an organization created by the Moroccan monarchy and staffed with pro-integration tribal elders), the Moroccan government, in

[92] This listing of resolutions included United Nations General Assembly Resolutions #46/67, #47/25, #48/49, #48/250, #48/250[A], #48/250[B], #49/44,#49/427, #50/36, #51/143, #52/75, #52/228[A], #52/228[B], #53/18[A], #53/18[B], #53/64, #54/87, #54/268, #55/141, #55/262, #56/69, #56/298, #57/109, #57/135, #57/309, #57/331, #58/109, #58/309, #59/131, #59/308, #60/114, #60/280, #61/125, #61/290, #62/116, and #63/105, and United Nations Security Council Resolutions #809, #907, #1033, #1942, #1056, #1084, #1108, #1131, #1133, #1148, #1163, #1185, #1198, #1204, #1215, #1224, #1228, #1232, #1235, #1238, #1263, #1282, #1292, #1309, #1324, #1342, #1349, #1359, #1380, #1394, #1406, #1429, #1463, #1469, #1485, #1495, #1513, #1523, #1541, #1570, #1598, #1634, #1675, #1720, #1754, #1783 and #1813 (United Nations General Assembly/Security Council Resolutions, 1991-2008).

an effort to further discourage Saharan nationalism, encourages native Sahrawis to assimilate within metropolitan Morocco through offers of employment and free housing. Even with such blandishments, however, a second Intifada broke out in the territory during May 2005 following the transfer of a popular POLISARIO prisoner from the Saharan town of al-'Ayun to a location in the southern region of metropolitan Morocco. Amid the violence, the Moroccan government announced an offer, during November of that year, of 'enhanced autonomy' for the territory under general Moroccan sovereignty (Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 9-18). While an autonomy plan was subsequently presented to the United Nations during 2007, the territory still remains under de-facto Moroccan sovereignty, although its legal status under international law remains unresolved (The World Factbook, 2007: 627-628).

Exploiting divisions existing within the General Assembly and among the OAU, the Jāmi 'at ad-Duwal al-'Arabiyya, and the Islamic Conference allowed the Moroccan government to reduce the international isolation that doomed South Africa's campaigns in Namibia. Great power support of the Moroccan position by the United States and France, enhanced by support from Sa'udi Arabia and the Gulf states, also ensured that POLISARIO would be denied the legitimacy and recognition it needed to present a viable alternative to Moroccan rule. Meanwhile, the Moroccan government has made inroads into co-opting indigenous nationalism by morphing its original cost-benefit approach to counterinsurgency toward an approach along the lines of the social welfare model that encourages native Sahrawis to assimilate within metropolitan Morocco and emphasizes Morocco as the motherland for the Arab and Berber population residing along the Atlantic coast of Northwest Africa. King Mohammed VI also attempts to

present himself as a quasi-father figure who seeks to call into remembrance a past union of these peoples in the area he terms the 'Great South.' This combined counterinsurgency strategy has resulted in a number of disillusioned former POLISARIO guerillas moving to Morocco proper to live and work as Moroccan citizens, and may indeed be, as Moroccan officials claim, a sign of the decline of POLISARIO as a political force (Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 9-18). Even so, unrest continues among the indigenous population to the point that the the Moroccan government finally presented an autonomy plan for the territory to the United Nations during 2007. It thus remains to be seen whether the nationalists of POLISARIO, having now contested Moroccan rule for nearly 33 years, will ever set aside their dream of independence (Mohsen-Finan, 2002: 5-6; Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 9-18; The World Factbook, 2007: 627-628). Given the success of the Moroccan government at dividing its critics, little outside support can now be found for Sahrawi nationalist aspirations outside of non-government organizations (NGOs) such as the Roxbury, Massachusetts-based Freedom House, which recently found the Moroccan administration in Western Sahara to be among the 'worst of the worst' globally (Worst of the Worst, 2009: 2).

It is enlightening to compare this counterinsurgency campaign with the previous one conducted by the South African government. Both countries faced strong insurgent movements in territories they claimed as their own (although South Africa's claim to Namibia was arguably more legitimate that Morocco's claim to Western Sahara, given the League of Nations mandate under which South Africa exercised sovereignty over the territory), both countries were physically contiguous with the territories involved, and both countries, at times, used strong coercive measures associated with the cost-

benefit approach. In both cases, guerillas were able to gain sanctuary and training camps within neighboring states, both insurgent groups gained legitimacy through the verbiage of United Nations resolutions, and insurgents in both cases continued to strive for independent statehood for an extended period of years (24 years for SWAPO, and 34 years – thus far – for POLISARIO).[93] The cases differed in the nature of international support for the insurgencies, however. Whereas the Soviet Union and its Cuban auxiliaries were actively involved in support of the Namibian insurgents, POLISARIO searched in vain for great power support (Albright, 1994: 42; Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 6). The reaction of the United Nations to the conflict in Western Sahara also differed dramatically from that of the Namibian case. While the United Nations membership was fairly united in opposition to South African counterinsurgency operations for well over twenty years (although France, the United States, and the United Kingdom frequently abstained from anti-South African resolutions in the Security Council), United Nations' unity regarding Western Sahara was frustrated from the start. After issuing three strong resolutions during late 1975 (United Nations Security Council Resolutions #377, #379, and #380, 1975), the Security Council went into silence for the next 13 years, possibly because France and the United States, both of which were permanent members of the Security Council, were actively being co-opted by the Moroccan government into supporting the annexation (Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 6). The General Assembly, on the other hand, initiated its interest in the matter by passing four resolutions during 1976-1978 expressing vague wishes for Sahrawi self-

[93] By 1973, the United Nations General Assembly had recognized the legitimacy of the anti-South African insurgency in Namibia by referring to SWAPO by *name*, whereas the Assembly only recognized the anti-Moroccan insurgency in Western Sahara as a general grouping without specific references to POLISARIO ((United Nations General Assembly Resolutions #5111 and #32/19, 1973 and 1980).

determination (United Nations General Assembly Resolutions #31/32, #31/45, #32/22, and #33/31, 1976-1978), only to heighten its opposition to foreign occupation of the territory during 1979-1980 by directly naming and castigating both Morocco and Mauritania and recognizing the legitimacy of the insurgency (United Nations General Assembly Resolution #34/37, 1979; United Nations General Assembly Resolution #35/19, 1980). During that period of rising General Assembly support, POLISARIO motivation was enhanced to the point that Moroccan occupation forces found themselves in a virtual state of siege; indeed, by 1983, the COW Extra-State Dataset had coded this conflict as a defeat for Morocco (Solarz, 1979/1980: 281, 284-285; Sarkees, 2000: 123-144). By the early 1980s, however, a split in the General Assembly between sub-Saharan Africa and the Arab states linked to Jāmi ‘at ad-Duwal al-‘Arabiyya and the Islamic Conference reduced General Assembly resolutions to mere calls for a territorial referendum; calls that were routinely ignored by a Moroccan government which was now being openly courted by both France and the United States (United Nations General Assembly Resolutions, 1982-2008; Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 6). By 1988, this lack of international support had left POLISARIO virtually friendless and forced it to accede to a temporary political solution of Moroccan administration that eventually granted quasi-legitimacy to an occupation that continues to this day (United Nations Security Council Resolutions #621, #658, and #690, 1988-1991).[94] Even so, the rising and falling of POLISARIO’s fortunes in concert with the ebb and flow of General Assembly support provides support for Hypothesis #1, while the lack of great

[94] This continuance of the Moroccan occupation leads me to disagree with the COW Extra-State Dataset’s coding of this conflict as a victory for POLISARIO and argue that the conflict should now be codes as a victory for Morocco (Sarkees, 2000: 123-144).

power opposition that has allowed the Moroccan government to prevail in its occupation provides support for Hypothesis #2.

D. China, and Victory in Tibet (1950-1951, through 1974)

Tibet has a long history with the Chinese state. During the Qing and Manchu dynasties extending from 1644 through 1911, the imperial Chinese court began to extend formal control over Tibet, with the stationing there of imperial envoys protected by Chinese garrisons. In the wake of early 19th century European incursions into China, however, Tibet obtained substantial autonomy to the point that Chinese control became essentially symbolic. Although this autonomy further increased following the 1911 revolution that established the Republic of China, claims of continuing Chinese sovereignty were enhanced during the next few decades by the lack of meaningful efforts on the part of Tibetan officials to secure de jure symbols of independence might gain international recognition (Chen, 2006: 56).

Following the October 1, 1949 declaration of the PRC, however, Tibetan representatives were sent to India, the United Kingdom, and the United States to appeal for support of Tibet's membership in the United Nations as an independent state. None of the three countries offered any such support, and cautioned the Tibetans against unduly provoking the PRC. Nor were any resolutions issued by the United Nations in support of Tibetan independence. Meanwhile, Máo Zédōng, Chairman of the Chinese Communist Party, was developing a sudden urgency for reincorporating Tibet into the Chinese state; an urgency that now appears to have derived from his suspicions that India, the United Kingdom, and the United States were actively working to incorporate Tibet into an emerging anti-PRC political bloc encircling the Chinese state (Sheng,

2006: 17, 25). Máo had, in fact, received a certain amount of Tibetan encouragement for the reincorporation of the territory into the PRC as a result of an internal religious rivalry between the Dalai Lama and the Pachen Lama for leadership in the territory. The 13th Dalai Lama had died during 1933, and the 9th Pachen Lama followed him in death in 1937, even as the two year-old Tenzin Gyatso was being recognized as being the 10th incarnation of the Dalai Lama. It took twelve more years until Lobsang Trinley Lhündrub Chökyi Gyaltsen was recognized in 1949 as being the 14th Pachen Lama, and since that recognition was conducted by followers of the late 9th Pachen Lama living in exile in Xining, China, only the earlier recognition of the Dalai Lama was confirmed by Tibetan authorities. This rebuff led the Pachen Lama to express loyalty to the newly proclaimed PRC on October 1, 1949, and call for the 'liberation' of Tibet at an early date in order to press for his own confirmation (Sheng, 2006: 29).

During the following year, Chinese forces prepared for the impending operation through which Tibetan annexation would be effected, and by early October 1950, deployment of Chinese military assets in Sichuan Province on Tibet's eastern frontier had been completed. In the Changdu area of eastern Tibet, adjacent from Sichuan Province, the Tibetan military stood at 8,000 strong, with 4,500 regular troops backed by 3,500 militiamen, and, on October 6, 1950, elements of the Chinese People's Liberation Army (PLA) 18th Army with a manpower of 40,000 troops entered Tibet in two detachments in an effort to encircle Changdu. Although PLA forces suffered high losses due to exhaustion and the difficult terrain, Changdu was taken on October 24, 1950 with Tibetan losses of 5,700 troops and militiamen; fully 70% of Tibet's military assets in the area. The suddenness with which the Changdu garrison collapsed did not

go unnoticed by the Tibetan population. Many local officials now viewed further resistance as futile, and were willing to endorse Máo's Ten Agreements (published on November 11, 1950) regarding the nature of the Chinese presence in Tibet. To secure further local cooperation, Máo promised the Tibetans that the PLA's purpose in its campaign was to cleanse Tibet of foreign imperialists and Jiang Jieshi reactionaries, and agreed to inform Tibetan authorities in advance of further PLA movements, adding that cooperation with the PLA would reduce the need for large numbers of Chinese troops to be introduced into the territory. With Tibetan resistance now checkmated, the main adversary to the Chinese occupation would be the bitter cold which inflicted heavy casualties on both soldiers and horses (Sheng, 2006: 15-16, 18-19, 22-23, 31-32).

In the wake of the military collapse at Changdu, the Dalai Lama, just enthroned as Tibetan head of state, departed Lhasa and resettled in Yadong, near the Indian frontier. He then sent a message to Máo; calling for negotiations, but rejecting the incorporation of Tibet within the PRC and demanding a full Chinese military withdrawal. The Indian government, fearing a change in the balance of power in South Asia, initially provided political support to Tibetan authorities by condemning the Chinese operation, but President Jawaharlal Nehru declined to sponsor Tibetan efforts to bring the case before the United Nations after bluntly being informed by Máo that Tibet was an integral part of the Chinese state whose frontiers would be robustly defended. With Indian support blocked, the Dalai Lama, desperate to salvage a measure of autonomy for the territory, arranged to send a delegation to Beijing to negotiate Tibet's political status only to find Máo now demanding Lobsang Trinley Lhündrub Chökyi Gyaltsen's confirmation by Tibetan authorities as the 14th Pachen Lama be announced prior to any

such negotiations. With no outside support from either the major powers or the United Nations, the Dalai Lama soon agreed to Máo's demands, and, on May 24, 1951, signed the Seventeenth Agreement of Tibet's 'peaceful liberation' by the PLA (Sheng, 2006: 23, 30-31). While the Dalai Lama would remain the spiritual and religious leader of Tibet, the actual authority would from this time forward be held by the Chinese government itself (Chen, 2006: 54).

Indian President Nehru was not at all comfortable with the Chinese presence directly across India's northeastern frontier, however, and his efforts to encourage Tibetan notables to establish a people's democratic movement for the advancement of Tibetan independence soon led to the formation of the Mimang Tsogpa, or People's Party. Elements of a nationalist insurgency also began to form in the eastern region of Kham shortly after the incorporation of Tibet within the PRC, due to local protests against the replacement of local secular and religious leadership with direct Chinese authority. Worsening conditions in that region led many of those disenchanted individuals to the environs of Lhasa, where, during the course of the 1950s, they sought to form a volunteer guerilla army to support the Dalai Lama at the same time as the Mimang Tsogpa was distributing pamphlets and urging the people to unite against the Chinese presence (McGranahan, 2006: 109-111).

By 1956, The Far East Division of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) became interested in these anti-Chinese efforts, and began to offer material support toward the formation of a Tibetan resistance army. This army, formed by uniting various disparate guerilla groupings into a single entity known as the Chushi Gangdrug, held its inauguration ceremony on June 16, 1958 in the Lhoka region, south of Lhasa, with

about 5,000 guerillas deployed with a rank structure and administered as a quasi-army. A merit system was also established, with a cash prize of 500 Indian rupees offered for the capture of a PLA officer's documents and possessions. By that time, Chushi Gangdrug troops were being covertly trained at Camp Hale, Colorado; training that would continue for the next six years in such fields as paramilitary operations, bomb building, map making, photographic surveillance, radio operation techniques, and intelligence collection (McGranahan, 2006: 109-111, 113-114). That training also included simulation in high-altitude, low-temperature combat operations, and on their return to South Asia, the guerillas were resupplied at their base camps in Tibet and Nepal by American aircraft flying through Indian airspace (Kramer, 2006: 11, 13).

The Chushi Gangdrug, far from being a mere creation of the CIA, was a genuine, grassroots resistance movement against Chinese occupation, however, and CIA efforts to manage the insurgency were often hindered by the agency's poor understanding of Tibetan regional variations, language, and culture. While, to outside observation, this organization was a pan-Tibetan resistance group, it was in fact dominated by Khampans, many of whom were antagonistic to the central government in Lhasa even as they were respectful of the Dalai Lama. CIA logistics were typically coordinated through Gyalo Thondup, one of the Dalai Lama's elder brothers, who, being from the northeast region of Amdo, was not always sympathetic to systems of authority laid down by the Khampa, even though the Khampa were providing the bulk of the guerilla force. In return, many of the Chushi Gangdrug soldiers viewed the worldly Thondup as being more of a patron of American aid than a true resistance leader, while other members of the insurgency retained strong elements of autonomy and allegiances based upon

native-place networks. Failure by the CIA to understand these regional alliances of politically fractured Tibet occasionally led to guerillas being sent into areas where they lacked popular support, and, on at least one occasion, resulted in the decimation of a Chushi Gangdrug unit caught in a PLA ambush (McGranahan, 2006: 109-111, 113-118).

On March 10, 1959, amid rumors that Chinese authorities were planning to arrest the Dalai Lama, a popular armed revolt involving thousands of Tibetans arose in Lhasa against Chinese occupation. PLA troops were initially ordered to remain in Lhasa in defensive positions to avoid inflaming the situation, and those orders would remain in effect for ten days.[95] By March 20, 1959, however, Chinese troops were directed to take robust measures to crush the rebellion; taking control of all strategic points, and containing the rebels in the capital city of Lhasa with the understanding that troop reinforcements would arrive within ten days. On the following day, Chinese authorities accused the Tibetan Kashag (council of ministers) of betrayal of the Chinese motherland, and dissolved the Kashag seven days later. During the following weeks as Chinese reinforcements arrived, Tibetan guerillas were ruthlessly hunted down in Lhasa and in other parts of Tibet in a counterinsurgency operation of the cost-benefit mode that was essentially concluded by the end of March, 1959, although the rebellion wasn't fully contained until late 1961 (Chen, 2006: 54, 61-62, 71, 77-80).[96]

[95] During that time, the 14th Dalai Lama fled the capital, and, on March 31, 1959, crossed into India to the city of Dharamsala, where he remains to this day (Chen, 2006: 54).

[96] The subsequent Chushi Gangdrug capture of classified documents from a PLA intelligence officer proved that over 87,000 Tibetans had been killed in Lhasa alone during PLA counterinsurgency operations conducted during March 1959 - September 1960 (McGranahan, 2006: 119-120).

The United Nations, having moved into a more activist phase of its existence, issued United Nations General Assembly Resolution #1353 on October 21, 1959 that stated that "the Tibetan people, like all others, are entitled . . . to civil and religious liberty . . . [and] the autonomy which they have traditionally enjoyed" (United Nations General Assembly Resolution #1353, 1959).[97] Two further United Nations General Assembly resolutions would follow; Resolution #1723 on December 20, 1961, which renewed its call for "the cessation of practices which deprive the Tibetan people of their fundamental human rights and freedoms, including their right to self-determination" (United Nations General Assembly Resolution #1723, 1961), and Resolution #2079 on December 18, 1965, which again renewed the call for "the cessation of all practices which deprive the Tibetan people of the human rights and fundamental freedoms they have always enjoyed" (United Nations General Assembly Resolution #2079, 1965). Ominously missing from this latter resolution was the prescient verbiage relating to either autonomy or self-determination found in the earlier two resolutions, and none of these resolutions ever mentioned China by name, nor did they question the legitimacy of Chinese rule in Tibet. Even if they had, United Nations' recognition of Taiwan instead of the PRC as the legal representative of the Chinese people assured that any such resolutions would be treated with little more than contempt by the Chinese government (Grunfeld, 1996: 180).

The massive Tibetan exodus of 1959 led to Chushi Gangdrug operations being eventually based in the little Tibetan kingdom of Mustang, located within the frontiers of

[97] The decision by the United Kingdom, a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, to abstain from voting on this resolution served to weaken its impact (United Nations General Assembly Resolution #1353, 1959).

Nepal, where CIA support of the insurgency continued. Guerilla training at Camp Hale also continued, with Chushi Gangdrug soldiers occasionally being parachuted into Tibet from American aircraft (McGranahan, 2006: 120-122). Even so, Chushi Gangdrug strength stood at only 2,100 guerillas by 1964; hardly enough to seriously challenge Chinese control of Tibet, and regarded as little more than a foreign-inspired nuisance by the Chinese government (Goldstein, 2006: 150). Indeed, the organization's American-derived agenda was not truly designed to gain a viable independence for Tibet, but was rather focused upon simply distracting the Chinese government, inflicting casualties upon the PLA, and, most importantly, gathering intelligence against the PRC. Even this limited support base from the United States came to an end in 1971 after National Security Advisor Henry Kissinger's secret trip to Beijing during July of that year led to a strengthening of bonds between the two countries and the cessation of all American support for the Tibetan guerillas (Kramer, 2006: 6-7, 10-11, 13). At that time, the Nepali government, which had been quietly allowing the Chushi Gangdrug to operate from its territory, moved to force the guerillas to withdraw altogether from Mustang. The insurgency was finally terminated in 1974 by the intervention of the Dalai Lama's brother-in-law, who convinced the remaining Chushi Gangdrug guerillas to cease fighting and surrender to the Nepalese army. Since the over-riding allegiance of the Chushi Gangdrug was to the Dalai Lama, the guerillas ceased operations and turned their weapons over to Nepali authorities. Many of them received long sentences in Nepali prisons, and Chushi Gangdrug survives today as little more than a Khampa-dominated social and political presence in the Tibetan community (McGranahan, 2006: 121-124, 127-128).

Today, those who view Tibetan independence as a realistic possibility will take little comfort from the international community. Since at least 1966, the United States has categorically accepted Chinese sovereignty over Tibet, and specifically disallowed relations with the Dharamsala-based Tibetan exile community led by the Dalai Lama (Goldstein, 2004: 224).[98] Shortly after Tibetan protests against Chinese rule erupted during March 2008, European Union (EU) President José Manuel Durão Barroso assured Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao that Europe supported China's territorial integrity and added that such support "naturally applies to Tibet" (EU Considers Tibet Part of China, 2008: 1). This political support was markedly reinforced by an official statement issued on October 29, 2008 by David Miliband, British Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, in which Miliband stated that the British government "do[es] not support Tibetan independence . . . [and] regard[s] Tibet as part of the People's Republic of China." Within this statement, Miliband explicitly replaced the "outdated concept of suzerainty" under which United Kingdom, former colonial authority over much of South Asia, had previously viewed China's position in Tibet with full Chinese sovereignty over the territory (Miliband, 2008: 1). From both the Chinese and the international points of view, the matter is considered to be closed.

This insurgency floundered for a number of reasons. First, as previously mentioned, international support for Tibetan independence was then as it remains today: virtually nonexistent. Even though Tibetan independence is currently a widely-

[98] "Since at least 1996, US policy has explicitly recognized the Tibetan Autonomous Region . . . as part of the People's Republic of China. This long-standing policy is consistent with the view of the entire international community, including all China's neighbors: no country recognizes Tibet as a sovereign state. Because we do not recognize Tibet as an independent state, the United States does not conduct diplomatic relations with the self-styled 'Tibetan Government-in-Exile'" (Relations of the United States with Tibet, 1994).

championed cause throughout much of academia and the arts, it is important to remember that Tibet ceased to exist as a completely sovereign, independent state during the late 17th century, having been politically subsumed by China (Chen, 2006: 56). Since that time, not a single country has ever recognized the independence of a Tibetan political entity, and both the EU and the United Kingdom have recently affirmed their recognition of full Chinese sovereignty of the territory (Relations of the United States with Tibet, 1994; Grunfeld, 1996: 258; EU Considers Tibet Part of China, 2008: 1; Miliband, 2008: 1). Second, the United States government, which covertly supported the Chushi Gangdrug, viewed the insurgency as little more than a platform for American intelligence collection efforts and general harassment of Chinese occupation forces, and at no time ever officially viewed Tibetan independence as being politically feasible, or even desirable (Kramer, 2006: 6-7, 10-11, 13). Third, United Nations support of an independent Tibet was limited to a single phrase mentioning self-determination within General Assembly Resolution #1353; verbiage that was not repeated in General Assembly Resolution #2079, the subsequent and final such resolution on the Tibetan issue. On October 25, 1971, as per General Assembly Resolution #2758, the PRC replaced Taiwan in both the United Nations General Assembly and Security Council (United Nations General Assembly Resolution #2758, 1971), allowing Chinese interests to be more fully protected and decreasing the likelihood that any further offending resolutions would ever be passed. While United Nations pressure has successfully been countered, interest by NGOs continues to impact global public opinion, with Freedom House recently finding the Chinese administration in Tibet to be among the top two of the 'worst of the worst' globally (Worst of the Worst, 2009: 2).

This case differed radically from the previous two counterinsurgency campaigns, even though the issues of United Nations condemnation and great power support of the insurgency were very much in effect. First, United Nations pressure was very vague and confined to the General Assembly which issued only three mild resolutions regarding the conflict (United Nations General Assembly Resolutions #1353, #1723, and #2079), 1959, 1961, and 1965); a far cry from the combination of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions which initially chastened Moroccan intervention into Western Sahara and vilified South African counterinsurgency operations in Namibia. Second, great power support to insurgents – overt and eventually definitive against South African forces in Namibia - was covert and conducted through CIA channels; a potential advantage for the Chinese government in being able to claim that no major power was recognizing the insurgency (Kramer, 2006: 11, 13; McGranahan, 2006: 109-111, 113-114). Third, Chushi Gangdrug insurgents were united on little more than fealty to the Dalai Lama, and willingly ceased their struggle at his indirect request during 1974 (McGranahan, 2006: 121-124, 127-128); a far different motivation than the unrelenting nationalism that drove SWAPO and POLISARIO to fight foreign occupation unceasingly for decades (Moroney, ed., 1989: 384-386; Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 9-18). Fourth, and perhaps most important, the international pressure which drove the South Africans to develop nuclear weapons and led the Moroccans to successfully divide the United Nations membership had little impact upon the Chinese leadership, which regarded the United Nations with ill-disguised contempt and the Chushi Gangdrug as little more than an American provocation (Goldstein, 2006: 150; Grunfeld, 1996: 180). Faced with little viable

international opposition, the Chinese government was able to place the insurgency into irrelevance. Few insurgencies can survive so ignominious a fate, and Chushi Gangdrug was no exception.

E. The United Kingdom, and Victory in Malaya (1948-1960)

British Malaya, located at the southern end of a narrow peninsula extending southward from Southeast Asia into the South China Sea, was, by mid-20th century, a long-term British possession with vital importance to the Sterling area of British international currency flows due to its status as producer of one-third of the world's rubber and tin (Silcock, 1952; 445-446). By the late 1940s, however, Malaya might well have appeared to be an insurgent's paradise, with little future for continued British authority (Ladwig, 2007: 57). Three-fourths of the territory was covered by jungle, British authorities had only recently returned to the area following four years of wartime Japanese occupation, and insurgencies were raging throughout the entire region: in China, between the Communists and the Nationalists, in Indonesia, between Dutch authorities and Indonesian rebels, in Indochina, between French authorities and Việt Minh guerillas, and in the Philippines, between recently established government authorities and Hukbalahap insurgents (Derry, 2003: 236). Even so, Malaya remained quiet during the initial years of the post-Second World War era; a bastion of undisputed European control within a sea of political instability (Pye, 1956: 70-71, 87-89).

Unrest simmered within the ethnic-Chinese community represented by the Malayan Communist Party (MCP), however; a consequence of the Japanese war-time occupation of the region. Following the British capitulation of early 1942, the MCP-initiated Malayan People's Anti-Japanese Army (MPAJA) had provided the bulk of

resistance activities against Japanese forces, fielding roughly 7,000 guerillas in support of Allied objectives. Although MPAJA insurgents managed to inflict only a few hundred casualties against the highly-disciplined Japanese forces during the next three and one-half years, the Chinese community itself paid a bitter price for providing such support, losing up to 40,000 residents to Japanese retribution (Pye, 1956: 64-65, 69, 72).[99] The abrupt end to the war in the Pacific following the August 1945 nuclear attacks against Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan left a political vacuum in Japanese-occupied Southeast Asia that was to shake European colonial domination in the area to its core, and by the time that British Indian troops landed at Singapore on September 5, 1945 to re-establish British sovereignty in Malaya, they found that the MPAJA, as the only viable military force on the Malayan peninsula, had already established de-facto control across much of the territory (Komer, 1972: 4).

As a gesture of understanding to the dynamic political situation, the British government initially attempted to co-op the MPAJA, according them official military status and staging impressive ceremonies in which MPAJA guerillas marched alongside British Commonwealth troops under joint military command. Individual guerillas were clothed, paid, and decorated by British authorities, and MCP leader Chin Peng, considered by British authorities to be an outstanding guerilla leader, was invited to London to receive the highly-coveted Order of the British Empire. Weapons were also quietly collected from the guerillas, and the MPAJA eventually disbanded by the colonial government (Komer, 1972: 4-5).

[99] The MPAJA were more successful against fellow Malayans who did not share their vision of the future, executing 2,543 of them as traitors and collaborators during the war years (Pye, 1956: 64-65, 69, 72).

The MCP had not abandoned its goal of establishing a Communist state in Malaya, however, and initially organized labor strikes to bring down the colonial government before moving directly into terrorist activities that resulted in 191 murders and abductions between October 1945 and December 1947 (Pye, 1956: 70-71, 87-89; Komer, 1972: 5). To counter the anti-colonial credentials of the MCP, the British Colonial Office encouraged the formation of a Malayan Chinese Association (MCA) to allow for political expression among the ethnic Chinese apart from the Communists, and, on February 1, 1948, announced the formation of a new political arrangement entitled the Federation of Malaya to moderate nationalist demands by restoring sovereign rights to the Malay sultans (Campbell, 1968: 139-140). This new political arrangement markedly disfavored the Chinese community, however, since native Malays automatically became citizens of the federation while second generation residence was required for ethnic Chinese, even though ethnic Chinese and native Malay communities in 1948 each accounted for approximately 42% of Malaya's six million residents (the remainder including 13% Indian, 2% aboriginal, and 1% European/Eurasian). Such a plan appeared to place existing Chinese communities into the permanent status of a settler population, and a Gallup Poll of the period found that less than one percent of Chinese residents would give undivided loyalty to the proposed Malayan state (Hawkins, 1948: 76-80, 82).[100] British officials also questioned the true loyalty of the Chinese population, fearing that the activities of the MCP simply

[100] While the poll, organized by Singapore newspaper Nan Chiau, received replies from 4,344 respondents, there was no system of selection, so the results are unscientific. Even so, it is remarkable that only 38 individuals from that number were willing to surrender their existing Chinese citizenship in order to become citizens of Malaya. Of the remainder, 4,275 were willing to accept Malayan citizenship only within dual Chinese/Malayan nationality, and six were unwilling to accept Malayan citizenship in any form (Hawkins, 1948: 82).

represented the onward march of monolithic international Communism. Those fears would be heightened following the declaration of the PRC on October 1, 1949, with the spectre of ethnic Chinese rule in Malaya serving as little more than a stalking horse for de-facto control of the territory by the Communist leadership in Beijing (Silcock, 1949: 457-458).

MPAJA veterans, led by Chen Ping, were incensed by the diminished Chinese position within this new political structure, and, believing that the Chinese community (if not the entire Malayan population) would rally behind an effort to force out the British, initiated a full-blown insurgency against the colonial administration with attacks against police posts, communications facilities, rubber plantations, and tin-mining sites. The insurgents initially took the title of the Malayan People's Anti-British Army (MPABA; so named to provide linkage to their previous anti-Japanese activities), but soon renamed the movement the Malayan Races Liberation Army (MRLA) in an effort to co-op a wider range of Malayan ethnic groupings. The establishment of a Communist state in Malaya ruled by the ethnic-Chinese had little appeal outside of the Chinese community, however, and even that community was badly split, with the insurgency being denounced by a sizeable portion of the Malayan Chinese (especially those belonging to the Kuomintang Party) as being unrepresentative of national aspirations (Hawkins, 1948: 76-80, 82; Pye, 1956: 87, 109 footnote; Hall, 1981: 877, 924). As a result, the actual insurgency recruiting pool resided within a 500,000 strong grouping of Chinese squatters (about one-twelfth of the national population) who had taken up residency on the edge of the jungle during the time of the Japanese occupation and were considered to have no legal rights to the land there whatsoever. Disenfranchised and disillusioned,

they were easily induced to seek a change in the status quo and soon were responsible for about 70% of total guerilla strength. Much of the remainder of the insurgency came from MPAJA veterans who provided most of the officers of this underground army; an army equipped primarily with light infantry weapons held over from wartime British supply drops. In addition, a support group, approximately 11,000 strong and known as the Min Yuen, was organized by the MCP to provide food, drugs, information, recruits, and funding for MRLA operations (Komer, 1972: 7-8). With such basic competency in organization, the MRLA was soon able to field between 7,000 and 12,000 Communist guerillas operating in company-sized groups of about 100 members (Pye, 1956: 96-97, 109 footnote; Komer, 1972: 8-9).

The onset of this insurgency came at a bad time for British authorities, given that British forces in Southeast Asia at the time consisted of just twelve infantry battalions and one artillery battalion; less than half of which were combat troops (Ladwig, 2007: 58). Outnumbered at best, the British were loath to acknowledge such a direct challenge to their authority, and, for nearly four months, attempted to present the insurgent campaign as reflecting simple criminal activity to be responded to with traditional police methodology. The resulting British inaction allowed the MRLA to prosper during the next few months by heightening their attacks and gaining traction among the population for their goals, and by the time a State of Emergency was finally declared on June 16, 1948, the British position had further deteriorated (Pye, 1956: 88-89; Rahman, 1965: 659-660).

The British government also had other concerns, being well aware of (and personally involved in) the ongoing Security Council seizure of the Dutch

counterinsurgency campaign in the Netherlands East Indies; a seizure that eventually doomed the Dutch political position there during January 1949 (United Nations Security Council Resolutions, 1947-1949). In an effort to avoid a similar fate for British counterinsurgency measures in Malaya, the British government quickly presented the MRLA insurgency to the West as being part and parcel of an international movement by Communist forces designed to overwhelm and conquer the Third World (The Police and Internal Security, 1966: I-4, L-1; Shafer, 1988: 59-60). Indeed, the verbiage of a sensitive official British retrospective on the conflict (issued in 1968) described the insurgent campaign as "part of a wider Soviet-inspired drive to obtain control of what is strategically and economically one of the most important areas of South-East Asia" (NAA A452/2, 1968: 3). It was also widely speculated by British authorities that an overall plan for Southeast Asian insurgencies had been laid out by Soviet authorities at a February 1948 Cominform conference in Calcutta, India attended by representatives of most Asian Communist parties, since insurrections broke out later that year in Malaya and Burma to complement the existing insurgencies in the Philippines, and French Indochina (Komer, 1972: 6). The necessity of courting the vitally important United States public opinion base on the issue was discussed in a Top Secret British document dated December 1, 1949, with the notation that failure in this regard would deny the necessary "sympathy and support from American public opinion in our praiseworthy struggle to combat the well-known international Communist menace" and reduce the issue to simply that of "a bad colonial power coping with rebellions" (Watson, 1949). Overall, these efforts appear to have succeeded, since no resolutions were ever issued against British authority in Malaya by either the United Nations Security Council or

General Assembly during the twelve years of counterinsurgency operations (United Nations General Assembly/Security Council Resolutions, 1948-1960).

The lack of such international pressure allowed the British to conduct an innovative form of counterinsurgency campaign through the implementation of a long-term social welfare approach designed to reward the population for rejecting the insurgency; indeed, British authorities could be virtually credited with inventing the tactics involved therein (Pye, 1956: 102-103). As part of that approach, British regulations for the conduct of counterinsurgency operations were carefully defined to strike only against the insurgency, not the civilian population, and those regulations were essentially adhered to throughout the state of emergency, punishing troops who exceeded their orders, and closely defining air strike missions to avoid hitting civilian areas (Campbell, 1968: 147-148, 154, 157, 159-160). A mechanism also existed within the sixty District War Executive Committees (DWECs), created among the native population to coordinate local counterinsurgency activities, to confer with British troops and determine the precise level of operational flexibility required to diminish the insurgency without alienating the population (Ladwig, 2007: 61).

Counterinsurgency operations were subsequently broken down into three distinct phases. During the first phase, lasting from 1948 through 1952, a system of national registration was introduced, requiring all individuals over the age of twelve to carry identity cards. Border sealing was successfully conducted through an agreement reached between the British colonial administration and the Thai government that eventually allowed British forces to physically clear Malaya of insurgents from south to north, forcing the remnants against the Thai border for final resolution (Campbell, 1968:

140-141). An indigenous Malayan Army was created to defend the peninsula; an army whose requirement for compulsory service led to the emigration of many young Chinese and removed them from the MRLA's potential recruiting pool (Peterson, 1955: 312). The British utilization of 'food denial' was also found to be very effective against guerilla forces operating in heavily forested regions (Campbell, 1968: 127, 140-141, 160), as it forced the MRLA to take increased risks in order to secure food supplies; risks which made them vulnerable to British ambushes (Ladwig, 2007: 61). In all cases, the British focused upon building support for the government in areas of the country where the insurgency was the weakest in an effort to create the perception of optimistic momentum for the campaign (Markel, 2006: 39).

The official concern about 'winning hearts and minds' did not rely entirely upon the benignity of British forces, however, since British counter-insurgency methods were often brutal and involved, at times, elements of a cost-benefit approach. Due to the ethnic make-up of the insurgency, the rural Chinese were the principal target of the counterinsurgency campaign, which involved both individual and mass detention, deportation, and collective punishment, including communal fines and curfews. By 1951, 2,800 Chinese had been deported back to the PRC, and, of the 25,641 Malayans detained more than 28 days without trial under the Emergency Regulations, 22,667 were Chinese (Ramakrishna, 2001: 82). Collective punishment was also utilized, with a 22 hour per day curfew being imposed during early 1952 on the guerilla stronghold of Tanjong Malim, while simultaneously cutting the village's food ration in half to prevent residents from supplying the insurgency (Markel, 2006: 39-40). Tactics of this sort undoubted served to instill a strong antipathy within the Chinese rural communities

against both the Malayan and British authorities, and potentially provided at least a passive neutrality regarding MRLA activities (Ramakrishna, 2001: 82). This feeling of antipathy was undoubted heighted by the controversial 'Briggs Plan' of population resettlement programs developed by General Sir Harold Briggs. Sir Harold, appointed Director of Operations for British forces in Malaya during April 1950, quickly produced a plan for defeating the insurgency entitled Federation Plan for the Elimination of the Communist Organization and Armed Forces in Malaya that proposed resettlement of the entire half-million strong Chinese squatter population. This resettlement program was quickly carried out, and, by June 1952, over 400,000 such squatters had been resettled into some 400 new villages (Newsinger, 2002: 49). Life in these villages was onerous, with dusk-to-dawn curfews, body searches of workers departing for the rubber plants (to insure they had no extra food to deliver to insurgents), and a large, impersonal population element all contributing to the perception of an Asian concentration camp program (Ramakrishna, 2001: 81-82). Not surprisingly, many of those squatters, especially those affiliated with the insurgency, did not willingly acceded to resettlement, especially as they watched their existing homes torn down, their agricultural implements smashed, and their livestock killed or turned loose (Newsinger, 2002: 49-50). Even so, nearly all of the 500,000 Chinese squatters were eventually resettled in 550 of these 'new villages' where, along with the 24-hour security surveillance, they received thirty-year leaseholds upon farmland, indoor plumbing, electricity, village home guards, and elected councils. As time went on, the repressive aspects of the program gradually receded with the 50,000-strong grouping of home guards eventually being all ethnic Chinese, the villagers gaining a reasonable hope of a

viable future within the framework of an independent Malaya, and the isolation of the squatter recruiting pool far from the jungle-bound guerilla bases slowly crushing any remaining chances for an insurgent victory (Campbell, 1968: 157; Hall, 1981: 878, 924).[101]

By the early 1950s, the British government had assembled a robust military force to decisively confront the insurgency, with nearly 40,000 British Commonwealth troops (25,000 British, 10,500 Nepalese Gurkhas, and 4,500 Malay) backed up by approximately 100,000 armed Malay auxiliary police officers (Pye, 1956: 96-97 footnotes, 109 footnote). This heightened security force, along with the primacy of the social welfare approach within the British counterinsurgency campaign, successfully denied any significant popular support for the insurgency to the point that by September 1951, the MRLA had renounced all acts of terrorism against the population and further defined its attacks against British forces by using smaller units of 20 to 30 guerillas (Campbell, 1968: 139, 142). At the same time, the MRLA was ordered by the MCP to withdraw further into the jungle, and attempt to attain a measure of self-sufficiency from the population (Newsinger, 2002: 52).

British authorities were determined to keep up the pressure, however, and further enhanced counterinsurgency operations in December 1951 by merging the posts of British High Commissioner for Malaya and Director of Military Operations to provide a

[101] Nor were the Chinese squatters the only population placed under resettlement. Laborers assigned to estates and mines - a grouping of nearly 650,000 people - were also viewed as being a potential force for disruption, and were confined to tightly-guarded barbed wire-enclosed compounds. In addition, efforts were made to similarly 'resettle' the aboriginal tribes of the jungle areas; efforts which were abandoned after thousands of such tribesmen died of disease and despair. All tolled, these policies resulted in the compulsory movement of nearly *15%* of the entire Malayan population. While those suspect areas of the population were, indeed, successfully pacified, it is doubtful that any significant winning of their 'hearts and minds' ever took place among them (Newsinger, 2002: 51, 54, 56).

unified control of both civil and military forces under General Sir Gerald Termpler, a former director of military intelligence. Upon arriving in Malaya, Sir Gerald advised government officials that all government activities were to be linked to the counterinsurgency campaign, and assured that the 'Briggs Plan' would continue to be implemented (Ladwig, 2007: 63). Sir Gerald also became well known for stressing, at every meeting he attended, the need to win the "hearts and minds of the Malayan people" to the ideal of a free and democratic political process for an independent Malaya (Pye, 1956: 102-103). This strategy was successful to the point that, by 1952, Silcock could write that a civilian in Malaya had nearly as great a chance of being involved in a road accident as being a victim of a "terrorist," and that while British military operations were costly, the conflict was "not a war like the war in Korea or even the war in Indo-China" (Silcock, 1952: 445).

During the second phase of the counterinsurgency campaign, lasting from 1952 to 1955, the Royal Air Force supplied one hundred aircraft to assist in crushing the insurgents, sending Douglas Dakota transports flying low over the jungle areas to conduct psychological warfare campaigns (dropping surrender leaflets and conducting voice broadcasts stating surrender terms), while strike aircraft dropped 33,000 tons of bombs and fired nearly 100,000 rockets during the course of over 25,000 air sorties. At the same time, Royal Navy surface vessels patrolled the seas around the peninsula to prevent weaponry from being smuggled to the insurgents. During 1952 alone, 1,097 insurgents were killed, and numerous others were captured or encouraged to surrender (Campbell, 1968: 140, 153-154, 156, 160-161). A rewards program was instituted during February 1953, allowing for a reduction of the oppressive British security

presence in areas deemed to be 'white' and cleared of insurgent activity (Ramakrishna, 2001: 88-89), and, by May 1954, 1,314,400 Malayans (or nearly one-fourth of the population) were residing within 'white areas' in which the violence of the insurgency often seemed far away indeed (Ramakrishna, 2001: 89).[102] As the second phase of the insurgency closed out, a total of 5,892 insurgents had been killed and approximately 1,700 more had surrendered to British security forces (Sully, 1968: 127). Those losses, which reduced the insurgency down to approximately 3,000 guerillas, came at a price, however; the lives of 1,563 members of the security forces (Campbell, 1968: 160). Even so, by 1954, the fate of the insurgency was sealed as a result of these measures, with only a lengthy mopping-up operation remaining to destroy it entirely (Ladwig, 2007: 64).

As the third and final phase of the insurgency, lasting from 1955 to 1960, commenced, British forces became even more relentlessly effective. During 1956 and 1957, over 540 insurgents were killed, 84 captured, and 343 surrendered, at the cost of only 58 members of the security forces (Sully, 1968: 127), reducing insurgent strength to about 2,000 personnel, of which only about 200 were active combatants (Markel, 2006: 40). During 1958, 153 insurgents were killed, 22 were captured, and 502 surrendered - at the cost of only ten British troops (Sully, 1968: 127). By that time, the ethnic Chinese element represented only 38% of the population; a decline that further justified the enhanced political provisions for the Malay majority while reducing the

[102] Following the declaration of a region of Malacca as being 'white,' large signs proclaiming 'You are now entering the Malacca White Area' were erected around the region, and travelers entering the area from a dreary neighboring section of Malaya were often impressed by the liveliness of the people and the bustling commercial activity. That perception led to further regions of Malaya competing for 'white zone' status (Ramakrishna, 2001: 89).

insurgency recruiting pool of young ethnic Chinese men (MacGillivray, 1958: 161). The combination of these factors shattered the MRLA structure to the point that it no longer existed as a viable guerilla movement, and the organization subsequently issued a decision to "fold up the banner and silence the drums" (Newsinger, 2002: 57-58). The insurgency was over.[103]

When independence was granted to Malaya by the United Kingdom on August 31, 1957, the indigenous Malayan government came into being with a broadly-based national mandate to destroy the remainder of the Communist insurgency. Sir Donald MacGillivray, British High Commissioner for Malaya, writing in the April 1958 issue of International Affairs, noted that the Malayan insurgents had entirely lost the support they might have initially enjoyed from the ethnic Chinese community, and were now facing a newly independent Malayan government armed with a popular mandate to "keep up the pressure against the Communists until they are wiped out" (MacGillivray, 1958: 161). That transfer of power denied the colonial issue to the insurgents, and allowed the Malayan government – with continuing British assistance - to finally crush any remnants

[103] This campaign was extremely costly for the era. Each contact made with armed insurgents cost British authorities 1,000 security man-hours, while each confirmed kill cost 1,500 security man-hours, resulting in total expenditures of £180,000,000 (Campbell, 1968: 153-154, 160-161). British-led security forces suffered an estimated 4,425 casualties (including killed and wounded; within those figures, 519 British troops were killed and 959 wounded), and 4,668 civilian casualties resulted from combat operations between the security forces and the MRLA. Insurgent casualties were meanwhile reported as 9,520 killed, 1,287 captured, and 2,702 surrendering to the government (Komer, 1972: 22). The British heavy bomber campaign had been singularly ineffective against the extreme dispersion of the guerilla network, with the 17,500 tones of ordinance dropped by Lincoln bomber squadrons between 1950 and 1958 credited with killing only 16 guerillas. While those strike missions undoubtedly denied the insurgents much solace, the separation of the insurgency from its recruiting/ support pool (the key element of any counterinsurgency campaign) was accomplished primarily through the combination of sealing of the Malaya/Thai frontier and the 'Briggs Plan' of population resettlement, regardless of how repugnant the latter activities ultimately became (Newsinger, 2002: 50, 55). Interestingly enough, Lawrence also determined aerial bombing of insurgent forces to be a waste of military resources (writing that "guerilla tactics are a complete muffing of air force"), and argued that securing informers within insurgent ranks represented the most lethal counterinsurgency tactic (Brown, 1988: 239).

of the rebellion (Rahman, 1965: 659-661; Sully, 1968: 128, 179). On July 31, 1960, the twelve-year old state of emergency was formally brought to an end with the remaining 500 MRLA guerillas forced across Malaya's northern frontier into Thailand's southern Yala Province, where they were to survive by levying 'taxes' on rubber plantations operated by ethnic-Chinese farmers (Sully, 1968: 128, 179). Incidental guerilla encounters with Malayan (and, subsequently, Malaysian) authorities would continue off and on for over two more decades, however (Rahman, 1965: 659-661; Osbourne, 1979: 152-156).

British authorities utilized numerous controversial tactics (for which the Briggs Plan serves as the exemplar) during the course of this campaign, and, had the United Nations or one of the great powers applied enough pressure, those tactics might not have had enough time to fully develop into viable measures. British efforts to portray the insurgency as an element of international Communism may have prevented such pressure from forming within the United States, and the ability of British forces to seal the northern frontier on the Malayan peninsula also denied the possibility of any physical reinforcement by the Soviet Union or the PRC of the besieged guerillas. Had those elements been available to the Dutch in the Netherlands East Indies or to the French in Indochina, the outcomes of those campaigns might have been different indeed. In addition, the British victory did not allow for a return to the status quo ante, and the subsequent withdrawal of nearly 200 years of British sovereignty from the Malayan Peninsula makes this campaign somewhat less than an unqualified win for the United Kingdom.

This case study, which was to serve as the exemplar of a successful counterinsurgency campaign for the next fifty years, possessed a number of unique elements which could not easily be extrapolated to other such campaigns, although numerous countries have since attempted to do so. First, Malaya's geographical position as a peninsula with a relatively narrow northern frontier allowed British authorities to seal the territory's borders almost completely, denying to MRLA the external resupply and safe havens enjoyed by insurgents in Tibet, Namibia, and Western Sahara. Second, the large-scale popular support underlying SWAPO, POLISARIO, and – to a lesser extent – Chushi Gangdrug was not available to MRLA, given that its recruiting/support pool comprised less than nine percent of the population. Third, successful British efforts to present the insurgency to the world at large as a product of Communist-inspired terrorism prevented the coalescing of international opposition from the United Nations and great powers that initially frustrated Moroccan efforts in Western Sahara and eventually doomed the South African campaign in Namibia (United Nations General Assembly/Security Council Resolutions, 1948-1960). This lack of international interest allowed the British to conduct an unhurried social welfare approach that would, over time, crush MRLA and consolidate British interests in the region (Pye, 1956: 102-103). The 'forgotten war' status of the conflict also permitted British forces to utilize such controversial tactics as individual/mass detention, deportation, collective punishment, and large-scale population resettlement; tactics which would have resulted in wide-spread condemnation against the governments of South Africa and Morocco given the nature of international scrutiny focused upon the conflicts in Namibia and Western Sahara (Ramakrishna, 2001: 82; Newsinger, 2002:

49; Markel, 2006: 39-40). Since United Nations/great power opposition succeeded in destroying Dutch counterinsurgency efforts in the neighboring Netherlands East Indies as the Malayan campaign entered its second year, the British government, along with conducting a very competent counterinsurgency campaign, was also very fortunate in being able to deter such pressure.

F. Summary

As previously stated in Chapter Three, I find the outcomes of all four counterinsurgency campaigns offering significant evidence for my three hypotheses. The overwhelming United Nations opposition to South African occupation of Namibia isolated the South African government both diplomatically and militarily to the point that even the United States eventually agreed to the implementation of an arms embargo against the South African military (United Nations Security Council Resolution #418, 1977). Great power support of the SWAPO insurgents by the Soviet and Cuban governments initially led South African authorities to develop nuclear weapons (Albright, 1994: 42), and subsequently, at the battle of Cuito Cuanavale, Angola, destroyed remaining South African goals of maintaining any form of political control over Namibia (O'Sullivan, 2005: 111). The impact of both of these external forces appears to support Hypotheses #1 and #2. United Nations opposition to Moroccan occupation of Western Sahara lasted from 1975 through the early part of 1981, during which time POLISARIO prospered to the point that Moroccan forces, under a virtual state of siege from up to 15,000 full time guerillas, were struggling to hold on to scattered urban enclaves within the desert territory while yielding the vast interior of the country to the insurgency. During that same period of insurgency successes, regional power-blocs such as the

OAU and NAM were also condemning Moroccan counterinsurgency efforts (United Nations General Assembly Resolution #34/37, 1979).[104] Beginning in late 1981, however, the tide began to turn with both the United Nations and regional political groupings as the Moroccan government, using its unique position as both an African and an Arab state, succeeded in moderating the voice of the General Assembly to the point that subsequent resolutions offered little more than vague appeals for a undefined territorial referendum (Solarz, 1979/1980: 281, 284-285; United Nations General Assembly Resolutions, 1982-2008); OAU and NAM antipathy to the Moroccan position was similarly blunted after Jāmi ‘at ad-Duwal al-‘Arabiyya and the Islamic Conference expressed support for the integrity of a Moroccan state extending from the Straits of Gibraltar to the Mauritanian frontier (Zunes, 1995: 23). From that time forward, POLISARIO fortunes began to tumble; initially into stalemate, and ultimately into submission (Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 6; Campbell, 2003: 47-48). I argue that this case study offers even more support for Hypotheses #1 and #2 than does the Namibian case study, since the turning point in insurgency fortunes took place at the moment of receding United Nations and regional power-bloc support; in short, the dependent variable – success in counterinsurgency measures - underwent a defined change at the time of an adjustment in the independent variables of United Nations and great power support. Chinese occupation of Tibet was virtually unhindered by weak and ill-defined General Assembly and United States opposition; General Assembly verbiage that failed

[104] As previously mentioned, this dismal counterinsurgency scenario led the conflict to be listed within the COW Extra-State Dataset as a defeat for Morocco as of 1983 (Sarkees, 2000: 123-144), but subsequent events allowed the Moroccan government to prevail in its counterinsurgency efforts. As a result, I disagree with the dataset and argue that the conflict should now be coded as a victory for Morocco as long as the Moroccan government is able to maintain its current elements of sovereignty within the territory.

to even directly challenge Chinese sovereignty in Tibet, and American support of Chushi Gangdrug insurgents that was limited to intelligence gathering and general harassment (United Nations General Assembly Resolutions #1353, #1723, and #2079, 1959, 1961, and 1965; McGranahan, 2006: 121-124, 127-128). British counterinsurgency operations in Malaya were meanwhile conducted unhindered entirely by either United Nations or great power interest (United Nations General Assembly/Security Council Resolutions, 1948-1960; Newsinger, 2002: 57-58). The fact that the latter two counterinsurgency campaigns succeed further supports my contentions in Hypotheses #1 and #2. Finally, successful counterinsurgency campaigns were clearly achieved in both the Tibetan and Malayan cases (and somewhat less clearly in the case of Western Sahara) regardless of the counterinsurgency strategy employed, offering support for Hypothesis #3.

In the next and final chapter, I will offer my final conclusions for the impact of the 17 counterinsurgency campaigns in general and these four case studies in specific, and suggest potential future studies that may impact the validity of those conclusions.

CHAPTER V: RESULTS

A. Introduction

Military operations conducted by major powers against irregular forces in foreign countries no longer find unqualified acceptance in today's world. During the past sixty years, formal reproaches conducted by the United Nations against such activities has often served to make them untenable, regardless of either the countries involved or counterinsurgency strategy employed (Appendices I, II, III, IV, and VIII). Security Council condemnations can be devastating to foreign counterinsurgency efforts, and the ability of the five permanent members of the Council to veto resolutions of which they disapprove has granted extended flexibility to military operations conducted by the Americans, British, Chinese, French, and Soviets/Russians; flexibility that is not enjoyed by other states.[105] The General Assembly has been less cautious about castigating the military activities of the five permanent members, however, and military operations coming under strong General Assembly condemnation typically fail.[106]

[105] While none of the counterinsurgency campaigns conducted by the five permanent members have engendered any Security Council condemnations, campaigns conducted by Indonesia, Morocco, the Netherlands, Portugal, and South Africa during that same time period were dramatically, and, at times, fatally hobbled by Security Council seizures (United Nations Security Council Resolutions, 1946-2008).

[106] General Assembly interest extended well beyond the 17 campaigns listed in the COW Extra-State Dataset. French campaigns in Cameroun, North Africa, and Suez met with at least 23 resolutions of varying degrees of severity before falling to defeat (Soustell, 1956: 119-120; Howe, 1966: 261; Talbott, 1980: 72-73; Smolansky, 1956: 588-605). British campaigns in Aden and Suez collapsed during the issuance of ten highly critical resolutions, and the British campaign in Oman, the subject of seven resolutions (six of which were condemnatory), only began to be effective after the cessation of General Assembly interest in 1970 (Newsinger, 2002: 130, 142-143, Smolansky, 1956: 588-605). British campaigns in Cyprus and Kenya received only a total of three mild resolutions, however, and were both generally successful (Anderson, 2005: 3; Elkins, 2005a: B11). While the three rather vague resolutions issued against the Chinese campaign in Tibet provided little assistance to the insurgents given Chinese antipathy to basic United Nations legitimacy (McGranahan, 2006: 121-124, 127-128), the Soviet campaign in Afghanistan failed after enduring eight years of annual condemnations (Suhrke, 1990: 242). Only the United States has escaped General Assembly condemnations of its counterinsurgency campaigns (United Nations General Assembly Resolutions, 1946-2008).

Great power condemnations may also shatter even robust foreign counterinsurgency campaigns. In virtually all cases in which major powers such as the United States, the Soviet Union, or the PRC offered succor to local insurgencies, counterinsurgency measures eventually collapsed. During the past 64 years, those defeats include the Dutch in the Netherlands East Indies, France in Indochina, the Portuguese in Angola, Guinea-Bissau, and Mozambique, the United States in Vietnam, South Africa in Namibia, and the Soviets in Afghanistan (Friend, 2003: 37-38; Katzenbach, 1952: 190; Karnow, 1983: 184-185; Tonnesson, 1985: 11-12, 18; Chabal, 1981: 75, 80-83, 91, 95-97; Albright, 1994: 42; O'Sullivan, 2005: 111; Nyrop, 1986: 35; Runov, 2002: xxiv, 53-72, 222, 312). The exception is, of course, the 1959-1974 Chinese campaign in Tibet which easily contained and eventually defeated the Chushi Gangdrug despite the insurgency being supported by the United States (Goldstein, 2006: 150; McGranahan, 2006: 120-122).

Even with such recent evidence of the importance of international pressure upon the viability of foreign counterinsurgency campaigns, the need to court both international opinion and the interests of affected great powers is rarely found to be an important focus of counterinsurgency planning.[107] Instead, many, if not most, modern counterinsurgency instruction manuals (including the most recent one designed for the

---

[107] Indeed, concerns regarding international opposition to the American exercise of the use of force have come under clear derision within the United States during recent years. During candidate George Bush's 2000 presidential election campaign, future Secretary of State Dr. Condoleezza Rice denounced the belief "that the support of many states - or even better, of institutions like the United Nations - is essential to the legitimate exercise of power" (Kagan, 2004: 84). Glennon, in evaluating The National Security Strategy of the United States (Bush, 2002: 15), wrote that the document made it very clear that the United States would "no longer be bound by the [United Nations] Charter's rules governing the use of force," but would instead would utilize preemptive military force in the circumstances of its choosing, regardless of international opinion (Glennon, 2003: 24).

United States military, Counterinsurgency (Field Manual 3-24), issued in 2006) place the probability of achieving victory over indigenous insurgents almost entirely within the nature of the strategy utilized by counterinsurgent forces; either the social welfare approach, or the cost-benefit approach (Kahl, 2006). While the manual notes that "eventually all foreign armies are seen as interlopers or occupiers," the belief is stated that an affected population will have greater faith in the vitality of its own government once it is clearly understood that a long-term commitment by American military forces is in place (Counterinsurgency, 2006: 1-24, 1-26). I find the idea that an indigenous population will accept the presence of an unruly foreign occupier as long as they believe that occupier is determined to stay to be analytically unsound, to say the least.

International opinion, especially within the United Nations, confers legitimacy, and I believe that indigenous populations are more likely to accept foreign occupation if they believe it is legitimate. Lacking such legitimacy, local antipathy to foreign occupation may invigorate resistance movements even in the absence of formal international condemnations. While the United Nations has been virtually silent regarding the United States-led invasion and occupation of Iraq (although Secretary-General Kofi Annan publically stated prior to the invasion that such an action would "would not be in conformity with the [United Nations] Charter" (Jervis, 2003: 375)),[108] regional anger at American military operations in Iraq has been palpable, with over 90%

[108] The General Assembly has passed only two resolutions on the matter, both of which related strictly to funding issues (United Nations General Assembly Resolutions #58/304 and #60/274, 2004, 2006). The Security Council has passed five resolutions in which any questions regarding the legitimacy of the occupation are limited to occasional reminders that 'the day when Iraqis govern themselves must come quickly' (United Nations Security Council Resolutions #1483 and #1511, 2003), statements 'looking forward to the end of the occupation' (United Nations Security Council Resolution #1546, 2004), and 'recognizing the importance of consent of the sovereign government of Iraq for the presence of the multinational force' (United Nations Security Council Resolutions #1723 and #1790, 2006-2008).

of Jordanian, Moroccan, Palestinian, and Turkish respondents, and 80% of Indonesian and Pakistani respondents indicating shortly after the invasion that the United States "didn't try very hard" to avoid Iraqi civilian casualties (Pew Global Attitudes Project, 2003: 24-25). After Iraqi news reporter Muntaẓar az-Zaydī angrily hurled both of his shoes at President George Bush during a press conference held at the Prime Minister's palace in Baghdad, Iraq on December 14, 2008 to protest the continuing United States-led occupation of the country, a poll jointly commissioned by American Broadcasting Company, the British Broadcasting Company, and Nippon Hōsō Kyōkai found 62% of Iraqis regarding az-Zaydī as a hero for standing up to the hated American presence (Langer, 2009).[109] Research conducted by Weede and Muller has shown that regimes dependent upon the support of foreign occupation forces tend to lose legitimacy within their populations (Weede and Muller, 1998: 54), and the current governments of both Afghanistan and Iraq – installed following United States-led military invasion and occupation – appear to be existentially dependent upon American military support. It should be remembered that the United States lost the war in Vietnam even in the

[109] This poll, conducted by D3 Systems of Vienna, Virginia and KA Research Ltd. Of Istanbul, Turkey, was based upon 2,228 face-to-face interviews of a random sample of Iraqis conducted during February 17-25, 2009 (including oversamples in Anbar Province, Basra City, Mosul, and the Sadr City district of Baghdad), and the results have a 2.5 margin of error (National Survey of Iraq, 2009). Az-Zaydī's act of defiance has attracted wide-ranging support from across the Arab world and even beyond. The Lebanese television channel NTV offered az-Zaydī a journalistic position with the salary in force from the moment he threw the first shoe (Faraj, 2008). Regional public figures have also voiced support. Emir of Qatar Sheikh Hamad bin Khalifa al-Thani promised az-Zaydī a 'golden horse,' Libyan leader Mu'ammar al-Qaḏāfī has spoken of granting the Iraqi reporter Libya's highest honor (Welcome Awaits Iraqi Shoe-Thrower, 2009: 1), and Malaysian Foreign Minister Rais Yatim praised the shoe-throwing incident action as just retaliation against President Bush for the invasion of Iraq (Malaysian Minister Yatim Praises Iraqi Shoe Thrower, 2008: 1). These official accolades for the humiliation of an American president are even more impressive given the recent normalization of relations between the United States and Libya, the reputation of Malaysia as being a moderate, Western-leaning state (the United States is Malaysia's largest trading partner), and the fact that Qatar hosts the United States Central Command forward headquarters and provided direct support to the 2003 United States-led invasion of Iraq (Background Note: Libya, 2009; Background Note: Malaysia, 2009; Background Note: Qatar, 2009).

complete absence of United Nations resolutions due to the inability of the American-sponsored government in Saigon to exist without perpetual United States military support (Karnow, 1983: 643). While external actors may successfully question legitimacy, Latham writes that only indigenous actors can provide it (Latham, 2006: 40), and continuing to ignore both internal and international opinion regarding the basic legitimacy of the United States military presence in Afghanistan and Iraq will provide little benefit to American interests in the region.

The theoretical model for my dissertation includes three hypotheses which acknowledge the value, clearly evident in the academic literature, of acquiring strong international support and recognizing the interests of affected great powers before engaging in counterinsurgency operations in foreign countries, while generally discounting the importance of operational strategy in the final outcome of victory or defeat. Hypothesis #1 states that *the higher the level of United Nations condemnation of foreign counterinsurgency measures, the less successful will be those measures*, Hypothesis #2 states that *the higher the level of great power recognition and support of the legitimacy of an insurgency, the less successful will be foreign counterinsurgency measures*, and Hypothesis #3 states that *the employment of either the Social Welfare or the Cost-Benefit approach to counterinsurgency operations will not be significant in determining success in such operations.* The independent variable of United Nations opposition (Hypothesis #1) has been operationalized through websites affiliated with the United Nations Documentation Centre, New York, New York which provide a record of all General Assembly and Security Council resolutions issued since 1946. The independent variable of great power opposition (Hypothesis #2) has been

operationalized by verbiage found in the academic literature detailing insurgent recognition and support by countries and regional power-blocs. The independent variable of counterinsurgency strategy (Hypothesis #3) has been operationalized through official statements of policy, judgments of military analysts, and sources in the academic literature describing the nature of the various campaigns, especially those involving reports of significant civilian casualties indicative of cost-benefit campaigns.[110] The dependent variable of victory or defeat for foreign counterinsurgency forces has, in all cases, been operationalized through data contained within the COW Extra-State Dataset for the period of 1945-1997 (Sarkees, 2000: 123-144).

B. Results of These Four Case Studies

In-dept evaluation of these four case studies appears to yield support for all three hypotheses. Both Hypothesis #1, which predicted that heightened levels of United Nations condemnations of foreign counterinsurgency measures would impact the viability of those measures, and Hypotheses #2, which posited that insurgencies granted great power recognition would be more likely to defeat foreign occupation powers, found support through the case study of South Africa's 1966-1988 counterinsurgency campaign against SWAPO. South African efforts to maintain control of Namibia during that time period led the country into such international isolation from the United Nations that the South African government, in a move of desperation, developed nuclear weapons to encourage Western security guarantees and keep potential threats at bay. United Nations recognition of insurgent legitimacy also may

[110] Even with the assistance of these sources, four of the 17 cases resulted in a determination of 'Mixture of Both,' while two further cases resulted in a determination of 'Strategy Unclear.' (Table IV).

have served to motivate both SWAPO and its supporters in the MPLA, and indirectly legitimize Cuban intervention into the conflict. Against such wide-ranging United Nations condemnation of South African policies, even the United States was eventually forced to accept the defeat of its Cold War position in southern Africa and cease abstaining from Security Council condemnations against its anti-Communist ally, South Africa (United Nations General Assembly/Security Council Resolutions, 1946-1990).[111] Soviet efforts through its Cuban client may have been nearly as important as United Nations condemnations, however, since, by the mid-1980s, some South African officials felt that an all-out effort by the 50,000 Cuban troops resident in the area might have overwhelmed South African security forces in Namibia, and the Cuban military victory at Cuito Cuanavale, Angola during May 1988 brought an decisive end to South African goals of maintaining sovereignty in the territory (Albright, 1994: 42; O'Sullivan, 2005: 111). I thus argue that, in the case of Namibia, both Hypotheses #1 and #2 contributed equally to the defeat of South African counterinsurgency efforts.

Moroccan efforts to defeat POLISARIO insurgents in Western Sahara also provide insight into the validity of Hypotheses #1 and #2. The Moroccan campaign initially met condemnations from both the General Assembly and the Security Council (United Nations General Assembly/Security Council Resolutions, 1975), a denial by the ICJ of legal title to the territory (Western Sahara: Advisory Opinion of 16 October 1975,

[111] As mentioned in Chapter IV, South African efforts to stem the flood of United Nations condemnations against its control of Namibia by defining the SWAPO insurgency as a Communist movement may have temporarily led France, the United Kingdom, and the United States to reject a mandatory United Nations arms embargo against the South African state (Horton, 1999: Occasional Paper #27; United Nations General Assembly Resolution #3411, 1975). Subsequent development of nuclear weapons by South African authorities not only failed to force Western security guarantees, but triggered the long-deferred mandatory arms embargo, however, and nearly led to Soviet air strikes against South Africa's Valindaba nuclear facilities (United Nations Security Council Resolution #418, 1977; Albright, 1994: 37-42).

1975: 4, 29-31, 39-54), and subsequent acceptance of POLISARIO legitimacy by both the OAU and NAM that left Moroccan troops in a state of siege in the urban areas of the territory by the late 1970s (Solarz, 1979/1980: 281, 284-285). Morocco's unique status as both an African and an Arab state allowed it to successfully play Jāmi 'at ad-Duwal al-'Arabiyya off against the OAU with an acceptance by the former of Moroccan territorial claims in Western Sahara (Zunes, 1995: 23; Campbell, 2003: 47), however, and the 13-year silence regarding the issue from the Security Council along with the bland nature of General Assembly resolutions from 1982 onward make it clear that little unity existed for isolating or punishing Morocco for its counterinsurgency campaigns in the territory (United Nations General Assembly/Security Council Resolutions, 1976-2008). Great power recognition and support of the Moroccan government through the efforts of the United States, France, and Sa'udi Arabia, was also essential to the success of Moroccan counterinsurgency campaigns (typified by the construction of the 800 mile long sand wall in the territory), and appear to have turned the tide against POLISARIO; especially in the absence of any viable United Nations opposition (Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 6). As a result, I disagree with the COW Extra-State Dataset that determines a defeat for Morocco in this campaign and argue that the Moroccan efforts have thus far been successful, thanks to a combination of weak, divided international opinion and robust great power recognition and support; an outcome that appears to provide additional support for the Hypotheses #1 and #2. Having said that, however, nationalist agitation for independence in Western Sahara continues to the present day as a stark testament to the enduring quality of Sahrawi national consciousness (Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 9-18).

Further support for Hypotheses #1 and #2 can be found in Chinese efforts to initially reintegrate Tibet within the People's Republic of China. Once the Western powers (here including India) fully understood the determination of Máo Zédōng's administration to subjugate the territory during 1950, none of them were willing to sponsor Tibetan membership in the United Nations despite desperate appeals by Tibetan officials to support the initiative. With the collapse of Tibetan forces at Changdu during October 1950, the United States, preparing to encounter an unprecedented assault by Chinese forces in North Korea, appears to have been willing to accept the inevitable Chinese victory there and offered no support at all for an independent Tibetan entity (Sheng, 2006: 15-16, 17, 18-19, 22-23, 25, 31-32). While Indian President Nehru encouraged a Tibetan independence movement during the 1950s and the CIA provided direct assistance to the subsequent Chushi Gangdrug organization (McGranahan, 2006: 109-111, 113-114), neither India nor the United States ever recognized Tibetan independence or even the Chushi Gangdrug as being the authentic representative of the Tibetan people (Grunfeld, 1996: 258). Following the uprising of March 1959, the CIA-funded Chushi Gangdrug insurgents served as little more than a platform for American intelligence collection and harassment of PLA forces than as a truly viable national liberation movement (McGranahan, 2006: 121, 124, 127-128). Even the three General Assembly resolutions issued during 1959, 1961, and 1965 in opposition to Chinese policies in Tibet declined to mention China by name, and none of them questioned the actual legitimacy of Chinese rule in Tibet (United Nations General Assembly Resolutions, 1959-1965). Nor did a single country during this period ever recognize the independence of a Tibetan political entity, and none have done so to date

(Grunfeld, 1996: 180, 258). With United Nations pressure negligible at best and great power support from the United States and India far too limited to seriously challenge Chinese authority in the territory, Chinese counterinsurgency operations were able to continue virtually unhindered by international pressure (Goldstein, 2006: 150).

Additional support for Hypotheses #1 and #2 is also available in the British counterinsurgency response to the MRLA insurgency in Malaya, as British efforts to defeat Communist guerillas there were conducted in the silence of international pressure, from either the United Nations or intervening great powers. Since the issue was never seized by either the General Assembly or the Security Council (United Nations General Assembly/Security Council Resolutions, 1948-1960), British forces were able to conduct counterinsurgency operations without the international pressure from the United Nations that led to Dutch defeat in the neighboring Netherlands East Indies (United Nations General Assembly/Security Council Resolutions, 1947-1949). Meanwhile, American pressure was successfully warded off by proactive British perception management of the MRLA as a tool of international Communism (Shafer, 1988: 59-60), and Soviet/Chinese intervention was prevented by Malaya's geographical position as a peninsula with a short, easily-sealed frontier (Campbell, 1968: 140-141); a significant geographical advantage that French authorities in Indochina lacked in their efforts to block Chinese support to the Việt Minh (Tonnesson, 1985: 18).[112] In such an

[112] As previously mentioned, British authorities held strong concerns regarding international pressure against their counterinsurgency efforts, and took robust measures to present the MRLA insurgency as a Soviet/Chinese-sponsored program designed to incorporate the developing countries of Southeast Asia into the 'Communist Bloc' (NAA A452/2, 1968: 3). These measures were directly principally toward the United States, with the goal of overcoming traditional American aversion to colonialism with the spectre of advancing international Communism (Watson, 1949).

advantageous counterinsurgency environment, British forces were free to utilize unconventional tactics, such as the Briggs Plan, which, despite its repressive nature, would be generally credited with the ultimate defeat of the MRLA (Hall, 1981: 878, 924; Campbell, 1968: 157). That said, the culmination of the United Kingdom's successful counterinsurgency campaign was predicated upon the withdrawal of British sovereignty from the Malayan peninsula, and, had the British government been unwilling to hand over sovereignty to an indigenous government, the MRLA's goal of uniting Malayan society against foreign control might indeed have been more successful.[113]

Hypothesis #3 also appears to have gained support from this evaluation. The cost-benefit approach was, by every source I was able to find within the literature (and compounded by United Nations resolutions condemning South African counterinsurgency tactics), employed by South African forces in their campaign in Namibia; a campaign which clearly failed (Moroney, ed., 1989: 383). In a similar manner, Chinese forces, following the March 1959 native uprising in Lhasa, Tibet, responded with a brutal, coercive campaign of the cost-benefit model that drove the Chushi Gangdrug guerillas into neighboring Nepal, forced the Dalai Lama into political exile in Dharamsala, India (where he remains to this day), and successfully crushed any pretentions of potential independence on the part of the Tibetan population (Chen, 2006: 54, 61-62, 71, 77-80; McGranahan, 2006: 119-120). Meanwhile, British forces

[113] It might also be suggested that, among these four cases, great power support appears to trump United Nations pressure regarding the viability of counterinsurgency operations. Soviet-Cuban support of SWAPO objectives in Namibia, not United Nations pressure, led to the terminal defeat of South African forces during May 1988 (O'Sullivan, 2005: 111), and Western support (combined with Jāmi 'at ad-Duwal al-'Arabiyya recognition of Moroccan claims in Northwest Africa) allowed the Moroccan government to maintain its position in Western Sahara despite a continuing series of admittedly weak United Nations resolutions (Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 6).

in Malaya can be credited with virtually inventing the social welfare approach which concentrated upon rewarding regional communities that rejected the call of insurgency and ultimately frustrated MRLA efforts to build a multi-racial consensus against British rule among the ethnically divided population (Pye, 1956: 102-103). Finally, the Moroccan government appears to have employed both approaches in its ultimately successful campaign in Western Sahara. While Moroccan forces have utilized a strongly coercive cost-benefit campaign in Western Sahara designed not only to defeat the POLISARIO insurgents but to destroy any lingering feelings of Sahrawi nationalism (Smith, 1987: 145), aspects of the social welfare approach appear to be involved in Moroccan efforts to encourage native Sahrawis to assimilate within metropolitan Morocco and view Moroccan King Mohammed VI as a paternal figure of leadership (Stephan and Mundy, 2006: 9-18).

C. Additional Evidence Across the Remaining 13 Cases

Similar evidence can be found among the remaining 13 cases listed in the COW Extra-State Dataset, especially through the campaigns conducted within the Netherlands East Indies, Portugal's African territories of Angola, Guinea-Bissau, and Mozambique, and the former Portuguese East Timor; given that they attracted the most United Nations interest (Appendix II). The 13 Security Council resolutions addressing Dutch counterinsurgency operations in the Netherlands East Indies issued during 1947-1949 stunted Dutch efforts to retain their 300-year old sway within the archipelago and tended to guide significant areas of Dutch military and political policy for the conflict (United Nations Security Council Resolutions #27, #30, #31, #32, #35, #36, #40, #41, #55, #63, #64, #65, and #67, 1947-1949). The final resolution of January 28, 1949

(adopted with no abstentions whatsoever) which demanded a complete withdrawal of Netherlands sovereignty from most of the Indonesian archipelago by July 1, 1950 ended any remaining Dutch hopes of maintaining their East Indian empire (excepting West New Guinea, which remained Dutch territory until 1962), and may have been responsible for the upsurge in insurgent activity that occurred over the next few months against the politically weakened Netherlands government (United Nations Security Council Resolution #67, 1949; Collins, 1950: 181-193).[114] Following the onset of guerilla activity in Angola during February 4, 1961, the Portuguese ambassador to the United States quickly took active measures to block United Nations discussions of Portuguese colonial control of Angola, Guinea-Bissau, and Mozambique (Ribeiro, 2002: 168; NA, SDCF, 1960-1963), and went on to blame subsequent Security Council discussions of the matter for triggering the insurgent outrage of March 15 in northern Angola which killed at least 200 Portuguese nationals (NA, SDCF, 1960-1963). Even so, a barrage of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions (20 from the Security Council and 31 from the General Assembly) against Portuguese counterinsurgency efforts over the next 13 years made Portugal, during that time period, the third greatest target of United Nations resolutions (after South Africa and Morocco)

[114] Dutch concern at the onset of United Nations pressure was so strong that three days after Security Council Resolution #27 was issued on August 1, 1947, the Dutch colonial government brokered an agreement with Soekarno's forces that temporarily reduced the level of violence in the territory (United Nations Security Council Resolution #27, 1947; Ricklefs, 1991: 226). While the British and French governments, conducting their own counterinsurgency efforts against indigenous guerillas in Southeast Asia, abstained from ratifying a number of these 13 resolutions (United Nations Security Council Resolutions, 1947-1948), the United States, apparently viewing Soekarno's Republican leadership to be more reasonable than that of the Dutch government, ratified all 13 without issue (Ricklefs, 1991: 226). By January 1949, even His Majesty's Government was willing to ratify the most damning of the 13 Security Council resolutions against the Dutch government; a surprising move considering the United Kingdom's own sputtering counterinsurgency campaign in neighboring Malaya (United Nations Security Council Resolution #67, 1949).

and the second most condemned state in the world (after South Africa); a level of political isolation that made it difficult for Portugal to claim any realistic legitimacy within its African territories (United Nations General Assembly/Security Council Resolutions, 1961-1974). Indonesia's 25 year occupation of East Timor (1975-2000) resulted in twelve Security Council resolutions and 24 General Assembly resolutions, and the brutal nature of that occupation and its suppression of Timorian nationalism caused serious damage to Indonesia's national reputation and international credibility. While the Indonesian government initially gained support from the United States and Australia by branding Falintil insurgents as Communists, the closing of the Cold War in 1991 ended the basis of that justification in the West and led to increased international scrutiny into issues of self-determination and human rights in the territory (Schwartz, 1994: 195, 207-208, 223).[115] In all cases, international opposition held serious consequences for occupying powers and provides additional support for Hypothesis #1.

Across those 13 cases, only four of the intervening states encountered any appreciable great power opposition: the Dutch in the Netherlands East Indies, France in Indochina, Portugal within its African empire, and South Africa in Namibia (Appendix III). Sensing an apparent Dutch inattention to Security Council resolutions during early January 1949, American authorities threatened to curtail all Marshall Plan aid to the Netherlands should an independent Indonesian state fail to emerge from negotiations

[115] Mirroring, after a fashion, Morocco's strategy over Western Sahara, the Indonesian government was able to use the threat of Communism in East Timor to co-opt support from Australia and United States, and the mantle of anti-colonialism to gain support from India and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations; successfully dividing and marginalizing United Nations condemnations (Schwartz, 1994 207-208; Dunn, 1996:311-312). Interestingly enough, Indonesian aspirations to chair the NAM during the 1980s were undercut by the country's occupation of East Timor, as many developing states apparently identified with the occupied population in East Timor rather than with their Indonesian occupiers (Schwartz, 1994: 195-196).

(Collins, 1950: 173-176; Friend, 2003: 37-38). Since the Netherlands were still striving to rebuild from the carnage of the Second World War, such a threat served to make continuation of the campaign in the East Indies untenable; a reminder that decisive great power pressure against foreign counterinsurgency campaigns does not necessarily require military support to insurgents (Collins, 1950: 173-176; Friend, 2003: 37-38). Following Soviet and Chinese recognition of Hồ Chí Minh's administration in Vietnam during January 1950, 60,000 resupplied and highly-motivated Việt Minh troops were able to take the offensive against French Union forces, and, by the end of the year, take Dongkhe, Caobang, Langsom, Laokay, and Thai Nguyen, seize control of the Chinese frontier, and doom the entire French campaign (Katzenbach, 1952: 190; Karnow, 1983: 184-185; Tonnesson, 1985: 11-12, 18).[116] Subsequent Soviet support to FNLA, MPLA, and UNITA guerillas in Angola, PAIGC in Guinea-Bissau, and FRELIMO in Mozambique heightened insurgent capabilities while it constrained Portuguese counterinsurgency operations in those territories; especially in Guinea-Bissau, where PAIGC (operating through a military unit entitled Forças Armadas Revolucionarias do Povo) was able to acquire Soviet surface-to-air missiles that successfully destroyed nearly 50% of the Forca Aerea Portuguesa aircraft deployed within the territory (Chabal, 1981: 75, 80-83, 91, 95-97). Following the collapse of the Portuguese African empire, Soviet opposition to South Africa's counterinsurgency campaign in Namibia nearly resulted in a Soviet air strike against South African nuclear facilities during the summer of 1977, and the Soviet support to SWAPO insurgents

[116] Westad argues that Soviet and Chinese recognition of the Việt Minh may have been even more significant to the French defeat than their subsequent material support, since it personally granted to Hồ the legitimacy he needed to prevail against his indigenous opponents (Westad, 1992: 461); another case in which successful great power pressure does not solely involve military resupply.

which followed led to the presence of about 50,000 Cuban troops in Angola by the mid-1980s; a substantial military force that could conceivably have overwhelmed the South African position there during that time period (Albright, 1994: 37-42). The Cuban victory over South African forces at Cuito Cuanavale, Angola during May 1988 set the stage for a humiliating South African withdrawal from Namibia and the eventual unraveling of the apartheid South African state itself (O'Sullivan, 2005: 111). In all four cases, great power opposition resulted in serious impacts against foreign counterinsurgency operations, and provides further support for Hypothesis #2.

Both of the counterinsurgency strategies were utilized with these 13 cases, with no significant results for victory or defeat (Appendix IV). The cost-benefit approach was fairly clearly followed in five of these cases, three of which resulted in victories within the COW Extra-State Dataset. The social welfare approach appeared to be followed in only one of the cases; a case which also resulted in a victory. A combination of both approaches appeared to represent the counterinsurgency strategy in five of the cases, all of which are listed as defeats. Finally, no clear strategy was apparent to this writer in two of the cases, both of which are listed as defeats.[117] The lack of any discernable

[117] The cases involving the cost-benefit approach include France in Madagascar (a victory), Indonesia in East Timor (a victory, according to the COW Extra-State Dataset, although I argue otherwise), France in Indochina (a defeat), the United Kingdom in Kenya (a defeat, according to the COW Extra-State Dataset, although I argue otherwise), and France in Algeria (a defeat) (Cole and Middleton, 2001: 10, Cooper, 2006: 33; Kiernan, 2003: 594; Philpott, 2007: 6; Katzenbach, Jr., 1952: 190, 211; Elkins, 2000: 29, 46; Elkins, 2005a: B9-B11; Lackey, 1989: 79). The case representing the social welfare approach was India's 'one hundred hour war' in Hyderabad (Talbot, 1949: 325-327). The cases involving a combination of both strategies include the Netherlands in the Netherlands East Indies, France in Cameroun, and Portugal in Angola, Guinea-Bissau, and Mozambique (Emerson, 1948: 61, 64-66, 68, 74-76; Moroney, 1989: 71; Howe, 1966: 355; Marcum, 1978: 177; Chabal, 1981: 83; Mendy, 2003: 57). Finally, I was unable to discern any clear strategy in the cases of France in Morocco and Tunisia (Soustelle, 1956: 119-120; Hutchinson, 1972: Gershovich, 2004: 143), since French distraction with Indochina and Algeria appeared to reduce French activities within those territories to little more than 'muddling through' and graduated concessions.

significance in the counterinsurgency approach pursued provides additional support for Hypothesis #3, and should serve as a cautionary tale for military units basing the viability of their military campaigns upon choice of strategy.

As previously mentioned, an evaluation of the 17 cases contained within the COW Extra-State Dataset for the period of 1945-1997 provides evidence that foreign counterinsurgency campaigns falter when confronted with opposition from either the United Nations or great powers/power blocs, and succeeds when such opposition is not present: This is borne out by the fact that four of the five cases categorized as victories for the foreign intervening power encountered no United Nations opposition, while all but one of the twelve cases categorized as defeats did indeed encounter such opposition (Appendices I, II, and III; Sarkees, 2000: 123-144; United Nations General Assembly/Security Council Resolutions, 1946-2008; Gordge, 1949: 133, 136-138; Talbot, 1949: 325-327; Campbell, 1968: 140-141, 153-154, 156, 160-161; Chen, 2006: 56). This data yields a negative correlation coefficient of 72% between the application of United Nations pressure and occupation power victory, and provides significant empirical support for Hypothesis #1 (Appendix VIII), which is the crux of my entire argument.

D. Potential for Further Research

While I believe that my theoretical model has provided valid confirmation of my hypotheses, weaknesses do exist within that model. First, as noted by Gleditsch, the COW Extra-State Dataset is limited and tends to include and exclude a number of conflicts based upon ad hoc decisions, chronicling the American experience in Vietnam from 1961 to 1975 under the COW Inter-State Dataset as a victory for the Socialist

Republic of Vietnam rather than under the Extra-State Dataset as a defeat for the United States against the Việt Cộng (Weede and Muller, 1998: 49-51; Gleditsch, 2004: 235, 245-246). Libicki, who coded the appendix database for insurgency outcomes in RAND Corporation's 2008 study War by Other Means, implicitly disagrees with three of the Extra-State Dataset's outcomes: the win by the Mau Mau insurgency in Kenya, the win by POLISARIO guerillas in Western Sahara, and the win by Indonesian forces in East Timor (Gampert and Gordon, 2008: 373-374). Mack notes the absence of four major British counterinsurgency campaigns from both databases: the 1944-1948 campaign against the Palmach, Lehi, Stern, and Irgun in Mandatory Palestine, the 1955-1960 campaign against the Ethnikí Orgánosis Kipriakoú Agónos in Cyprus, the 1963-1967 campaign against the National Liberation Front in Aden Colony and Protectorate, and the 1963-1976 campaign against the Dhofar Liberation Front/Popular Front for the Liberation of the Occupied Arabian Gulf in Oman (Mack, 1975: 175, 189). I personally question the omissions of the Soviet campaigns against insurgents in Hungary (1956) and the Mujihadin in Afghanistan (1979-1989), the Vietnamese campaign against the Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea in Cambodia (1978-1989), and the Indian campaign against the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam in Sri Lanka (1987-1990), and suggest that the database be chronologically updated to include the Israeli campaign against Hizb'ullah insurgency in South Lebanon (1985-2000) (Chanda, 1989: 31; Krivosheev, ed., 1993: 397; Kaplan, 2001: 223-224; Avraham, 2007: 64-65). Second, while United Nations pressure is easily validated through statistics maintained within the United Nations Documentation Centre, the precise nature of great power involvement is not always clear since little viable

information is available regarding some of the more obscure conflicts. In some cases, such involvement can only be determined or inferred by the use of essentially anecdotal information, as precise statistics are either unavailable or being intentionally withheld under terms of government classification. Third, a clear determination of strategy is, at times, difficult to define, as evidenced by the six cases in which the strategy was listed as either a mixture of both approaches or simply unclear (Appendix IV). Having said that, the key argument of this dissertation – that international pressure from the United Nations tends to make foreign counterinsurgency campaigns untenable – can certainly be inferred, even on a coincidental basis, from statistics maintained within the United Nations Documentation Centre placed alongside the conflict outcomes as found in the COW Extra-State Dataset.

Potential for further research on this issue abounds. A deeper evaluation of the remaining foreign counterinsurgency campaigns listed above might be conducted to determine the viability of my arguments. Since international pressure tends to focus on the basic legitimacy of these counterinsurgency campaigns, current operations in such diverse locations as Sri Lanka, Pakistan, and Chechnya might be polled and further evaluated to determine popular opinions regarding overall government legitimacy as an indicator of the eventual success or failure of those operations. Given the positive nature of the existing results against the three proffered hypotheses, one might expect further validation of those hypotheses from extended testing and analysis.

More importantly, however, would be the possibility that, should this dissertation be granted wider dissemination, military planners studying these cases might consider employing more caution before recommending military responses to future political

issues. If my research has taught me anything, it is that few indigenous peoples react positively to foreign military occupation, regardless of the stated motivation of the occupiers.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Military Guide to Terrorism in the Twenty-First Century. (2005). Fort Leavenworth: US Army Training and Doctrine Command.

National Survey of Iraq. (2009). ABC News/BBC/NHK.

Abizaid, John. Face the Nation. (2005). CBS News.

Aboul-Enein, Youssef. (2004). A Short History of Moroccan Armed Forces. Military Review 84(1): 75-79.

Adams, Michael. (1988). The Middle East. New York and Oxford: Facts on File.

Addendum to the Report of the Panel of Experts of the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources and Other Forms of Wealth of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. (2001). S/2001/1072. New York: United Nations Panel of Experts.

Address at Johns Hopkins University, April 7, 1965. (Undated). Pentagon Papers. Washington, D.C.: Gravel Edition III. Boston: Beacon Press.

Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Viet-Nam. (1954). New Haven: the Avalon Project at Yale Law School.

Ajami, Fouad. (2003). Iraq and the Arabs' Future. Foreign Affairs 82(1): 2-18.

Albright, David. (1994). South Africa and the Affordable Bomb. Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists 50(4): 37-47.

Aldrich, Winthrop. (1967). The Suez Crisis. Foreign Affairs 45(3): 541-552.

Allen, William. (1943). Guerilla War in Abyssinia. London: Penguin Books.

Analysis of Counterinsurgency Operations in Afghanistan and The Philippines: Key Judgments. (1988). McLean: Defense Systems, Inc.

Anderson, David. (2005). Burying the Bones of the Past. History Today 55(2): 2-3.

Andrade, Dale and Willbanks, James. (2006). CORDS/Phoenix: Counterinsurgency Lessons from Vietnam for the Future. Military Review 86(2): 9-23.

Andrews, William. (1973). The Village War. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.

Annual Message to the Congress of the State of the Union. (1956). Eisenhower Papers 1956. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Arab League Supports Morocco's Territorial Integrity. (1999). Arabic News. Dubai: LyngSat.

Arendt, Hannah. (1958). The Origins of Totalitarianism. Cleveland: Meridian.

Armstrong, John. (1964a). European Resistance Movements 1939-1945. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Armstrong, John. (1964b). The Soviet Partisans in World War II. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Army Field Manual 3-24. (2006). Counterinsurgency. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army.

Arquivo Histórico Diplomático. (1960). MNE-SE, PEA Conference Box 15.

Arreguin-Toft, Ivan. (2005). How the Weak Win Wars: a Theory of Asymmetric Conflict. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Asher, Michael. (1999). Lawrence: The Uncrowned King of Arabia. Woodstock and New York: The Overlook Press.

Avraham, Sela. (2007). Civil Society, the Military, and National Security: the Case of Israel's Security Zone in South Lebanon. Israeli Studies 12(1): 53-78.

Ayres, R. William. (2000). A World Flying Apart? Violent Nationalist Conflict and the End of the Cold War. Journal of Peace Research 37(1): 105-119.

Azam, Jean-Paul. (2002). Looting and Conflict between Ethnoregional Groups: Lessons for State Formation in Africa. Journal of Conflict Resolution 46(1): 131-153.

Bach, William. (1986). A Chance in Cambodia. Foreign Policy 62: 75-95.

Background Note: Libya. (2009). United States Department of State: Washington, D.C.

Background Note: Malaysia. (2009). United States Department of State: Washington, D.C.

Background Note: Qatar. (2009). United States Department of State: Washington, D.C.

Barber, Benjamin. (1997). Fantasy of Fear. Harvard International Review 20(1): 66-71.

Beaufre, Andre. (1965). Introduction to Strategy. New York: Praeger.

Beckett, Ian F. W. (1999). Encyclopedia of Guerilla Warfare. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO.

Begin, Menachem. (1951). The Revolt. New York: Dell Publishing Company.

Behr, Edward. (1958). The Algerian Dilemma. International Affairs 34(3): 280-290.

Békés, Csaba. (2006). The 1956 Hungarian Revolution and the Declaration of Neutrality. Cold War History 6(4): 477-500.

Bender, Gerald. (1972). The Limits of Counterinsurgency: an African Case. Comparative Politics 4(3): 331-360.

Berger, Mark. (2003). Decolonization, Modernization and Nation-Building: Political Development Theory and the Appeal of Communism in Southeast Asia, 1945-1975. Journal of Southeast Asian Studies 34(3): 421-448.

Berman, Larry. (2007). Perfect Spy: The Incredible Double Life of Phạm Xuân Ẩn. New York: Smithsonian Books.

Berman, Paul. (1996). In Search of Bin Linder's Killers. The New Yorker 72(28: 58-81.

Biddle, Stephen. (2006). Seeing Baghdad, Thinking Saigon. Foreign Affairs 85(2): 2-14.

Blanche, Ed. (2004). Emulating the Tactics of Terror. The Middle East 342: 9-11.

Blanton, Robert, Mason, T. David, and Athow, Brian. (2001). Colonial Style and Post-Colonial Ethnic Conflict in Africa. Journal of Peace Research 38(4): 473-491.

Boettcher, III, William and Cobb, Michael. (2006). Echoes of Vietnam?: Casualty Framing and Public Perceptions of Success and Failure in Iraq. Journal of Conflict Resolution 50(6): 831-854.

Bonneuil, Noel and Auriat, Nadia. (2000). Fifty Years of Ethnic Conflict and Cohesion: 1945-94. Journal of Peace Research 37(5): 563-581.

Boot, Max. (2002). The Savage Wars of Peace. New York: Basic Books.

Borhi, Lazlo. (1999). Rollback, Liberation, Containment, or Inaction?: U. S. Policy and Eastern Europe in the 1950s. Journal of Cold War Studies 1(3): 67-110.

Boucher, Richard. (2001). State Department Briefing of July 2, 2001. Http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2001/4656.htlm. Washington, D.C.: Department of State.

Boudon, Raymond. (1982). The Unintended Consequences of Social Action. London: Macmillan.

Boyd, Ernest. (1922). Ireland: Resurgent and Insurgent. Foreign Affairs 1(1): 86-97.

Brown, David. (1998). Why is the Nation-State So Vulnerable to Ethnic Nationalism? Nations and Nationalism 4(1): 1-15.

Brown, Malcom, ed. (1988). T. E. Lawrence, the Selected Letters. New York and London: W. W. Norton and Company.

Brubaker, Rogers. (1996). Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bruce, Leigh. (1985). Cyprus: A Last Chance. Foreign Policy 58: 115-133.

Buhaug, Halvard and Gates, Scott. (2002). The Geography of Civil War. Journal of Peace Research 39(4): 417-433.

Burrin, Philippe. (1996). France Under the Germans. New York: New York Press.

Bush, George W. (2002) The National Security Strategy of the United States of America. Portland: Common Dreams News Center.

Buss, Arnold. (1961). The Psychology of Aggression. New York: Wiley.

Byman, Daniel. (2006). Do Targeted Killings Work? Foreign Affairs 85(2): 95-111.

Byman, Daniel. (2003). Should Hezbollah Be Next? Foreign Affairs 82(6): 54-66.

Byman, Daniel, Chalk, Peter, Hoffman, Bruce, Rosenau, William, and Brannan, David. (2001). Trends in Outside Support for Insurgent Movements. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.

Cairns, E. (1997). A Safer Future: Reducing the Human Cost of War. Oxford: Oxfam.

Campbell, Arthur. (1968). Guerillas. New York: The John Day Company.

Campbell, Patricia. (2003). Morocco in Transition: Overcoming the Democratic and Human Rights Legacy of King Hassan II. African Studies Quarterly 7(1): 38-58.

Canby, Henry. (1919). The Irish Mind. The Atlantic Monthly 123(1): 34-43.

Carman, Harry. (1921). England and the Egyptian Problem. Political Science Quarterly 36(1): 51-78.

Carment, David. (1993). The International Dimensions of Ethnic Conflict: Concepts, Indicators, and Theory. Journal of Peace Research 30(2): 137-150.

Carver, Michal. (1998). Britain's Army in the Twentieth Century. New York: MacMillan.

Celeski, Joseph. (2006). Attacking Insurgent Space: Sanctuary Denial and Border Interdiction. Military Review 86(6): 51-57.

Chabal, Patrick. (1981). National Liberation in Portuguese Guinea, 1956-1974. African Affairs 80(318): 75-99.

Chanda, Nayan. (1989). Civil War in Cambodia? Foreign Policy 76: 26-43.

Chen, Jian. (2006). The Tibetan Rebellion of 1959 and China's Changing Relations with India and the Soviet Union. Journal of Cold War Studies 8(3): 54-101.

Christenson, Sig. (2004). U.S. Commander in Iraq Says Winning Hearts and Minds of People Not Essential. The San Antonio Express-News, August 4, 2004.

Claessen, Erik. (2007). Discouraging Hearts and Minds: Democracies and Insurgencies. Military Review 87(3): 97-103.

Clark, David. (2006). The Vital Role of Intelligence in Counterinsurgency Operations. USAWC Strategy Research Project. Carlisle Barracks: U. S. Army War College.

Clark, Michael. (1959). Algeria in Turmoil. New York: Frederick A. Praeger.

Clayton, Anthony. (1994). The Wars of Decolonization. New York: Longman Group-UK.

Coakley, John. (2004). Mobilizing the Past: Nationalist Images of History. Nationalism and Ethnic Politics 10(4): 531-560.

Cochrane, Feargal. (2007). Irish-America, the End of the IRA's Armed Struggle and the Utility of 'Soft Power'. Journal of Peace Research 44(2): 215-231.

Cohen, Michael. (1982). Palestine and the Great Powers, 1945-1948. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.

Cole, Jennifer, and Middleton, Karen. (2001). Rethinking Ancestors and Colonial Power in Madagascar. Africa 71(1): 1-37.

Coleman, James. (1954). Nationalism in Tropical Africa. American Political Science Review 48(2): 404-426.

Coleman, James. (1958). Nigeria: Background to Nationalism. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Collier, Paul. (1999). Doing Well out of War. Paper presented at Conference on Economic Agendas in Civil Wars, April 26-27, 1999, London, England (http://econ.worldbank.org/programs/conflict/topic/13188/library/doc?id – 13200). London: Conference on Economic Agendas in Civil Wars.

Collier, Paul and Hoeffler, Anke. (1998). On Economic Causes of Civil War. Oxford: Oxfam.

Collier, Paul and Hoeffler, Anke. (1999). Justice-Seeking and Loot-Seeking in Civil War, DECRG Paper, World Bank (http://econ.worldbank.org/programs/conflict/topic/13190/library/doc?id = 13203). New York: World Bank Group Archives.

Collier, Paul and Hoeffler, Anke. (2000). Greed and Grievance in Civil War. World Bank Policy Research Paper 2355. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group Archives.

Collier, Paul and Hoeffler, Anke. (2002a). Greed and Grievance in Civil War. Oxford: Oxford University, Center for the Study of African Economies.

Collier, Paul and Hoeffler, Anke. (2002b). The Political Economy of Secession. Manuscript of June 30, 2002.

Collier, Paul and Sambanis, Nicholas. (2002). Understanding Civil War: A New Agenda. Journal of Conflict Resolution 46(1): 3-12.

Collins, J. Foster. (1950). The United Nations and Indonesia. International Conciliation 28(459): 115-200.

Conner, Walker. (1993). Ethnonationalism. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Constaninou, Costas and Richmond, Oliver. (2005). The Long Mile of Empire: Power, Legitimation and the UK Bases in Cyprus. Mediterranean Politics 10(1): 65-84.

Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. (1994). New York: United Nations Documentation Centre.

Cooper, Frederick. (2006). A Parting of the Ways: Colonial Africa and South Africa, 1946-1948. African Studies 65(1): 27-43.

Cordesman, Anthony. (2007). Afghanistan, Iraq & Self-Inflicted Wounds. Washington, D.C.: The Center for Strategic and International Studies.

Coser, Lewis. (1961). The Termination of Conflict. Journal of Conflict Resolution 5(4): 347-353.

Counterinsurgency Operations. (2004). Headquarters, Department of the Army, FMI 3-07.22. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army.

Counterinsurgency. (2006). Headquarters, Department of the Army, COIN FM 3-24. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army.

Cowan, L. Gray. (1951). The New Face of Algeria: Part I. Political Science Quarterly 66(3): 340-365.

Crawford, Neta. (2003). Just War Theory and the U.S. Counterterror War. Perspectives on Politics 1(1): 5-25.

Crenshaw, Martha. (1981). The Causes of Terrorism. Comparative Politics 13(4): 379-399.

Cribb, Robert. (1986). A Revolution Delayed: the Indonesian Republic and the Netherlands Indies, August-November 1945. Australian Journal of Politics and History 32(1): 72-85.

Cribb, Robert. (1990). Introduction: Problems in the Historiography of the Killings in Indonesia, in The Indonesian Killings of 1965-1966: Studies from Java and Bali, ed. by Cribb, Robert. Victoria: Monash University Center of Southeast Asian Studies: 1-43.

Cross, James. (1964). Conflict in the Shadows: the Nature and Politics of Guerilla War. London: Constable.

Cunha, Euclides da. (1957). Rebellion in the Backlands. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dalder, Ivo and Lindsay, James. (2003). America Unbound: the Bush Revolution in Foreign Policy. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Davidson, Nigel. (1933). The Termination of the Iraq Mandate." International Affairs 12(1): 60-78.

Davis, Jacquelyn. (2007). Radical Islamist Ideologies and the Long War: Implications for U. S. Strategic Planning and U. S. Central Command's Operations. Washington, D.C.: The Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis, Inc.

Davis, Jacquelyn and Perry, Charles. (2007). Rethinking the War on Terror: Developing a Strategy to Counter Extremist Ideologies. Washington, D.C.: The Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis, Inc.

Debray, Regis. (1967). Revolution in the Revolution. New York: Grove Press.

Dedijer, Vladimir. (1951). With Tito Through the War: Partisan Diary, 1941-1944. London: Hamilton.

Deery, Phillip, (2003), The Terminology of Terrorism: Malaya, 1948-52, Journal of Southeast Asian Studies 34(2):

DeFronzo, James. (1991). Revolutions and Revolutionary Movements. Boulder: Westview.

Deitchman, Seymour. (1964). Limited War and American Defense Policy. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

Dekmejian, R. Hrair. (1971). Egypt Under Nasir: a Study in Political Dynamics. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Dekmejian, R. Hrair. (1980). The Anatomy of Islamic Revival: Legitimacy Crisis, Ethnic Conflict, and the Search for Islamic Alternative. Middle East Journal 34(1): 1-12.

Dekmejian, R. Hrair. (1985). Islam in Revolution: Fundamentalism in the Arab World. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

Dequincey, T. (1877). Supplementary paper on murder considered as one of the fine arts, in Works. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

De Rouen, Jr., Karl and Sobek, David. (2004). The Dynamics of Civil Duration and Outcome. Journal of Peace Research 41(3): 303-320.

Desai, Raj, and Eckstein, Harry. (1990). Insurgency: The Transformation of Peasant Rebellion. World Politics 42(4): 441-465.

De Soysa, Indra. (2002). Ecoviolence: Shrinking Pie or Honey Pot? Global Environmental Politics 2(4): 1-34.

Deutsch, Karl. (1964). The Price of Integration, in The Integration of Political Communities, eds. Jacob, Philip and Toscano, James. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott: 143-178.

Deutsch, Morton. (1960). The Effect of Motivation Orientation upon Trust and Suspicion. Human Relations 13(2): 123-139.

De Silva, K. and May, Ronald. (1991). Internationalization of Ethnic Conflict. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Djerejian, Edward. (2006). From Conflict Management to Conflict Resolution. Foreign Affairs 85(6): 41-48.

Diplomat's Letters to Blair and Bush. (2004). Middle East Policy 11(2): 185.

Dominguez, Jorge. (1986). Insurgency in Latin America and the Common Defense. Political Science Quarterly 101(5): 807-823.

Dragojevic, Mila. (2005). Competing Institutions in National Identity Construction: the Croatian Case. Nationalism and Ethnic Politics 11(1): 61-87.

Drake, St. Clair. (1957). Some Observations on Interethnic Conflict as One Type of Intergroup Conflict. Journal of Conflict Resolution 1(2): 155-178.

Drif, Zohra. (1960). La Mort De Mes Fréres. Paris: Maspéro.

Duiker, William. (2000). Ho Chi Minh: A Life. New York: Hyperion.

Dunn, James. (1996). Timor: A People Betrayed. Sydney: Australian Broadcasting Corporation.

Durkheim, Emile. (1951). Suicide: A Study in Sociology. New York: Free Press of Glenco.

Edelstein, David. (2004). Occupational Hazards: Why Military Occupations Succeed or Fail. International Security 29(1): 49-91.

Effects of Stalin's Death, in NA, RG 273. (1953). State Department OCB and National Security Council (NSC), Box 125. Washington, D.C.: Department of State.

Eisenhower, Dwight. (1953). Address, The Chance for Peace. Delivered before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Eisenhower Papers 1953. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Eisenstadt, Michael and White, Jeffrey. (2005). Assessing Iraq's Sunni Arab Insurgency. Washington, D.C.: The Washington Institute for Near East Policy.

Eisenstadt, Michael and White, Jeffrey. (2006). Assessing Iraq's Sunni Arab Insurgency. Military Review 86(3): 33-51.

Ekstein, Harry. (1970). On the Etiology of Internal Wars, in Why Revolution?, ed. by Blackey, R. and Paynton, C. Cambridge: Schenkman: 124-150.

Elbadawi, Ibrahim and Sambanis, Nicholas. (2002). How Much War Will We See? Explaining the Prevalence of Civil War. Journal of Conflict Resolution 46(3): 307-334.

Elkins, Caroline. (2000). The Struggle for Mau Mau Rehabilitation in Late Colonial Kenya. International Journal of African Historical Studies 33(1): 25-57.

Elkins, Caroline. (2005a). A 'Civilizing' Mission in Late Colonial Kenya. Chronicle of Higher Education 51(20): pp. B9-B11.

Elkins, Caroline. (2005b). Imperial Reckoning: the Untold Story of Britain's Gulag in Kenya. New York: Henry Holt.

Ellingsen, Tanja. (2000). Colorful Community or Ethnic Witches' Brew? Multiethnicity and Domestic Conflict During and After the Cold War. Journal of Conflict Resolution 44(2): 228-249.

Ellis, Stephen. (1995). Liberia 1989-1994: a Study of Ethnic and Spiritual Violence. African Affairs 94(1): 165-197.

Elon, Amos. (1971). The Israelis: Founders and Sons. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Wilson.

Elster, John. (2006). Redemption for Wrongdoing: the Fate of Collaborators after 1945. Journal of Conflict Resolution 50(3): 324-338.

Emerson, Rupert. (1940). The Dutch East Indies Adrift. Foreign Affairs 18(4): 735-741.

Emerson, Rupert. (1948). Reflections on the Indonesian Case. World Politics 1(1): 59-81.

Ernõ, Nagy. (1989). 1956 Sajtója – Október 23. – Noember 4 Válogatás. Budapest: Tudósítások Kiadó.

Esposito, John. (1984). Islam and Politics. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

EU Considers Tibet Part of China. (2008). The Times (Pakistan), April 26, 2008.

Fairlic, John. (1933). British Malaya. American Political Science Review 27(5): 811-815.

Fall, Bernard. (1961). Street Without Joy: Indochina at War, 1946-1954. Harrisburg: Stackpole.

Fall, Bernard. (1963). The Two Vietnams. New York: Praeger.

Fall, Bernard. (1966). Vietnam in the Balance. Foreign Affairs 45(1): 7-18.

Fall, Bernard. (1966). Vietnam Witness 1953-1966. New York: Praeger.

Fanon, Franz. (1968). The Wretched of the Earth. New York: Grove Press.

Faraj, Salam. Iraq to Probe 'Custody Abuse' of Bush Shoe Assailant. Agence France-Presse, December 22, 2008.

Farr, Thomas. (1997). Overcoming the Cyprus Tragedy: Let Cypriots be Cypriot. Mediterranean Quarterly 8(4): 32-62.

Fearon, James and Laitin, David. (2003). Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War. American Political Science Review 97(1): 75-90.

Fearon, James. (2004). Why do Some Civil Wars Last so Much Longer than Others? Journal of Peace Research 41(3): 275-301.

Fearon, James, Kasara, Kimuli, and Laitin, David. (2007). Ethnic Minority Rule and Civil War Onset. American Political Science Review 101(1): 187-193.

Feis, Herbert. (1960). Suez Scenario: a Lamentable Tale. Foreign Affairs 38(4): 598-612.

Feldman, Noah. (2004). What We Owe Iraq: War and the Ethics of Nation-Building. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Flibbert, Andrew. (2003-2004). After Saddam: Regional Insecurity, Weapons of Mass Destruction, and Proliferation Pressures in Postwar Iraq. Political Science Quarterly 118(4): 547-567.

Fogelson, Robert. (1968). From Resentment to Confrontation: the Policy, the Negroes, and the Outbreak of 1960's Riots. Political Science Quarterly. 83(1): 218-291.

Ford, Christopher. (2007). Of Shoes and Sites: Globalization and Insurgency. Military Review 83(3): 85-91.

Fox, Jonathan. (2002) Ethnic Minorities and the Clash of Civilizations: A Quantitative Analysis of Huntington's Thesis. British Journal of Political Science 32(3): 415-434.

Fox, Jonathon. (2003). Ethnoreligious Conflict in the Third World: The Role of Religion as a Cause of Conflict. Nationalism and Ethnic Politics 9(1): 101-125.

Fraser, T. G. (1984). Partition in Ireland, India, and Palestine: Theory and Practice. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Frederikse, Julie. (1982). None But Ourselves: Masses vs. Media in the Making of Zimbabwe. Harare: Zimbabwe Publishing House.

Freedman, L. (1982). Why Does Terrorism Terrorize?, in The Rationalization of Terrorism, eds. Rapoport, David and Alexander, Yuri. New York: Pergamon.

Friend, Theodore. (2003). Indonesian Destinies. Boston: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Frisch, Hillel. (2006). Motivation or Capabilities: Israeli Counterterrorism Against Palestinian Suicide Bombings and Violence. Ramat Gan: The Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies.

Frum, David and Perle, Richard. (2003). An End to Evil: How to Win the War on Terror. New York: Random House.

Fryer, Donald and Jackson, James. (1977). Indonesia. London: Ernest Benn, Ltd.

Fuller, John. (1954). The Decisive Battles of the Western World and their Influence upon History. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode.

Freedman, Lawrence. (2003). War. Foreign Policy 137: 16-24.

Galtung, Johan. (1967). On the Effects of International Economic Sanctions. World Politics 19(3): 378-416.

Gampert, David and Gordon, John. (2008). War by Other Means. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.

Garnett, David, ed. (1951). The Essential T. E. Lawrence. London: Jonathan Cape.

Gates, Scott. (2002). Recruitment and Allegiance: The Microfoundations of Rebellion. Journal of Conflict Resolution 46(1): 111-130.

Gavin, J. M. (1968). Crisis Now. New York: Vintage Books.

Gellner, Ernest. (1983). Nations and Nationalism. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

George, James. (1994) Discourses of Global Politics. Boulder: Lynn Reinner Publishers.

Gershovich, Moshe. (2004). Collaboration and "Pacification": French Conquest, Moroccan Combatants, and the Transformation of the Middle Atlas. Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East 24(1): 139-146.

Gibbs, David. (1987). Does the USSR Have a 'Grand Strategy'? Journal of Peace Research 24(4).

Gibbs, David. (1991). The Political Economy of Third World Intervention: Mines, Money, and U. S. Policy in the Congo Crisis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gleditsch, Kristian. (2004). A Revised List of Wars Between and Within Independent States, 1816-2002. International Interactions 30(3): 231-262.

Gleditsch, Kristian. (2007). Transnational Dimensions of Civil War. Journal of Peace Research 44(3): 293-309.

Glennon, Michael. (2003) Why the Security Council Failed. Foreign Affairs 82(3): 16-31.

Goldstein, Melvyn. (2004). Tibet and China in the Twentieth Century, in Governing China's Multiethnic Frontiers, ed. Rossabi, Morris. Seattle: University of Washington Press: 186-229.

Goldstein, Melvyn. (2006). The United States, Tibet, and the Cold War. Journal of Cold War Studies 8(3): 145-164.

Goodwin, Jeff and Skocpol. (1989). Explaining Revolutions in the Contemporary Third World. Politics and Society 17(4): 489-509.

Gonzalez-Perez, Margaret. (2006). Guerrilleras in Latin America: Domestic and International Roles. Journal of Peace Research 43(3): 313-329.

Gordge, John. (1949). The Outlook in Madagascar. African Affairs 48(191): 133-141.

Gordon, Bernard. (1986). The Third Indochina Conflict. Foreign Affairs 65(1): 66-85.

Gordon, Philip. (2007). Can the War on Terror be Won? Foreign Affairs 86(6): 53-66.

Granville, Johanna. (2003). Reactions to the Events of 1956: New Findings from the Budapest and Warsaw Archives. Journal of Contemporary History 38(2): 261-290.

Gray, J. Glen. (1998). The Warriors: Reflections on Men in Battle. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Green, Maia. (1990). Mau Mau Oathing Rituals and Political Ideology in Kenya: a Re-Analysis. Africa 60(1): 69-87.

Greenberg, Jonathan. (2005). Generations of Memory: Remembering Partition in India/Pakistan and Israel/Palestine. Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East 25(1): 89-110.

Greene, T. H. (1974). Comparative Revolutionary Movements. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Griffiths, James. (1969). Pages From Memory. London: J. M. Dent.

Grunau, Steve. (2003). The Limits of Human Security: Canada in East Timor. Journal of Military and Strategic Studies 6(1): 1-21.

Grunfeld, A. Tom. (1996). The Making of Modern Tibet. Armonk and London: M. E. Sharpe.

Guerre Revolutionnaire, Guerre Psychologique, ou Guerre 'Tout Court.' (1959). Revue Militaire d'Information. Paris: Revue Militari Française.

Guevara, Ernesto "Che." (1969). Guerilla Warfare. New York: Random House.

Gupta, H. (1959). A Critical Study of the Thugs and Their Activities. Journal of Indian History 38(1): 167-176.

Gurr, Ted. (1970). Why Men Rebel. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gurr, Ted. (1993). Minorities at Risk: a Global View of Ethnonational Conflicts. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace.

Gurr, Ted. (2000). People Versus States: Minorities at Risk in the New Century. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press

Gwynn, Stephen. (1924). Ireland, One and Divisible. Foreign Affairs 3(2): 183-198.

Hachey, Thomas. (1972). The Problems of Partition: Peril to World Peace. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Hague Convention IV. (1907). New Haven: The Avalon Project at Yale Law School.

Hale, Henry. (2004). Explaining Ethnicity. Comparative Political Studies 37(4): 458-485.

Hall, D. G. E. (1981). A History of South-East Asia. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Halliday, Fred. (1974). Arabia Without Sultans. London: Penquin Books.

Halstead, John. (1969). A Comparative Historical Study of Colonial Nationalism in Egypt and Morocco. The International Journal of African Historical Studies 2(1): 85-100.

Hamilton, Paul. (2004). Converging Nationalisms: Quebec, Scotland, and Wales in Comparative Perspective. Nationalism and Ethnic Politics 10(4): 657-685.

Hammes, Thomas. (2006). Countering Evolved Insurgent Networks. Military Review 86(4): 18-26.

Hamoumou, Mohand. (1993). Et ils sont Devanus Harkis. Paris: Fayand.

Harmony and Disharmony: Exploiting al-Qa'eda's Organizational Vulnerabilities. (2006). West Point: Combating Terrorism Center.

Harrison, Martin. (1964). Government and press in France During the Algerian War. American Political Science Review 58(2): 273-285.

Hashim, Ahmed. (2003). The Sunni Insurgency in Iraq. Washington, D.C.: Middle East Institute.

Hawkins, Gerald. (1948). Marking Time in Malaya. International Affairs 24(1): 76-88.

Hechter, Michael. (1975). Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hechter, Michael. (1995). Explaining Nationalist Violence. Nations and Nationalism 1(1): 53-68.

Hegre, Havard. (2002). Some Social Requisites of a Democratic Civil Peace: Democracy, Development, and Armed Conflict. Paper presented to the Annual

Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, MA, August 29, 2002 – September 1, 2002. Boston: American Political Science Association.

Hegre, Havard. (2004). The Duration and Termination of Civil War. Journal of Peace Research 41(3): 243-252.

Helman, Gerald and Ratner, Steven. (1992/1993). Saving Failed States. Foreign Policy 89: 3-20.

Henderson, Errol and Singer, J. David. (2000). Civil in the Post-Colonial World, 1946-92. Journal of Peace Research 37(3): 275-299.

Hensel, Paul. (2006). Correlates of War Project. Tallahassee: Florida State University, Department of Political Science.

Heraclides, Alexis. (1997). Ethnicity, Secessionist Conflict and the International Society: Towards Normative Paradigm Shift. Nations and Nationalism 3(4): 493-520.

Herbst, Jeffrey. (2000). The Organization of Rebellion in Africa. Paper presented at the joint World Bank and Princeton University Workshop, March 2000, Princeton, New Jersey. Princeton: Princeton University.

Herbst, Jeffrey. (2004). African Militaries and Rebellion: the Political Economy of Threat and Combat Effectiveness. Journal of Peace Research 41(3): 357-368.

Herring, George. (1977). The Truman Administration and the Restoration of French Sovereignty in Indochina. Diplomatic History 1(1): 97-117.

Hersvik, Jarle, and Larsen, Stein. (2003). Democratic Breakdown and Transitions to Democracy in Portugal. Portuguese Journal of Social Science 2(3): 165-192.

Hess, Gary. (1972). Franklin Roosevelt and Indochina. Journal of American History 59(2): 353-368.

Hess, Gary. (1975). United States Policy and the Origins of the French- Việt Minh War, 1945-46. Peace and Change 3(2/3): 21-33.

Hillier, Debbie. (2007). Africa's Missing Billions: International Arms Flows and the Cost of Conflict. Oxford: The International Action Network on Small Arms and Oxfam, International.

Hills, Alice. (2006). Fear and Loathing in Falluja. Armed Forces & Society 32(4): 623-639.

Historical Survey of Guerilla Actions. (1961). Readings in Guerilla Warfare. Fort Bragg: U. S. Army Special Warfare School.

Hixson, Walter. (1997). Parting the Curtain: Propaganda, Culture and the Cold War, 1945-1961. London: MacMillan.

Hobsbawm, E. J. (1990). Nations and Nationalism Since 1780. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hodges, Tony. (1983). Western Sahara: the Roots of a Desert War. Westport: Lawrence Hill.

Hodges, Tony. (2001). Angola: From Afro-Stalinism to Petro-Diamond Capitalism. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Hoffman, Bruce. (1983). The Failure of British Strategy Within Palestine, 1939-1947. Tel Aviv: Bar Ilan University Press.

Hoffman, Bruce. (2004). Insurgency and Counterinsurgency in Iraq. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.

The Holy Qu'ran.

Homer-Dixon, T. (1999). Environment, Scarcity, and Violence. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hoopes, Townsend. (1970). Legacy of the Cold War in Indochina. Foreign Affairs 48(4): 601-616.

Horne, A. (1979). A Savage War of Peace: Algeria 1954-1962. New York: Penguin Books.

Horowitz, Donald. (1985). Ethnic Groups in Conflict. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Horsley, R. (1979). The Sicarii; Ancient Jewish 'Terrorists.' Journal of Religion 59(4): 435-458.

Horton, Roy. (1999). Out of (South) Africa: Pretoria's Nuclear Weapons Experience. Occasional Paper #27. Denver: USAF Institute for National Security Studies.

Hosmer, Stephen. (2007). Why the Iraq Resistance to the Coalition Invasion was so Weak. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.

Hourani, Albert. (1991). A History of the Arab Peoples. New York: MJF Books.

Howe, Russell. (1966). Black Africa: From the Colonial Era to Modern Times. New York: Walker and Company.

http://www.president.kremlin.ru/text/psmes/2003/03/40900.shtml.

Hudson, Michael. (1977). Arab Politics: the Search for Legitimacy. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Human Rights Violations in the Western Sahara. (1996). AI Index MDE 29/04/96. London: Amnesty International.

Huntington, Samuel. (1968). Political Order in Changing Societies. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Huntington, Samuel P. (1993a). If Not Civilizations, What? Foreign Affairs 72(5): 186-194.

Huntington, Samuel P. (1993b) The Clash of Civilizations. Foreign Affairs 72(3): 22-49.

Huntington, Samuel. (1996). The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order. New York: Simon and Shuster.

Hurley, Patrick. The Ambassador in China (Patrick J. Hurley), Temporarily in Iran, to the Secretary of State. Correspondence of April 14, 1945 from Tehran, Iran. Ashland: Ashbrook Center for Public Affairs at Ashland University.

Hutchinson, Martha. (1972). The Concept of Revolutionary Terrorism. The Journal of Conflict Resolution 16(3): 383-396.

Hutton, J. (1857). A Popular Account of the Thugs and Dakoits. London: W. H. Allen.

Hourani, Albert. (1991). A History of the Arab Peoples. New York: MJF Books.

Ignatieff, Michael. (1993). Blood and Belonging: Journeys into the New Nationalism. New York: Farrar, Strauss, and Giroux.

In Their Own Words: Reading the Iraqi Insurgency. (2006). Middle East Report #50. Washington, D.C.: International Crisis Group.

Iraq Consular Information Sheet. (2008). Washington, D.C.: United States Department of State.

Iraq: Where Things Stand. (2007). ABC News/BBC/NHK Poll, September 10, 2007. New York: ABC News.

Iraq War Illegal, Says Annan. (2004). BBC News, September 16, 2004.

Ismael, Tareq and Ismael Jacqueline. (2005). Whither Iraq? Beyond Saddam, Sanctions and Occupation. Third World Quarterly 26(4-5): 609-629.

Jackson, Julian. (2001). France, the Dark Years. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jager, Elliot. (2008). 13 Years After the Assassination, Wounds Still Fester. Hollywood, Florida: Israel Humanitarian Foundation.

Janowitz, Morris. (1968). Social Control of External Riots. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Janis, Irving and Katz, Daniel. (1959). The Reduction of Intergroup Hostility. Journal of Conflict Resolution 3(1): 85-100.

Jervis, Robert. (2003). Understand the Bush Doctrine. Political Science Quarterly 118(3): pp. 365-388.

Jian, Chen. (2006). The Tibetan Rebellion of 1959 and China's Changing Relations with India and the Soviet Union. Journal of Cold War Studies 8(3): 54-101.

Johnson, Chalmers. (1962a). Civilian Loyalties and Guerrilla Conflict. World Politics 14(4): 646-661.

Johnson, Chalmers. (1962b). Peasant Nationalism and Communist Power. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Johnson, Chalmers. (1964). Revolution and the Social System. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Johnson, Dominic. (2004). Overconfidence and War: the Havoc and Glory of Positive Illusions. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Johnson, Robert. (1970). Vietnamization: Can it Work? Foreign Affairs 48(4): 642-647.

Jonah, James. (2000). Economic Dimensions of the Conflict in Sierra Leone. Speech presented by the Minister of Finance of Sierra Leone in Development and Disarmament, Development Policy Forum of the German Foundation for International Development, October 2000, Bonn, Germany. Bonn: German Foundation for International Development.

Judis, John. (2004). Imperial Amnesia. Foreign Policy 143: 50-59.

Justiniano, Medardo. (1961). Combat Intelligence. Counter-Guerilla Operations in the Philippines, 1946-1953. Fort Bragg: Counter-Guerilla Seminar.

Kabwegyere, Tarsis. (1972). The Dynamics of Colonial Violence: the Inductive System in Uganda. Journal of Peace Research 9: 303-314.

Kagan, Robert. (2004). America's Crisis of Legitimacy. Foreign Affairs 83(2): 65-87.

Kahl, Colin. (2007). COIN of the Realm. Foreign Affairs 86(6): 169-176.

Kahl, Colin. (2007). In the Crossfire or the Crosshairs? International Security 32(1): 7-46.

Kalashnikov Kids. (1999). The Economist 352(8127): 19-21.

Kalyvas, Stathis. (2003). The Ontology of "Political Violence": Action and Identity in Civil Wars. Perspectives on Politics 1(3): 474-494.

Kaplan, Robert. (2001). Soldiers of God. New York: Vintage Departures.

Karnow, Stanley. (1983). Vietnam. New York: The Viking Press.

Kattenburg, Paul. (1984). Living with Hanoi. Foreign Policy 53: 131-149.

Katzenbach, Jr., Edward. (1952). Indo-China: a Military-Political Appreciation. World Politics 4(2): 186-218.

Kaufmann, Chaim. (1996). Possible and Impossible Solutions to Ethnic Civil Wars. International Security 20(4): 136-175.

Kaufmann, Chaim. (1998). When All Else Fails: Ethnic Population Transfers and Partitions in the Twentieth Century. International Security 23(2): 120-156.

Kecskemeti, P. (1967). Insurgency as a Strategic Problem. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.

Kedourie, Elie. (1993). Nationalism, 4th Edition. Oxford: Blackwell.

Keegan, John. (2004). The Iraq War. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Keen, David. (1998). The Economic Functions of Violence in Civil Wars. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kende, Istvan. (1971). Twenty-Five Years of Local Wars. Journal of Peace Research. 8(1): 5-22.

Kennedy, Dane. (1992). Constructing the Colonial Myth of Mau Mau. The International Journal of African Historical Studies 25(2): 241-260.

Kennedy-Pipe, Caroline. (1997). The Origins of the Present Troubles in Northern Ireland. London: Longman.

Kenya: the Hola Massacre. (2003). New African 424: 34-37.

Khalidi, Rashid. (2004). Resurrection Empire: Western Footprints and America's Perilous Path in the Middle East. Boston: Beacon Press.

Khalili, Laleh. (2007). 'Standing with my Brother': Hizb'ullah, Palestinians, and the Limits of Solidarity. Comparative Studies in Security and History 49(2): 276-303.

Khrushchev, Nikita. (1963). Communism – Peace and Happiness for the Peoples, Volume 1. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House.

Kiernan, Ben. (2003). The Demography of Genocide in Southeast Asia: the Death Tolls in Cambodia, 1975-79, and East Timor, 1975-80. Critical Asian Studies 35(4): 585-597.

Kilcullen, David. (2006). 'Twenty-Eight Articles': Fundamentals of Company-Level Counterinsurgency. Military Review 86(3): 103-108.

Kissinger, Henry. (1969). The Vietnam Negotiations. Foreign Affairs 47(2): 211-234.

Kissinger, Henry. (1999). Years of Renewal. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Kiszely, John. (2007). Learning About Counterinsurgency. Military Review 87(2): 5-11.

Knack, Stephen. (2001). Aid Dependence and the Quality of Governance: a Cross Country Empirical Analysis. Southern Economic Journal 68(4): 310-329

Kohn, Hans. (1944). The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in its Origins and Background. New York: MacMillan.

Komer, R. W. (1972). The Malayan Emergency in Retrospect: Organization of a Successful Counterinsurgency Effort. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.

Korb, Lawrence and Boorstin, Robert. (2005). Integrated Power. Washington, D.C.: The Center for American Progress.

Kouega, Jean-Paul. (2005). Promoting French-English Individual Bilingualism Through Education in Cameroon. The Journal of Third World Studies 22(1): 185-196.

Kramer, Helmut and Bauer, Helfried. (1972). Imperialism, Intervention Capacity, and Foreign Policy Making: on the Political Economy of the US Intervention in Indochina. Journal of Peace Research 9(4): 285-302.

Kramer, Mark. (1998). The Soviet Union and the 1956 Crisis in Hungary and Poland: Reassessments and New Findings. Journal of Contemporary History 33(2): 163-214.

Kramer, Mark. (2006). Great Power Rivalries: Tibetan Guerilla Resistance, and the Cold War in South Asia. Journal of Cold War Studies 8(3): 5-14.

Krepinevich, Andrew. (1986). The Army and Vietnam. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Krepinevich, Jr., Andrew. (2005). How to Win in Iraq. Foreign Affairs 84(5): 87-104.

Krivosheev, G. A., ed. (1993). Grif Sekretnosti Snyat: Poteri Voorruzhenykh Sil SSSR v Voinaka, Boevykh Deistviyakh i Voennykh Konfliktakh: Statisticheskoe Issledovanie. Moskva: Voenizdat.

Krueger, Alan and Malechkova, Jitka. (2003). Education, Poverty, and Terrorism: is there a Causal Connection? Journal of Economic Perspectives 17(4): 119-144.

Kumar, Radha. (1997). The Troubled History of Partition. Foreign Affairs 76(1): 22-34.

Kundera, Milan. (1981). The Book of Laughter and Forgetting. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Kuperman, Alan. (1999). The Stinger Missile and U. S. Intervention in Afghanistan. Political Science Quarterly 114(2): 219-263.

Kyriacou, Andreas. (2000). A 'Just and Lasting Solution' to the Cyprus Problem: In Search of Institutional Viability. Mediterranean Politics 5(3): 54-75.

Lackey, Douglas. (1989). The Ethics of War and Peace. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Ladwig, Walter. (2007). Managing Counterinsurgency: Lessons From Malaya. Military Review 87(3): 56-65.

Laird, Melvin. (2005). Iraq: Learning the Lessons of Vietnam. Foreign Affairs 84(6): 22-43.

Laitin, David. (2001). Secessionist Rebellion in the Former Soviet Union. Comparative Political Studies 31(8): 839-861.

Laitin, David. (1999). Somalia: Civil War and International Intervention, in Civil Wars, Insecurity, and Intervention, eds. Walter, Barbara and Snyder, Jack. New York: Columbia University Press: 146-181.

Landon, Robert. (1967). Oman Since 1856: Disruptive Modernization in a Traditional Arab Society. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Langer, Gary. (2009). Al-Zeidi the Shoe-Thrower Wins Broad Support in Iraq. ABC News, March 12, 2009.

Lansdale, Edward. (1961). Introductory Comments on the Huk Campaign. Counter-Guerilla Operations in the Philippines, 1946-1953. Fort Bragg: Counter-Guerilla Seminar.

Lansdale, Edward. (1964). Viet Nam: Do We Understand Revolution? Foreign Affairs 43(1): 75-86.

LaPonce, J. A. (2004). Minority Languages and Globalization. Nationalism and Ethnic Politics 10(1): 15-24.

Lapus, Ismail. (1961). The Communist Huk Enemy. Counter-Guerilla Operations in the Philippines, 1946-1953. Fort Bragg: Counter-Guerilla Seminar.

Laqueur, Walter. (1977). Terrorism. Boston: Little Brown.

Laqueur, Walter. (1998). Guerilla Warfare: a Historical and Critical Study. New Brunswick: Transaction.

Latham, Michael. (2000). Modernization as Ideology: American Social Science and 'Nation Building' in the Kennedy Era. Chapel Hill: University of North Caroline Press.

Latham, Michael. (2006). Redirecting the Revolution? The USA and the Failure of Nation-Building in South Vietnam. Third World Quarterly 27(1): 27-41.

Lawrence, Thomas E. (1935). Seven Pillars of Wisdom. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Leal, Jurat Sir John. (1946). Guernsey Under German Rule. International Affairs 22(2): 214-226.

Lear, Elmer. (1961). The Japanese Occupation of the Philippines, Leyte, 1941-1945. Data Paper #42, Southeast Asia Program, Department of Far Eastern Studies. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Le Billon, Philippe. (1997). Nature, Factionalism, and Political Power in Cambodia. Paper presented at Inaugural Critical Geography Conference, Vancouver, Canada. Vancouver: Inaugural Critical Geography Conference.

Le Billon, Philippe. (2001a). Angola's Political Economy of War: the Role of Oil and Diamonds 1975-2000. African Affairs 100(398): 55-80.

Le Billon, Philippe. (2001b). The Political Ecology of War: Natural Resources and Armed Conflicts. Political Geography 20(5): 561-584.

Legal Consequences for States of the Continuing Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South-West Africa) Notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970). (1971). The Hague: International Court of Justice.

Legum, Colin, ed. (1975). Africa: Contemporary Record, 1974-75. London: Rex Collings.

Leites, Nathan. (1970). The Viet Cong Style of Politics. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.

Leites, Nathan and Wolf, Charles. (1966). Rebellion and Authority: Myths and Realities Reconsidered. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.

Lenin, Vladimir. (1964). Critical Remarks on the National Question. Prosveshcheniye. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Levinger, Matthew and Lytle, Paula. (2001). Myth and Mobilization: the Triadic Structure of Nationalist Rhetoric. Nations and Nationalism 7(2): 175-194.

Lewis, Bernard. (1967). The Assassins: a Radical Sect in Islam. London: Nicholson and Weidenfeld.

Lewis, Bernard. (1985). Islamic Political Movements. Middle East Review 17: 23-27.

Lichback, Mark. (1987). Deterrence or Escalation? The Puzzle of Aggregate Studies of Repression and Dissent. Journal of Conflict Resolution 31(2): 266-297.

Lichback, Mark. (1994). What Makes Rational Peasants Revolutionary?: Dilemma, Paradox, and Irony in Peasant Collective Action. World Politics 46(3): 383-418.

Liddle, R. William. (1992). Indonesia's Threefold Crisis. Journal of Democracy 3(4): 60-74.

Lijphart, A. (1977). Democracy in Plural Societies: a Comparative Exploration. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Lintner, Bertil. (1999). Burma in Revolt: Opium and Insurgency Since 1948, Second Edition. Chiang Mai: Silkworm.

Lodge's Talk with the Spanish Foreign Minister. (1956). Fischer Howe to the Acting Secretary of State (Hoover). USNA, RG 59 764.00/11-856. Washington, D.C. Department of State.

Lujala, Paivi, Gleditsch, Nils Petter, and Gilmore, Elisabeth. (2005). A Diamond Curse?: Civil War and a Lootable Resource. Journal of Conflict Resolution 49(4): 538-562.

Lukin, Aleksandr. (2003). Russia, US, China and the Iraqi Conflict. International Affairs: a Russian Journal of World Politics, Diplomacy & International Relations 49(3): 9-22.

Luttwak, Edward. (2005). Iraq: The Logic of Disengagement. Foreign Affairs 84(1): 26-36.

Lynn, John. (2005). Patterns of Insurgency and Counterinsurgency. Military Review 85(4): 22-27.

MacDonald, Peter. (1993). The Victor in Vietnam: Giap. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company.

MacGaffey, Janey and Bazenguissa-Ganga, Remy. (2002). Congo-Paris: Transnational Traders on the Margins of Law. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

MacGillivray, Donald. (1958). Malaya - The New Nation. International Affairs 34(2): 157-163.

MacGregor, Douglas. (2007). Fire the Generals! Washington, D.C.: Straus Military Reform Project.

Machiavelli, Niccolò. (1517/1988). The Prince. Edited by Quentin Skinner and Russell Price. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mack, Andrew. (1975). Why Big Nations Lose Small Wars: The Politics of Asymmetric Conflict. World Politics 27(2): 175-200.

Maier, Norman. (1941). Frustration: The Study of Behavior Without a Goal. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Makovsky, David. (2004). How to Build a Fence. Foreign Affairs 83(2): 50-64.

Malaysian Minister Yatim Praises Iraqi Shoe Thrower. (2008). The China Post, December 20, 2008.

Malesevic, Sinisa. (2004). Divine '*Ethnies'* and 'Sacred Nations': Anthony D. Smith and the Neo-Durkhemian Theory of Nationalism. Nationalism and Ethnic Politics 10(4): 503-531.

Mallin, Jay, ed. (1970). Strategy for Conquest. Coral Gables: University of Miami Press.

Malone, Joseph. (1973). The Arab Lands of Western Asia. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Mandelbaum, Michael. (1991/1992). Foreign Affairs 71(1): 164-183.

Marcum, John. (1978). The Angolan Revolution, Volume II: Exile Politics and Guerilla Warfare (1962-1976). Cambridge and London: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

Markel, Wade. (2006). Draining the Swamp: the British Strategy of Population Control. Parameters 36(1): 35-48.

Marks, Thomas. (1976). Spanish Sahara – Background to Conflict. African Affairs 75(298): 3-13.

Mason, T. David and Fett, Patrick. (1996). How Civil Wars End: a Rational Choice Approach. Journal of Conflict Resolution 40(4): 546-568.

Massu, Jacques. (1971). La Vraie Bataille d'Alger. Paris: Plon.

Maxwell, Kenneth. (1976). The Thorns of the Portuguese Revolution. Foreign Affairs 54(2): 250-270.

Mazrui, Ali. (1968). From Social Darwinism to Current Theories of Modernization: a Tradition in Analysis. World Politics 21(1): 69-83.

Mazrui, Ali. (1982). Africa Between Nationalism and Nationhood: a Political Survey. Journal of Black Studies 13(1): 23-44.

Mboukou, Alexandre. (1983). The Pan-African Movement, 1900-1945: a Study in Leadership Conflicts Among the Disciples of Pan Africanism. Journal of Black Studies 13(3): 275-288.

McCain, John. (2007). An Enduring Peace Built on Freedom. Foreign Affairs 86(6): 19-34.

McCauley, Brian. (1981). Hungary and the Suez, 1956: the Limits of Soviet and American Power. Journal of Contemporary History 16(4): 777-800.

McCuen, John. (1966). The Art of Counter-Revolutionary War: The Strategy of Counterinsurgency. Harrisburg: Stackpole Books.

McDougall, James. (2005). Savage Wars? Codes of Violence in Algeria, 1830s – 1990s. Third World Quarterly 26(1): 117-131.

McGarry, John and O'Leary, Brendan, eds. (1993). The Politics of Ethnic Conflict Regulation: Case Studies of Protracted Ethnic Conflicts. New York: Routledge.

McGranahan, Carole. (2006). Tibet's Cold War. Journal of Cold War Studies 8(3): 102-130.

McLellan, David. (1983). The International System: Unequal and Revolutionary, in The Theory and Practice of International Relations, ed. by Olson, William. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

McMillan, Richard. (2005). The British Occupation of Indonesia 1945-1946. Melbourne: Routledge.

McNamara, Robert. (1995). In Retrospect. New York: Times Books.

Mearsheimer, John and Van Evera, Stephen. (1995). The Partition that Dare Not Speak its Name: When Peace Means War. New Republic 213(25): 16-21.

Medina, Joao. (1999). The Old Lie: Some Portuguese Contemporary Novels on the Colonial Wars in Africa (1961-1974). Portuguese Studies 15: 149-161.

Meisler, Stanley. (1970). Tribal Politics Harass Kenya. Foreign Affairs 49(1): 111-121.

Meliani, Abd El Aziz. (1993). Le Drame des Harkis. Paris: Perrin.

Memorandum from Bohlen to Dulles, in NA, RG 59. (1953). Records of the Policy Planning Staff 1947-1953 (PPS). Working Papers, Eisenhower 1953 Folder 1, Box 72. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Memorandum from USIA Munich to USIA Office of Research and Intelligence, in NA, RG 306. (1957). Refugee Radio Listening Attitudes. USIA, Box 39. Washington, D.C.: United States Information Agency.

Memorandum from William Clark to Joseph B. Phillips, Acting Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, in NA, RG 306. (1953). Office of the United States Information Agency, Office of Administration, 1953-1986, Box 1. Washington, D.C.: United States Information Agency.

Mendy, Peter. (2003). Portugal's Civilizing Mission in Colonial Guinea-Bissau: Rhetoric and Reality. The International Journal of African Historical Studies 36(1): 35-58.

Mercer, John. (1976). The Cycle of Invasion and Unification in the Western Sahara. African Affairs 75(301): 498-510.

Midlarsky, Manus. (1981). The Revolutionary Transformation of Foreign Policy: Agrarianism and its International Impact, in The Political Economy of Foreign Policy Behavior, ed. by Kegley, Charles and McGowan, Patrick. Beverly Hills: Sage: 39-62.

Midlarsky, Manus. (1982). Scarcity and Inequality. Journal of Conflict Resolution 26(1): 3-38.

Midlarsky, Manus and Roberts, Kenneth. (1985). Class, State, and Revolution in Central America: Nicaragua and El Salvador Compared. Journal of Conflict Resolution 29(2): 163-193.

Miliband, David. (2008). Written Ministerial Statement. Foreign and Commonwealth Office, October 29, 2008.

Mill, John Stuart. (1888). A System of Login. New York: Harper and Row.

Miller, T. (1970). Soviet Policies South and East of Suez. Foreign Affairs 49(1): 70-80.

Mills, Lennox. (1943). The Future of Western Dependencies in South Eastern Asia and the Pacific. American Political Science Review 37(5): 909-919.

Mishali-Ram, Meirav. (2006). Ethnic Diversity, Issues, and International Crisis Dynamics, 1918-2002. Journal of Peace Research 43(5): 583-600.

Mitchell, Edward. (1969). Some Econometrics of the Huk Rebellion. American Political Science Review 63(4): 1159-1171.

Mohsen-Finan, Khadija. (2002). The Western Sahara Under UN Pressure. Mediterranean Politics 7(2): 1-13.

Montagne, Robert. (1947). Evolution in Algeria. International Affairs 23(1): 42-51.

Moore, Barrington, Jr. (1966). Social Origins of Dictatorships and Democracy. Boston: Beacon Press.

Moroney, Sean, ed. (1989). Africa. New York and Oxford: Facts on File.

Moyer, Mark. (1997). Phoenix and the Birds of Prey: The CIA's Secret Campaign to Destroy the Viet Cong. Annapolis: Naval Institute Press.

Moynihan, Daniel. (1994). Pandemonium: Ethnicity in International Politics. New York: Oxford University Press

Mueller, John. (1980). The Search for the "Breaking Point" in Vietnam: the Statistics of a Deadly Quarrel. International Studies Quarterly 24(4): 497-519.

Mueller, John. (2001). The Remnants of War: Thugs as Residual Combatants. Paper presented at the Nobel Institute Research Seminar, May 2001, Oslo, Norway. Oslo: Nobel Institute Research Seminar.

Muir, Ramsay. (1917). Nationalism and Internationalism: The Culmination of Modern History. London: Constable.

Mungiu, Alina and Krastev, Ivan. (2004). Nationalism After Communism. Budapest: Central European University Press.

Murden, Simon. (2000). Understanding Israel's Long Conflict in Lebanon: the Search for an Alternative Approach to Security During the Peace Process. British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies 27(1): 27-47

Myers, Frank. (2000). Harold Macmillan's "Winds of Change" Speech: a Case Study in the Rhetoric of Policy Change. Rhetoric and Public Affairs 3(4): 555-575.

Nafziger, E. Wayne and Richter, William. (1976). Biafra and Bangladesh: the Political Economy of Secessionist Conflict. Journal of Peace Research 13(2): 91-109.

Nagy, Imre. (1957). The Five Basic Principles of International Affairs and Our Foreign Policy, in On Communism. In Defense of the New Course. London: Thames and Hudson.

Najem, Tom. (2003). Lebanon and Europe: the Foreign Policy of a Penetrated State. The Review of International Affairs 3(2): 209-231.

NA, SDCF, 1960-1963, Box 1815.

NA, SDCF, 1960-1963, Box 1821.

Nasr, Vali R. (2000). International Politics, Domestic Imperatives, and Identity Mobilization: Sectarianism in Pakistan, 1979-1998. Comparative Politics 32(2): 171-190.

Newitt, Malya. (2001). Formal and Informal Empire in the History of Portuguese Expansion. Portuguese Studies 17: 1-21.

Newman, Saul. (2000). Nationalism in Postindustrial Societies: Why States Still Matter. Comparative Politics 33(1): 21-41.

Newsinger, John. (2002). British Counterinsurgency. Wiltshire: Palgrave.

Nissimi, Hilda. (2006). Mau Mau and the Decolonization of Kenya. Journal of Military and Strategic Studies 8(3): 1-35.

Niv, David. (1976). The Campaigns of the Etzel. Jerusalem: Klausner Institute.

Nyrop, Richard. (1986). Afghanistan. Chicago: Paul V. Galvin Library, Illinois Institute of Technology.

Nyangoni, Wellington. (1985). Africa in the United Nations System. London and Toronto: Associated University Press.

O'Balance, Edgar. (2000). Sudan, Civil War, and Terrorism 1956-1999. New York: St. Martin's Press.

O'Brien, William. (1981). The Conduct of Just and Limited War. New York: Praeger Publishers.

O'Connor, Raymond. (1969). Victory in Modern War. Journal of Peace Research 6(4): 376-384.

Official Transcript. (2003). Department of Defense Office of Public Affairs. Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense.

O'Hanlon, Michael and Campbell, Jason. (2007). Iraq Index: Tracking Variables of Reconstruction & Security in Post-Saddam Iraq. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

Oksenberg, Michel. (1977). Mao Tsetung in the Scales of History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Neill, Bard. (1990). Insurgency & Terrorism: Inside Modern Revolutionary Warfare. Washington, D.C.: Brassey's.

Opp, Karl-Dieter. (1994). Repression and Revolutionary Action: East Germany in 1989. Rationality and Society 6(1): 101-138.

Opp, Karl-Dieter, Voss, Peter, and Gern, Christiane. (1993). Die Volkseigene Revolution. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.

Orekhova, E. D., Sereda, V. T., and Stykalin, Aleksandr, eds. (1998). Sovetskii Soiuz Vengerskii Krisis 1956 Goda. Dokumenty. Moscow: Rosspen.

Orjuela, Camilla. (2003). Building Peace in Sri Lanka: A Role for Civil Society? Journal of Peace Research 40(2): 195-212.

Orson, Robert. (2002). The 'Azeri' Question and Turkey-Iran Relations, 2000-2002. Nationalism and Ethnic Politics 8(4): 61-85.

Osbourne, Milton. (1979). Southeast Asia. Sydney: George Allen & Unwin.

Ostermann, Christian. (2001). The Origins of the Crisis: Introduction, in Uprising in Germany 1953, ed. Ostermann, Christian. Budapest: Central European University Press:

Ostrom, Elinor. (1990). Governing the Commons. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Sullivan, Christopher. (2005). The United Nations, Decolonization, and Self-Determination in Cold War Sub-Saharan Africa, 1960-1994. The Journal of Third World Studies 22(2): 103-120.

Ouzegame. Amar. (1962). Le Meilleur Combat. Paris: Julliard.

Overview of the Enemy. (2004). Staff Statement #15. The 9/11 Commission Report. National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Ozerov, O. (2007). Hot Summer in the Middle East. International Affairs: a Russian Journal of World Politics, Diplomacy & International Relations 53(1): 33-42.

Gonzalez-Perez, Margaret. (2006). Guerrilleras in Latin America: Domestic and International Roles. Journal of Peace Research 43(3): 313-329.

Padmore, G. (1972). Pan Africanism or Communism. Garden City: Doubleday.

Paige, Jeffery. (1975). Agrarian Revolutions. New York: Free Press.

Pape, Robert. (1996). Bombing to Win: Air Power and Coercion in War. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Passos, Alaor. (1968). Development Tensions and Political Instability: Testing Some Hypotheses Concerning Latin America. Journal of Peace Research 5(1): 70-86.

Pentagon Papers. (1971). Gravel Edition. Boston: Beacon Press.

Perham, Margery. (1959). White Minorities in Africa. Foreign Affairs 37(4): 637-648.

Peters, Guy. (1998). Comparative Politics, Theory and Method. New York: New York University Press.

Peterson, A. D. C. (1955). The Birth of the Malayan Nation. International Affairs 31(3): 311-316.

Pew Global Attitudes Project. (2003). Views of a Changing World. Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center for the People and the Press.

Philpott, Simon. (2007). Another Go at Life: Dili, East Timor. Theory and Event 10(2): 1-24.

Pimenta, Fernando. (2005). Angola's Whites: Political Behaviour and National Identity. Portuguese Journal of Social Science 4(3): 169-193.

Pipes, Richard. (1990). The Russian Revolution. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Popper, Karl. (1959). The Logic of Scientific Discovery. London and New York: Routledge Classics.

Posen, Barry. (1993). The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict, in Ethnic Conflict and International Security, ed. by Michael Brown. Princeton: Princeton University Press: 103-124.

Preston, Matthew. (2004). Stalemate and the Termination of Civil War: Rhodesia Reassessed. Journal of Peace Research 41(1): 65-83.

Proceedings of the Low-Intensity Warfare Conference. (1986). Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense.

Prosterman, Roy and Riedinger, Jeffrey. (1982). Toward an Index of Democratic Development, in Freedom in the World: Political Rights and Civil Liberties 1982, ed. by Gastil, Raymond. Westport: Greenwood Press: 177-215

Pye, Lucian. (1956). Guerilla Communism in Malaya. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Pye, Lucian. (1971). The Legitimacy Crisis, in Crises and Sequences in Political Development, ed. by Binder, Leonard et al. Princeton: Princeton University Press:

Rabasa, Angel, Chalk, Peter, Cragin, Kim, Daly, Sara, Gregg, Heather, Karasik, Theodore, O'Brien, Kevin, and Rosenau, William. (2006). Beyond Al-Qa'eda: the Global Jihadist Movement. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.

Rabushka, Alvin and Shepsle, Kenneth. (1972). Politics in Plural Societies: a Theory of Democratic Instability. Columbus: Merrill.

Rahman, Tunku Abdul. (1965). Malaysia: Key Area in Southeast Asia. Foreign Affairs 43(4): 659-670.

Ramakrishna, Kumar. (2001). 'Transmogrifying' Malaya: the Impact of Sir Gerald Templer (1954-54). Journal of Southeast Asian Studies 32(1): 79-92.

Rapoport, David. (1982). Terror and the Messiah: An Ancient Experience and Modern Parallels, in Morality of Terrorism: Religious and Secular Justifications, eds. Rapoport, David, and Alexander, Yuri. New York: Pergamon.

Rapoport, David. (1984). Fear and Trembling: Terrorism in Three Religious Traditions. American Political Science Review 78(3): 658-677.

Rawkins, Phillip. (1978). Outsiders as Insiders: the Implications of Minority Nationalism in Scotland and Wales. Comparative Politics 10(4): 519-534.

Raymond, Chad. (2005). Regional Geographic Influence on two Khmer Polities. Journal of Third World Studies 22(1): 135-150.

Razi, G. Hossein. (1987). The Nexus of Legitimacy and Performance: the Lessons of the Iranian Revolution. Comparative Politics 91(4): 453-469.

Razi, G. Hossein. (1990). Legitimacy, Religion, and Nationalism in the Middle East. American Political Science Review 84(1): 69-91.

Record, Jeffrey and Terrill, Andrew. (2004). Iraq and Vietnam: Differences, Similarities, and Insights. Carlisle: Strategic Studies Institute.

Reed, W. (1998). Guerillas in the Midst, in African Guerillas, ed. by Clapham, C. London: James Currey: 135-154.

Regan, Anthony. (1998). Current Developments in the Pacific: Causes and Course of the Bougainville Conflict. Journal of Pacific History 33(3): 269-285.

Regan, John. (2007). Southern Irish Nationalism as a Historical Problem. The Historical Journal 50(1): 197-223.

Regan, Patrick. (1996). Conditions of Successful Third Party Intervention in Intrastate Conflicts. Journal of Conflict Resolution 40(4): 336-359.

Regan, Patrick. (2002). Third-Party Interventions and the Duration of Intrastate Conflicts. Journal of Conflict Resolution 46(1): 55-73.

Relations of the United States with Tibet. (1994). Public Law 103-236. Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994-1995. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of State.

Renner, Michael. (1996). Fighting for Survival: Environmental Decline, Social Conflict, and the New Age of Insecurity. New York: Norton.

Reno, William. (1995). Corruption and State Politics in Sierra Leone. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Review of the Emergency in Malaya From June 1948 to August 1957 by the Director of Operations, Malaya (SECRET). (1968). NAA A452/2, 1968/4248. Sydney: National Archives of Australia.

Reynal-Querol, Marta. (2002). Ethnicity, Political Systems, and Civil Wars. Journal of Conflict Resolution 46(1): 29-54.

Ribeiro, Margarida. (2002). Empire, Colonial Wars and Post-Colonialism in the Portuguese Contemporary Imagination. Portuguese Studies 18: 132-214.

Richards, Paul. (1996). Fighting for the Rain Forest: War, Youth, and Resources in Sierra Leone. Oxford: James Currey.

Richmond, Oliver. (2002). Decolonization and Post-Independence Causes of Conflict: the Case of Cyprus. Civil Wars 5(3): 163-190.

Richmond, Oliver. (2004). The Dilemmas of Conflict Resolution: A Comparison of Sri Lanka and Cyprus. Nationalism and Ethnic Politics 10(2): 185-219.

Ridgway, Matthew. (1971). Indochina: Disengaging. Foreign Affairs 49(4): 583-592.

Ricklefs, M. C. (1991). A History of Modern Indonesia Since C. 1300. Second Edition. London: MacMillan Publishers, Ltd.

Risse, Thomas. (2005). Neo-functionalism, European Identity, and the Puzzles of European Integration. Journal of European Public Policy 12(2): 291-309.

Rivlin, Benjamin. (1982). The United States and Morocco International Status, 1943-1956: a Contributory Factor in Morocco's Reassertion of Independence from France. The International Journal of African Historical Studies 15(1): 64-82.

Roberts, Michael. (1945). The New Forces in Western Europe. International Affairs 21(1): 1-14.

Rodrigues, Luís. (2004). 'Today's Terrorist is Tomorrow's Statesman': the United States and Angolan Nationalism in the Early 1960s. Portuguese Journal of Social Science 3(2): 115-140.

Roling, Bert. (1976). The Legal Status of Rebels and Rebellion. Journal of Peace Research 13: 149-163.

Rosen, Steven. (1972). War Power and the Willingness to Suffer, in Peace, War, and Numbers, ed. by Russett, Bruce. Beverly Hills: Sage: 167-183.

Rosenstiel, Annette. (1953). An Anthropological Approach to the Mau Mau Problem. Political Science Quarterly 68(3): 419-432.

Ross, Charles. (1948). Draft of Recognition of Israel. Handwriting of the President, Harry S. Truman Presidential Library, Independence, Missouri. Independence: Harry S. Truman Presidential Library.

Ross, Michael. (2003). Oil, Drugs and Diamonds: the Varying Role of Natural Resources in Civil War, in The Political Economy of Armed Conflict: Beyond Greed and Grievance, eds. Ballentine, Karen and Sherman, Jake. Boulder: Lynne Rienner: 47-70.

Ross, Michael. (2004a). How does Natural Resource Wealth Influence Civil War? Evidence from 13 Cases. International Organization 58(1): 35-67.

Ross, Michael. (2004b). What do We Know About Natural Resources and Civil War? Journal of Peace Research 41(3): 337-356.

Rostow, Walt. (1960). The Stages of Economic Growth: a Non-Communist Manifesto. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rotberg, Robert. (1962). The Rise of African Nationalism: the Case of East and Central Africa. World Politics 15(1): 75-90.

Rothchild, Donald. (1997). Secession as a Last Resort. Politics and Life Sciences 16(2): 270-272.

Rubin, Barnett. (1995). The Search for Peace in Afghanistan. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Rudolph, Joseph and Thompson, Robert. (1985). Ethnoterritorial Movements and the Policy Process: Accommodating Nationalist Demands in the Developed World. Comparative Politics 17(3): 291-311.

Runov, Valenti. (2002). The Soviet-Afghan War. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Russell, D. (1974). Rebellion, Revolution, and Armed Force. New York: Academic Press.

Russett, Bruce. (1964). Inequality and Instability: the Relation of Land Tenure to Politics. World Politics 16(3): 442-454.

Safran, William. (2004). Introduction: The Political Aspects of Language. Nationalism and Ethnic Politics 10(1): 1-14.

Salem, Paul. (2006). The Future of Lebanon. Foreign Affairs 85(6): 13-22.

Salla, Michael. (1997). Creating the 'Ripe Moment' in the East Timor Conflict. Journal of Peace Research 34(4): 449-466.

Sambanis, Nicholas. (2000). Partition as a Solution to Ethnic War: an Empirical Critique of the Theoretical Literature. World Politics 52(4): 437-483.

Sambanis, Nicholas. (2001) Do Ethnic and Non-Ethnic Civil Wars Have the Same Causes? Journal of Conflict Resolution 45(3): 259-82.

Sambanis, Nicholas. (2004). What is Civil War?: Conceptual and Empirical Complexities of an Operational Definition. Journal of Conflict Resolution 48(6): 814-858.

Saperstein, Alvin. (1991). The "Long Peace" – Result of a Bipolar Competitive World? Journal of Conflict Resolution 35(1): 68-79.

Sarkees, Meredith Reid. (2000). The Correlates of War Data on War: An Update to 1997. Conflict Management and Peace Science 18(1): 123-144.

Schelling, Thomas. (1966). Arms and Influence. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Schock, Kurt. (1996). A Conjunctural Model of Political Conflict. Journal of Conflict Resolution 40(1): 98-133.

Schroder, Harold and Harvey, O. J. (1963). Conceptual Organization and Group Structure, in Cognitive Determinants of Motivation and Group Interaction, ed. by Harvey, O. J. New York: Ronald: 134-166.

Schubert, Frank. (2006). "Guerillas Don't Die Easily": Everyday Life in Wartime and the Guerilla Myth in the National Resistance Army in Uganda, 1981-1986. International Review of Social History 51(1): 93-111.

Schwarz, A. (1994). A Nation in Waiting: Indonesia in the 1990s. Boulder: Westview Press.

Scott, William. (1958). Rationality and Non-Rationality of International Attitudes. Journal of Conflict Resolution 2(1): 8-16.

Scott, James. (1976). The Moral Economy of the Peasant. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Segev, Tom. (1999). One Palestine, Complete. New York: Henry Holt and Company, LLC.

Sepp, Kalev. (2005). Best Practices in Counterinsurgency. Military Review 85(3): 8-12.

Shafer, D. Michael. (1988). The Unlearned Lessons of Counterinsurgency. Political Science Quarterly 103(1): 57-80.

Shapiro, Robert and Page, Benjamin. (1988). Foreign Policy and the Rational Public. Journal of Conflict Resolution 32(2): 211-247.

Shaplen, Robert. (1967). Vietnam: Crisis of Indecision. Foreign Affairs 46(1): 95-125.

Sheng, Michael. (2006). Mao, Tibet, and the Korean War. Journal of Cold War Studies 8(3): 15-33.

Sherman, Jake. (2003). Burma: Lessons from the Ceasefires, in The Political Economy of Armed Conflict: Beyond Greed and Grievance, eds. Ballentine, Karen and Sherman, Jake. Boulder: Lynne Rienner: 225-255.

Schmidt, Dana. (1968). Yemen: the Unknown War. New York, Chicago, and San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Shulman, Stephen. (2002). Challenging the Civic/Ethnic and West/East Dichotomies in the Study of Nationalism. Comparative Political Studies 35(5): 554-585.

Shulman, Stephen. (2003). Exploring the Economic Basis of Nationhood. Nationalism and Ethnic Politics 9(2): 23-49.

Shultz, Richard. (1978a). Breaking the Willing of the Enemy During the Vietnam War: the Operationalization of the Cost-Benefit Model of Counterinsurgency Warfare. Journal of Peace Research 15(2): 109-129.

Shultz, Richard. (1978b). The Limits of Terrorism in Insurgency Warfare: the Case of the Viet Cong. Polity 11(1): 69-71.

Shy, John. (1976). A People Numerous and Armed: Reflections on the Military Struggle for American Independence. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Silcock, T. H. (1949). Forces for Unity in Malaya: Observations of a European Resident. International Affairs 25(4): 453-465.

Silcock, T. H. (1952). Policy for Malaya 1952. International Affairs 28(4): 445-451.

Simpson, Brad. (2005). 'Illegally and Beautifully': the United States, the Indonesian Invasion of East Timor and the International Community, 1974-1976. Cold War History 5(3): 281-315.

Siqueira, Kevin and Sandler, Todd. (2006). Terrorists Versus the Government: Strategic Interaction, Support, and Sponsorship. Journal of Conflict Resolution 50(6): 878-898.

Siracusa, Joseph. (1974). The United States, Viet-Nam and the Cold War: a Reappraisal. Journal of Southeast Asian Studies 5(1): 82-101.

Skocpol, Theda. (1979). States and Social Revolutions: a Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China. London: Cambridge University Press.

Sleeman, James. (1933). Thugs; or a Million Murders. London: S. Low and Marston.

Smallman-Raynor, M. R. and Cliff, A. D. (1991). Civil War and the Spread of AIDS in Central Africa. Epidemiology and Infection 107(1): 69-80.

Smillie, Ian. (2002). Dirty Diamonds, Armed Conflict and the Trade in Rough Diamonds. Fafo-Report 377, Oslo: Fafo. www.fafo.no/pub/rapp/379/379.pdf. Oslo: Forskningsstiftelsen Fafo.

Smillie, Ian, Gberie, Lansana, and Hazleton, Ralph. (2000). The Heart of the Matter: Sierra Leone, Diamonds and Human Security. Ottawa: Partnership Africa Canada.

Smith, Anthony. (1986). The Ethic Origins of Nations. Oxford: Blackwell.

Smith, Teresa. (1987). Al-Mukhtufin: a Report on Disappearances, in War and Refugees: The Western Sahara Conflict, eds. Lawless, Richard and Monahan, Laila. New York: Pinter.

Smolansky, O. M. (1965). Moscow and the Suez Crisis, 1956: A Reappraisal. Political Science Quarterly 80(2): 581-605.

Solarz, Stephen. (1979/1980). Arms for Morocco? Foreign Affairs 58(2): 278-299.

Sorli, Mirjam, Gleditsch, Nils Petter, and Strand, Havard. (2005). Why is There So Much Conflict in the Middle East? Journal of Conflict Resolution 49(1): 141-165.

Sorens, Jason. (2005). The Cross Sectional Determinates of Secessionism in Advanced Democracies. Comparative Political Studies 38(3): 304-326.

Soustelle, Jacques. (1950). Indo-China and Korea: One Front. Foreign Affairs 29(1): 56-66.

Soustelle, Jacques. (1956). France Looks at her Alliances. Foreign Affairs 35(1): 116-130.

Sovetsko-Izrail'skie Otnosheniia: Sbornik Dokumentov, 1948 Mai 1949. (2000). Moskva. Arkhivy.

Stedman, Stephen. (2001). Implementing Peace Agreements in Civil Wars: Lessons and Recommendations for Policymakers. Paper presented at International Peace Academy and Center for International Security and Cooperation, New York City, New York, May 2001. New York: International Peace Academy and Center for International Security and Cooperation.

Stephan, Maria and Mundy, Jacob. (2006). A Battlefield Transformed: From Guerilla Resistance to Mass Nonviolent Struggle in the Western Sahara. Journal of Military and Strategic Studies 8(3): 1-32.

Sternhell, Zeev. (1998). The Founding Myths of Israel: Nationalism, Socialism, and the Making of the Jewish State. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Stykalin, Aleksandr. (2001). The Hungarian Crisis of 1956: the Soviet Role in the light of New Archival Documents. Cold War History 2(1): 113-144.

Suhrke, Astri. (1990). Afghanistan: Retribalization of the War. Journal of Peace Research 27(3): 241-246.

Suicide Bombing in the COE: Handbook No. 1.03. (2005). Fort Leavenworth: U. S. Army Training and Doctrine Command.

Suliman, M. (1998). Ecology, Politics, and Violent Conflicts. London: Zed Books.

Sullivan, Patricia. (2007). War Aims and War Outcomes: Why Powerful States Lost Limited Wars. Journal of Conflict Resolution 51(3): 496-524.

Sully, Francois. (1968). Age of the Guerilla. New York: Parents' Magazine.

Suyin, Han. (1972). The Morning Deluge. Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown and Company.

Sykes, Christopher. (1959). Orde Wingate. Cleveland and New York: World Publishing Company.

Swinton, E. D. (1986). The Defence of Duffer's Drift. Wayne: Avery Publishing Group, Inc.

Taber, Robert. (2002). War of the Flea: the Classic Study of Guerilla Warfare. Washington, D. C.: Brassey's.

Talbott, John. (1980). The War Without a Name. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Talbot, Phillips. (1949). Kashmir and Hyderabad. World Politics 1(3): 321-332.

Tang, Truong Nhu. (1985). A Viet Cong Memoir: An Inside Account of the Vietnam War and its Aftermath. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

Tanter, Raymond, and Midlarsky, Manus. (1967). A Theory of Revolution. Journal of Conflict Resolution 11(3): 264-280.

Tareke, Gebru. (2002). From Lash to Red Star: the Pitfalls of Counter-Insurgency in Ethiopia, 1980-1982. Modern African Studies 40(3): 465-498.

Tec, Nechama. (1993). Defiance: the Bielski Partisans. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Telephone Call from President Eisenhower to Undersecretary of State Hoover, in DDE Library. (1956). AWF, International Series, Hungary, Box 28, Folder 1, Eisenhower. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Terhune, Kenneth. (1965). Nationalistic Aspiration, Loyalty, and Internationalism. Journal of Peace Research 2(3): 277-287.

Terrorism in the Twenty-First Century. (2007). US Army TRADOC G2 Handbook No. 1 Fort Leavenworth: US Army Training and Doctrine Command.

The Global Menace of Local Strife. (2003). Economist 367(8325): 23-25.

The Police and Internal Security. (1966). Washington, D.C.: International Police Academy.

The World Factbook. (2007). Central Intelligence Agency. Pittsburgh: Imaging and Publishing Support.

Thee, Marek. (1976). The Indochina Wars: Great Power Involvement – Escalation and Disengagement. Journal of Peace Research 13(2): 117-129.

Tho, Tran Dinh. (1977). Pacification. Indochina Refugee Authored Monograph Program. Department of the Army, Contract No. MDA 903-76-0172. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army.

Thompson, Robert Grainger Ker. (1966). Defeating Communist Insurgency. New York: Praeger.

Thorne, Christopher. (1976). Indochina and the Anglo-American Relations 1945-45. Pacific Historical Review 45(1): 73-96.

Thornton, E. (1837). Illustrations and Practices of the Thugs. London: W. H. Allen.

Tilley, Charles. (1998). Durable Inequality. Oakland: University of California Press.

Tillion, Germaine. (1960). Les Ennemis Complémentaires. Paris: Minuit.

Tir, Jaroslav. (2005). Dividing Countries to Promote Peace: Prospects for Long-Term Success of Partitions. Journal of Peace Research 42(5): 545-562.

Titorenko, Vladimir. (2003). Iraq: Six Months Under Occupation. International Affairs: A Russian Journal of World Politics, Diplomacy & International Relations 49(6): 58-65.

Titorenko, Vladimir. (2004). Saddam Captured. International Affairs: A Russian Journal of World Politics, Diplomacy & International Relations 50(1): 31-37.

Tonnesson, Stein. (1985). The Longest Wars: Indochina 1945-75. Journal of Peace Research 22(1): 9-29.

Toranska, Teresa. (1987). Them: Stalin's Polish Puppets. New York: Harper & Row.

Tronchon, J. (1986). L'Insurrection Malgache de 1947. Paris: Karthala.

Tse-tung, Mao. (1967). Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung. Peking: Foreign Languages Press.

Tudda, Chris. (2005). "Reenacting the Story of Tantalus": Eisenhower, Dulles, and the Failed Rhetoric of Liberation. Journal of Cold War Studies 7(4): 3-35.

Ullman, Harlan and Wade, James. (1996). Shock and Awe: Achieving Rapid Dominance. Washington, D.C.: National Defense University.

United Nations Charter. (1945). New York: United Nations Documentation Centre.

United Nations General Assembly Resolutions. (1946-2008). New York: United Nations Documentation Centre.

United Nations Security Council Resolutions. (1946-2008). New York: United Nations Documentation Centre.

Urban, George. (1997). Radio Free Europe and the Pursuit of Democracy: My War Within the Cold War. New Haven: Yale University Press.

United States-Vietnam Relations, 1946-1969. (Undated). Study in 12 Volumes. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

U. S. Policy and the Conflict in Western Sahara. (1979). Subcommittees on Africa and on International Organizations, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, 96th Congress, First Session. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Van Wingen, John and Tillema, Herbert. (1980). British Military Intervention After World War II: Militance in a Second-Rank Power. Journal of Peace Research 17(4): 291-303.

Valentino, Benjamin, Huth, Paul, and Balch-Lindsay, Dylan. (2004). "Draining the Sea": Mass Killing and Guerilla Warfare. International Organization 58(2): 375-407.

Van Evera. (1994). Hypotheses on Nationalism and War. International Security 18(4): 5-39.

Vasquez, John. (2000). What Do We Know About War? Lanham: Roman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Vayrynen, Raimo. (1980). Focus on: Afghanistan. Journal of Peace Research 17(2): 93-102.

Venter, Al. (1969). The Terror Fighters. Cape Town: Purnell.

Verba, Sidney. (1971). Sequences and Development, in Crises and Sequences in Political Development, ed. by Leonard Binder et al. Princeton: Princeton University Press: 283-316.

Verdross, Alfred. (1954). General International Law and the United Nations Charter. International Affairs 30(3): 342-348.

Vidal-Naquet, Pierre. (1963). Torture: Cancer of Democracy – France and Algeria 1954-1962. Baltimore: Penguin.

Clausewitz, Karl. (1984 [1832]). On War. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Walt, Stephen. (1997). Building Up New Bogeymen. Foreign Policy 106: 176-189.

Walter, Barbara. (1997). The Critical Barrier to Civil War Settlement. International Organization 51(3): 335-364.

Walter, Barbara. (2004). Does Conflict Beget Conflict? Explaining Recurring Civil War. Journal of Peace Research 41(3): 371-388.

Walter, Eugene. (1969). Terror and Resistance. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Watson, J. H. to Morris, O. H. (1949) PRO, FO 371/76005. Top Secret Correspondence. Whitehall: Foreign Office Archives.

Watson, Robert and Schnabel, James. (1979). The History of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Volume 5. Washington, D.C.: Michael Glazier.

Weber, Max. (1968). Economy and Society, eds. Roth, Guenther and Wittich, Claus. New York: Bedminster Press.

Weede, Erich and Muller, Edward. (1998). Rebellion, Violence and Revolution: a Rational Choice Perspective. Journal of Peace Research 36(1): 43-59.

Weinstein, Jeremy. (2005). Resources and the Information Problem in Rebel Recruitment. Journal of Conflict Resolution 49(4): 598-624.

Weitz, Richard. (1986). Insurgency and Counterinsurgency in Latin America, 1960-1980. Political Science Quarterly 101(3): 397-413.

Weitzer, Ronald. (1987). The Struggle Over British Security Policy in Northern Ireland. Comparative Politics 19(3): 281-298.

Welcome Awaits Iraqi Shoe-Thrower. (2009). British Broadcasting Company, September 10, 2009.

Wesley-Smith, Terence. (1992). Development and Crisis in Bougainville: a Bibliographical Essay. Contemporary Pacific 4(2): 407-433.

West, F. J. Bing. (2006). American Military Performance in Iraq. Military Review 86(5): 2-7.

Western Sahara: Advisory Opinion of 16 October 1975. (1975). The Hague: International Court of Justice.

Westad, Odd. (1992). Rethinking Revolutions: the Cold War in the Third World. Journal of Peace Research 29(4): 455-464.

White, Jeffrey and Schmidmayr, Michael. (2003). Resistance in Iraq. Middle East Quarterly 10(4): 17-32.

Whittlesey, Derwent. (1953). Kenya, the Land and the Mau Mau. Foreign Affairs 32(1): 80-90.

Who are the Current Coalition Members? (2003). Washington, DC: The White House.

Wilkinson, Paul. (1974). Political Terrorism. London: MacMillan.

Will, Donald. (1982). Zionist Settlement Ideology and Its Ramifications for the Palestinian People. Journal of Palestinian Studies 11(1): 37-59.

Will, Donald. (2007). Nonracialism versus Ethnonationalism: Transcending Conflict in Israel/Palestine and South Africa. Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East 27(2): 412-422.

Wilson, Robin. (2001). The Politics of Contemporary Ethno-Nationalist Conflicts. Nations and Nationalism 7(3): 365-384.

Worst of the Worse. (2009). Roxbury: Freedom House.

Yockelson, Mitchell. (1997). The United States Armed Forces and the Mexican Punitive Expedition: Part 1. Prologue 29(3): 214-216.

Zagorin, Perez. (1973). Theories of Revolution in Contemporary Historiography. Political Science Quarterly 88(1): 23-52.

Zariski, Raphael. (1989). Ethnic Extremism Among Ethnoterritorial Minorities in Western Europe: Dimensions, Causes, and Institutional Responses. Comparative Politics 21(3): 253-272.

Zimmerman, Andrew. (2006). "What Do You Really Want in German East Africa, *Herr Professor*?": Counterinsurgency and the Science Effect in Colonial Tanzania. Comparative Studies in Society and History 48(2): 419-461.

Zunes, Stephen. (1995). Algeria, the Maghreb, and the Western Sahara Stalemate. Arab Studies Quarterly 17(3): 23-36.

APPENDICES

Appendix I Foreign Counterinsurgency Campaigns, 1945-1997 (COW Dataset)

Campaign	COIN Strategy	UN/Great Power Opposition	Outcome
Netherlands East Indies, 1945-1946[118]	Mixture of both	13 UNSC, 2 UNGA/US	Defeat
French Indochina, 1946-1954	Cost-Benefit	None/China, USSR	Defeat
France in Madagascar, 1947-1948	Cost-Benefit	None/None	Victory
India in Hyderabad, 1948	Social Welfare	None/None	Victory
United Kingdom in Malaya, 1948-1957[119]	Social Welfare	None/None	Victory
China in Tibet, 1950-1951[120]	Cost-Benefit	None/None	Victory
France in Tunisia, 1952-1954	Strategy unclear	2 UNGA/None	Defeat
United Kingdom in Kenya, 1952-1956	Cost-Benefit	1 UNGA/None	Defeat[121]
France in Morocco, 1953-1956	Strategy unclear	3 UNGA/None	Defeat
France in Algeria, 1954-1962	Cost-Benefit	9 UNGA/None	Defeat
France in Cameroun, 1955-1960	Mixture of both	6 UNGA/None	Defeat
Portuguese Africa,[122] 1961-1975	Mixture of both	20 UNSC, 31 UNGA/USSR	Defeat
South Africa in Namibia, 1975-1988	Cost-Benefit	114 UNSC, 150 UNGA[123]/USSR	Defeat
Indonesia in East Timor, 1975-1977	Cost-Benefit	12 UNSC, 24 UNGA/None	Victory[124]
Morocco in Western Sahara, 1975-1983	Mixture of both	54 UNSC, 51 UNGA/OAU, NAM	Defeat[125]

[118] This counterinsurgency campaign actually lasted into 1949 (Collins, 1950: 181-193).

[119] The Malayan State of Emergency continued in effect until July 31, 1960 (Rahman, 1965: 661).

[120] While China successfully annexed Tibet during 1950-1951, the actual Tibetan counterinsurgency campaign took place during 1956-1974 with 3 UNGA resolutions (McGranahan, 2006: 103).

[121] The claim of a British defeat is questionable, since the United Kingdom essentially defeated the Mau Mau in 1956, and maintained sovereignty in Kenya until 1963 (Nissimi, 2006: 8, 9; Anderson, 2005: 3).

[122] Portugal's campaigns in Angola, Guinea-Bissau, and Mozambique are considered as a unit due to the United Nations' reference to them all under the heading of 'territories under Portuguese administration.'

[123] United Nations' condemnations of South African administration of Namibia began with the first session of the General Assembly in 1946, and the Security Council became involved during 1968; the actual insurgency erupted during 1966 and only intensified after 1975.

[124] The claim of an Indonesian victory is questionable, since Falintil's campaign continued, albeit at a reduced scale, until Timor-Leste independence of May 20, 2002 (Philpott, 2007: 14).

[125] The claim of a Moroccan defeat in Western Sahara is questionable, since Morocco continues to occupy the territory (The World Factbook, 2007: 627).

Appendix II United Nations Opposition to Foreign Counterinsurgency Campaigns

Campaign	UN Opposition	Outcome
South Africa in Namibia, 1975-1988	114 UNSC, 150 UNGA	Defeat
Morocco in Western Sahara, 1975-1983	54 UNSC, 51 UNGA	Defeat[126]
Portuguese Africa, 1961-1975	20 UNSC, 31 UNGA	Defeat
Indonesia in East Timor, 1975-1977	12 UNSC, 24 UNGA	Victory[127]
Netherlands East Indies, 1945-1946	13 UNSC, 2 UNGA	Defeat
France in Algeria, 1954-1962	9 UNGA	Defeat
France in Cameroun, 1955-1960	6 UNGA	Defeat
France in Morocco, 1953-1956	3 UNGA	Defeat
France in Tunisia, 1952-1954	2 UNGA	Defeat
United Kingdom in Kenya, 1952-1956	1 UNGA	Defeat[128]
French Indochina, 1946-1954	None	Defeat
France in Madagascar, 1947-1948	None	Victory
India in Hyderabad, 1948	None	Victory
United Kingdom in Malaya, 1948-1957	None	Victory
China in Tibet, 1950-1951	None	Victory[129]

[126] See my notes under Table I regarding the determination of this defeat.

[127] See my notes under Table I regarding the determination of this victory.

[128] See my notes under Table I regarding the determination of this defeat.

[129] China's 1959-1974 counterinsurgency campaign in Tibet was the subject of three General Assembly resolutions, however.

Appendix III Great Power Opposition to Foreign Counterinsurgency Campaigns

Campaign	Great Power Opposition	Outcome
Netherlands East Indies, 1945-1946	United States	Defeat
French Indochina, 1946-1954	USSR/China	Defeat
Portuguese Africa, 1961-1975	USSR	Defeat
South Africa in Namibia, 1975-1988	USSR/Cuba	Defeat
France in Algeria, 1954-1962	Jāmi ‘at ad-Duwal al-‘Arabiyya, Egypt	Defeat
France in Tunisia, 1952-1954	Jāmi ‘at ad-Duwal al-‘Arabiyya	Defeat
France in Morocco, 1953-1956	Jāmi ‘at ad-Duwal al-‘Arabiyya	Defeat
Morocco in Western Sahara, 1975-1983	OAU/NAM	Defeat[130]
United Kingdom in Kenya, 1952-1956	None	Defeat[131]
France in Cameroun, 1955-1960	None	Defeat
China in Tibet, 1950-1951	None[132]	Victory
Indonesia in East Timor, 1975-1977	None	Victory[133]
France in Madagascar, 1947-1948	None	Victory
India in Hyderabad, 1948	None	Victory
United Kingdom in Malaya, 1948-1957	None	Victory

[130] See my notes under Table I regarding the determination of this defeat.

[131] See my notes under Table I regarding the determination of this defeat.

[132] China’s 1959-1974 counterinsurgency campaign in Tibet did indeed encounter great power resistance in the form of United States aid to the insurgency; aid that was too limited and ill-defined to prevent another Chinese victory, however

[133] See my notes under Table I regarding the determination of this victory.

Appendix IV Strategies Utilized in Foreign Counterinsurgency Campaigns

Campaign	Strategy Employed	Outcome
France in Madagascar, 1947-1948	Cost-Benefit	Victory
Indonesia in East Timor, 1975-1977	Cost-Benefit	Victory[134]
China in Tibet, 1950-1951	Cost-Benefit	Victory
French Indochina, 1946-1954	Cost-Benefit	Defeat
United Kingdom in Kenya, 1952-1956	Cost-Benefit	Defeat[135]
France in Algeria, 1954-1962	Cost-Benefit	Defeat
South Africa in Namibia, 1975-1988	Cost-Benefit	Defeat
Netherlands East Indies, 1945-1946	Mixture of Both	Defeat
France in Cameroun, 1955-1960	Mixture of Both	Defeat
Portuguese Africa, 1961-1975	Mixture of Both	Defeat
Morocco in Western Sahara, 1975-1983	Mixture of Both	Defeat[136]
France in Tunisia, 1952-1954	Strategy Unclear	Defeat
France in Morocco, 1953-1956	Strategy Unclear	Defeat
India in Hyderabad, 1948	Social Welfare	Victory
United Kingdom in Malaya, 1948-1957	Social Welfare	Victory

[134] See my notes under Table I regarding the determination of this victory.

[135] See my notes under Table I regarding the determination of this defeat.

[136] See my notes under Table I regarding the determination of this defeat.

Appendix V Comparison of Variables Impacting Four Case Studies

	Resolutions	Great Power Intervention for Insurgents	Strategy
Namibia	189	Wide-ranging Soviet Union, Cuba	Cost-Benefit
W. Sahara	103	None; Western Support for Moroccan Claim	Mixed
Tibet	3	Limited, Ill-defined United States	Cost-Benefit
Malaya	None	None	Social Welfare

Appendix VI Comparison of Foreign Counterinsurgency Campaigns

	1816-1944	1945-1997	Total
Failure	**13**	**12**	25
• Row %	52.0	48.0	100.0
• Column %			
• Expected Frequency	14.29	70.59	23.15
	21.1	3.9	
Success	**78**	**5**	83
• Row %	93.98	6.02	100.0
• Column %			
• Expected Frequency	85.71	29.41	76.85
	69.9	13.1	
Total	91	17	108

Pearson $\chi^2 = 25.52$ ($p<.000$)

Appendix VII Dissertation Hypotheses

Hypothesis #1: *The higher the level of United Nations condemnation of foreign counterinsurgency measures, the less successful will be those measures.* Cases will be chosen on the basis of the combined number of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions pertaining to the insurgency, and success or failure will be judged on the basis of COW Extra-State Dataset determinations.

Hypothesis #2: *The higher the level of great power recognition and support of the legitimacy of an insurgency, the less successful will be foreign counterinsurgency measures.* International recognition will be determined through primary and secondary sources of insurgency recognition, and success or failure will be judged on the basis of COW Extra-State Dataset determinations.

Hypothesis #3: *The employment of either the Social Welfare or the Cost-Benefit approach to counterinsurgency operations will not be significant in determining success in such operations.* The nature of the strategy utilized will be determined on the basis of primary and secondary sources detailing counterinsurgency practices, and success or failure will be judged on the basis of COW Extra-State Dataset determinations.

Appendix VIII Correlation Between United Nations Pressure and Insurgent Victory

UN Pressure: 1=Yes, 0=No
Outcome: 1=Foreign Power Victory, 0=Insurgency Victory

Campaign	UN Pressure	Outcome
1. South Africa in Namibia, 1975-1988	1	0
2. Morocco in Western Sahara, 1975-1983	1	0
3. Portugal in Angola, 1961-1975	1	0
4. Portugal in Guinea-Bissau, 1962-1974	1	0
5. Portugal in Mozambique, 1964-1975	1	0
6. Indonesia in East Timor, 1975-1977	1	1
7. Netherlands East Indies, 1945-1946	1	0
8. France in Algeria, 1954-1962	1	0
9. France in Cameroun, 1955-1960	1	0
10. France in Morocco, 1953-1956	1	0
11. France in Tunisia, 1952-1954	1	0
12. United Kingdom in Kenya, 1952-1956	1	0
13. French Indochina, 1946-1954	0	0
14. France in Madagascar, 1947-1948	0	1
15. India in Hyderabad, 1948	0	1
16. United Kingdom in Malaya, 1948-1957	0	1
17. China in Tibet, 1950-1951	0	1
17	**12**	**5**
Sample Mean 1.0	**0.71**	**0.29**

Correlation Coefficient: -.72

VITA

Donald F. Butler is a Senior Counterintelligence Analyst for the Department of Energy's IN-20 Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence. He holds a long-term interest in asymmetrical warfare, having served on combat operations in the Republic of Vietnam with the United States Marine Corps during the late 1960s, and briefly worked as a volunteer with Tzva HaHagana LeYisra'el (the Israel Defense Forces) in the State of Israel during 1990. He speaks Russian, is pursuing a doctorate in Political Science at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee, and hopes to eventually serve as a full-time Professor of Political Science.