THE EFFICACY OF URBAN INSURGENCY IN THE MODERN ERA

A thesis presented to the Faculty of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE
Strategy

by

Thomas Erik Miller, MAJ, USA
B.S., University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 1989
M.S., Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California, 2000

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas
2002

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE

Name of Candidate: MAJ Thomas Erik Miller

Thesis Title: The Efficacy of Urban Insurgency in the Modern Era

Approved by:

_____, Thesis Committee Chair
Clinton J. Ancker III, M.A.

_____, Member
Harold S. Orenstein, Ph.D.

_____, Member
William W. Mendel, M.A.

Accepted this 31st day of May 2002 by:

_____, Director, Graduate Degree Programs
Philip J. Brookes, Ph.D.

The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the student author and do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College or any other governmental agency. (References to this study should include the foregoing statement.)

ABSTRACT

THE EFFICACY OF URBAN INSURGENCY IN THE MODERN ERA, by MAJ Thomas Erik Miller, 159 pages.

Insurgency is one of the oldest and most prevalent forms of warfare. The last fifty years have seen the increase in the numbers and intensity of insurgencies worldwide, particularly in urban insurgencies. Global trends of virtually unconstrained population growth and urbanization (particularly in underdeveloped countries), globalization and the information revolution create conducive environments for urban insurgency.

The approach taken in this thesis is to examine three exemplar case studies to determine causation in the outcome of the urban insurgencies, their purposes, differences in technique between rural and urban insurgency, the advantages and disadvantages of the urban insurgent, and whether these advantages were capitalized upon in order to determine the feasibility of urban insurgency in the modern era. The case studies examined were the Battle of Algiers from 1956 to 1957, Uruguay from 1962 to 1972, and Northern Ireland from 1969 to 1974.

The conclusion of this work is the feasibility of modern urban insurgency. Urban insurgents will apply modern technologies to enhance their security, use discriminate targeting, especially in economic targeting, and skillfully conduct information operations in exploitation of the media and technologies for dissemination. Counterinsurgents must win the information war and execute a coherent strategy addressing the underlying cause of insurgency to prevail.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my distinguished committee for their exceptional body of knowledge, advice, and patience. In keeping with the Combined Arms Doctrine Directorate motto, since you did not get speed, I sincerely hope that I provided quality with my quantity.

My sincerest thanks also go to my family (Susan, Isabelle, and Traveller) for their unending patience and perseverance. Truly, without the wholehearted and loving support of my wife Susan, this work could not have been completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE ii

ABSTRACT iii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iv

ABBREVIATIONS vi

CHAPTER

1. INTRODUCTION 1

2. LITERATURE REVIEW 14

3. THE BATTLE OF ALGIERS..... 28

4. THE TUPAMOROS OF URUGUAY 60

5. THE TROUBLES: NORTHERN IRELAND FROM 1969 TO 1974 89

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 131

REFERENCE LIST 146

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST 150

CERTIFICATION FORM FOR MMAS DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT..... 151

ABBREVIATIONS

ALN	*Armée de Libération Nationale*, National Liberation Army (Algeria)
B Specials	The reserve component of the Royal Ulster Constabulary (Northern Ireland)
CCE	Committee for Coordination and Execution (Algeria)
CCI	Interservice Coordinating Center (Algeria)
CNRA	*Conseil National De La Révolution Algérienne*, National Council for the Algerian Revolution (Algeria)
Colons	French colonists in Algeria
CRUA	*Comité Révolutionnaire Pour l'Unité et l'Action*, Revolutionary Committee for Unity and Action (Algeria)
CS	A riot control agent
DIME	Diplomatic, Information, Military and Economic
DOP	*Dispotif* (or *Détachement*) *Opérationel de Protection*, Operational Security Organization (Algeria)
DPU	*Dispositif de Protection Urbaine*, Urban Security Service (Algeria)
FIS	Islamic Salvation Front (Algeria)
FLN	*Front de Libération Nationale*, National Liberation Front (Algeria)
IRA	Irish Republican Army
MLN	*Moviemiento de Liberación Nacional*, National Liberation Movement (Uruguay), Tupamoros
MTLD	*Mouvement Pour Le Triomphe des Libertés Démocratiques*, Movement for the Triumph of Democratic Liberties (Algeria)
NICRA	Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association
OAS	*Organisation Armée Secrète*, Secret Army Organization (Algeria)

OS	*Organization Secréte*, Secret Organization (Algeria)
PD	People's Democracy (Northern Ireland)
Pied Noirs	French colonists in Algeria, literally black feet
PIRA	Provisional Irish Republican Army, the Provos
PPA	*Parti du Peuple Algérien*, Algerian People's Party
Provos	Provisional Irish Republican Army
RUC	Royal Ulster Constabulary (Northern Ireland)
SDLP	Social Democratic and Labor Party (Northern Ireland)
Tupamoros	*Moviemiento de Liberación Nacional*, National Liberation Movement (Uruguay), a compression of the name Tupac Amaru
UDR	Ulster Defense Regiment (Northern Ireland)
UN	United Nations
US	United States of America
WWI	World War I
WWII	World War II

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Insurgency is one of the oldest and most prevalent forms of warfare. Traditionally, it has been the method a weaker group or subgroup uses to address real or perceived wrongs instituted against it by a ruling group or foreign occupying power, and has been based in geographically isolated areas, away from cities. During the last fifty years of the twentieth century, there has been an increase in the numbers and intensity of insurgencies worldwide. Unfortunately, conditions continue to exist in much of the world, particularly the Third World, that contribute to the growth and development of insurgencies. Thus, continuation of insurgent activities should be expected in the twenty-first century.

Insurgency has been adaptive in both strategy and technique. As Bernard Fall states in his essay, "Theory and Practice of Insurgency and Counterinsurgency," "If it works, it is obsolete" (Fall 1967, 223). Urban insurgency is a relatively new strategy. Since World War II, a non-inclusive list of insurgencies using, at least in part, an urban insurgent strategy include the Tupamoros in Uruguay, the Monteneros in Argentina, the Irish Republican Army (IRA) in Northern Ireland, the National Liberation Front (FLN) in Algeria, numerous insurgent organizations to form an Israeli and Palestinian state, and the National Organization of Cypriot Fighters (EOKA) in Cyprus. The overarching goals of these organizations vary greatly, from the removal of a colonial power, to reunification of a state, to the creation and reestablishment of a state, to the overthrow of a perceived repressive government in order to establish a socialist society. While these insurgencies

experienced varying levels of success in achieving their stated goals, they had and continue to have significant impact and offer valuable lessons to both the insurgent and counterinsurgent. Based on the adaptive nature of insurgency and certainly reinforced by the techniques employed on 11 September 2001, the lessons of the past will be used in the future in the development of new strategies and techniques to be used by urban insurgents.

Possible Factors Contributing to Future Urban Insurgencies

The trends of urbanization, globalization, and the information revolution all tend toward the focal point of future insurgencies being the urban environment. Urbanization refers to the increasing move of people from rural to urban areas. Larger percentages of populations worldwide are becoming urban based. Governments are forced to provide services and security to this increasing urban population and economies must be stable enough to adequately support them. Unfortunately, this trend often leads to large slums, psychological disorientation of formerly rural people, and areas where crime and violence are virtually omnipresent conditions. Larger urban populations can offer the insurgent a larger recruiting pool, anesthetized to violence, as well as, a larger area in which to hide. However, these generalizations may only apply to recent and rapid increases in urban environments in less developed and less industrialized nations.

Urbanization

The effects of urbanization as a driving factor in urban insurgency were primarily seen in Latin America during the late1960s and early 1970s, and may, in part, be used to illustrate an adaptation of insurgency in reaction to failings in the Cuban model, in which

the action of a small armed force established the conditions leading to a successful insurgency, as espoused by Ernesto "Che" Guevara and Régis DeBray. Not surprisingly, Latin America produced the major "theorists" of urban insurgency, Abraham Guillén and Carlos Marighella. While both of these theorists stated that, under the conditions then existing in Latin America, there was a requirement of mixing both rural and urban insurgency, with the urban insurgent beginning the "revolution," this may not hold true now, since the most undeveloped nations are now seeing the greatest amount and impact of urbanization.

Globalization

Globalization refers to the increasing integration of the world's economies and the movement of people and information across international borders, as well as the cultural, environmental, and political effects that occur due to this integration. In the latter half of the twentieth century, there has been significant global average income growth. However, there has also been significant income inequality, in that the gap between rich countries and poor countries, as well as the gap between the rich and poor within countries, grew (International Monetary Fund Staff, 2000). While this may not be a direct result of globalization, the income inequality gap alone provides a potential powder keg for insurgent exploitation both in developed and undeveloped countries. Globalization, with its necessary integrating communications technologies, specific market focuses, and movement of people, also provides the insurgent a rich urban target set.

The Information Revolution

The information revolution closely interconnects with globalization not just in the economic arena but also in the political and cultural dimensions. Examples of the information revolution are the Internet and the "CNN effect." The CNN effect refers to the effect caused by the massive and immediate transmission of media images to an audience that molds popular opinion and demands an almost immediate response from policy makers. The information revolution not only allows the passage of information and propaganda globally in near real time but also provides vulnerabilities, as information storage and systems controls realize a format of greater digitization.

An important aspect of the information revolution is as a forcing function in Ted Robert Gurr's Perceived Relative Deprivation calculus. Gurr, in his book *Why Men Rebel*, proposed the concept of Perceived Relative Deprivation, defined as the difference between a society's expectations and its capabilities to meet these expectations (Moss 1972, 24-26). Though the information revolution is not the sole domain of Western society, it is a strong carrier of Western culture, particularly of United States culture. This export of Western culture, more massive in scope than ever before through television, radio and the Internet, to name but a few sources, can seriously unbalance the gap between value expectations and value capabilities of societies. This can lead to conflict from a rise in expectations within a society, as well as the opposite through a conflict of maintaining a society's traditional culture or restoring an oftentimes-idealized former societal culture.

Research Questions

From the context of continuing and adaptive insurgency, the primary research question emerges as, "Are urban insurgencies feasible in the modern age?" In order to answer this primary question several secondary questions must be answered. The first issues that must be addressed are Why have urban insurgencies in the post-World War II era succeeded or failed? and For what purposes were the urban insurgencies conducted? These provide a starting point for determining the feasibility of urban insurgency in the future.

The third secondary question is, What are the advantages and disadvantages for the urban insurgent? The fourth question is, Are there differences in basic techniques between urban and rural insurgency? The final question is, Were these advantages capitalized on through the appropriate and effective use of tactics, techniques and procedures in order to meet the purposes of the urban insurgency? These questions directly address the feasibility issue posed in the primary question. The information required to answer these secondary questions will provide the information with which to analyze the feasibility of modern urban insurgency.

Assumptions

There are several major assumptions that need to be made for this research project. The first assumption is that the lessons learned from modern era urban insurgencies that will be used in this thesis as case studies will be applicable to future insurgencies. Inherent in this assumption is that trends in urbanization, globalization, and the information revolution continue. The second assumption is that insurgencies will not

fail without some measure of counterinsurgent actions taken against them. This does not imply that the counterinsurgent action is an application of military force or that an urban insurgency does not leave itself vulnerable through its own actions. A final assumption is that where urban insurgency was not the only strategy pursued but was a piece of a larger insurgent context, the urban insurgency had significant impact on the larger context in some form.

Definitions

The following definitions will apply throughout this research project.

Insurgency: Defining insurgency is a difficult task. Joint Publication 1-02, *Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms,* defines it in the most traditional sense as "an organized movement aimed at the overthrow of a constituted government through use of subversion and armed conflict" (Joint Publication 1-02 1994, 228). However, this study will use the definition of insurgency used by Bard O'Neill in *Insurgency and Terrorism.* He defines insurgency more broadly,

> as a struggle between a nonruling group and ruling authorities in which the nonruling group consciously uses political resources (e.g., organizational expertise, propaganda, and demonstrations) and violence to destroy, reformulate or sustain the basis of legitimacy of one or more aspects of politics. (1990, 13)

O'Neill's definition of insurgency is expanded to cover situations currently emerging in the security environment. Examples may include subgroup actions in a failed nation state against United Nations or coalition forces control or actions taken against multinational organized crime or narcotrafficking cartels.

Politics: Since O'Neill's definition for insurgency is being used, his definition of politics and its aspects is also essential. He defines politics as "the process of making and

executing binding decisions for the society." He defines four major aspects of politics as "the political community, the political system, the authorities and policies" (1990, 13).

Counterinsurgency (COIN): Counterinsurgency is a term too for which there is no commonly agreed upon definition, but generally mirrors the definitions of insurgency, except that the actions are conducted by the ruling authority. Joint Publication 1-02 offers for a definition, "Those military, paramilitary, political, economic, psychological and civic actions taken by a government to defeat insurgency" (Joint Publication 1-02 1994, 112). Ian Beckett says, "Modern counter-insurgency encompasses those military, political, socio-economic and psychological activities employed by the authorities and their armed forces to defeat the threat in question" (2001b, viii). Again these definitions lack a significant aspect, informational actions, and the joint publication definition is limited by specifically stating that a government must conduct these actions. O'Neill does not directly define counterinsurgency but addresses it under the heading of governmental response and says it is how the ruling authorities "mobilize and use the political and military resources at their disposal" (1990, 125). The definition that will be used in this study for counterinsurgency is a combination of the joint publication and Beckett's definitions with factors addressed in O'Neill's definition of insurgency as follows, those military, paramilitary, political, socioeconomic, psychological, *informational*, and civic actions taken by the ruling authorities to defeat insurgency and sustain the legitimacy of its political aspects.

Urban insurgency: Also urban-centered insurgent strategy. Insurgency primarily focused in urban areas with an intermediate goal of reducing the ruling authorities will to resist (O'Neill 1990, 46).

Terrorism: An insurgent warfare tactic which is "the calculated use of unlawful violence or the threat of unlawful violence to inculcate fear; intended to coerce or to intimidate governments or societies in the pursuit of goals that are generally political, religious or ideological" (Joint Publication 1-02 1994, 462). O'Neill adds that it is "directed primarily at noncombatants (usually unarmed civilians), rather than the operational military and police forces or economic assets (public or private)" (1990, 24).

Scope

The scope of this research will be bounded by the following limitations and delimitations. The study is partially limited by the availability of primary source material of the insurgents and the counterinsurgents. It is also limited by the researcher's language capability being restricted to either English or Spanish in the examination of primary and secondary source material. Additionally, only a limited number of case studies can be examined, given the available time of this project. The study is delimited by examining only post-World War II urban insurgencies. However, events prior to the end of World War II that significantly impact the studied insurgencies will be addressed. The study will further confine the examination of counterinsurgency to how it affects the urban insurgency without delving into theory, unless required for clarity. It will further be delimited through a careful selection and analysis of a limited number of exemplar case studies, more specifically focused within Latin America, Northern Ireland, and Saharan Africa. The case studies themselves will address a specific time period in a generally specific location, under the unique situation of the environment in which the urban insurgencies were conducted.

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study is to provide a starting point to Special Operations and joint force commanders to gain insight in analyzing future insurgencies, as well as future counterinsurgency operations, in a complex, urban environment. Urban operations have gained considerable attention within the Army, as well as the Marine Corps, within recent years. A block of instruction on urban operations has been added to the Tactics course of the Command and General Staff College's curriculum for the class of 2002, and a new urban operations Army field manual will be published soon. Within the Special Operations community, the definition and conduct of unconventional warfare are being reconsidered. Thus, topics of urban insurgency and counterinsurgency are being examined and are currently on the list of proposed study issues and research projects from the U.S. Army John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School in coordination with the U.S. Army Special Operations Command. Additionally, the events of 11 September 2001 show, at a minimum, a new technique open to the urban insurgent for use and adaptation.

Thesis Organization

The research methodology used in this thesis involves case study analysis, thus the standard five-chapter Master of Military Arts and Sciences model will not be followed; instead a six-chapter format will be used. The first chapter will address the introduction to urban insurgency, possible factors leading to future urban insurgencies, the research questions, the scope, assumptions, limitations, delimitations and significance of the study, definitions used in the study, the thesis organization, and the research methodology. Chapter 2 is the literature review and examines insurgent strategies and

theory and counterinsurgent theory. Chapters 3 through 5 will be the three case studies, the Battle of Algiers in 1956 to 1957, the Tupamoros in Uruguay from 1962 to 1972, and the Irish Republican Army in Northern Ireland from 1969 through 1974. The case studies will address the background of the urban insurgency, significant actions during the time period studied, short and long-term outcomes and individual analysis of the specific case study. Chapter 6 presents the conclusions drawn from this study and topics for future research.

Research Methodology

In answering the research questions this study presents, a case study analysis research methodology will be used. Initially, research on insurgency, urban insurgency and counterinsurgency was conducted. Advantages and disadvantages of the urban insurgent were tentatively identified for validation through analysis of the cases. Through the examination of primary and secondary sources and advice from the thesis committee, three exemplar case studies of modern urban insurgency were chosen: the Battle of Algiers from 1956 to 1957, the Tupamoros in Uruguay from 1962 to 1972 and the Irish Republican Army in Northern Ireland from 1968 to 1974. These cases illustrate a variety of tactical and strategic successes and failures, as well as the application of the French and British counterinsurgency theories (discussed in detail in the literature review) against the urban insurgents.

The case studies will follow a general format, which addresses the similarities and differences of each case and establishes the framework for individual and collective analysis. Each case will start with articulating what insurgent group is being examined, the geographical location, and the time frame. The significance of the case and any

additional assumptions, limitations, and delimitations relating to the case will be presented, as necessary.

The background of the insurgency will then examined in order to provide relevant information as it relates to the specific period under study. Sources of the insurgency and principal events leading to the case will be discussed, as well as the effects of these elements on the strategy pursued by the insurgents. The principal insurgents and counterinsurgents will be identified. The reasons that urban insurgency was chosen will be addressed, as well as unique considerations causing this choice for urban insurgency. The organization of the urban insurgency will be examined. Difficulties facing the insurgents at the outset of their campaign will be identified. The uniqueness of these difficulties and the planned method to counteract them will be assessed.

The purposes of the urban insurgents will be examined and will provide the litmus test of success on whether or not they were achieved. The stated and unstated goals of the insurgents will be identified, and whether or not these goals were translated into a coherent strategy will be examined. Particular events affecting the formation of these goals and the insurgents' assumptions will be discussed, particularly in regards to their validity and effect on the period under study. Shifts in the insurgents' goals will be addressed, as well as reasons behind these shifts and their impact on the overall strategy of the case.

The principal events occurring during the delimited period of study will be addressed in terms of the insurgents, the counterinsurgents, and outside sources. Insurgent actions will be examined in terms of their strategy and relations to their goals. Insurgent and counterinsurgent events will be discussed in terms of the desired effect,

then action, reaction, and counteraction. The specific tactics, techniques, and procedures of the event will be identified, as well as events of unusual effectiveness or counter productivity. The events produced by outside sources will identify the source, the action, its significance, and its overall effect.

The outcome and analysis of the study period will conclude the presentation of the case study. Whether or not the insurgents met their goals will be the first topic addressed. Which goals, to what extent they were achieved and the impact of the achievement of these goals will be examined in the context of their effect on the final outcome of the period under study. The effectiveness of the insurgents will be examined under two different categories. First, their application of the diplomatic, informational, military and economic (DIME) elements of national power will be examined. Second, their use of the advantages of the urban insurgent and sufferance of disadvantages will be examined. The use of tactics, techniques, or procedures that were especially effective or counterproductive will be analyzed in relation to an advantage or disadvantage. The outcome of the period of study will then be examined in terms of the effects produced by the counterinsurgent force. Their overall effectiveness and their effectiveness of applying specific facets of national power will be addressed. Additionally, the creation of positive effects for the insurgents by the counterinsurgent forces will be discussed. Finally, the long-term outcome of the case study will be examined with particular focus on the affects on the insurgents and counterinsurgents. Significant events following the conclusion of the period under study will be discussed, as well as the possible influence of the insurgents on other insurgencies.

The conclusion will focus on identifying commonalities and uniqueness. Particular focus will be placed on the validation of the advantages and disadvantages of the urban insurgent and differences in techniques from rural insurgency. The effective application of these advantages and differences, if they exist, should provide evidence on why urban insurgencies have failed or succeed in the modern age, thus, directly illustrating if urban insurgencies are feasible and providing information to develop a picture of future urban insurgency.

Summary

This chapter addressed the background of urban insurgency and the possible factors contributing to future urban insurgency. The research questions were articulated. Assumptions, limitations, delimitations, scope, and significance of the study were addressed. Relevant definitions for use in this thesis were provided. The organization of the thesis and the research methodology were also discussed.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun. (Griffin 1961,12)

Mao Tse-tung

Introduction

This chapter provides a general overview of modern insurgency strategy and theory. It addresses two theories of urban insurgency and discusses briefly their differences, as well as differences with general insurgency theories. Two counterinsurgency theories are discussed due to their relevance to the case studies.

Insurgency Strategy

Bard O'Neill in *Insurgency & Terrorism: Inside Modern Revolutionary Warfare* defines four broad strategic approaches under which most modern insurgencies can be categorized. Of interest, the British army drew heavily from O'Neill's book for their counterinsurgency doctrine as promulgated in their 1995 edition army field manual on operations other than war. They are the conspiratorial strategy, the strategy of protracted popular war, the military-focus strategy, and the urban-warfare strategy.

Conspiratorial Strategy

The conspiratorial strategy is essentially a coup d'etat or the rapid removal of the ruling authorities by force. This strategy may be the easiest to implement and is most certainly one of the oldest insurgent strategies. The most critical piece leading to the success of this strategy is a "small, secretive, disciplined and tightly organized group" (O'Neill 1990, 32). The conspiratorial strategy is usually executed in urban areas,

normally the capital of a state, because that is where the ruling authorities are located and the political, economic and informational powers are most concentrated. Unlike most other insurgent strategies, popular support and mobilization, as well as external support, are of minimal concern. An example of the employment of this strategy is the October Revolution by the Russian Bolsheviks in 1917.

Strategy of Protracted Popular War

The goal of the protracted popular war strategy is to wear down the ruling authorities in order to defeat their will or ability to continue to resist the insurgency. This is the most widely adopted insurgency strategy. This strategy requires the primacy of political over military concerns in mobilizing the people. The people of the state must be mobilized and sympathetic to the insurgency, and the insurgency must spend considerable time and organizational effort to gain and maintain this support.

The popular protracted war strategy is conducted in three phases. Phase I is based on organization, consolidation, and preservation (Griffith 1961, 21) or the strategic defense (O'Neill 1990, 35). This phase focuses on gaining and maintaining the support of the people, establishing shadow governments and base areas, training and indoctrinating volunteers, propagandizing against the ruling authorities, and carrying out selective and limited military or terrorist acts. Phase II is progressive expansion (Griffith 1961, 21) or the strategic stalemate (O'Neill 1990, 36). The most important aspect of this phase is direct action or guerrilla warfare. The insurgents continue to isolate the people from the government and expand their "liberated areas." They collect arms, ammunition, and other essential supplies and establish logistics systems, which allows for the creation of full-time guerilla forces in larger units, which, in turn, leads to a higher level of

professionalism. Phase III focuses on the decision or destruction of the enemy (Griffith 1961, 21) or the Strategic Offense (O'Neill 1990, 36). The focus of this phase is to convert the guerilla force into a conventional maneuver force, defeat the ruling authorities' military forces in battle and politically, assume control, and displace the existing authorities. The insurgent force will normally attempt to pass through these phases sequentially, but the ruling authorities may cease their resistance during any phase. Additionally, if insurgency leaders misjudge that the insurgency is ready to move to the next phase, they may step back into the procedures of a previous stage to recover. The Chinese communist revolution and the Algerian insurgency are both examples of the strategy of protracted popular war.

Military-Focus Strategy

The military-focus strategy places great importance on military successes to erode the ruling authorities' will and ability to continue to resist the insurgency through the destruction of resources and personnel. Additionally, military successes may also lead to external pressures on the ruling authorities through international recognition and support of the insurgents or the withdrawal of support from the authorities. While the military-focus strategy often deals with the application of conventional forces by the insurgency, this strategy may also be used through the application of asymmetric forces. Thus, the American Civil War, as well as the Cuban Revolution, fall under this strategy.

Urban-Warfare Strategy

The urban-warfare strategy is, generally, the systematic application of terror tactics within an urban environment in order to erode the ruling authorities' will and

ability to resist the insurgency and delegitimize the government in the eyes of the population. The mobilization of popular support is important in this strategy, but difficult, since the means of achieving this support are more limited to military options than political indoctrination or cooption. There are two primary variations of this strategy. First is the case in which the insurgency eventually moves to include a rural insurgency. This is primarily a Latin American phenomenon. The second case is an insurgency that remains solely urban-centric. This is the case of the Provisional Irish Republican Army since its inception. Additionally, like the other strategies, urban warfare can be used in conjunction or secondarily within a different strategy, like the Battle of Algiers during the Algerian insurrection. The urban strategy is the newest and least practiced of the four strategies.

Insurgency Theory

While insurgency is not strictly a communist phenomenon, communists developed the most significant theoretical works on this theme, including the above-mentioned "classic" three phases of insurgency. Insurgency theory falls into four general groups, essentially matching the insurgency strategies. The groups are generally the Marxist-Russians (Lenin and Trotsky), the Asians (Mao and Giap), the Cubans (Guevara and Débray), and the Latin Americans or Urbanites (Guillén and Marighella). Note that the categories generally reflect where insurgencies occurred vice the specific nationalities of the authors (Guevara is an Argentine, Débray is French and Guillén is Spanish).

The Marxist-Russian theory deals with a coup d'etat or "a single blow, limited to a very short time and a very small area" (Lenin 1971, 28) conducted by the politically aware proletariat led by the vanguard party to create the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat."

The goal was to destroy and replace the old regime, not just take it over. Instead of mobilization of the entire population, only certain discontented social groups would be called upon to support the highly organized political party of professional revolutionaries. In part, the total population could not be mobilized because it would consume too much time to conduct a successful coup, but there was also the belief that the rural peasants and many urban workers were too ignorant and politically unaware to be used in the insurgency. These groups would be armed and trained to conduct "brief, climatic encounters fought for control of the nerve centers of modern society" (Shy and Collier 1986, 829). The theory also dealt in the ultimate success of world revolution (which essentially meant the industrialized European nations) and its export, case in point being the First Congress of the Communist International (Comintern) meeting in the spring 1919, at the height of the Russian Civil War, where a manifesto drafted by Trotsky and Lenin called for the world's workers to "Unite and Revolt" (Asprey 1975, 1:315-316).

The Asians, most specifically Mao Tse-tung, developed the popular protracted war strategy. Mao developed this strategy through the analysis of the historical development, situation and environment of China. Though Mao developed his strategy specifically for China, he realized that it would have possible worldwide application, as demonstrated in *Yu Chi Chan (Guerilla Warfare)*, where he says,

> Historical experience is written in blood and iron. We must point out that the guerilla campaigns being waged in China today are a page in history that has no precedent. Their influence will not be confined solely to China in her present Anti-Japanese war but will be world-wide. (1961, 65)

Due to his assessment of the Chinese situation, Mao broke with Moscow and the Comintern, ceasing Chinese pursuit of the dogmatically dictated urban, proletariat-based

conspiratorial insurgency of the Marxist-Leninist model. Instead, the Chinese communists aligned with Mao undertook the Long March, completely disengaging them from the urban areas, allowing the establishment of secure rural bases and beginning the pursuit of a rural, peasant-based protracted insurgency as the appropriate course for Chinese insurrection. The focus of this strategy places the political goals of mobilizing the people above strictly military concerns. In *On Protracted War*, Mao says, "Our view is opposed to this; we see not only weapons but also people. Weapons are an important factor in war, but not the decisive factor; it is people, not things that are decisive" (1977, 196).

In *Guerilla Warfare* and in more detail in *On Protracted War*, Mao describes the three phases of insurgency or protracted war, as discussed above in popular protracted war strategy. He points out that "the course of objective events will be exceedingly rich and varied, with many twists and turns" (1977, 189), indicating that there is no concrete guidance on the advancement of phases and the insurgent must be prepared to step back if an incorrect assessment has been made. Mao also states that the phases do not have to occur uniformly across China, so one area may be in the strategic offense (Phase III) while another area may still be in the strategic defense (Phase I). The ability to conduct assessment and analysis for the specific situation of the insurgent is a consistent theme throughout Mao's writings, though frequently overlooked or misunderstood (Shy and Collier 1986, 844).

Other Asian theorists include Ho Chi Minh, General Vo Nguyen Giap, and Lin Piao. Ho and Giap were the political and military leaders of the Vietnamese communist insurrection. They were familiar with both the conspiratorial, protracted popular war,

and military-focus strategies and at different times applied all three between 1945 and 1975. However, though they were successful in applying the theories of others to their eventually successful strategy, their theoretical writings added little new and were more a variation of Mao's previously stated themes. Lin Piao, who was a division commander in the Eighth Route Army and later the Minister of Defense for the Peoples Republic of China, amplified another Mao theme in his emphasis of "encircling the cities of the world." He felt that Mao's concept of the rural base area and protracted war had universal applicability, particularly in the underdeveloped nations of the third world. Additionally, he felt that world revolution could be brought about by insurgent action within the third world by viewing America and the industrialized Western European nations as the "cities" to encircle and the third world as the rural base areas (Lin 1977, 200).

The Cuban theorists, also known as the Fidelistas or Focoists, consist of Ernesto "Che" Guevara and Regis Débray. As the essential fundamental basis of this theory, Débray says in *Revolution in the Revolution?*

> *Under certain conditions, the political and military are not separate, but form one organic whole, consisting of the people's army, whose nucleus is the guerilla army. The vanguard party can exist in the form of the guerilla foco itself. The guerilla force is the party in embryo.*
>
> This is the staggering novelty introduced by the Cuban Revolution. (1972, 106)

Guevara states it similarly in *Guerilla Warfare* that,

> We consider that the Cuban Revolution contributed three fundamental lessons to the conduct of revolutionary movement in America. They are:
>
> (1) Popular forces can win a war against the Army.
> (2) It is not necessary to wait until all conditions for making revolution exist; the insurrection can create them.

> (3) In the underdeveloped America the countryside is the basic area for armed fighting. (1985, 47)

Their theory is a variation of Mao's protracted popular war strategy. The rural based strategy is maintained as appropriate for the Americas. However, the first phase political mobilization of the people does not occur under this theory. Violence, instead of careful preparation and organization, leads to political mobilization. The use of violence, as applied by a small revolutionary force or the guerilla foco, mobilizes the people rapidly. Another significant aspect of this theory is its call for insurrection, with the theory itself as the basis of execution. Both Guevara and Débray push focoism as an exportable insurgency theory. Two significant weaknesses of the Cuban model are that the initial violence can leave it exposed to the ruling authority forces when the insurgency is at its weakest state, and that the preparation and mobilization of the people also allow the insurgent to learn and live the situation and environment in which the insurgency will take place.

Urban Insurgent Theory

The theorists of the urban-warfare strategy are Latin Americans. They shifted their focus from the countryside to the city for a number of reasons, to include growing urbanization and the accompanying economic and social changes it brought, Moscow's *via pacifica* policy toward Latin America, and the apparent failure of rural focoism. There are two primary urban insurgency theorists, Abraham Guillén and Carlos Marighella.

Carlos Marighella was a long-time Brazilian communist who wrote the *Minimanual of the Urban Guerilla* shortly before his death in a police ambush in 1969.

In part, the *Minimanual* is more widely known than the works of Guillén due to Marighella's death and martyrdom by the political left. The *Minimanual*, though written specifically to address the situation at the time in Brazil, is in many ways a list of tactics, techniques and procedures for the urban guerilla anywhere and addresses reasonably modern concepts, such as airplane hijacking and political kidnappings for fund raising and prisoner exchange purposes. In the *Minimanual*, Marighella states that the urban guerilla "systematically inflicts damage on the authorities and on the men who dominate the country and exercise power" and that the purpose of the urban guerilla is "to distract, to wear out, to demoralize" the ruling authorities (1971, 71). Key to objectives of Marighella's urban guerilla is that the decisive culmination of the insurgency will come from the countryside. In large part, the actions of the urban guerilla are to make the ruling authorities' forces pull back from rural areas in order to protect critical infrastructure within the cities, thus allowing a rural insurgency to grow and flourish. Marighella also forwards the concept of "armed propaganda" in which the urban guerilla action "carried out with specific and determined objectives, inevitably become propaganda material for the mass communications systems" (1971, 103).

Also of note is that the urban guerilla gains popular support through two means. First, "the rebellion of the urban guerilla and his persistence in intervening in public questions is the best way of insuring public support of the cause we defend" (Marighella 1971, 111). The other method is through forcing the goverment to such repressive measures through insurgent acts that "the people refuse to collaborate with the authorities, and the general sentiment is that the government is unjust, incapable of

solving problems, and resorts purely and simply to physical liquidation of its opponents" (Marighella 1971, 111).

Having fought in the Spanish Civil War against Franco, Abraham Guillén was a Spanish exile who moved to Argentina and finally sought and was granted political asylum in Uruguay. He is acknowledged as the intellectual mentor of the Tupamoros of Uruguay, and he and his writings have had significant influence on urban insurgencies in Argentina and Brazil, as well as organizations, such as Quebec National Liberation Front, Black Panthers, and Weathermen, who were influenced by the Tupamoro organizational structure.

Guillén was a prolific author, publishing more than twenty works in all, but until the mid-1960s was known as an economic and political analyst. Starting in 1965, he published four significant works addressing urban insurgency: *The Theory of Violence* (1965), *Strategy of the Urban Guerilla* (1966), *The Challenge to the Pentagon* (1969), and *The People in Arms: Revolutionary Strategy* (1972). Like Marighella, Guillén agrees that the urban insurgency in Latin America can not stand alone but needs rural insurgency. In *Strategy of the Urban Guerilla*, he states, "Consequently, not even in those countries with a high percentage of urban population is an effective strategy possible without including the countryside." (1973, 244). However, he strongly disagrees that the rural area must be the strategic focus. In *Strategy of the Urban Guerilla* he says, "Strategically, in the case of a popular revolution in a country in which the highest percentage of the population is urban, the center of operations of the revolutionary war should be in the city" (1973, 238).

In *The People in Arms: Revolutionary Strategy* he states, "By assigning a tactical character to the urban guerillas and a strategic significance to the rural guerillas, Marighella confuses tactics and strategy, thus subordinating the principal to the secondary tasks of the revolution" (1973, 257). Another major point of Guillén's theory, is that in the urban environment mobility is the means of security until there is no danger from ruling authority forces and the insurgent force must not fasten "itself to a given space." He states that the urban insurgency must be conducted such that it "is in all parts at the same time and nowhere permanent or tied to the terrain" (1973, 234).

Strongly apparent in Guillén's work is a strong influence by Maoist theory and a general repudiation of Guevara and Débray. Guillén advocates a strategy of protracted popular urban war. In lines almost lifted directly from Mao, Guillén says, "In revolutionary war, that side wins which endures the longest: morally, politically and economically. . . . If one knows how to employ strategically the factors of time and space with the support of the population, the side that knows how to or can endure the longest will ultimately win" (1973, 233). On the need for the support of the population he says, "The guerilla will be able to endure if he can count on the support from the great majority of people . . ." (1973, 241) and "Between a favorable territory and a favorable population, the army of liberation must choose the population." (1973, 232). In regards to Guevara, Guillén believed in the efficacy of legal gains made through labor strikes and political coalitions and disagreed on the strategic focus on the rural versus urban. Additionally, he felt that the foco could become too elitist, losing the support of the population. In fact, in his assessment of the Tupamoros in *The People in Arms: Revolutionary Strategy,* Guillén accuses the Tupamoros of *foquisimo,* the exagerated reliance on guerilla focos to create

popular uprisings, and says, "It is an insurrectional movement [the foco] for piling up cadavers" (1973, 269).

Counterinsurgency Theory

The two counterinsurgent theories of relevance to this thesis are the French theory of counterinsurgency, *guerre révolutionnaire*, expounded by Roger Trinquier, and the English theory, essentially expounded by Sir Robert Thompson. There are significant differences in their focus and execution. *Guerre révolutionnaire* was viewed by its proponents as a continuous ideological struggle of life and death between the communists and free society, while the British approach had a greater focus on patience and flexibility.

Roger Trinquier was a career French military officer who served in French Indochina (Vietnam), as well as Algeria. During World War II, he remained loyal to the Vichy French government instead of joining DeGaulle and the Free French forces. This affected his military career through slow promotions, and he ended his career as only a colonel, giving him a strong animosity toward DeGaulle (Trinquier 1964, xi). He had extensive experience with the French paratroop forces and counterinsurgent operations in Indochina and was the intelligence officer for the 10th Parachute Division during the Battle of Algiers. He is considered the architect of *guerre révolutionnaire*, which he articulated in *La Guerre Moderne* (Modern War), published in 1961 after his retirement from the French Army. Trinquier draws heavily from Maoist theory in the development of *guerre révolutionnaire*, namely that the people are the goal, terrorism is a weapon of insurgency to influence the people, and "control of the masses through a tight organization . . . is the master weapon of modern warfare" (1964, 30). In *guerre*

révolutionnaire, ends are what are significant and not the means. The rules of law can be trampled in order to destroy the insurgency and preserve free society. Torture is acceptable in order to get actionable information. The *guerre révolutionnaire* concept of the continuous life and death struggle between free society and communism clearly emerges from the concluding paragraph of Trinquier's section on defining modern warfare,

> In seeking a solution it is essential to realize that in modern warfare we are not up against just a few armed bands spread across a given territory, but rather against an *armed clandestine organization* whose essential role is to impose its will upon the population. Victory will be obtained only through the complete destruction of that organization. This is the master concept that must guide us in our study of modern warfare. (1964, 8-9)

Sir Robert Thompson was a British counterinsurgency theorist who saw extensive service in Malaya and Vietnam. His book, *Defeating Communist Insurgency: Experiences from Malaya and Vietnam*, published in 1966, is an essential articulation of British counterinsurgency theory. Thompson, like Trinquier, is also influenced by Maoist insurgent theory in espousing his counterinsurgency theory. In the chapter on the basics of counterinsurgency, Thompson lays down five basic principles. The principles focus heavily upon government actions versus military actions, with the people as the focus. The principles are as follows:

> (1) The government must have a clear political aim: to establish and maintain a free, independent and united country that is politically and economically stable and viable.
> (2) The government must function in accordance with law.
> (3) The government must have an overall plan.
> (4) The government must give priority to defeating political subversion, not the guerillas.
> (5) In the guerilla phase of an insurgency, a government must secure its base areas first. (1966, 50-57)

The French and British models show significant differences, with the French ideology having the military the primary focus, while the British model, in the words of Shy and Collier, showing "their colonial traditon at its best" (Shy and Collier 1986, 854). The British view counterinsurgency as primarily a social action, with the security forces providing a secure environment in which to operate. In contrast to the French, the British see the need to generally work within the law, or to restrict civil liberties through a process approved legally to create the desired outcome, and then to return those restricted liberties. Additionally, the British generally appreciated that the insurgent forces had genuine greivances specific to their situation and were willing to negotiate for solutions short of total victory for either side, an option unavailable to the French, who viewed their coounterinsurgency efforts as a crusade against monolithic communism striving for world domination.

Summary

This chapter began with a general overview of the four modern insurgency strategies. It then addressed the insurgent theorists and their works, to include two theories of urban insurgency. The differences between the urban insurgencies were examined, as well as differences with general insurgency theories. The French and British counterinsurgency theories were discussed due to their relevance to the case studies.

CHAPTER 3

THE BATTLE OF ALGIERS

Introduction

This chapter will examine the Battle of Algiers, fought between 30 September 1956 and 8 October 1957 between the Algerian National Liberation Front (FLN) and the French. The Battle of Algiers was staged by the FLN as a deliberate provocation and test of wills to the colonial or *colon* population and French forces. The FLN was losing the military initiative in the countryside, facing executions of captured insurgents by French authorities and acts of indiscriminate terror conducted by extremist *colons*. The FLN leadership felt the need to provide a strong response so as not to lose face, raise Muslim population morale, externalize or internationalize the conflict, and advance their political goals. As a further delimitation of this study, a start date for the Battle of Algiers of 30 September 1956 will be used, which corresponds to the day the FLN began the indiscriminate bombing campaign against the French *colon* civilians, instead of the more commonly accepted start date of 7 January 1957, corresponding to the arrival of the 10th Colonial Parachute Division.

Background

The French began the occupation of Algeria in 1830, though active resistance continued until 1881. Unlike the rest of the French North African colonies, Algeria was made part of metropolitan France in 1848 (Beckett 2001a, 6), and sent elected officials to Paris. As such, Algerian nationals had the right to become citizens of the French republic, but only if they were willing to abdicate their legal rights and obligations under

Muslim law. Additionally, there was a large French colonial population (approximately one million in 1954) known as *colons* (colonists) or *pied noirs* (black feet), many of whose families had lived several generations in Algeria.

Due in part to this relationship to France, Arab nationalism in France was largely latent until the end of World War I. During the interwar years, three groups appeared. The *Fédération des Élus Musulmans d'Algérie* was a group of Algerian French educated intellectuals and former Algerian officers in the French Army, led by Fehrat Abbas, which pushed for full integration with France and political equality between native Algerians and the French (Special Operations Research Office 1962, 236). The *Étoile Nord-Africaine* (ETA), led by Messali Ahmed ben Hadj, was a movement of Algerian soldiers returning from World War I and Algerian workers who demanded economic reform and independence. A small communist party was also formed but was banned in 1929 (Asprey 1975, 2:905). In the 1930s, the Association of *Ulema's*, an orthodox Islamic religious institution, was formed; it stressed independence, opposition to French culture, and Arabic as the national language of Algeria (Special Operations Research Office 1962, 236).

Following the fall of France in 1940, Algeria was ruled by the Vichy French government, which actively persecuted the nationalist groups. The Free French government actively sought the Islamic population's support after the Allied invasion of North Africa in 1942. In response, Fehrat Abbas and other Islamic leaders presented the Algerian Manifesto, which demanded self-determination and specific agrarian reforms as the price for full participation in World War II. Charles De Gaulle made no specific promises in regards to the Algerian Manifesto but seemed sympathetic, and the Algerian

Moslem population fought on the side of the Allies. At the same time, the ETA was reconstituted as the *Parti du Peuple Algérien* (Algerian People's Party, PPA), and called for direct action as the only means of improvement.

On Victory in Europe Day (8 May 1945), in response to the arrest of Messali Hadj, the PPA instigated an uprising in Sétif, where 103 Europeans were killed (Beckett 2001b, 161). French citizens, backed by the police and the Army, retaliated massively, invading the Muslim sections of the major cities. The official French reports claimed 1,500 Muslim dead, but *Time* magazine reported 20,000 and the Algerian nationalists claimed 45,000 (Asprey 1975, 2:906). Many of the leaders of the insurgency leading to Algeria's independence became convinced that, due to the brutality of the French retaliation, violence was the only means for Algerian independence. Among these leaders was Ahmed Ben Bella, the first president of independent Algeria, who had served as a sergeant in the French Army during World War II and had been decorated for bravery,

In 1946, the outlawed PPA reconstituted as a legal political party, the *Mouvement Pour Le Triomphe des Libertés Démocratiques* (Movement for the Triumph of Democratic Liberties, MTLD). In March 1947, at the MTLD's first congress, a fissure occurred between the moderate and radical wings of the party over a policy of direct action, but the decision to create a paramilitary branch was delayed. In 1947, the French government passed the Algerian Statute, which nominally modified the existing system. An elected assembly of 120 delegates was formed, half of whom would be elected by the *colons*, which constituted about one-ninth of the population, and the other half by the native Algerians. Passage of legislation required a two-thirds majority vote, essentially giving the *colons* undisputed veto power. In reality, the governor-general maintained the

real power. Elections were held in 1948, but were rigged so that parties more moderate than the MTLD gained the majority of the native seats.

In response, in 1948 the radicals from the MTLD formed a covert, armed organization within the MTLD, the *Organization Secréte* (Secret Organization, OS), led by Ben Bella. Ben Bella built up the OS but was captured and jailed by the French in 1949. After Ben Bella's capture, the existence of the OS became known to all members of the MTLD, which split irrevocably. Following Ben Bella's escape from prison and flight to Egypt to join other exiled OS members, nine members of the OS formed the *Club de Neufs* (League of Nine), which subsequently became the *Comité Révolutionnaire Pour l'Unité et l'Action* (CRUA) in 1954. The CRUA formed an external and internal delegation. The external delegation consisted of three of the League of Nine, including Ben Bella, who remained in Cairo, worked on international awareness and supported the insurgency. The remaining six members formed the internal delegation and returned to Algeria as military commanders of districts or *willayas.* In October 1954, the internal delegation met in Algiers and set the date for the start of the insurgency for 1 November 1954

On 1 November 1954, the Catholic holiday of All Saints Day, the CRUA, numbering as many as 3,000, struck around 30 targets. The colons were staunchly Catholic, and All Saints Day was chosen for the maximum propaganda impact and an expected lack of vigilance by the police force due to the holiday. On this date, the CRUA became the *Front de Libération Nationale* (National Liberation Front, FLN) and established an insurgent army. Pamphlets were distributed throughout the country announcing that the FLN would lead the Algerian people to independence. It also offered

the French the opportunity to grant independence politically, in which case Europeans would retain their right and a special relationship would be established with France (Asprey 1975, 2:909). France, assuming that this was a minor uprising, refused to negotiate and began military actions.

The insurgency spread rapidly. The French responded with a military build up, going from 50,000 troops in 1954 to over 100,000 in 1955, and in April 1955, the French government declared a limited state of emergency. In August 1955, the Afro-Asian Bloc proposed that the United Nations (UN) examine the insurgency, and Fehrat Abbas and other Muslim moderates addressed a manifesto to the French government urging negotiation. Both of these actions had an impact on French public opinion, as well as bolstering the insurgents' morale.

In 1956, the FLN had an estimated strength of 8,500 insurgents supported by 21,000 auxiliaries (Asprey 1975, 2:916) in Algeria. The French, still needing more troops to expand their military build up, granted Morocco and Tunisia full independence and fully mobilized their reserves, establishing troop levels of 250,000 in April 1956 to over 400,000 by the fall (Asprey 1975, 2:916). However, the insurgency was facing internal dissension. Neither Fehrat Abbas nor Messali Hadj and their followers had joined the FLN. Within the FLN itself there were problems between the external and internal delegations, problems with tribalism and cohesion, and problems between the old leadership (like Ben Bella) and new leaders who had moved up due to combat losses.

In August 1956, Ramdane Abbane, a new leader challenging Ben Bella's leadership, called the Soumann Conference. Notably, the external delegation did not arrive to participate in the conference. The conference established a new governing

body, the *Conseil National De La Révoltion Algérienne* (National Council for the Algerian Revolution, CNRA), which provided wider representation to all the FLN factions; the military arm of the FLN was named the *Armée de Libération Nationale* (National Liberation Army, ALN); a regular command structure was established, as well as a coherent system of administration; and a five-man general staff, the Committee for Coordination and Execution (CCE), was created. A year later, the CCE was expanded to include the three members of the external delegation and its responsibilities were expanded to include the exercise of broad executive powers (Special Operations Research Office 1962, 252). This expansion was significantly influenced by the immediate results of the Battle of Algiers. Another significant decision made was to prepare for an urban campaign in the city of Algiers, an action to which Ben Bella was strongly opposed.

General Goals of The Revolution

The main goal of the insurgency was nationalist in nature and strove for Algerian independence and "restoration of the sovereign, democratic and social Algerian state within the framework of Islamic principles" (Special Operations Research Office 1962, 253). More specifically, the FLN called for political reorganization and removal of corruption, liquidation of the colonial state, internationalization of the conflict, affirmation of active sympathy within the UN, and "the fulfillment of North African unity within the natural Arab-Muslim framework" (Special Operations Research Office 1962, 253). However, the political aims of the FLN leadership were more an effort to establish internal legitimacy. They strove to establish themselves as the only negotiating agent for Algerian independence, to gain support of the Algerian people and influential leaders, to

drive a wedge between the French and Algerian peoples, and to force France to recognize the separateness of the Algerian nation (Special Operations Research Office 1962, 254).

National Liberation Front Key Players

The following section provides information about key players in the Battle of Algiers from the FLN.

Larbi Ben M'Hidi--the FLN political leader in Algiers. He was a member of the CCE and a key participant at the Soumann conference. He was captured on 25 February 1957 and "committed suicide" while in custody on 6 March.

Saadi Yacef--Ben M'Hidi's operational deputy or military commander. He assumed command of Algiers with the capture of Ben M'Hidi and the flight of the other CCE members from Algiers. He was the organizer of the FLN and ALN structure in Algiers and was also responsible for the militarization of the Casbah, to include hideaways, caches, and bomb factories. He reorganized the organization after the initial withdrawal of the paratroopers. He had a significant attachment to Djamila Bouhired, and the second bombing campaign was, in large part, due to her capture and death sentence. He was captured on 24 September 1957 and condemned to death three times by military tribunals in 1958. The sentences were permanently stayed by Charles DeGaulle when he became president. Yacef went on to successfully produce movies, to include *The Battle of Algiers*, which he produced and starred in, playing himself.

Ali la Pointe--Yacef's primary lieutenant. He carried out the assassination of Amédée Froger, a prominent *colon* extremist and the President of the Federation of Mayors of Algiers, the action that brought the 10th Parachute Division to Algiers. Ali la Pointe was an underworld figure in the Casbah who had been won over to the nationalist

cause while serving a jail sentence for resisting arrest. His knowledge and connections in the criminal world of Algiers made him an invaluable asset. His death on 8 October 1957 marked the last significant FLN leader at large in Algiers and ended the Battle of Algiers.

Djamila Bouhired--one of Yacef's heroines, who delivered one of the bombs on 30 September 1956 to start the Battle of Algiers. She was the primary procurer of suitable young women for insurgent action in Algiers. She was captured in April 1957 and sentenced to death in July 1957, which may have begun the second round of the bombing campaign during the Battle of Algiers. Her sentence was remitted.

French Forces of Order Key Players

The following section addresses the key players from the colonial French government of Algeria and the French Armed Forces who participated in the Battle of Algiers.

Robert Lacoste – Governor-General of Algeria. He was appointed to the position due to his political acceptance by the *colons.* He may have been directly involved in the hijacking and arrest of Ben Bella's plane in October 1956. He gave the order passing control of the city of Algiers to the 10th Parachute Division in January and in June 1957.

General Jacques Massu--Commander of the 10th Colonial Parachute Division. He was not considered to be particularly intelligent, but embraced the concept of *guerre-révoltionnaire* and gave his colonels free reign to practice it during the Battle of Algiers. The *guerre-révoltionnaire* was a counterrevolutionary doctrine that arose from the French experience and defeat in the Indochina war. The doctrine was based on the premises of a monolithic atheist communist goal of world domination, which had to be met and defeated. The movement combated revolutionary doctrine by calling for a Christian

religious revival in concert with hatred of communism. Psychological warfare in combination with social and economic reform were key elements of the doctrine. Armed forces would be reorganized to execute a primary mission of counterinsurgency. The final elements were the use of counterterror and torture. There was some disagreement and reservation among proponents of *guerre-révoltionnaire* concerning counter-terror and torture on moral, legitimacy and efficiency grounds. The strong proponents of the doctrine, such as Godard and Trinquier (discussed below), did not have these reservations and fully felt that the ends justified the means in the fight against the ultimate evil of communism.

Paul Teitgen--a hero of French resistance and Dachau survivor, having been tortured no less than nine times by the Gestapo. He was the secretary-general of the Algiers prefecture and in charge of the city police. After viewing the actions of the 10th Parachute Division, he tendered his resignation on 29 March 1957 to the governor general. His reasons for resigning were his perception that he had failed in his duties and had allowed since January the "irresponsibility which can only lead to war crimes" (Horne 1987, 204). Lacoste convinced him to withdraw his resignation, but this was merely temporary. Teitgen resigned for good in September 1957. He was one of the proponents denouncing the systematic use of torture and provided the numbers of "disappeared" Algerian detainees.

General Raoul Salan--military commander in chief in Algeria. He was the most decorated man in the French Army and had seen combat through most of his service. He had been the military commander at the time of the French withdrawal from Indo-China.

Colonel Yves Godard--Chief of Staff of the 10th Parachute Division. He was one of the strong proponents of the *guerre-révoltionnaire* school.

Colonel Roger Trinquier--intelligence officer of the 10th Parachute Division. He worked as head of the Urban Security Organization after its creation and took the lead in the 10th Parachute Division's reorganization of its intelligence elements in June 1957. He was another of the strong proponents of the *guerre-révoltionnaire* school.

Others

This section addresses French citizens whose actions or circumstances played a role in the Battle of Algiers.

Henri Alleg--French member of the Algerian communist party and editor of the communist newspaper in Algiers. He was tortured by members of the 10th Parachute Division in 1957. His book, *The Question*, published in 1958, described the techniques to which he had been subjected and provided the names of officers who had participated in his torture. The French government rapidly suppressed it. *The Question*, in conjunction with Jean Larteguy's *The Centurions* (1960) and Jean-Jacques Servan-Scheiber's *Lieutenant in Algeria* (1957), brought the fact of institutionalized torture in practice by part of the French Army to light for the French civilian population, as well as to the world at large. The fact that the French Army would torture a French citizen eroded French popular opinion for maintaining French Algeria and essentially discredited any further actions by the French Army in Algeria.

Maurice Audinp--European professor at the University of Algiers and a member of Alleg's communist cell. Audin had, in fact, collaborated with the Algerian nationalists. He disappeared under unusual circumstances in June 1957, after being

arrested by French paratroopers. His body was never found. His assumed murder also eroded French will and further discredited the Army.

Germaine Tillion--heroine of the French resistance, she survived torture and three years in the German concentration camp at Ravensbrück. She was an ethnologist who had done significant work in the Aurès, a remote region in Algeria. She reported on economic conditions in Algeria in 1954 and had been tasked to set up *centres sociaux* (social centers) to bring aid to more backward Muslim communities. In June1957, while in Algiers working on a committee investigating reports of torture, she acted as an intermediary between the French government and the FLN.

FLN Organization in Algiers

Algiers was established as an autonomous zone by the FLN. At the beginning of the Battle of Algiers there were approximately 1,200 to 1,400 ALN and 4,500 FLN operatives in Algiers. The city had a zonal council composed of four members, the political-military leader (Ben M'Hidi), a political assistant, a military assistant (Yacef) and intelligence and external liaison assistant. The zone of Algiers was broken into three regions. Each region was divided into sectors, which, in turn, were divided into districts. In all, the Zone of Algiers had ten sectors and thirty-four districts. The ALN and FLN followed the same geographical system but were compartmented from each other (Trinquier 1964, 10-12).

Both the FLN and ALN used a cellular structure. The FLN cells, as the political arm, were not functionally differentiated and generally consisted of a chief, a tax collector and a propagandist. At the group (an intermediate control level between the cell and the district), the FLN maintained armed commandos who were generally used to

maintain discipline in the Muslim population by carrying out sentences passed by the FLN judiciary (Heggoy 1972, 127). The ALN, while also cellular in nature, was also functionally differentiated, particularly in the case of bomb networks. While the basic ALN cell comprised three armed men, a bomb network could consist of cells for bomb body makers, explosive experts, transport teams, and the actual bomb setters (Trinquier 1964, 11-13).

Goals, Justification, and Events Leading to the Battle of Algiers

The primary reason that the FLN conducted the urban campaign in Algiers was that by late 1956 it had lost the military initiative to the French. The flow of supplies, particularly weapons, was being heavily interdicted both on land and sea. Now that they had adequate manpower, the French were continuing their military buildup and were using their forces more effectively, to include the implementation of the *quadrillage*, a system of population and resource control that divided areas into quadrants, manned by static outposts which were backed by mobile forces doing sweeps and cordon and search operations (Beckett 2001b, 164). This was increasingly affecting the FLN's internal mobility. Thus, the actions to increase effectiveness arising from the conference in Soumann did not lead to the improvements hoped for by the FLN and further decisive action needed to be taken.

The FLN was hoping for an impressive show of strength and victory. They were seeking a boost in morale for both the FLN and the Muslim population as a whole. They hoped to seriously weaken French administration in Algeria. The French could not survive the loss of Algiers and maintain their presence in Algeria. Since Algiers was one of the two FLN strongholds and the Army was not active in the city, the FLN thought

they would only be combating the civilian police force and, to an extent, the *colon* ultras. By the end of 1956, there were 1,400 ALN operatives organized in Algiers, to include women and youths. Additionally, the Muslim quarter of Algiers, the Casbah, had been purged of all "doubtful elements," and bomb factories, caches, and secret hiding places had been established (Horne 1987, 184).

The Soumann conference produced doctrinal objectives important for the Battle of Algiers, as well as administrative reforms. One such objective was the destruction of the colonial economy by sabotage. Another dealt with measures to destabilize the normal administration of the country and to further separate the French government from the Algerian people. Additionally, metropolitan France itself would be targeted for economic and social subversion in order to "prevent a vigorous pursuit of the war in Algeria" (Heggoy 1972, 168).

The urban campaign in Algiers also allowed the FLN leadership to pursue its political goals for legitimacy. Internationalization of the conflict was a goal and a large contingent of national and international news media was on hand. Additionally, the UN was holding discussions about the Algerian problem in early 1957 and the FLN wanted the insurgency in Algeria to be highly publicized leading up to and during those discussions. The show of strength in Algiers would lend further legitimacy to the FLN, both internally and internationally, as the sole negotiator for Algerian independence. Further, the FLN felt that the campaign in Algiers would provoke such a strong *colon* reaction so as to permanently drive in a wedge, ensuring no political compromise between the moderate Muslim population and the *colons*.

Major Events

Two major events drove the campaign in Algiers. First, the execution (by the guillotine) of captured insurgents was begun. The first executions occurred on 19 June 1956 (Horne 1987, 183). Ramdane Abane ordered immediate reprisals and vowed that one hundred French would be killed indiscriminately for every FLN member guillotined. Saadi Yacef, the military commander, was authorized to kill European males between eighteen and forty-four, but "no women, no children, no old people" (Horne 1987, 184), since earlier episodes of unconstrained violence in 1954 and 1955 (for example, Phillipeville) had brought disapproval from elements of the Muslim population. From 21 to 24 June 1956, forty-nine French civilians were assassinated (Horne 1987, 184).

The second major event was the advent of French ultras exploding bombs in the Casbah, with the most serious of these incidents occurring on 10 August 1956, at Rue de Thébes. The attack was against the house of reputed FLN terrorists who had taken part in the June reprisals. The bomb destroyed the house and three neighboring residences, causing over seventy Muslim deaths, including women and children (Horne 1987, 184). The ultras readily acknowledged their responsibility, but no European was ever arrested. The FLN needed to take action both to exact revenge and to maintain influence. This incident caused the FLN to authorize the indiscriminate use of terror tactics against the entire *colon* population, and was, in part, why the order for the preparations for the urban offensive came out of the Soumann conference. Additionally, it appeared to be the turning point of popular opinion by the Muslim population toward the acceptance of indiscriminate terror as an act of survival and retaliation.

The Battle of Algiers

The Battle of Algiers will be examined in four parts: prior to the arrival of the 10th Colonial Parachute Division (30 September 1956 to January 1957) the use of the paratroopers until their first withdrawal (January to March 1957) the pause (March to June 1957) and then the second bombing campaign, and the second deployment of the paratroopers (June 1957 to 8 October 1957).

30 September 1956 to January 1957

The Battle of Algiers began on 30 September 1956, with bombs placed in public areas (a Milk-Bar, a Cafétéria, and the Air France terminus) by three Muslim women, on the belief that attractive young women would not be searched as thoroughly and could go where Muslim men could not. Two of the three bombs detonated and caused three deaths and over fifty casualties.

On 22 October, an airplane flying to Morocco for a conference and carrying members of the external delegation, most notably Ben Bella, and members of the international press, to include a *New York Times* reporter, was hijacked and landed in Algiers. Ben Bella and others were arrested. France was castigated in the world media for this breach of international law. On 5 November, French and British paratroopers jumped into Egypt to seize the Suez Canal. Forty hours later, after a humiliating diplomatic defeat, these forces, which for the French came from the 10th Parachute division, were withdrawn. Both these acts angered the FLN, but the world reaction and French humiliation raised morale.

Violence in Algiers gathered momentum and intensity. Schools were closed in October. The *colons* began to carry arms as a general course of business. The *colons*

increased their counterterror responses to the FLN actions, causing greater distrust between them and the Muslim community. To increase this separation, Yacef ordered Ali la Pointe to assassinate Amédée Froger, the President of the Federation of Mayors of Algiers and an extremist or "ultra" mayor of a *colon* area. The assassination was conducted on 28 December. The funeral was the following day and a bomb was set off at the cemetery. The *colons* retaliated violently, killing four Muslims and injuring fifty more. The assassination and the retaliatory mob violence were what brought about the decision to hand control of Algiers to the 10th Parachute Division. For the first time since the insurgency began in 1954, the French Army would be allowed to go head to head against the FLN in an unconstrained environment and in a situation that had to end in a clear defeat for one side.

January to March 1957

On 7 January 1957, Generals Salan and Massu met with Robert Lacoste. Lacoste explained that the 1,500 city police could no longer control the situation. Massu was granted full police powers and responsibility for maintenance of order in Algiers.

The division began deployment to Algiers the following week. The city was divided into four regions and each regiment in the division was given a region. A census was conducted to identify and classify all people in Algiers. As part of the census, everyone was issued an identification card, which had a person's name, address, occupation and place of business (Special Operations Research Office 1962, 258). The 3rd Colonial Parachute Regiment drew the region that included the Casbah and subsequently sealed it off from the rest of the city with gates and checkpoints. Additionally, random patrols and searches (called *ratissages* or raking operations) were

conducted in the Casbah itself. Of note, even though the Casbah was isolated, it never became a "no-go" area for the French either by choice to stay out or through the FLN to keep them out.

The night before the paratroopers entered Algiers, an armed element from the 11th Shock, a unit formed and commanded previously by Colonel Goddard, arrived at the police (Sûreté) headquarters and demanded all the police files on suspected insurgents. The police handed them over. The files were rapidly scrutinized and lists of personnel were provided to each regiment for summary arrest, but without warrants or other judicial impediments. These lists led to a massive number of arrests in the first days of the paratroopers' arrival, with many of the arrested facing "strong" interrogation methods.

The *Dispositif de Protection Urbaine* (Urban Security Service, DPU) was established by the order of Robert LaCoste. Trinquier was given the command of this new unit. It was here that Trinquier exercised the *îlot*, island, concept, a system of collective responsibility, where the city was subdivided down to individual buildings with responsible individuals reporting on and being responsible for the activities in their sectors. The system brought in great amounts of intelligence and was directly responsible for the capture of Ben M'Hidi.

On 26 January 1957, Yacef launched another round of bombings. Three targets were hit (all food serving businesses) on that Saturday, causing five dead and another sixty casualties. Two weeks later, two bombs were detonated in Algiers stadiums, resulting in ten dead and forty-five wounded. Females, the youngest being sixteen, placed all five bombs. A waiter was able to substantiate that one of the bombers was a female and provide an accurate description of her. Women leaving the Casbah were now

subject to thorough searches. Additionally, the French made a concerted effort to go after Yacef's bomb network.

The FLN called for an eight-day general strike starting on 28 January 1957, coinciding with the opening of the UN discussion on the Algerian question. Realizing that such a long strike was a terrible risk, the CCE, nevertheless, felt it was essential in order to indisputably show the world that the FLN represented and had the right to negotiate for the Algerian people. The CCE underestimated the strength of the French response while overestimating FLN will and strength. Lacoste ordered Massu to break the strike at all costs. The strike was initially thought to be a success until Massu released his division. Shops were broken open. Looting was encouraged in order to force out shop owners to protect their goods. Once shop owners arrived they were threatened with imprisonment if they did not stay open. Sweeps were done through the Casbah and workers were loaded onto trucks and taken to their place of employment (based on the information on their identification cards). The paratroopers also acted as truant agents, rounding up children and forcibly taking them to school. Within forty-eight hours, the French had broken the strike, with little indication anything had been gained on the international scene.

The effectiveness of the French counterinsurgency effort was beginning to be felt. Ben M'Hidi had not been identified as the top man in Algiers, but Yacef had been identified by several sources. The organization that Yacef had built had begun to disintegrate and was being squeezed back almost exclusively into the Casbah. After raids on 19 February, his bomb network was essentially completely gone. On 15 February, the CCE met and decided to leave Algiers (for Tunis) in ten days, thus allowing time to

reorganize the Algiers command structure. On 25 February, Ben M'Hidi was captured (by accident), and by 6 March he had died under mysterious circumstances. Yacef was given charge of Algiers. In late March, the French claimed that they had captured 182 operatives, 160 cell chiefs and 232 fund collectors (Heggoy 1972, 238). There were no bombs set off in March, the first time since September 1956 that there had been an entire month without incident. At the end of the month Algiers was returned to civilian control and the paratroopers redeployed.

However, the methods used by the 10th Parachute Division, exposed in press reports, were beginning to draw national and international criticism. The suspicious nature of the deaths of Ben M'Hidi and of Ali Boumendjel, a young respected Muslim lawyer, was being questioned. There were also breaks in the French officer ranks, with a general officer requesting to be reassigned from Algeria. Upon his return to metropolitan France, he published a letter questioning the wisdom of using the paratroop division for police duty and criticizing the use of torture. At the same time, Paul Teitgen submitted his resignation to Robert Lacoste.

March to June 1957

Following the withdrawal of the paratroopers there was a lull in the Battle of Algiers. Yacef used this time to reconstitute his networks, particularly in the bomb arena. In spite of the reconstitution, the FLN was steadily being attacked and was losing ground in Algiers. In April, Djamina Bouhired was arrested and attempts were made to free her. In May, two paratroopers were assassinated in the outskirts of Algiers. In retaliation, a group of paratroopers, led by a DPU informer, went to an alleged FLN hideout (a Turkish bath) and indiscriminately killed everyone there. Eighty Muslims were killed and no

paratroopers were ever brought to justice. To avenge the Turkish bath incident and to try to stop the FLN's slide, Yacef decided to open another bombing campaign in June 1957.

June 1957 to 8 October 1957

On 3 June 1957 a new bombing campaign began when four bombs, set to explode during rush hour, were placed in bus stops in the city center. This was the first and only time Yacef indiscriminately targeted Muslims, as well as *colons.* Eight people were killed, over sixty were wounded, and the casualties were close to equal distribution between the Muslims and *colons*. In this incident, a number of school children were killed, and the outcry of the Muslim population over the children and Muslim casualties turned Yacef back to *colon* targets to insure Muslim popular support.

On Sunday, 9 June 1957, a powerful bomb exploded in the Casino, a popular *colon* gambling establishment and nightclub. The bomb had been placed under the bandstand, and caused extensive wounding to the lower portion of the victims' bodies. There were nine dead and eighty-five wounded, nearly half of them women. The victims were buried on Tuesday, and the *colons* began a more violent riot than was previously exhibited. A spontaneous strike closed many of the European shops in Algiers, and then a *colon* mob began a rampage through the Muslim areas. The violence was made worse by the failure of the police and paratroopers to suppress it. The mob was finally dispersed when Colonel Trinquier, with a French flag and his jeep, directed the mob to the city center, where General Salan made an impassioned plea for them to disperse and led them in singing the French national anthem. The mob, estimated to be at least 10,000 people, did disperse. The end result was five Muslim dead, fifty injured, one hundred

Muslim shops sacked, and twenty cars burned. Following this incident, Lacoste turned the city back over to the control of the 10th Parachute Division.

Massu decided that this time they would crush the insurgents once and for all in Algiers. The techniques used in the initial deployment were implemented but with greater aggression (Beckett 1985, 64). In July 1957, the 10th Parachute Division's intelligence section was reorganized as the Interservice Coordinating Center, CCI, and the *Dispotif* (or *Détachement*) *Opérationel de Protection* (Operational Security Organization, DOP). The DOP consisted of the interrogation specialists and, as such, institutionalized torture.

In June 1957, two incidents involving torture and Europeans occurred. Henri Alleg was held and subjected to torture for a month. Maurice Audin mysteriously disappeared while in custody of the paratroopers. Both these incidents shocked the French public. Based on the renewed campaign of the paratroopers, Paul Teitgen resigned for good in September, citing the excesses of the paratroopers, and claimed that at least 3,000 (of 24,000) detainees had died or been killed in custody.

On 2 July Yacef made contact with Germaine Tillion, the female ethnologist who had earlier established the *centres sociaux* and had returned to Algeria as part of an official commission to investigate allegations of torture by French forces. The following day a clandestine meeting was held between Tillion and Yacef. Yacef wanted a deal with the French government, according to which he would stop the bombing campaign if the French would stop executing Algerian insurgents. Additionally, Yacef renounced any future bombing attacks on the civilian population. Tillion returned to Paris to present the deal to the prime minister, and also saw DeGaulle to entreat him to personally intervene.

While Tillion was in Paris, Djamila Bouhired was sentenced to death and Yacef announced that he would destroy entire city quarters if the sentence was carried out. Ten bombs were detonated between her sentencing and Tillion's return on 20 July, but there were no civilian casualties. Tillion was authorized to establish further talks with Yacef, but only in an unofficial capacity. Upon her return to Algiers, Tillion was informed that executions would not be stayed to facilitate her discussions and three executions would be conducted on 25 July. In response to the executions, eight more bombs exploded, again without civilian casualties. Tillion met with Yacef one more time, but with the French government refusing to call off executions, she realized it was futile. She returned to Paris on 16 August, the date of the next scheduled executions.

The counterinsurgent force was rapidly closing in on the remaining elements of Yacef's networks. On 26 August, Yacef's new chief of the bomb network and his military deputy were killed in a raid. The intelligence that launched the raid was due to Trinquier's Urban Security Service. By mid-September, Yacef ordered the zone headquarters to split up. On 24 September, Yacef surrendered after being cornered during a raid. With Yacef's capture, Ali la Pointe was the last important FLN leader at large in Algiers. On 8 October 1957 he was trapped in a hideout in a house in the Casbah by French forces. He refused to surrender and the French paratroopers prepared a breaching charge to enter the hideout. The hideout was also a bomb cache, which sympathetically detonated, destroying the house and collapsing surrounding residences. In addition to Ali la Pointe and his two companions, seventeen other Muslims died, to include four children, and four paratroopers were injured by the blast effect. The death of Ali la Pointe ended the Battle of Algiers.

Outcomes and Analysis

The outcome of the Battle of Algiers for the FLN was a severe tactical defeat that, nevertheless, laid the groundwork for a strategic victory. The FLN never regained the military initiative after Algiers and was never able or willing to significantly challenge the French again militarily. The immediate effect of the defeat was a severe loss of face for the FLN, causing a drop in morale and some defections from the ranks. Additionally, the non-committed Algerians, while not going over to the French, were showing less support for the FLN and began to show indications of tiring of the war.

Diplomatic, Informational, Military and Economic Analysis

Strategically, a number of positive aspects emerged for the FLN. First, the executive body of the FLN, the CCE, was forced from Algiers to the sanctuary of Tunis. This move allowed the CCE to effectively communicate and plan as an executive body since they were largely removed from the security constraints and need for survival that was found in Algiers. Second, the FLN reevaluated its strategy and concluded that independence could not be won militarily and focused on endurance within Algeria and political victory in the international arena. Third, the Battle of Algiers caused a level of internationalization of the conflict not conceived by the FLN previously. World public opinion turned against the French. Finally, the effects of the actions by the 10th Parachute Division produced a series of unintended consequences that helped the FLN to achieve its political goals. The Algerian moderates aligned with the FLN, essentially making the FLN the sovereign negotiating agent for Algerian independence, with Fehrat Abbas becoming a member of the CCE in 1958. The colonial economy and normal administration were severely and permanently disrupted. A permanent division was

created between the French military and civilian authority, essentially discrediting all future military action. Additionally, French public opinion was shocked and permanently shifted toward favoring a settlement leading to independence. The FLN also created a non-reconcilable rift between the *colons* and the Muslim Algerians, preventing any political compromise short of complete independence. Thus, the catalyst of the Battle of Algiers produced the final victory of Algerian independence for the FLN.

Exploitation of Advantages and Sufferance of Disadvantages

The examination of the use of advantages by the insurgents, the disadvantages used effectively against them, and the appropriate conditions or situations in which they applied will assist in establishing their validity in a modern context and in part help to address the feasibility of modern urban insurgency. The FLN exploited a number of advantages and suffered disadvantages relating to urban insurgency during the Battle of Algiers. Some advantages shifted in effectiveness during the course of the battle. Additionally, both the insurgent and counterinsurgent exploited some situations, either turning them to their own advantage or turning them to their opponent's disadvantage. Of note, while the duration of the Battle of Algiers is the shortest of the three case studies examined, many of the advantages and disadvantages discussed below were exploited or suffered by both the Irish Republican Army and the Tupamoros.

Effective Use of Nontraditional, Nonprofile Combatants

The FLN effectively used nontraditional, nonprofile combatants during the Battle of Algiers. Children were used as illustrated by the use of Petit Omar, a twelve-year-old courier, who was killed with Ali La Pointe. Surprisingly for an Islamic society, this

advantage was most effectively exploited through the use of attractive young women, usually in Western attire. This played on the traditional male dominance of Islamic society that includes the seclusion of women. It also led to Saadi Yacef clearly recognizing this nuance, having Djamila Bouhired identify and recruit suitable women (Horne 1987, 185). Women delivered all the bombs that began the Battle of Algiers and for the bombings immediately preceding the general strike. However, this advantage decreased in effectiveness following the pre-strike bombings, when testimony indicated that at least one bomb had been delivered by a woman. Once the French recognized that women, such as Djamila Bouhired, were playing a major role in the insurgency, women lost some of their freedom of action and began to be subjected to more substantial searches.

The use of women in Algeria was not completely without difficulty. More traditionalist male insurgents viewed the use women with mistrust. The use of women in the insurgency also led to a rising female expectation of emancipation following independence, an expectation yet to be fully met. As Alistair Horne says, "The emancipation of women lagged behind the promises of the war years, with the equality they had come to enjoy then forgotten in peace" (Horne 1987, 559).

Discriminate Targeting

The FLN successfully used discriminate targeting to it advantage. The consolidation soft targets (nonmilitary or forces of order) in the urban setting facilitated this advantage. Examples of discriminate targeting include the assassination of Amédée Froger, a prominent extremist *colon* and the President of the Federation of Mayors of Algiers, and the Casino bombing. The FLN was able to effectively reduce inflicting

Muslim causalities in its attacks, while striking at targets of economic, cultural or political significance to the *colons* and French forces. These actions had the dual effect of maintaining Muslim popular support and raising Muslim morale. Discriminate targeting also assisted in achieving political goals, especially the polarization of the society as addressed below. Indiscriminate targeting was used at the opening of the second bombing campaign in June 1957, but was rapidly dropped as a technique due to a backlash from the Muslim population.

The Mobilization of Public Demonstrations

The ability to mobilize public demonstrations was minimally exploited for advantage during the Battle of Algiers (but was used more effectively later in the insurgency, particularly in 1960). This relative lack of advantage came not from the invalidity of the concept but through its misapplication through miscalculation. The specific example during the Battle of Algiers was the general strike starting on 28 January 1957 and scheduled to last eight days, corresponding to the address of the Algerian Issue at the UN. The strike was organized as a massive show of support for the FLN and was a direct challenge to French authority and legitimacy. Conceptually, the strike was an excellent idea, but practically the FLN overestimated its ability to last the eight days and underestimated the French reaction. The French, through the use of coercive force, were able to break the strike by the end of the second day. The FLN had accomplished its essential objectives, to include the show of solidarity, the challenge of authority, the provocation of the authorities to excess, and extensive media coverage, by the time the strike was broken. A shorter strike, lasting two or three days, would have

been virtually impossible to break. However, the FLN suffered a tactical defeat due to its inability to sustain the strike for the stated the full eight days.

Polarization of Society

The FLN actively strove to create a polarization of Algerian society between the native Algerians and French. They recognized that the use of discriminate targeting, particularly of soft targets, would further accelerate a rise of anti-Muslim counterterror organizations and acts. Acts of counterterror and extralegal excesses by the authorities were skillfully manipulated and publicized to impact both previously moderate Algerians and the population of Metropolitan France. This, in part, provided justification for the FLN's acts in order to maintain popular support, ended possibilities of negotiated settlements short of independence, and created legitimacy to the FLN's claims to sovereignty as the sole negotiating agent for Algeria's independence.

The Establishment of Insurgent Influenced Areas

The FLN created an area significantly influenced by the insurgents in the Casbah. Ideally, such an area would be controlled by the insurgents, but the FLN was never able to significantly hamper French movement and operations there. The FLN, under the guidance of Saadi Yacef, militarized the Casbah, setting up the base of operations for the Battle of Algiers, to include bomb-making factories, arms and munitions caches, and hideaways. The FLN achieved several other advantages from this action. First, in light of counterterror acts and French operations, the FLN was able to portray itself as the protector of the Muslim population, in turn leading to increased public support. Second, it was able to set up a parallel governing authority, which allowed it greater control of the

Muslim population, if necessary through coercive intimidation, and gave it the ability to purge undesirable elements from the population. Third, due to increased popular support as well as control, it facilitated recruitment.

Security Requirements for Urban Insurgency

The security requirements brought about by conducting an urban campaign were a disadvantage for the FLN. First, the use of the cellular structure facilitated internal security but mandated lesser centralized control of operations and complicated communications. Additionally, the urban environment prohibited the rise of a "folk hero" leader, directly in control of operations, though to some part the imprisoned Ben Bella was able to assume that role. The inability of the FLN to establish a controlled area required that the insurgency leadership keep almost constantly on the move for security reasons. Saadi Yacef moved at least fifteen times on the opening day of the General Strike and Ben M'Hidi was captured entirely by accident when French forces, acting on dated intelligence but looking for a lesser FLN figure, raided the house he had just moved to (Horne 1987, 194). These constant moves further inhibited effective command and control. Security requirements also limited the overall possible size of the insurgent forces.

The Use of Extralegal Techniques

In *Modern Warfare*, Roger Trinquier quotes the chief of the Algiers FLN in 1957, following the arrival of the 10th Parachute Division, as saying, "We are no longer protected by legality. We ask all our friends to do the impossible to have legality re-established; otherwise we are lost" (1964, 47). The FLN suffered tremendously from the

extralegal activities of the French forces. First, French military forces seized the Algiers police files. They subsequently used them to do a massive round up of possible suspects, who were arrested without charges and interned indefinitely without trial. These suspects were interrogated and many were tortured for information about insurgent activities, personnel and organization. Searches were conducted without warrant. Trials were conducted by military tribunal, with death sentences handed down and executed. Additional losses of civil liberties were applied exclusively to the Muslim population through various manners of population and resource controls. The sum of these activities severely curtailed the FLN's freedom of action and eventually broke the security of their cellular organization.

The Effects Created by the Counterinsurgents

From a strictly military viewpoint, the 10th Parachute Division executed an enormously successful tactical counterinsurgency campaign. It met all its objectives and restored order and completely destroyed the FLN operatives and infrastructure in Algiers. Politically, however, the campaign was a disaster, as shown above. Additionally, it further exacerbated the growing split between the civilian government and the professional military and sped up the politicization of the professional French Army. The results led directly to the overthrow of the Fourth Republic in May 1958, which returned Charles DeGaulle to the presidency and set France irrevocably on the path to granting Algerian independence, the paratroopers coup attempt in 1961 (Beckett 2001b, 167), and the formation of the Organisation Armée Secrète (OAS), which terrorized Muslims and French favoring withdrawal from Algeria, as well as attempted to assassinate then President DeGaulle (Horne 1987, 543).

Long Term Outcome

In October 1958, DeGaulle announced the Constantine Plan, a program of reform for Algeria, and shortly after offered the FLN amnesty. In September 1959, he made his self-determination speech, which promised that within four years after peace, Algeria could fully integrate with France, become a member of the French Union or achieve total independence, less the oil producing Sahara region. DeGaulle began negotiations with the FLN in April 1961, and in March 1962 Algerian independence was agreed to between the FLN and the French government. Algeria became independent on 3 July 1962. The war cost 35,000 French dead, with an additional 3,663 non-French European dead. On the Algerian side, FLN casualties are estimated between 158,000 and 600,000 dead, with at least an additional 30,000 dead among Algerians killed by the FLN (Beckett 2001a, 7; Asprey 1994, 679).

Ben Bella became the first President of independent Algeria, but was ousted in 1965 due to an inefficient and corrupt government. He was jailed from 1965 until 1978. Houari Boumedienne, Ben Bella's defense minister, ruled Algeria as a military dictatorship until his death in 1978, and laid the groundwork for the political stability and relative economic prosperity from oil that lasted into the 1980s. Falling oil prices led to economic and social difficulties in the late 1980s, which, in turn, led to a rise in Islamic fundamentalism and the belief that Algeria should become an Islamic republic ruled in strict adherence to Muslim law. In 1991, the Islamic Salvation Front (FIS), a political party representing the Islamic fundamentalists, won the majority of the contested seats in the Algerian legislature. However, the army cancelled the elections in 1992 and repealed

the results of the 1991 election, starting a terrorist campaign by the FIS that has resulted in over 75,000 deaths to date (Beckett 2001a, 7; Asprey 1994, 680-682).

Following Algerian independence, DeGaulle led France on an unrivalled economic revival (on the scale on West Germany's recovery in 1945) and assimilated over a million *colons* into the mainstream of metropolitan France. In 1968, a general amnesty was granted for all Frenchmen convicted for acts committed during the war. France continues to have a large Algerian worker population. They are largely illiterate and are poorly treated. Occasional incidents of violence flare up between these workers and French society.

Conclusion

The Battle of Algiers created the conditions that led eventually to FLN victory and Algerian independence. The battle was a significant military tactical defeat for the FLN and showed that Algerian independence would not be gained through the military defeat of French forces. It forced the flight of the FLN executive committee (CCE) to Tunis and caused its reorganization. However, the reorganization of the CCE created a command structure of greater representation and the reformulation of strategy that led to Algerian independence. The Battle of Algiers brought the Algerian question into the forefront of international consideration, leading to considerable condemnation of the French government in the international arena. The skillful use of the media by the FLN strongly affected the public opinion within Metropolitan France and brought about the decay of continued support for continued counterinsurgency operations and the idea of French Algeria. The proscription of the military and the government of the Fourth Republic by the French population caused by the reports of military extralegal activities

during the Battle of Algiers was the significant cause of the fall of the Fourth Republic and the return of Charles DeGaulle to power in the Fifth Republic.

CHAPTER 4

THE TUPAMOROS OF URUGUAY

Introduction

This chapter will examine the *Moviemiento de Liberación Nacional* (MLN, National Liberation Movement, Tupamoros) urban insurgency campaign that was conducted in Montevideo, Uruguay, from 1963 to 1972. It took its popular name, Tupamoros, from an Incan, Tupac Amaru, who was executed after leading a revolt against Spanish colonial rule in 1728. This insurgency rose primarily over failing economic conditions and needed political reform. Significantly, in terms of this study, this is the best case study addressing modern urban insurgency. The insurgency was conducted against its own democratic government (versus a nationalist campaign against a colonial power) and within a homogenous, modern, and fully urbanized society. Uruguay's population ran to almost 80 percent urban inhabitants and its capital, Montevideo, was a city of 1.5 million people, half the total population of the country (Porzecanski 1973, x). The Tupamoros were strongly influenced by the writings on urban insurgency by Abraham Guillén, who also acted as their adviser. The Tupamoros conducted a protracted campaign, lasting ten years, gained a large amount of popular support, essentially destroyed the legitimacy of the legally constituted government, and viably presented itself as capable of seizing power. Their rapid and ultimate destruction in 1972 was caused by two critical policy mistakes: involving the military directly in the counterinsurgency campaign and failing to establish a fallback position either militarily or, more importantly, through a viable, broad-based, ideologically committed political movement to exploit the popular support generated by their urban campaign.

Background

Unlike the majority of Latin American nations at the time, Uruguay was a successful democratic society. In the early twentieth century, Uruguay went through a bloodless social revolution, led by President José Batlle y Ordoñez. Batlle established nationalized industries in key economic sectors, instituted labor reforms, such as the eight-hour work day, unemployment benefits, pensions and paid holidays, broke the power of the Roman Catholic church, legalized divorce, abolished capital punishment, established a free university system, and established taxes on property and capital gains (Moss 1972, 210).

Until the 1950s, Uruguay was economically prosperous and developing, based primarily on agricultural exports, such as wheat, beef and wool. The Uruguayan state had developed a welfare system based on its prosperity, which created a large governmental bureaucracy, but also provided a social security pension system and free medical care, in addition to free education. Following the Korean War, the world wool market collapsed and Uruguay's economy went into stagnation and contraction, with its gross national product declining from 1954 onwards, and inflation and unemployment drastically increasing. The standard of living declined, and the government bureaucracy, accounting for an estimated 20 percent of the entire work population during the 1960s, became more inefficient and corrupt. (Godfrey 1985, 125). The economic conditions set off a series of strikes and disturbances from which the Tupamoro movement emerged.

General Goals of The Revolution

The Tupamoros have been frequently accused of lacking a coherent ideological goal base for their urban insurgency. While this is not entirely factual, the Tupamoros

were sensitive about releasing ideological statements. The primary goal of the Tupamoros was not to take charge of the Uruguayan government, but instead to create the conditions in which a mass movement would overthrow the government with Tupamoro participation. Since the MLN did not feel the current political party system was appropriate to revolutionary change, the primary goal may be stated as "uniting all groups in the struggle . . . 'with or without a party'" (Miller 1980, 149). The Tupamoros saw the urban insurgency as a means to destroy the government's security forces in order to allow the political struggle, in which there would a mass popular uprising, to overthrow the government (Porzecanski 1974, 14-15). In a document captured in 1972, the Tupamoros stated their goals as follows,

> The MLN's minimum objective was said to create an undeniable state of revolutionary war inside Uruguay, polarizing politics (between the Tupamoro movement and the oligarchy). The medium objective would be (to) create a Frente de Liberacion Nacional (National Liberation Front), which would negotiate a series of minimum demands backed by both mass organizations (trade unions, etc.) and by the Tupamoros. This would have the effect of institutionalizing the guerilla movement. The maximum objective would be to bring the government to the point of collapse with the subsequent installation of a coalition government in which the MLN would have "indirect participation." (Miller 1980, 152)

Tupamoros Key Players

The following section provides information on key individuals in the Tupamoros organization.

Raúl Sendic Antonaccio--Founder of the MLN, known more popularly as the Tupamoros, in 1962-1963. A former law student and Uruguayan Socialist Party member, Sendic served as a labor organizer and agitator in northern Uruguay from 1960 to 1962. He was imprisoned in 1970 and escaped in 1971, and reimprisoned in 1972. He was

pardoned and released in 1985, and died in 1989, reportedly from the long-term effects of torture he suffered while in prison.

Hector Amodio Perez--A member of the Executive Committee, he was captured on 2 February 1972 (Gilio 1972, 201). Perez reportedly assisted the authorities in destroying the Tupamoro organization following his capture. The security forces were extremely effective due to Perez's significant knowledge of the Tupamoro organization because of the high level of access he had as an Executive Committee member.

Uruguayan Forces of Order Key Players

This section provides information on the key players from the Uruguayan government and forces of order.

Jorge Pacheco Areco--became president in 1967. Pacheco's presidency was shaken by scandals, resignations, increasing economic decline, and rising Tupamoro violence. He declared a state of emergency in 1968, and continued to push for restrictions on civil liberties for security reasons. Juan Maria Bordaberry (see below) was his hand picked successor.

Juan Maria Bordaberry--elected president of Uruguay in 1971 and took office in March 1972. He declared a state of internal war in April 1972, which allowed the unrestricted use of the military in the counterinsurgency campaign. Bordaberry remained president following the military soft coup or *auto-golpe* in 1973 until his removal in 1976.

Ernesto Motta--Naval Captain. Motta, a counterintelligence officer, was the first military officer killed by the Tupamoros (1972). He was the driver for a senior police officer who was a principal interrogator of the Tupamoros, and was the primary target.

Others

This section provides information on internationals and Uruguayan citizens whose circumstances had an impact on the Tupamoro campaign.

Dan Mitrione--U.S. Central Intelligence Agency operative working under US Agency for International Development (USAID) cover to train Uruguayan police in counterinsurgency tactics and techniques. Mitrone was kidnapped and killed in 1970, after being held for an extensive time in a "People's Prison." This resulted in significant loss of popular support from the largely Catholic Uruguayan population since he was a Catholic with nine children.

Tupamoro Organization

The Tupamoros established a complex, but flexible and somewhat decentralized, compartmentalized, hierarchical organization, based on a cellular structure. Organizationally, the Tupamoros consisted of the cell, the column, the Executive Committee, and the National Convention. The cells consisted of two to eight members, with the leader normally appointed by the Executive Committee. Cells were functionally differentiated as action or support cells. The true identities of the cell members were hidden from each other and only the cell leader conducted upward communication. Cells were encouraged to act in a decentralized manner by creating their own intelligence and propaganda systems, and communications were minimized. Columns were composed of several cells and were either geographically or functionally organized. Columns were strictly an administrative level in the hierarchy. Functionally, columns might have a medical or supply mission, for example. The Executive Committee provided the operational and daily leadership for the Tupamoros, and the National

Convention, the highest ruling body, consisted of representation from all units (Porzecanski 1974, 32-37). The National Committee, which met at least twice (1966 and 1968), was charged with appointing the Executive Committee and establishing long-range policy (Porzecanski 1974, 34).

The Tupamoros organization was generally broad based, consisting of approximately one-third educated professional workers, one-third students and one-third blue-collar workers. Additionally, women comprised at least 25 percent of the organization (Porzecanski 1974, 37). The movement did not recruit minors and the average age of the insurgents was in the thirties (Porzecanski 1974, 31).

Goals, Justification and Events Leading to Uruguayan Insurgency

The primary reasons that the Tupamoros launched their campaign was failing economic conditions and the perceived need for political reform, neither of which was being adequately addressed by the government. Additionally, they felt that the necessary changes could not occur through the existing political system and, therefore, required revolutionary change. Their immediate objectives were:

> To constitute as rapidly as possible an armed force capable of meeting any favorable situation. To make the people aware that without revolution, there will be no change. To strengthen unions, radicalize their struggles, and bring then closer to the revolutionary movement. To establish the material bases for the development of the urban and rural struggle. To establish relations with other Latin American revolutionary movements for action on the continental level. (Miller 1980, 150)

They wanted to establish a power duality, the condition in which a revolutionary movement represents “a real threat to the status quo” and commands “loyalty and adherence from significant sectors of the population,” since this would allow them to form a shadow government (Porzecanski 1974, 17). Additionally, in keeping with

Guillén's writings, their goal was for their armed actions to provoke increasingly repressive responses from the security forces that would become unbearable to the people and culminate in a mass uprising.

Major Events

In 1960, Raúl Sendic, a law student and Uruguayan Socialist Party member, moved to the north of the country to organize agricultural workers. Sendic organized the militant Artigas Sugar Workers Union, which successfully campaigned to enforce previously ignored labor protection laws (Miller 1980, 138). In 1962, Sendic organized a march from the north of Uruguay to the presidential palace, with the aim of land reform to redistribute privately owned but abandoned agricultural land. The march, known as "the march of the hairy ones" due to its agricultural worker make-up, was conducted on 1 May 1962, using the slogan "*Por la tierra y con Sendic* (For land and with Sendic)" (Moss 1972, 214). The march degenerated into a riot at the presidential palace and was brutally dispersed by Uruguayan soldiers. Sendic was jailed for several days. The march failed to secure the desired land reforms, but became an annual event during the period under study.

From Sendic's experiences with labor agitation in the north and the failure of the march, he determined that for change to occur an insurgent organization was needed and that it must be based in Montevideo. Thus, the MLN was formed in late 1962 and early 1963. Its more common moniker, the Tupamoros, came from an Incan, Tupac Amaru, who was burned at the stake after leading an unsuccessful revolt against Spanish colonial rule in 1728. It chose for its symbol a five-pointed red star.

The Tupamoro Campaign

1963 to 1967

The Tupamoro movement began to clandestinely develop its organization and conduct limited actions between 1963 and 1968. On 31 July 1963, Sendic led the first Tupamoro attack, a raid of a private shooting club for arms, which netted the MLN thirty-three guns (Miller 1980, 139). He was identified by the police and fled to Argentina, returning in 1964 (Moss 1972, 215-216). From the beginning of the movement, the Tupamoros recognized the need for public support and strove to develop a favorable popular image. On Christmas Eve, 1963, the Tupamoros hijacked a food truck and distributed the food in the poor district of Montevideo. They continued to conduct "Robin Hood" actions during this time, such as robbing banks and distributing the money to the poor, garnering considerable popular support. They also acted as an instigational force during strikes and other popular unrests during this time.

The movement developed rapidly, with an estimated 500 guerillas and over 5,000 supporters by 1965 (Asprey 1974, 1073). In 1965, the name Tupamoro became public, as well as their red star emblem, when they bombed the Montevideo Bayer Chemical plant in protest against the Vietnam War (Moss 1972, 216). In December 1966, the first Tupamoro and the first policeman killed in the insurgency died in separate shootouts. The MLN conducted small-scale raids to gain weapons and funds, and these incidents began to increase substantially in 1967. At the end of 1967, the Tupamoros released a statement that claimed change in Uruguay required armed struggle and that they were going to fight.

1968 to 1971

In 1968, the Tupamoros went on the offensive and began to actively and often imaginatively conduct operations, with an estimated 1000 insurgents. The operations were classified by the Tupamoros as:

> (i) 'propaganda' exercises designed to discredit the government or to fashion a popular image of the MLN
> (ii) logistic operations designed to bring in money or arms; and
> (iii) frontal assault on the government and the forces at it disposal by sabotage, selective assassination and so on. (Moss 1972, 223)

A noninclusive list of operations conducted included political kidnapping, for which the Tupamoros became famous, robberies, intimidation, persuasion and embarrassment of security forces, prison breakouts, and large-scale raids.

In response to the rising wave of insurgent attacks, President Pacheco declared a state of emergency in June 1968, lasting until March 1969, that for security reasons restricted civil liberties. As part of the restrictions, strict censorship was imposed, to include banning the use of the word Tupamoro in the media. The press began to address them as "the nameless ones."

The Tupamoros instituted a campaign in order to distribute their propaganda. They ran a pirate radio station from a mobile transmitter until it was captured in 1970 (Moss 1972, 224). They seized control of radio stations and broadcast their information. They mass printed leaflets and distributed them in public places. They also took over theaters and businesses, where they would distribute leaflets and give lectures to their "captive" audiences (Porzecanski 1974, 43).

The Pacheco government continued to be assailed by scandals, economic woes, and Tupamoro aggression. Major struggles between the legislature and the president occurred over the suspension of civil rights. In August 1970, in response to the Mitrione assassination, all individual liberties were suspend for twenty days, followed by another complete suspension for forty days in early 1971. This situation was exasperated when a Uruguayan Senate report disclosed the widespread use of torture by the police force against Tupamoros (Miller 1980, 158). The situation became so bad that the legislature attempted to impeach Pacheco in June 1971 over the abuse of civil liberties (Miller 1980, 156).

Kidnapping

The Tupamoros conducted their first major kidnapping in July 1968. Their target, Ulises Pereyra Reverbel, whom they held for five days, was the head of the government power and telephone utility and a close personal friend of Pacheco (Miller 1980, 156). The Montevideo police force was tasked to recover him but failed. Due to their failure, the police conducted a massive search operation on the campus of the National University, where they believed Tupamoros to be hiding, and provoked a student riot in which a student was killed, creating a MLN martyr (Moss 1972, 227). The Tupamoros exploited the failure of the police and the death of the student for their maximum propaganda value.

The MLN continued Uruguayan kidnappings in 1969, and in 1970 began kidnapping international figures. In July 1970, the Brazilian consul and USAID representative Dan Mitrione were kidnapped, followed by another American in August. The Brazilian consul was held for ten months in the “Peoples Prison” before being

released for ransom (Miller 1980, 156). The Tupamoros attempted to use Mitrione as a bargaining tool to force the government to release captured MLN personnel. The Pacheco government was divided on how to respond, but Pacheco refused to negotiate, and to prove its seriousness, the MLN executed Mitrione on 10 August 1970 (Moss 1972, 228; Sloan 1979, 315). He was the only prisoner the Tupamoros ever executed, and they suffered a large blow to their popular support over the incident. However, the kidnappings were taking their toll on President Pachecho, who had gone so far as to draft a letter of resignation, which he withdrew after the fortuitous capture of Sendic on 7 August 1970.

The kidnappings continued in 1971, and the government continued to be embarrassed by its failure to recover victims from the "Peoples Prisons." The British ambassador was kidnapped and held for nine months before his release, even though the Uruguayan security forces had launched a massive search operation of 300,000 buildings in Montevideo (Miller 1980, 156). The attorney general was kidnapped and released after providing a taped confession describing extralegal activities conducted by his office against Tupamoros, which was subsequently released to the press. Other prominent Uruguayans were also kidnapped, including the head of the government utility company a second time, and were held for as long as sixteen months.

Robberies

The Tupamoros conducted a series of spectacular robberies of both money, amounting to as much as $10 million, and documents incriminating prominent citizens and government officials in corruption and illegal activity. In 1969, Tupamoros,

disguised as police, robbed the Casino San Rafael of $200,000 and the following year robbed a Montevideo bank of over $6 million in jewels and cash (Miller 1980, 154). On 14 February 1969, the Tupamoros robbed the *Financeria* Monty, an illegal loan company, and seized its confidential account books, which detailed the misuse of public funds and illegal currency speculation (Porzecanski 1974, 45). The Tupamoros sent the books to a judge and released the names of twenty-two prominent citizens and government officials, including a presidential advisor and the minister of agriculture. In the ensuing scandal, the minister of agriculture was forced to resign. While robbing the house of a prominent industrialist in 1970, the Tupamoros obtained evidence of his deliberate and significant tax evasion. Upon their release of this information, the industrialist was tried and given a record fine, amounting to over $2 million (Moss 1972, 225).

Intimidation, Persuasion and Embarrassment of Security Forces

The Tupamoros specifically targeted security forces in their offensive campaign, and in November 1969 began a campaign of selective assassination against the police, primarily those involved in extralegal activities involving the MLN. Following the assassination of a police inspector accused of torturing MLN members in 1970, the Tupamoros declared a unilateral cease-fire to begin on 17 June and end in July, calling on police officers to resign before the end of the cease-fire. In response, the police went on strike for higher pay and measures to safeguard their security (Moss 1972, 230). The Tupamoros tried a similar tactic in 1971 by sending an open letter to the military, calling on them not to participate in the security measures imposed by the government.

Intimidation and embarrassment of the security forces went beyond their inability to prohibit Tupamoro actions, such as kidnappings, robbery and prison breakouts. It was applied on a personal level. Tupamoros would surround police officers on the street and steal their weapons. Kidnapping, threats, and arson against personal residences were other techniques used, as well as home invasions, which involved intimidating family members (Miller 1980, 154-155), and theft of weapons, ammunition and uniforms (Porzecanski 1974, 46).

Prison Breakouts

The Tupamoros actively engaged in operations to free their captured personnel, particularly their leaders, achieving the escape of almost 180 personnel. Four mass escapes were successfully conducted, in which the Tupamoros embarrassed the government not only with their ability to conduct these operations, but also by highlighting, in comparison, the government's inability to find and release people from the MLN's "Peoples Prisons."

There were four major jailbreaks, two from the women's prison and two maximum security men's prison. Thirteen female prisoners escaped from the Women's Prison on 9 March 1970, through the assistance of Tupamoros disguised as police (Porzecanski 1974, 41). As a result, the minister in charge of prisons was forced to resign (Gilio 1972, 181). The other three escapes used tunnels and the Montevideo sewer system. On 20 July 1971, thirty-eight more female prisoners escaped from the Women's Prison. On 6 September 1971, 106 male prisoners, including Raúl Sendic, escaped from the Punta Carretas Maximum Security Prison, and 16 more escaped from the same prison on 12 April 1972 (Porzecanski 1974, 41). At least two other MLN leaders escaped while

in custody. Following the 6 September escape, the Tupamoros released a communiqué announcing the escape and promising the release of the British Ambassador.

Large Scale Raids

The Tupamoros conducted two large-scale raids, which demonstrated their ability to conduct coordinated actions to hold terrain for short durations. The first raid occurred in the town of Pando, twenty miles outside Montevideo. The raid was conducted on 8 October 1969, in commemoration of the second anniversary of Che Guevara's death. Approximately forty Tupamoros took control of the town, seizing the police station and its weapons, occupying the telephone exchange and cutting outside communication, and robbing three banks (Godfrey 1985, 127). Tupamoro casualties were high, with three killed and twenty captured (Moss 1972, 226), but they clearly scored a major propaganda victory.

On 29 May 1970, approximately twenty Tupamoros disguised as police officers seized control of the Naval Training Center in Montevideo (Godfrey 1985, 128). They stayed for several hours, giving a political lecture to the trainees. They escaped with 350 rifles and left propaganda leaflets (Moss 1972, 231). Once again the Tupamoros had scored a major propaganda victory and exposed the security forces as ineffective.

The 1971 Election and Cease-Fire

Presidential elections were scheduled for November 1971, and a large degree of focus was placed on them. The two traditional major Uruguayan political parties, the *Colorados* (Reds) and *Blancos* (Whites), were challenged in the election by a new left-wing coalition party known as *Frente Amplio* (Broad Front), which had been formed at

the end of 1970. The party's presidential candidate, General Liber Seregni, was a former Pachecho minister of security, who had resigned over "repressive practices." While third parties had traditionally not fared well in Uruguayan politics, public opinion polls in 1971 indicated the Broad Front could win as much as 37 percent of the vote (Moss 1972, 235). The Tupamoros, in contradiction to their strategy of change only through force, backed the Broad Front party and actively campaigned for them. In order to allow the elections to proceed undisturbed, the Tupamoros declared a unilateral cease-fire, following their mass prison break in September 1971. Unknown to the Tupamoros, as a result of the prison break, the Army had assumed control of the counterinsurgency effort from the police. Relative peace extended over the election period while the military prepared for the resumption of hostilities by developing an anti-Tupamoro contingency plan (Miller 1980, 173). Following the initial vote count, charges of electoral fraud were leveled and a recount was conducted. With electoral fraud issues still existing after the recount, Juan Bordaberry, Pacheco's handpicked successor, was announced the victor in February 1972. The Broad Front party had won only 18 percent of the vote.

Death of the Tupamoros

In February 1972, the Tupamoros announced the end of the truce and resumed the offensive. They announced their new strategy was to "harass directly and systematically the repressive forces as our most important method of action" (Sloan 1979, 316). As part of this strategy, the Tupamoros planned to spread the insurgency into the rural areas of Uruguay through the establishment of underground base areas. The rural expansion, known as Plan Tatu, was named after an indigenous Uruguayan burrowing armadillo. In

1972, the Tupamoros had 3,000 active insurgents and had established seven rural columns.

The Tupamoros resumed their campaign in February by assassinating a police officer accused of torture and kidnapping a newspaper editor who had supported Bordaberry. Additionally, they kidnapped a police photographer, who disclosed links between the security forces and right-wing counterterror groups, which they subsequently publicized (Miller 1980, 156). The police captured Tupamoro leader Hector Perez in late February 1972. In early March, President Bordaberry sent a draft security bill to the legislature, strengthening security force powers and reducing civil liberties, which was summarily rejected. In April, the Tupamoros drastically raised the level of armed attacks against the security forces and right-wing counterterror groups. On 12 April, the Tupamoros staged another mass jailbreak. On 14 April, the Tupamoros assassinated, Professor Armando Acosta y Lara, a former undersecretary of the interior, Oscar Delega Luzardo, a senior police official specializing in interrogation, and the police official's driver, Naval Captain Ernesto Motta (Miller 1980, 172). Motta was the first military officer killed by the Tupamoros. On 15 April, the three service chiefs of the Uruguayan military testified before the legislature and stated that, "the government was being assaulted not by common criminals but by organized forces seeking to gain power" (Miller 1980, 172). President Bordaberry declared a "state of internal war" and his security act was passed. The act allowed full deployment of the military to conduct counterinsurgency operations, which gave the armed forces authority to arrest and detain suspects under military law, conduct searches without warrants, censor the media, and

command the police (Sloan 1979, 316). Additionally, military tribunals were authorized to issue sentences for up to thirty years for subversive activity (Miller 1980, 172).

The armed forces immediately began a massive round up of known left-wing sympathizers and a systematic program of interrogation and torture to gain intelligence. Additionally, they now had procured the collaboration of Hector Perez, which allowed them to gain strategic insight into the command and decision processes of the Tupamoros, as well as information on Tupamoro base areas and personnel. The military began to use this information to dismantle the Tupamoros infrastructure. The security forces located more than seventy Tupamoro sites and collected significant internal documents to further fuel their campaign (Miller 1980, 172).

The Tupamoros continued to fight back, engaging in open combat and assassinating the chief of the joint staff's brother in May. However, the Tupamoros were clearly overmatched and being destroyed. On 27 May, the military determined the location of the "Peoples Prison" (Porzecanski 1974, 69) and liberated two kidnap victims, one of whom had been held for sixteen months. In May and June, the military launched a campaign in the rural areas, which destroyed the Tupamoro presence there. Raúl Sendic was recaptured on 1 September 1972 (Miller 1980, 173); by then over 800 Tupamoros had been arrested (Godfrey 1985, 129). Hundreds of insurgents had been killed and thousands of insurgents, sympathizers and left-wing political party members had been arrested by the end of the year. The Tupamoros were effectively destroyed by November 1972.

Outcomes and Analysis

The outcome of the Tupamoro urban campaign was the tactical destruction of their organization and the strategic and ultimate defeat of their movement. The Tupamoros had miscalculated their strength relative to the government. Through impatience, they had mistimed their *salto,* or jump, to the next level of violence both politically and in terms of their own preparedness, and had clearly not anticipated the destructive power or ruthlessness with which the military would pursue them. The Tupamoros miscalculation about the Uruguayan military is illustrated by the greater MLN concern about military intervention to save the existing government from Brazil, Argentina or the United States than they were about the Uruguayan military (Sloan 1979, 316). From mid-1971, there had been reports the Brazilian military had developed contingency plans for the military take over of Uruguay if the current government fell to the insurgents, including the endorsement of such an action by *Estado de São Paulo,* one of Brazil's leading newspapers (Moss 1972, 239).

Diplomatic, Informational, Military and Economic Analysis

Despite relative success in exploiting the elements of national power, the Tupamoros miscalculated their preparedness to achieve their end state, and paid the price through the failure of their cause and the destruction of their movement. Diplomatically and politically, the Tupamoros generally chose not to actively engage until the 1971 presidential campaign. The rapid destruction of the Tupamoros can be blamed, in part, on their failure to recognize the necessity to organize a popular and political power base as a fallback position in case of significant military setbacks. While their support of and

the significant success of the Broad Front party in 1971 did show a positive movement in that direction by the Tupamoros, they did not, however, take the time to strengthen this base before reengaging the security forces.

A further political timing miscalculation was to challenge the Bordaberry presidency while it was still in the honeymoon stage of its administration. Economic conditions were worsening, with an 11 percent rise in cost of living in April 1972 alone. Bordaberry's *Colorado* party was the minority party in both chambers of the legislature and was unable to pass legislation without significant bipartisanship. Tupamoro strength was steadily increasing. The Tupamoros clearly acted impatiently, while from all indications from economic, social and political conditions, time was on their side.

Internationally, the Tupamoros were largely self-sufficient and chose not to internationalize their conflict, though there were indications from captured documents that they were going to pursue international recognition. This failure cost them the possibility to establish sanctuaries in neighboring countries. Additionally, though the Tupamoros strove for an overall continental liberation and they had some contact with other Latin American insurgencies, these contacts were not sufficiently developed for the Tupamoros to receive either significant assistance or refuge from them.

Militarily, the Tupamoros had seen steady growth in the strength of their movement from around 500 insurgents in 1965 to a peak of 3,000 in 1972. With few setbacks, they had been staging a successful active insurgency campaign since 1968. They had developed a significant logistics infrastructure, to include the establishment of field surgical hospitals, and were pursuing the extension of the insurgency outside of Montevideo through Plan *Tatu.*

However, the security force they had been fighting was primarily the police and not the military. The Tupamoros' campaign since 1968 had seriously eroded both the morale and the legitimacy of the police force, while deliberately not actively targeting the military. Based of their successes against the police, the Tupamoros assumed, incorrectly, that they could effectively combat the military. In 1972, the volunteer force Uruguayan military had high morale and was well respected and supported by the general population. The Tupamoros failed to understand that their offensive in April 1972 would be viewed as a direct challenge to the military, and that the military would respond to the Tupamoros as a threat to the survival of the state, which, in fact, they were. Once again the Tupamoros showed impatience, when, in fact, they needed more time to shape their battlefield. It had taken nearly four years of active campaigning to reduce the police to the state in which they were in 1971. Additionally, Plan *Tatu* was still in the organizational development stage; there was still no provision for rural strongholds for the Montevideo insurgents to fall back upon, which left the rural insurgents exposed in the military's rural campaign conducted in May to June 1972.

Informationally, the Tupamoros had succeeded in garnering popular support and delegitimizing the government and the civilian security forces. As an indication, the Tupamoro-supported Broad Front party garnered 276,000 votes or 18 percent of the total in the 1971 elections. While certainly not all those voters directly supported the Tupamoros campaign, the MLN had declared a unilateral cease-fire for the elections and actively campaigned for the Broad Front, so the voters knew if the Broad Front won that the Tupamoros would be active participants in the new government. This was a significant show of popular support for a highly secretive insurgency that had formed

nine years earlier in a country of three million and did not have a revolutionary tradition. This is, in large part, due to the focus of the Tupamoros on intrinsically combining actions with propaganda, and actively disseminating propaganda starting at the cellular level of the organization. The only significant failing of the Tupamoros in the informational arena was the failure to develop or disseminate a coherent ideology, which could have allowed the development of a MLN guided mass organization.

Economically, the Tupamoros were incredibly sensitive in their economic targeting in order to avoid unintended consequences for the working class, which would have a negative impact on the Tupamoros popular image. Their primary economic goal was to drive foreign capital out of Uruguay and exasperate the economic crisis. As an example, the Tupamoros targeted the Uruguayan tourist industry in 1971, to include sending threatening letters to individuals known to annually vacation in Uruguay, causing an estimated 40 percent decline that year.

Exploitation of Advantages and Sufferance of Disadvantages

The examination of the use of advantages by the insurgents, the disadvantages used effectively against them, and the appropriate conditions or situations in which they applied will assist in establishing their validity in a modern context and, in part, help to address the feasibility of modern urban insurgency. The Tupamoros exploited a number of advantages and suffered disadvantages relating to urban insurgency during their conduct of the Montevideo campaign. Several unique advantages and disadvantages, as well as techniques to exploit advantages, emerge from this case study.

First, the Tupamoros made extensive use of the underground infrastructure of Montevideo. Second, since Uruguayan society was relatively homogenous versus being

religiously, culturally and or racially heterogeneous, as in the other case studies, the polarization of the society occurred strictly along political lines, a disadvantage, but this relative homogeneity lacked the overt discrimination seen in the other two cases and allowed the Tupamoros a greater level of penetration and infiltration into the government and industry in order to gain intelligence. Finally, the Tupamoros addressed the mobilization of public demonstrations differently in that they indirectly instigated them or participated in them as force multipliers.

The Use of Underground Urban Infrastructure

In many ways, the Tupamoros were truly an "underground" movement. They successfully exploited the subterranean infrastructure of Montevideo to their advantage. They created an elaborate underground logistics infrastructure and located their "People's Prisons," supply facilities, hideouts, and medical facilities primarily underground. Guillén criticized this elaborate infrastructure, since he believed it played a large part in their eventual downfall by inhibiting their mobility (1973, 267). The Tupamoros also used the underground infrastructure to create and exploit tactical surprise and, used this infrastructure successfully in three major prison breaks.

Infiltration and Penetration

The Tupamoros effectively exploited the infiltration and penetration of the government and industry to gather intelligence and execute attacks. Much of the detailed intelligence required to conduct the planning of their more spectacular operations was generated by Tupamoros inside the target organization. An employee of the tax-evading industrialist provided the house plans and then participated in the robbery. On the raid on

the Naval Training Base, the Tupamoros had a marine on the inside who provided them information for planning and assisted their entry while on guard duty.

Effective Use of Nontraditional, Nonprofile Combatants

The Tupamoros effectively integrated women into their operations, with women comprising as much as 25 percent of their total force. Women participated in the Pando raid and conducted two of the major jailbreaks. They were used to help create tactical surprise, as well as enhance the security of urban operations, since women generally arouse less suspicion than men, and they could create the appearance, with a male partner, of a traditional family existence.

The Mobilization of Public Demonstrations

The Tupamoros viewed the mobilization of public demonstrations differently than the insurgents in the other case studies, in large part due to their lack of a supporting political movement. Nevertheless, they still exploited the advantage primarily for propaganda purposes versus direct attacks on authorities. They were indirect instigators, using their ties with the labor and trade unions, or intimidation, as exemplified by the police strike in 1970. An example of their use as a force multiplier during a strike was their kidnapping of a bank president in 1969 during a bank workers strike. The Tupamoros held him for ten weeks, and released him after ransom was paid to a charitable organization.

Effective Propaganda

The Tupamoros were extremely effective in exploiting propaganda to their advantage. They were extremely conscious of trying to present themselves in the best

light, and worked especially hard to get their message out after government censorship cut them off from the national media. In large part, they conducted operations in order to generate propaganda to garner public support or delegitimize the government. Their overall success in propaganda was demonstrated in their achieving a high level of popular support. In 1971, polling showed that, "59 percent of the Uruguayan public thought of them as an organization motivated by social justice and human motives" (Asprey 1994, 1074). Additionally, even though the Broad Front only took 18 percent of the popular vote in the 1971 elections, no third party had previously achieved greater than 10 percent, and the Broad Front's percentage translated to 276,000 votes (Moss 1972, 238).

Discriminate Targeting

Discriminate targeting must be viewed as an advantage and disadvantage for the Tupamoros. The advantages spring primarily from non-violent targeting, while the disadvantages came mainly from their violent targeting. Prime examples of exploiting the advantage were their application of "Robin Hood" raids and their theft of money and documents. The "steal from the rich, give to the poor" raids established and maintained positive public opinion of the movement, particularly due to the trying economic times. The robberies assisted in delegitimizing and embarrassing the government. In addition, the "Robin Hood" raids were exciting and demonstrated the machismo trait of the organization.

The disadvantages arose from assassination of police personnel and the murder of Dan Mitrione. Uruguay was a democracy and a modern society that had been at internal and external peace during the twentieth century. The police and military were small but respected elements of the population. Regardless of the discriminate nature of the police

assassinations, the Uruguayan people were not readily accepting of this level of violence in their capital city. Dan Mitrione, the only kidnapped person who died while being held, was killed to demonstrate the Tupamoros' seriousness of purpose to the government. He was a Roman Catholic with nine children. The ruthlessness and relative purposelessness of his death, in concert with his religion and family situation, created a significant loss of popular support.

Polarization of Society

The polarization of society was essentially different in Uruguay, since it fell strictly along political lines, and must be viewed as a disadvantage to the Tupamoros. The Tupamoros needed to garner the maximum amount of popular support and polarization cost them. At least two right-wing counterterror groups arose which targeted the Tupamoro insurgents and their families. As a result, the Tupamoros were faced with an additional security and physical threat that they needed to combat. This polarization played a factor in their final downfall since their April 1972 attacks focused on the right-wing counterterror groups and security forces that were providing them support.

The Establishment of Insurgent Influenced Areas

The Tupamoros failed to establish insurgent influenced or controlled areas, primarily due to organizational secrecy and security. By failing to establish such areas, they were never able to fully exploit their creation of the duality of power, since they could never establish a shadow government. This failure also inhibited the creation of a base of political and popular support and the expansion of their organization, all of which may have helped them to survive the military's onslaught in 1972.

Security Requirements for Urban Insurgency

The security requirements imposed by urban insurgency created a disadvantage for the Tupamoros. While the clandestine, cellular structure the Tupamoros used managed to protect them for nearly ten years, it was vulnerable to destruction from the top, which was exploited by the security forces using the information provided by Hector Perez. The cellular structure's security was also compromised from the reintegration of the Tupamoro prisoners who escaped in 1971 back into the organization, creating a vulnerability that was exploited in the military counterinsurgency campaign in 1972. The vulnerability arose from the large number of Tupamoro operatives that came in contact with each other while imprisoned. An escaped insurgent, who may previously have only known the members of his cell, now knew and could identify significantly more insurgents and from different cells if he was recaptured, which was, in fact, what occurred.

Additionally, their security structure, with its focus on secrecy, did not allow them to emerge publicly in order to establish insurgent influenced zones or a shadow government, which, in turn, inhibited their creation of a popular or political support base. The security requirements also did not allow the rise of a popular hero. Though Raúl Sendic was known, he was not able to be presented as a revolutionary icon, like Mao, Ho or Castro in their respective countries, during the period of insurgency.

The Use of Extralegal Techniques

The Tupamoros ultimately suffered a disadvantage through the use of extralegal techniques by the Uruguayan security forces. The institutionalized use of torture by the police force was reported in 1970, and repeated limitations of civil liberties occurred

between 1968 and 1972, which minimally hampered the Tupamoros. In fact, the Tupamoros were able to effectively use the police repression in their propaganda campaign. However, in April 1972, basic civil liberties were revoked and the military ruthlessly pursued its counterinsurgency campaign. The military began mass arrests and searches and applied more thorough torture techniques, which began the disintegration of the Tupamoro organization and led to its eventual destruction.

The Effects Created by the Counterinsurgents

The effects created by the counterinsurgents need to be examined during the presidencies of Pacheco and Bordaberry separately. Pacheco, in response to rising Tupamoro actions, declared a state of emergency in June 1968, and continued to ask for limitations on civil liberties for security reasons throughout his presidency. This created a number of crises for his government, which was already struggling with the economy and corruption scandals. The revelation of institutionalized torture by a Senate committee and Pachecho's unwillingness or inability to stop it, combined with his attempts to limit civil liberties, led to a failed impeachment attempt in the summer of 1971. The conduct of the police further delegitimized an already failing government, creating a gain in popular support for the Tupamoros.

In April 1972, Bordaberry declared a state of internal war, which revoked basic civil liberties and loosed the military to conduct unconstrained counterinsurgency operations, which they conducted with great ruthlessness and success. The military became increasingly politicized, and during the destruction of the Tupamoros began to accuse and investigate government officials of illegal economic activities. In September 1972, based on documents obtained from the Tupamoros, the military began arrests for

economic crimes (Kaufman 1979, 110). The military disregarded orders from the minister of defense and the president to stop the use of torture, and in June 1973, the military staged a coup and dissolved the legislature, beginning a military dictatorship and ending Uruguayan democracy. The Tupamoros had created the conditions needed to topple the government but were destroyed by the military before they could realize their purpose.

Long Term Outcome

Following the military takeover in 1973, Uruguay degenerated into a brutal, repressive, military dictatorship. The military assumed a lion's share of the national budget (26.2 percent in 1973 up from 1 percent in 1963) (Beckett 2001b, 178) and its size expanded to 25,000 by 1976. During 1973, the military dissolved the Uruguayan Congress, outlawed all leftist political parties, dissolved labor unions and closed the national university (Miller 1980, 174). The military ousted President Bordaberry in 1976. By 1979, Uruguay had 6,000 political prisoners and Amnesty International estimated that "since 1972, one in every fifty persons has been subjected to interrogation, arrest, imprisonment or torture" (Sloan 1979, 316). However, the military dictatorship ended in 1985 with the election of a civilian controlled government. The new government allowed the Tupamoros to become a legitimate political party, pardoned Raúl Sendic, released political prisoners, and "amnestied all police and military personnel guilty of human rights violations from 1973 to 1985" (Asprey 1994, 1075). Further governmental efforts, such as Uruguay's inclusion in Southern Cone Common Market in 1991, have been made to revitalize the economy, and protect the democratic system, to include a new electoral system implemented in 1999. The US State Department reported

that in the 1999 election, the left-wing Broad Front coalition party was defeated for the presidency but controlled 40 percent of the Congress.

Conclusion

The Tupamoro urban insurgency was inspired by the inability of the Uruguayan government to respond to a failing economy and the need for political reform. The Tupamoros conducted a ten-year campaign in a modern, urbanized and democratic society, gaining extensive popular support. By 1972, they constituted a realistic threat to overthrow a significantly weakened government, and launched an all out offensive to do so. Their destruction by the end of 1972 resulted from political impatience, the miscalculation of their strength relative to the military and a lack of preparation in case of failure.

CHAPTER 5

THE TROUBLES: NORTHERN IRELAND FROM 1969 TO 1974

Introduction

This chapter will examine the urban insurgency as conducted from 1969 through 1974 involving the Provisional Irish Republican Army (PIRA), the British Army, and the Northern Ireland security forces. The urban insurgency arose from violence sparked by the action of the mass movement centered on civil rights for Northern Ireland's Catholic population and the reaction from the Unionist Protestant population. The significance of this case study arises from the resurgence of the Irish Republican Army (IRA), the transformation of a mass movement into an urban insurgency, the protracted length of the conflict, and the shifts in strategy and focus of both the insurgent and counterinsurgent forces.

Background

The conflict in Northern Ireland traces its roots back to 1603 with the "Flight of the Earls," where two Earls defeated by James I of England chose to exile themselves from Ireland and had their Ulster lands handed over to Protestant Scottish and English settlers. These settlers drove the native Catholic Irish from these areas. In 1607, England, under James I, completed the conquest of Ireland. During the Civil War in England in 1664, the Irish Catholics rebelled and massacred much of the Ulster Protestant population. In response, in 1668, after winning the English Civil War, Oliver Cromwell brutally crushed the Irish rebellion, retaliating for the Protestant massacres with Catholic massacres (Mansfield, 1980, 46-48).

In 1688, the Irish rebelled again, supporting dethroned English Catholic King James II against the Protestant William of Orange. The "Orange" heroes celebrated by the Protestant marching season emerged from this conflict. The victory over the Catholic Army at the River Boyne in 1690 opens the Protestant marching season on 12 July. The close of the marching season, on 12 August, is marked by the reenactment of the defense of Londonderry, where the "Apprentice Boys" held off a Catholic army for fifteen weeks in 1689. (Mansfield, 1980, 47-48).

Following this revolt, anti-Catholic laws were enacted, generally solidifying control by the Protestants. In 1795, the Orange Order was founded in order for the Protestants to "preserve their political, social and economic ascendancy" (Mansfield, 1980, 48). In 1800, the Union with Ireland Act was enacted, uniting all Ireland and England. In 1829, Irish Catholics began to push for an independent Ireland, which the Protestant minority strongly resisted. Two attempts for the authorization of Home Rule for Ireland in the British Parliament were defeated in the 1800s before it was finally authorized in 1914. When it was proposed to delay the implementation of Home Rule until the completion of World War I, the Irish republicans attempted an uprising in Dublin on Easter Sunday, 1916. The rebellion was rapidly crushed but added to the feeling of Irish republicanism and swung the Catholic Irish support to Irish independence and the Sinn Fein (Gaelic for ourselves alone) political party.

In 1918, seventy-three Sinn Fein candidates were elected to the British parliament, but instead chose to remain in Ireland and set up an Irish Parliament in Dublin in January 1919. Eamon de Valera was elected president of the Irish republic in April 1919.

The British immediately intervened and were confronted by Michael Collins and the IRA. The British forces fought the IRA from 1919 to 1921 in a war for Irish independence in what became known as the "Black and Tan War" from the uniforms worn by the British paramilitary force. Due to falling world opinion and general war weariness, the British negotiated a political solution and enacted the Government of Ireland Act of 1920. This legislation's purpose was the eventual unification of Ireland but created two Irish parliaments, one in Stormont, in the outskirts of Belfast, for six of the nine counties of Northern Ireland, and one in Dublin for the rest of Ireland. Both were subordinate to the British parliament.

Elections for these parliaments produced a Protestant unionist majority in the six northern counties and a Catholic republican majority in Dublin. Thus was created the Northern Ireland province of the United Kingdom, responsible for its internal affairs, with its external affairs being handled by the United Kingdom.

In 1921, the Irish Free State (Dublin parliament) accepted dominion status within the British Empire. The acceptance of any link to England, coupled with the apparent loss of the six northern counties, caused the radical republican element, supported by the IRA, to begin a civil war that lasted until 1923, when they were defeated by the forces of the Free State. In 1936, the Free State enacted legislation, which removed the English monarch as their head of state, and the following year passed a new constitution that proclaimed itself an independent sovereign state. In 1947, the Irish Free State became the Republic of Ireland and was no longer part of the British Commonwealth.

The two years following the creation of Northern Ireland were bloody, with over 300 people being killed. This led to the creation of the Royal Ulster Constabulary

(RUC), a paramilitary police force, and its reserve component, known as the "B Specials." While these forces were supposed to reflect the makeup of the Northern Irish population, with one-third being Catholic, they were, in fact, almost exclusively Protestant, with the majority of the members coming from the Orange Order. The Stormont Parliament enacted the Civil Authorities (Special Powers) Act of 1922, which allowed indefinite internment without trial. This act originally had to be renewed yearly, but in 1933 it was made permanent. It also gave the authority to search without warrant, restrict movement, and withdraw the freedom of the press, among other suspensions of basic liberties (London, 1972, 33-34).

From 1923 to the 1960s Northern Ireland remained relatively peaceful. However, Catholics were heavily discriminated against in almost all facets of life, most strongly in employment, education, enfranchisement, law enforcement and electoral districting. Educational reform in the 1940s, a growing Catholic middle class in the 1960s, and some earnest attempts for moderate legislative reform gave rise to hopes of peaceful assimilation and conciliation in Northern Ireland.

The IRA was generally discredited and largely considered to be thugs and radical gunmen by the 1960s. Their "border campaign" from 1956 to 1962 was a failure primarily because it lacked Catholic public support in the northern counties. However, there was a strong belief by Protestant Northern Ireland that the border campaign was defeated by the mobilization of the B Specials and the implementation of internment, which would strongly influence actions in the coming "troubles." Internment did, in fact, make a significant impact, but that was due to the British government supplying

intelligence support and organization from MI-5 to help in successfully identifying IRA members for arrest and internment (London, 1972, 20).

Unfortunately by the mid-1960s, the rising tide of Catholic expectation led to a situation of "perceived relative deprivation" and a push for greater and more rapid reform, while Protestant extremists began actively striving to maintain the status quo. In 1965, Reverend Ian Paisley, founder of the Free Presbyterian Church in Northern Ireland and emerging extremist Protestant leader, began to agitate against liberal reform.

General Goals of the IRA

The IRA has traditionally retained two primary goals. The first goal is the reunification of the thirty-two counties of Ireland into one republican state, using military means to force political concession. The second goal, often viewed as the most important, is the defense of the Catholic population in Northern Ireland, particularly in Belfast, where a Catholic minority lives surrounded by a Protestant majority. Their primary enemy is Great Britain, which they view as a colonial power in Northern Ireland.

IRA Organization

The PIRA, which was the main proponent of the urban campaign in Northern Ireland, organized itself, essentially from scratch, in 1969 and 1970, in a manner matching the traditional "Official" IRA structure. It established the "republican trinity" (Bell, 1993, 164) of the army, the party, and the paper. The Army Council is the central executive body and consists of leading members of the Army and the party. The army was organized traditionally in brigades, battalions and companies and "active service units." The units did not generally have the number of personnel associated with that

type of element, but were used for administration and control purposes. The active service units were the basic combat element of the Army and generally contained ten or fewer people. The Provos did not adopt a cellular structure until 1977 (Mockaitis 1995,108). They also established new matching support and auxiliary structures, to include Cumann Cabrach (the welfare organization that took care of families of the imprisoned and those on the run), Cumann na mBan (the traditional women's auxiliary), Fianna Éireann (the male youth auxiliary), and an accompanying female youth auxiliary. Significantly, women served as active fighters with the Provos, not just as auxiliaries (Bell, 1993, 163).

The Provisional Sinn Fein was established as the political arm of the PIRA and remains a nonproscribed political entity in both the Republic and Northern Ireland. Two newspapers also were published in support of the Provos, *An Phoblacht* (The or Their Republic) and *The Republican News.*

Republican and IRA Key Players

This section provides information on the key players from the Republican movements and the Official and Provisional IRA.

Cathal Goulding--chief of staff of the "Official" IRA. He led the IRA on a Marxist path, focusing on the colonial relationship between Ulster and Britain, where the economic relations were central and the religious issue was designed and exploited by the ruling elite to separate the natural allies, the Catholic and Protestant working man. He advocated political education of the Ulster masses leading to a nonsectarian, nonviolent means of Irish reunification. He claimed that his strategy was the legacy of John

Connolly, the leader of the Easter Rebellion. The militant, direct-action faction of the IRA was minimized, leading to the decay of the Ulster IRA elements prior to 1969.

Sean MacStiofáin (John Stephenson)--head of the Army Council of the PIRA. He was instrumental in the organizational build-up of the PIRA from 1969 to 1971. He opposed a PIRA political action program due to fear it might supercede military action, which led to the Official IRA accusation that he was "the man without ideas." He implemented the tactic of PIRA snipers only firing one shot and then displacing (Coogan 1993, 278).

Rory Brady (Ruairi O Bradaigh)--president of the Provisional Wing of Sinn Fein, the PIRA's political wing. He was a schoolteacher by trade. Cathal Goulding replaced him as the IRA chief of staff in 1962. Brady was a strong supporter of a political action program, which became known as *Eire Nua*, the New Ireland Policy (Coogan 1993, 281). He participated in the July 1972 negotiations. He voluntary resigned as President of the Provisional Wing of the Sinn Fein in 1983 to allow Gerry Adams to assume the position.

Gerry Adams--brigade commander of the PIRA's Belfast Brigade during 1972 to 1973. A barman by trade, he was interned in 1972 and again in 1973. Adams experienced "deep interrogation" in 1972 and participated in negotiations with British government in 1972 as well. He was known to be a good writer and pamphleteer and rumored to have been instrumentally involved in any PIRA policy decision since the early 1970s. He served as the PIRA chief of staff and was a strong proponent within the PIRA to pursue other means to victory while maintaining military pressure. Elected as the West Belfast delegate to the British Parliament in 1983, he became president of the

Provisional Sinn Fein the same year, a position he has held to the current day. Adams was instrumental in the current Northern Ireland peace agreements.

Gerry Fitt--opposition member of Parliament in both the Stormont and Westminister. Fitt was one of the founders of the Social Democratic and Labor Party (SDLP) in August 1970. He turned vehemently anti-PIRA during the 1970s. He became Lord Fitt in 1983 and took a seat in the House of Lords. Gerry Adams won his British parliament seat.

Bernadette Devlin--one of the founder's of People's Democracy and leader in the non-violent civil rights movement. Elected several times to the Stormont Parliament, Devlin maintained an active role in Northern Ireland but acted as an independent and became increasingly radicalized and marginalized.

Unionists and British Forces of Order Key Players

This section provides information on the key players from the Unionists and Stormont government, and the British and forces of order.

Lieutenant-General Sir Ian Freeland--the General Officer Commanding (GOC) of Northern Ireland from August 1969 to February 1971.

Terrence O'Neill--reform minded Prime Minister of the Stormont government from 1963 to 1969. O'Neill was brought down in a vote of no confidence over reform legislation, primarily dealing with one-man-one-vote, in response to civil rights demonstrations. He was replaced by his cousin, Bruce Chichester-Clark, who had been his Minister of Agriculture.

Bruce Chichester-Clark--served as Prime-Minister from 1969 to 1971. Chichester-Clark began to institute many of the reforms requested by the civil rights

movement. He announced that Northern Ireland was at war with the PIRA. He resigned when the British government refused to provide the number of British soldiers he felt were needed to restore order.

Brian Faulkner--prime minister who replaced Chichester-Clark in 1971. He resigned in 1972 when the British prorogued the Stormont, and was elected prime minister for the power-sharing government in 1973. He participated in Sunningdale Agreement. Faulkner resigned in May 1974 due to pressure from the Protestant general strike.

Reverend Dr. Ian Paisley--Protestant, Unionist militant and extremist and anti-papist. Active in Northern Ireland politics since 1956, Paisley was the founder of the Free Presbyterian Church in 1951 (Bell 1993, 20). He received his doctorate from Bob Jones University in Greenville, South Carolina. Demonstrating the already existing societal polarization and the general feeling of the extremist portion of the Protestant population, he was reported to have said to Bernadette Devlin in 1968, "I would rather be British than just" (London 1972, 55). Paisley was instrumental in Protestant actions leading to the failure of the Sunningdale Agreement.

Goals, Justification and Events Leading to the Irish Troubles

The three primary goals of the PIRA were defense, retaliation and offense (Coogan 1993, 277). Of note, the PIRA scorned the political policy of the Official IRA, the organization from which they had splintered, and pushed forward its own military policy of direct action. The initial and immediate goal was defense of the Catholic population in Northern Ireland. The Provos wanted to garner popular support by ensuring the population's recognition of them as defenders by discrediting the British

Army and the Official IRA. In retaliation, they wanted to portray the British Army as the enemy through propagandizing perceived injustices committed by the army and creating an atmosphere in which they could launch retaliatory actions and receive popular support. By creating a provocation and response cycle (Mockaitis 1995, 100), the Provos could conduct a protracted offensive campaign that would attempt to make Northern Ireland ungovernable to force the British government to make concessions (Bell 1983, 385).

Major Events

In August 1966, there was a secret meeting in Derry, at the home of a prominent Derry Republican, Kevin Agnew, to discuss the formation of a nonviolent civil rights movement in Northern Ireland (Coogan 1993, 250). Cathal Goulding, chief of staff of the IRA, attended, as well as Catholic members of the Stormont Parliament and other Catholic moderates (London 1972, 47). Goulding approved the concept. The IRA would be part of the movement but not in control. Significantly, this signaled a break with traditional IRA policy, which did not recognize the separate existence of Northern Ireland and proscribed military means. Goulding, in effect, by encouraging the Catholics of Northern Ireland to achieve the rights due to a citizen, began to lay the groundwork to accept a partitioned Ireland.

On 1 February 1967, the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association (NICRA) was founded in Belfast (London, 1972, 47). It was designed as a nonsectarian (though primarily Catholic) organization that would push for greater parliamentary reforms through nonviolent, civil protests, and was largely based on English and American civil rights organizations. Its stated goals were:

1) One-man-one-vote in local elections;

2) The removal of gerrymandered boundaries;
3) Laws against discriminations by local governments and the provision of machinery to deal with complaints;
4) Allocation of public housing on a points system;
5) Repeal of the Special Powers Act;
6) Disbanding the B Specials. (Mansfield 1980, 53)

Much of its first year was spent attempting to adjudicate individual complaints, but in August 1968, the NICRA reluctantly decided to hold its first civil rights march. The march was extremely successful, with over 4000 participants, and it ended without violence.

Due to its success, another march was scheduled for 5 October 1968 in Londonderry. The Unionists planned a countermarch. All marches were cancelled that day. However, the NICRA decided to march anyway. There was large media presence, and two leaders of the nationalist opposition in the Stormont Parliament (Gerry Fitt, who was also a member of the British Parliament, and Eddy McAteer) and three from the British Parliament were participating in the civil rights march. A police line stopped this demonstration. Fitt and McAteer advanced to the police line and were batoned "without justification or excuse" (London 1972, 28, 52), with a bloodied Fitt requiring hospital treatment.

Following this incident, the march became an impromptu meeting. After half an hour, the leaders asked the demonstrators to disperse. During the dispersal, there were minor provocations by extremist elements within the demonstration, and the police were ordered to disperse the crowd. The Cameron Commission, formed in 1969 to examine the disturbances in Ulster, found that the police used their batons "indiscriminately" in conjunction with the use of high-pressure water cannons (London 1972, 53). In the

ensuing melee, eleven police and seventy-seven civilians were injured (London 1972, 53). The extensive media coverage had significant effects in transforming the civil rights movement into a popular, mass movement, and bringing Northern Ireland back into British politics. It also gave rise to a primarily student based left wing movement called People's Democracy (PD), led by a twenty-one year old student named Bernadette Devlin.

On 22 November, Terrence O'Neill, the reform minded prime minister of the Stormont Parliament, announced a reform package that essentially addressed the NICRA's primary complaints. This action calmed sectarian tensions for a short time but eventually came to be recognized as too little too late.

Under PD leadership, a four-day march was scheduled for the first four days of 1969, scheduled to end in Londonderry. On the night of 3 January, a riot broke out in Londonderry. On the morning of 4 January, the marchers were attacked with extreme ferocity by a large number of Protestant extremists led by Paisley, leading to accusations that the police did not protect the marchers and were complicit in the attack. The night of the 4 January saw a large-scale illegal incursion by the RUC into the Londonderry Catholic ghetto of Bogside, resulting in 163 civilian casualties (London 1972, 68). In response, O'Neill formed the above-mentioned Cameron Commission on 15 January to investigate "the causes and nature of the violence and civil disturbance in Northern Ireland" (London 1972, 69).

In March, civil rights demonstrators rushed several RUC tenders, with the final result of seven tenders burned, twenty people injured and twenty people arrested (Bell 1983, 357). The civil rights movement was gaining momentum; Bernadette Devlin,

backed in part by the IRA, ran for a seat in the Stormont Parliament and won on 17 April 1969. To celebrate, the NICRA scheduled another march on 19 April, which led to another riot in Derry. By this time the IRA had begun to see the efficacy of nonviolent agitation and was heavily involved in the civil rights movement, working primarily to prevent attacks on the RUC or Protestant mobs by Republican elements and to protect civil rights demonstrators (Bell 1983, 357).

On April 28, O'Neill resigned as prime minister, to be replaced by James Chichester-Clark. Violence continued to erupt throughout the spring and early summer, most notably in the Unity Walk section of Belfast on 12 to13 July and again on 2 to 3 August. The British government, in response to the rising violence and in an effort to stop anticipated violence that would occur during the Protestant marching season in August, considered the deployment of British troops to keep the peace. They also threatened to prorogue the Stormont Parliament and institute home rule, an action that the British government was not willing to take at that time. Despite the pressures placed on them by the British government, the Stormont Parliament decided on 11 August to allow the Apprentice Boys' Parade to continue on the next day. In addition, the Stormont authorized the "mobilization of the B Specials at the discretion of local police" (London 1972, 122).

The Troubles

1969

On 12 August 1969, the Apprentice Boys' Parade began as a well-controlled event. At 1430, as the parade passed one of the entrances to Bogside, the Catholic ghetto, it was attacked by a barrage of stones and bottles in an unplanned assault by Catholic

youth (London 1972, 115). The police responded to the provocation and in a rapidly spiraling cycle of escalation, the Catholic residents of Bogside began to throw up barricades due to fear of a repeat of the attacks in January. They had prepared for such a situation by forming the Derry Citizens Defense Association. The RUC established a perimeter around the area and mobs of Protestant youths began to gather to follow the RUC in when they dismantled the barricades.

After continuing violent brushes, the reinforced RUC, against orders from their headquarters, attempted to penetrate the barricades at 1915 (London 1972, 116). They managed to penetrate the first barricade but were stopped by a second and forced to withdraw under pressure from the Catholic residents throwing stones and gasoline bombs. This began a three-day siege of Bogside, in which the police would charge the barricades and be driven back numerous times. The police attack fully mobilized the entire Catholic population in Derry into an insurrectional state, and "Free Derry" was declared. Around midnight on 12 August the riot control agent, CS, was used in Bogside, the first time ever on United Kingdom soil (London 1972, 120), and during the early morning of 13 August, the first B Special unit was mobilized in Derry (London 1972, 122). At 1500 on 14 August, the B Specials were mobilized throughout Northern Ireland (London 1972, 132).

The situation continued to deteriorate in Derry on 13 August. General Freeland sent a senior officer in civilian clothes to the Derry barricades. He reported that the RUC "could not possibly contain the Bogside for more than thirty-six hours" (London 1972, 121). In support of appeals from Derry, mass civil rights demonstrations were held and barricades arose around Catholic communities throughout Northern Ireland, causing the

RUC to be overstretched. Protestant mobs rose spontaneously outside the Catholic enclaves, especially in Derry and Belfast. In the Irish Republic, the Prime Minister accused the Stormont of losing control. He ordered the Irish Army to establish field hospitals along the border and requested a United Nations peacekeeping force be sent to Ulster (Coogan 1993, 105). During the day of 14 August, rioting broke out between Catholics and Protestants in other parts of Derry, with some B Specials participating in the riots. The RUC had no reinforcements to call in and were essentially overwhelmed. At 1500 on 14 August, Chichester-Clark requested intervention by the British Army in Derry and his request was granted by 1630 (London 1972, 125). However, in an attempt to minimize British Army involvement, it was not a blanket authorization for all of Northern Ireland, only for Derry. The army deployed an augmented battalion in Derry the evening of the fourteenth. The situation in Derry deescalated as the battalion commander and the Derry Citizens Defense Association "negotiated a perimeter agreement" (Coogan 1993, 106). The Catholics of Bogside felt they had won a victory and welcomed the British forces as their defenders.

Unfortunately, as the events in Derry were at their height, Belfast was becoming a war zone. Three separate areas in Belfast exploded, and before order was restored on 16 August, 10 civilians were killed, 145 civilians and 4 policemen were wounded by gunfire as part of an overall 750 injured (Asprey 1994, 1125), and over 150 houses were burned out, to include the whole Catholic area of Bombay Street (London 1972, 127, 136-137, 141).

The events leading to the explosion of violence in Belfast began on the evening of 13 August, when a peaceful civil rights demonstration devolved into violence involving

the stoning of an RUC station and return gunfire by RUC police. The RUC mobilized its armored cars, but did not arm them. On 14 August, the B Specials were mobilized and the armored cars mounted their 0.30 caliber Browning machine guns. That evening, rioting began again and rapidly got out of control, with fighting between Catholic and Protestant mobs. Shots were fired, reportedly initiated by the Protestant mob (London 1972, 134), and the RUC violently overreacted, spraying Catholic housing areas with the 0.30 caliber Brownings. General Freeland realized that troops would be required in Belfast also. However, he had only three battalions in Northern Ireland at the time, and one supported by companies from the other two was already engaged in Derry. The army was scheduled to deploy into Belfast on 16 August, but as the situation continued to deteriorate, the Stormont government asked for authorization to deploy army forces around noon on 15 August. At 1510, the British government gave the authorization. (London 1972, 138-139). The army, due to lack of intelligence, preparation, and numbers, was largely ineffective to prevent the violence on the night of the fifteenth, which engendered the belief in the Catholic community that the British Army had allowed it to happen. The disturbance in Belfast was finally quelled and order was restored on 16 August.

British Army reinforcements arrived in Northern Ireland, and by September, General Freeland had 6,000 men. On 19 August, all security forces in Northern Ireland were placed under Freeland's command. Additionally on 19 August, a joint communiqué was released by the Stormont and British governments that laid a framework for reform and stated, "every citizen of Northern Ireland is entitled to the same equality of treatment and freedom from discrimination as obtains in the rest of the United Kingdom

irrespective of political view or religion (Bell 1993, 116)." On 20 August, the UN Security Council adjourned the request for peacekeepers in Northern Ireland and, in response to the British command of security forces, Ian Paisley led a protest denouncing the military dictatorship in Northern Ireland on 23 August (Bell 1993, 118). Two commissions were also announced in August, one, headed by Lord Hunt, to examine the Northern Ireland security force structure, and the other, headed by Sir Leslie Scarman, a High Court judge, a full judicial tribunal of inquiry into the violence between April and August 1969 (London 1972, 147).

Following the significant outburst of violence in August, there was a period of relative calm until the beginning of the 1970 marching season, though there were small outbreaks of violence almost every weekend. However, during this time many important actions occurred. On 9 September the Army authorized "peace lines," or authorized barricades, that explicitly recognized Catholic (and Protestant) "no-go" areas (Bell 1993, 122). It also began the forced migration of over 60,000 people out of integrated neighborhoods into Catholic and Protestant enclaves (Mockaitis 1995, 99). However, these moves were looked on favorably by the Catholic population, who viewed them and the British Army as ways to defend their communities.

In September 1969, the Cameron Report about the violence in Derry during the 1968 civil rights demonstrations was released and strongly pressed for needed reforms. On 10 October 1969, the Hunt Report on police force structure was released. It called for the disarmament and restructuring of the RUC as the Ulster Defense Regiment (UDR), with a proportionate amount of Catholic representation, the assignment of a British police officer as its chief, and the disbandment of the B Specials (London 1972, 164). The

British government forced the implementation of the recommendations on the Stormont government. The Protestant extremists immediately reacted by rioting in Belfast, and the Army was called in to dispel the disturbance. The Protestant mob fired on the soldiers, who, after holding their fire for an hour and a half, were ordered to return fire. The soldiers fired sixty-six shots, killing two and wounding others, and then dispersed the mob with riot control squads (London 1972, 165). The army was accused of using excessive force and violence in dispelling the riot. Ironically, the first RUC officer killed during the Troubles was killed during this riot from a Protestant bullet. This situation accentuated the British Army's difficulty of maintaining its neutrality as peacekeeper.

The IRA was surprised by the outbreak of violence in August of 1969. Due to the change in its focus under the leadership of Cathal Goulding, the weapons and military structure of the IRA were wholly inadequate to come to the defense of the Catholic communities in Northern Ireland. In August 1969, the IRA had between ten to a few dozen firearms in Northern Ireland and there were none readily available in the Republic (Coogan 1993, 279 and Bell 1983, 369). The Catholic communities recognized the weakness of the IRA and its failure to respond during 12 to 16 August, and graffiti began to appear that said "IRA – I Ran Away" (Bell 1993, 145). On 22 September, a militant faction seized control of the IRA's Belfast Brigade and decided to spend money collected for relief efforts on arms (Bell 1993, 148). In December, a militant faction walked out of the yearly Army Council meeting and formed the PIRA, followed by the creation of the Provisional Sinn Fein in January 1970.

1970

With the division of the IRA, the Provos' key focus became obtaining arms, with the establishment of organizations and recruiting and training as secondary efforts. There was tacit and some active support for the Provos from the Irish Republic's government for the defense of Northern Ireland's Catholic population, but that was lost when a large arms shipment, arranged by members of the cabinet of the Irish Republic, was interdicted in April 1970. The Provos still grew from around 100 in January 1970 to 800 by December 1970 (Mockaitis 1995, 100) and to over 1,000 by early 1971 (Bell 1983, 374). The PIRA Belfast Brigade was formed, with three battalions as area commands and between fourteen and nineteen active service units (Asprey 1994, 1126 and Bell 1993, 172).

During 1970, several major incidents, like the Ballymurphy riots and the Falls Road curfew, helped the Provos in establishing themselves as defenders of the Catholic population and discrediting the British Army and the Officials. Additionally, the Provos began using the riots as provocation and stretched them out to several days duration. The riots in the Ballymurphy section of Belfast occurred from 31 March to 2 April 1970 and were spurred by a Catholic crowd stoning an Orange parade. The Army responded forcefully and used CS gas for the first time in Belfast to help disperse the crowd. In the effort to restore order, thirty-eight soldiers were injured (Bell 1993, 173). The Official IRA representatives in Ballymurphy "urged the nationalist crowd to disperse" (Bell 1993, 173). The outcome of the Ballymurphy riots was a net gain for the Provos due to the significant loss of acceptance of the British Army by the Catholic community and the loss of stature of the Official IRA through its unwillingness to fight in defense. The Provos

also skillfully exploited these losses through propaganda aimed at the Catholic population, the British, and international journalists.

In late June, there was significant rioting in Belfast with 7 dead and 200 injured civilians, 10 injured soldiers, and over 1,600 CS gas canisters fired (Bell 1993, 178-179). On 3 July the British Army seized a cache of nineteen IRA weapons, which provoked a riot. Lieutenant General Freeman, commander of the British forces in Northern Ireland, decided that provocation would be met with overwhelming force. He announced a total curfew in the Lower Falls area of Belfast, and deployed 3,000 troops, supported by helicopters, armored cars, and the extensive use of CS gas, to conduct house-to-house searches. The IRA responded as defenders of the area and firefights broke out in the streets. By the morning of 5 July, the area had been pacified and the curfew was lifted. The Army's house-to-house searches turned up around one hundred firearms, as well as explosives, ammunition, and radios, but the conduct of the searches and the indiscriminate use of CS gas in a residential area caused a surge in Provo recruiting and further alienated the British Army from the Catholic population. PIRA propaganda further played on the searches by accusing British soldiers of wanton destruction and looting.

Throughout the rest of 1970, rioting continued frequently but was increasingly instigated and orchestrated by the PIRA and focused against British troops. The Provos began their move from defense to retaliation. They began a major bombing campaign, which by the end of the year had caused an estimated £5 million worth of damage with 153 explosions (Bell 1993, 184). Catholic popular support was strongly leaning toward the PIRA, and their recruiting was surging. The Provos also had a number of incidents

with the Official IRA in Ulster, but these incidents were minimized by truces, which reduced the internecine violence but not the underlying causes and grievances.

1971

In January 1971, the Provisional Army Council recognized that "provocative retaliation" was in full effect and authorized the move to the offensive as well, which authorized the deliberate killing of British soldiers while on duty (London 1972, 245; Bell 1993, 187, 191, 199). On 3 to 4 February, British soldiers were wounded by gunfire and on 6 February the first British soldier was killed in Northern Ireland (Bell 1983, 379). The following day, during a television appearance, the Stormont Prime-Minister, Bruce Chichester-Clark proclaimed, "Northern Ireland is at war with the Irish Republican Army Provisionals" (Bell 1983, 379).

During March 1971, the truce between the two IRAs fell and gangland violence broke out on the streets of Northern Ireland (Moss 1972, 101). The truce was reestablished, but not before losses occurred on both sides. On 9 March, in an act that shocked both Republican and Unionist public opinion, three British soldiers (one of whom was seventeen) were executed, shot in the back of the head at close range, along a deserted roadside (Bell 1993, 198). Both IRAs denied responsibility, though it was later concluded that Provo gunmen had conducted the assault without authorization (London 1972, 250). Unionist backlash was severe and Chichester-Clark requested an additional 3,000 soldiers. The British government only agreed to send 1,300 and Chichester-Clark resigned in protest on 20 March. The PIRA leadership, though not responsible, saw this incident as a double victory in that it brought down a standing Stormont government

while, at the same time, the PIRA was able to maintain public support within the Catholic community despite the higher level of violence.

On 23 March 1971, Brian Faulkner was elected Prime Minister of the Stormont government. Internment, under the Special Powers Act, had begun to be discussed as the only way to restore order to Northern Ireland. As the Protestant marching season approached, the Stormont once again refused to ban the marches, against the Army's advice, and the PIRA stepped up the bombing campaign and instigated selected terrorism and riots (Bell 1983, 380). The Army was ordered to guard police stations and by July had reached a strength of 11,800 soldiers deployed in Northern Ireland (Bell 1993, 209). On 9 July, the SLDP announced a boycott of the Stormont parliament. Rioting occurred throughout July and in early August reached a crescendo with the accidental killing of a Catholic by the Army followed by the sniping death of a soldier.

On 9 August 1971, internment without charges or trial was authorized by the Stormont parliament (and was to last until 1975). From the beginning, internment faced tactical difficulties and shortly proved strategically disastrous. Operation Demitrius, the initial internment effort, was designed to decapitate the IRA command structure in one swoop, but faced severe troubles from the start. Intelligence was scanty and old, particularly in light of the loss of police contact with the Catholic enclaves and the rapid recruiting of the PIRA. The Army wanted to keep the initial effort to a minimum essential number of internees, no more than around 100, but was not the final deciding authority, and the list for internment reached 450. Additionally, there were no Protestants on the internment list. The army was not trained for mass arrests, and telegraphed its intentions to the PIRA by conducting trial runs in July and August (Bell 1983, 381).

Internment was authorized twenty-four hours before the Army had been told to plan for it to start.

The Army was able to capture 342 of the 450 listed, but this led to violence on a level previously unknown to Northern Ireland, with days of rioting and open assaults on British forces by the PIRA, and over seventeen dead within thirty-six hours (Asprey 1994, 1127). More troops were flown in, reaching a strength of 12,500 by 12 August (Bell 1993, 221). The media were not restricted and images of the violence were broadcast worldwide. The PIRA rapidly exploited the situation informationally. The British Army held a news conference in Belfast on 13 August, claiming internment was successful and that the IRA leadership and ranks had been decimated (Bell 1993, 222). The PIRA scored a major propaganda victory by holding a simultaneous news conference, only blocks away, where the Belfast Brigade commander appeared openly to refute the success of internment.

Internment irrevocably broke the legitimacy of the Stormont government with the Catholic community and cemented popular support of the IRA. Robert Moss in *The War for the Cities* reported that "By August 1971, British army spokesmen were ready to concede that as many as a quarter of the Catholics of Belfast and Derry were helping the IRA, and that as many as half were broadly in sympathy" (1972, 94). PIRA recruiting was skyrocketing. The SDLP and other republican parties launched a rate and rent strike, which by the end of 1971 was threatening the collapse of local government, due to 22,000 Catholic households participating (Asprey 1994, 1127). This resulted in the passage of another unpopular law, seen to strike against the Catholic community, allowing social welfare and pension funds to be impounded to pay rents.

Most strategically damaging to the Stormont and British governments was the revelation of maltreatment of the internees and physical and mental abuse through the use of "deep" or "in-depth" interrogation. Deep interrogation attempted to disorient internees in order to make them more pliable to answering questions through long-term exposure to white noise, hooding, sleep and food deprivation, and maintenance of painful positions for long periods of time (Bell 1993, 226). The initial story of mistreatment appeared on 19 August in Dublin's *Irish Times* (Bell 1993, 231). The editor of Dublin's *United Irishman*, the Sinn Fein's official monthly newspaper, who was interned because he was staying at the home of one of the people on the internment list, smuggled out the reports of abuse. The reports were rapidly picked up by the Irish and British press. The three man Compton Commission was formed on 31 August to investigate charges of abuse during the initial week of internment (London 1972, 291). The *London Times* added weight to the issue with continuing reports (17 September, 17 and 24 October and 28 November) of maltreatment (London 1972, 292, 295). The Compton Report was released on 17 November (London 1972, 292). On 30 November the Republic of Ireland brought charges of torture during internment before the European Commission on Human Rights. The Commission found that though torture had not been applied, internees had been treated inhumanely (Bell 1993, 474).

Also on 30 November the Parker Committee was formed to investigate interrogation techniques. The Parker report consisted of a majority and minority opinion. The majority opinion concluded that deep interrogation produced physical ill treatment of the internees but did not constitute torture or brutality, and should continue under the justification of producing valuable intelligence. The minority report stated that the

procedures used were “illegal, not morally justifiable and alien to the traditions of the greatest democracy in the world” (Bell 1993, 227). When the British Prime Minister announced the findings in March 1972, he stated that the techniques of deep interrogation would not be used again.

Following internment, the PIRA drastically escalated its urban campaign of violence. On 26 September the PIRA began using antitank rockets in its attacks (Bell 1993, 239). By the end of 1971, the situation was becoming critical. There had been 1,756 shootings and 1,022 bombings, the majority (roughly 70 percent) of which had occurred following internment (Coogan1993, 287; Bell 1993, 239). There had been 59 security force deaths and over 700 injuries and 115 civilian deaths and around 1,800 injuries (Coogan 1993, 287), and violence continued to escalate.

1972

By early 1972, there was a general belief that the IRA could not maintain its current level of violence, and that the Army would begin to regain control. However, there were continuing increases in bombings and deaths. On 30 January 1972, a day which became known as “Bloody Sunday,” the British Army created a counterinsurgency disaster for itself when British paratroopers in Derry fired on a civil rights demonstration that had turned into a riot, killing thirteen unarmed civilians. Press reports immediately brought international chastisement on the British government and further alienated the Catholic population of Northern Ireland, as well as making Northern Ireland an even larger media event. The British Embassy in Dublin was burned by a mob sympathetic to the Northern Ireland Catholics. US senators called for the withdrawal of British forces from Northern Ireland and the UN Secretary General offered his aid in the resolution of

the Northern Ireland situation (Bell 1993, 277-278). The British government formed the Widgery Tribunal to investigate the events of "Bloody Sunday," which released a report in April 1970 that determined that the soldiers may have acted in bad judgment but had not acted illegally.

The British government finally recognized that something had to be done to resolve the crisis in Northern Ireland and that it would need to deal with the PIRA. A three-day truce was conducted from 10 to 13 March, showing conclusively that the PIRA had central control of the situation. On 13 March the PIRA secretly met with the opposition leader of the British government in Dublin (Bell 1983, 386). On 24 March the British government prorogued the Stormont parliament for a year, a significant political success for the Provos. However, the Provos did not reciprocate as desired with another cease-fire. The situation continued to spiral out of control with escalating Provo violence.

In June, the SDLP arranged secret talks between the PIRA and the British government. Gerry Adams was released from prison on 17 June to take part in the negotiations, and on 20 to 22 June negotiated a truce between British forces and the PIRA to start on 27 June (Bell 1983, 389). The PIRA delegation was flown to England on a Royal Air Force plane and negotiations began on 7 July. The Provos provided a list of demands, the primary being a unified Ireland. The British government felt that there was room for negotiation and agreed to another meeting a week later (Bell 1983, 391). However, on 9 July British soldiers participated in a forced rehousing of Catholics, and, after trying to get this action stopped, the PIRA declared the truce over. On 10 July the

PIRA announced that it had been conducting negotiations with the British government, destroying any hope for renewed negotiations.

The PIRA, in announcing its negotiations, showed political immaturity and clearly overestimated its strength in relation to the British. The Provos thought the offer to negotiate was a sign of weakness and that they had bombed the British to the bargaining table. They essentially came to the British with a list of demands because they felt that they were in the position of strength. When the PIRA revealed the negotiations, it felt that by continuing to escalate the violence that it could force the British back to negotiations. Unfortunately, it were mistaken and lost the chance for significant dialogue and possible concessions.

Following the end of the truce, the PIRA strategy shifted away from the agitation of rioting and took a new path. The new strategy focused on shooting of security personnel, continued bombings, including car bombs, against economic targets of all sizes, and the exploitation of propaganda and intelligence (Coogan 1993, 283). On 21 July, which would become known as "Black Friday," the PIRA detonated no fewer than 22 bombs in Belfast, killing 9 and wounding 130 (Mansfield 1980, 55). By the end of 1972, the PIRA had detonated 1,382 bombs, conducted 10,628 shooting incidents, and killed 146 members of the security forces and 322 civilians (Coogan 1993, 287). This was the highest level of violence reached by the PIRA throughout the Troubles.

However, the PIRA also faced significant difficulties starting in 1972. In May, the Irish Republic proscribed the IRA, driving the PIRA General Headquarters underground, and on 31 May, Rory Brady, head of the Provisional Sinn Fein, was arrested and jailed (Bell 1983, 388). This was followed later in the year by the arrest of

the Chief of Staff, Sean MacStiofan (Asprey 1994, 1129). On 29 May the Official IRA declared a unilateral truce (Bell 1983, 388), criticizing the Provos for engaging in senseless violence. On 24 July the British government proclaimed its "first aim was to destroy the IRA" (Bell 1983, 393). On 31 July the British Army began Operation Motorman, whose purpose was to eliminate the "no-go" areas in Derry and Belfast, and gather detailed intelligence. Additional soldiers had been deployed for the operation, and British troop levels reached their highest numbers of the entire campaign at almost 22,000 (Mockaitis 1995, 107). The PIRA, alerted to the operation and unable to stop it due to the strength arrayed for its conduct, allowed the British Army to conduct the mission virtually unopposed. In addition to removing barricades, the Army collected house-to-house census data, and compiled the information through the use of computers, allowing activity to be tracked in these areas. The elimination of the "no-go" areas and the effective collection and use of intelligence began to curtail the PIRA's freedom of action.

In addition, the police force was rearmed and there was a sharp rise in sectarian violence caused by the formation of Protestant paramilitary groups. The Diplock courts, special trials conducted by one judge without a jury to hear terrorism cases, were instituted on 20 December in response to intimidation of juries and judges in Northern Ireland (Coogan 1993, 334). Finally, ninety-five Provos died in 1972 in confrontations with the security forces, more than in any other year, and internments were also beginning to tell.

1973 and 1974

Despite restrictions, the Provos actively conducted offensive operations during 1973 and 1974, but with a reduction in numbers when compared to 1972, with bombings falling to 978 in 1973 and 685 in 1974 (Coogan 1993, 287). The restrictions also drove the development of new techniques, such as the proxy car bomb, where civilians were forced to deliver PIRA bombs, usually through threats to their families. The Provos were hurt by continued pressure from the security forces and the new threat of the Protestant paramilitaries. The Belfast Brigade went through five commanders between the summers of 1973 and 1974 due to internments (Bell 1983, 405). Bombing attacks became more indiscriminate and limited bombing campaigns were conducted in Britain in the fall of 1973 to the spring of 1974 and again in the fall of 1974. The PIRA also increased its recruitment of younger "soldiers" in the ten to sixteen year old range (Asprey 1994, 1131). However, J. Bowyer Bell states that during this period, "the Provos had more trained volunteers than they could use and more volunteers than they could train" (Bell 1993, 388). War weariness and reaction to indiscriminate bombings, as well as the replacement of internment with detention, which required a judge's ruling in order to hold a detainee, began to erode the PIRA's direct popular support (Mansfield 1980, 55). However, even in a weakened form the PIRA was still a force with which to be reckoned.

In March 1973, the British government enacted a law that allowed self-government to return to Northern Ireland. Part of the law required a power-sharing executive, which would allow Catholic representation within the executive branch of the new government. This new government was formed in December 1973, with Brian Faulkner again named as Prime Minister, and was seen as a major development toward

peace. Also in December, the British, Irish Republic, and new Northern Ireland governments met at Sunningdale and reached an agreement, which established an Irish Council, linking the governments of Northern Ireland and the Irish Republic. Neither the PIRA nor the Unionist extremists liked the Sunningdale agreement because neither side was included in the negotiations, and the Unionists saw it as the first step toward British departure from Northern Ireland. Both sides actively fought against it, but the new government's legislative body ratified it on 14 May 1974 (Bell 1983, 409). This provoked a Protestant general strike. Power, postal and telephone services were disrupted, and Protestant paramilitaries staged a bombing campaign in the Irish Republic (Bell 1983, 409). On 28 May the new government resigned, the British government resumed direct rule, and power sharing and the Sunningdale agreements were dead. The lesson learned was that no peace program in Northern Ireland would occur without the participation of the PIRA and the Protestant paramilitaries.

In December 1974, the Reverend William Arlow, a Protestant clergyman on the Irish Council of Churches who was known to have informal ties with the British government, approached the PIRA about a Christmas cease-fire. The Provos, seeing an opportunity to reopen direct negotiations with the British government, declared a cease-fire from 22 December 1974 to 2 January 1975 (Bell 1983, 415).

Outcomes and Analysis

On 2 January the PIRA extended the truce for another two weeks, but ended it on 16 January and reopened its bombing campaigns in Ulster and England within a week. On 10 February the PIRA, following discussions with British officials, declared a truce between the PIRA and British security forces that had no set end date. Discussions with

British officials continued throughout the year through a number of different venues. The truce lasted until November 1975, with all IRA internees being released, and internment ended. Unfortunately, while deaths of security forces and the PIRA decreased, sectarian violence conducted by the Protestant paramilitaries and the PIRA rose significantly. The conflict between the PIRA and the security forces began again and remained active until 1998.

Diplomatic, Informational, Military and Economic Analysis

The PIRA, from its creation in 1970 to the end of 1974, had managed, with different levels of success, to exploit the elements of national power against the forces of order, but had failed to either force the British to leave or have them concede Northern Ireland. Diplomatically and politically, the Provos helped to end to Stormont governments and invoke direct rule by the British government twice. It had caused all parties involved to recognize that there would be no solution to the Northern Ireland troubles without the participation of the PIRA. However, the PIRA's political immaturity and failure to correctly analyze its true strength caused it to throw away its best chance for continued dialogue and negotiations toward its ultimate goal in July 1972. The PIRA leadership still believed it could drive the British out with the "gun," instead of the policy adopted later, which involved "the gun and the ballot." Militarily, the PIRA was largely able to defend the Catholic population from the forces of order, but had greater difficulty against the Protestant paramilitary groups. The Provos forced the British forces to realize that they could not be eliminated, and would be able to continue limited offensive operations even under extreme pressure.

The PIRA understood that it would never be able to defeat the British Army in direct confrontation and was forced to realize that it had not been able to make the war so militarily costly to force an immediate British withdraw. The peak of PIRA activity occurred in 1972, and by 1974 the Provo leadership realized the only hope for eventual success in forcing the British out militarily was through a protracted people's war.

Informationally, the PIRA had succeeded beyond all expectation, but still showed significant signs of immaturity. It had succeeded in turning a mass movement civil rights campaign into a full-fledged nationalist insurgency. It had displaced the popular leadership of the long-term existing Republican organization, the Official IRA, with its own, and had caused Catholic perception of the British Army to transition from that of defenders to enemies. It had also successfully used the national and international media to its advantage, which normally translated into disadvantage and embarrassment for the forces of order. On the flip side, indiscriminate bombings and killings, either through accident, incompetence, or miscalculation, cost the IRA Northern Irish Catholic, English, and international popular opinion, particularly at times such as following Bloody Sunday, when, if exploited properly, positive propaganda may have had significant results.

Economically, the PIRA was able to severely damage the economy of Northern Ireland, particularly after the switch to a higher level of economic targeting in 1972. From 1969 to 1979, the overall cost to England due to economic destruction was £1 billion annually, equal to the amount that it contributed to the European Economic Community per year (Coogan 1993, 283). However, even as great as this sum was, in addition to the military costs, it was still not a high enough price to force the British out of Northern Ireland in the short run.

Exploitation of Advantages and Sufferance of Disadvantages

The examination of the use of advantages by the insurgents, the disadvantages used effectively against them, and the appropriate conditions or situations in which they applied will assist in establishing their validity in a modern context and, in part, help to address the feasibility of modern urban insurgency. The PIRA exploited a number of advantages and suffered disadvantages relating to urban insurgency during the first five years of the "Troubles" in Northern Ireland. In many ways, the "Troubles" more closely resemble the Battle of Algiers rather than the more protracted campaign of the Tupamoros. However, the PIRA, as an insurgent force, has proved more persistent and adaptive, and has survived to the present day, through adaptations of strategy and techniques, as a political and insurgent force.

The Mobilization of Public Demonstrations

The PIRA used the mobilization of public demonstrations and the instigation of riots effectively during the period under examination, especially during the defense and provocation stages of its strategy. The PIRA demonstrated the ability to incite and then prolong rioting for up a week. This caused an overextension of the security forces (at times) and was used as provocation to attempt to cause overreaction by the authorities and security forces. Public demonstrations could be used to serve a retaliatory purpose. Demonstrations and riots were also used as cover and distraction for the conduct of offensive actions, primarily shooting incidents. A unique practice of public demonstration was the civil disobedience rent and rate strike following the introduction of internment. Though the campaign was originally established by the SDLP, the PIRA, by the direction of their chief of staff, strongly advocated and enforced the strike. The

strike resulted in the virtual collapse of local governments and the introduction of a law that further alienated the Catholic population.

Effective Propaganda--Exploitation of the Media

The PIRA excelled at propaganda and exploitation of the media and effectively made use of armed propaganda, the use of military action to support propaganda action, against the security forces. To illustrate the seriousness with which the PIRA viewed armed propaganda, large or significant actions were known as "spectaculars" to accent their newsworthiness. The Provos were exceptionally effective in their propaganda campaign to portray the British Army as the enemy of the Catholic population. Through the use of provocation followed by excessive response, as well as a certain lack of understanding on the part of the military, the PIRA was able to rapidly and convincingly portray the Army as being against the Catholic population. It was able to discredit the Army over internment by, for example, having a news conference held by the Belfast Brigade commander simultaneously with an Army news conference announcing the defeat of the PIRA, and by exploiting the revelations about deep interrogation. Additionally, the PIRA deliberately framed innocent Catholics for internment to create greater resentment within the Catholic community and to create embarrassments for the Army in the media (Goodspeed 2002, 50). It also was able to turn "Bloody Sunday" into a disaster of major proportions for the British Army.

The Establishment of Insurgent Influenced/Controlled Areas

The PIRA created a number of insurgent controlled areas (the no-go areas) in Belfast, Derry, Lurgan, Armagh, Newry and Coailisland (Pearson 2001, 108) and

maintained strong influence in others. The no-go areas were completely controlled by the PIRA and British governmental authority was flaunted as not legitimate. They were used for recruiting, indoctrination, fund raising, training, and staging bases for attacks, as well as sanctuaries. The Provos organized the people for defense and early warning. The no-go areas were dismantled in Operation Motorman in July 1972, and curtailed the PIRA's previously unrestricted freedom of action, but since the areas were based in predominantly Catholic areas, the PIRA still maintained considerable influence in these areas.

Discriminate Targeting

The PIRA effectively used discriminate targeting at times. From 1971 onward, the PIRA deliberately targeted soldiers and security force personnel. In 1972, bombings became more focused against economic targets. As previously stated, the economic costs of Northern Ireland to England from 1969 to 1979 averaged £1 billion annually and death toll of soldiers and police from 1971 to 1979 was 494, with almost 80 percent of these being soldiers (Coogan 1993, 283,287).

Effective Use of Nontraditional, Nonprofile Combatants

The PIRA effectively used nontraditional, nonprofile combatants. Unlike the Official IRA, the Provos made the decision to allow women to serve actively and not merely as auxiliaries. Charles Allen, in *The Savage Wars of Peace*, talks about how British forces were unprepared to have women used against them and that women "were always the ones sent in to get close to us, to distract us so snipers could get set-up or the bombers" (1990, 228, 245). In 1972, a raid on the Lagan Valley Hospital, conducted by

an active service unit led by two women, freed a Belfast Brigade staff member (Bell 1993, 365). The Price sisters were in charge of a bombing team in England in 1973 when they were captured and imprisoned. The Price sisters began a 206-day hunger strike, garnering significant public sympathy when they were tubally force fed for the final 167 days of their strike (Bell 1993, 388-389). The PIRA also began to recruit younger combatants from 1973 onward, some reported to be as young as ten years old.

The Rise of Folk Heroes and Martyrs

The PIRA's poor security, its connected political and military wings, tradition, the effective use of propaganda, and prisoner hunger strikes allowed the rise of new folk heroes and martyrs of the Republican cause. The brigade structure and relative poor security allowed operational IRA soldiers to become well known and publicized. Additionally, the linkage between the military and political wings allowed an operational soldier, when exposed, to transition into the legal political party system, with Gerry Adams providing a prime example. The PIRA hunger strikers brought about a great deal of national and international sympathy, even to the point that PIRA hunger striker Bobbie Sands was elected to the British parliament in April 1970; he subsequently died on 5 May (Bell 1993, 611, 613). The propaganda mechanism of the PIRA was able to effectively create martyrs for the Republican cause of those who died either resisting "the British imperialists" or on account of sectarian violence.

Polarization of Society

The polarization of society was both an advantage and disadvantage for the PIRA. As an advantage, it actively pursued polarization since it garnered popular support for the

offensive portion of its strategy. Propaganda was effectively applied around incidents, such as the Falls Road Curfew, internment, and "Bloody Sunday," to name a few. It allowed the PIRA to achieve a dominant role of leadership in the Republican movement and made it a required player in any settlement.

As a disadvantage, it provoked the unexpected rise in sectarian violence initiated primarily by the rise of the Protestant paramilitary groups. The rise of the Protestant paramilitaries came as surprise to the PIRA, which was well versed in Irish history. The Protestant paramilitaries had, as such, not needed to exist before because Protestant supremacy had been maintained through their control and use of the police force. The sectarian violence created greater polarization, but also put the PIRA in a position where it could not adequately respond in defense of the Catholic population. The PIRA also followed a policy of retaliation and response, which merely caused a further escalation of sectarian violence. Further, as the conflict protracted and the average age of the combatants lowered, the polarization led to an entire generation of Unionists and Republicans who only knew a situation of open conflict between the two communities, making negotiation and comprise more difficult for either side.

Security Requirements for Urban Insurgency

The security requirements of conducting an urban insurgency were a disadvantage for the PIRA. The Provos maintained the traditional IRA brigade structure until 1977, which allowed penetration, as well as the identification of leaders at all levels within the PIRA. Its security was further hampered by the systematic collection of census data from the previous no-go areas during Operation Motorman. Internment followed by detention, and the implementation of the Diplock courts further complicated security matters. The

Provos did have some counters for the security measures. These included the PIRA General Headquarters, the executive body, being maintained in the generally more permissive environment of the Irish Republic, and the policy of captured PIRA men losing their assigned position and not automatically regaining it upon release or escape.

Internecine Fighting

Without doubt, the PIRA suffered from the ongoing conflict with the Official IRA during the time period examined in this study, as well as with other splinter groups since 1974. First, the PIRA had to build itself from scratch and did not reap the benefits of the existing structure in Northern Ireland. Second, the conflict between the Officials and the Provos weakened the popular support for both groups by dividing the Catholic community. Additionally, in 1970, their internal fighting probably created as many IRA casualties as did fighting with security forces. Finally, the open rift gave the security forces a seam to exploit against both organizations.

The Use of Extralegal Techniques

Without question, the PIRA suffered from the use of extralegal techniques used against them by the security forces. Though not as extreme as either the French or Uruguayans, the British impinged on the legal rights of their citizens in an attempt to restore order and gain control of the situation. Internment, while an initial strategic disaster, was maintained until 1975, and kept considerable pressure on the PIRA. The use of deep interrogation was an effective tool in gathering actionable information, as confirmed by the recommendation to continue it in the Parker Report. Deep interrogations returned to use by the Ulster Defense Regiment in 1976 and 1977, when

the military returned control to the civilian forces of order. The one judge, no jury Diplock courts were also extremely effective, particularly when combined with deep interrogation.

The Effects Created by the Counterinsurgents

The two primary shortfalls of the British Army as the counterinsurgent force were allowing the no-go areas to be established and allowing its own transition from defender to enemy. While the no-go areas were primarily a political decision in which the British Army had no say, they were the source of their own failure in the second by losing their legitimacy in the Catholic community.

In transitioning from defender to enemy, the Army lost its legitimacy as an objective maintainer of order in the eyes of the Catholic population. Though PIRA propaganda acted as an accelerator in this transition, the PIRA propaganda was so effective because it was largely based in truth. The British Army was not properly trained or equipped to conduct the restoration of order mission it had been assigned during the period under examination. It acted as an Army and not as a constabulary force, both improperly applying force and using excessive force. In 1969 and 1970, it was forced to indiscriminately use CS gas to break disturbances because it was not trained to use or equipped with standard riot control gear, such as shields or rubber and or plastic bullets. The Army allowed itself to be used in actions specifically targeting the Catholic community, such as the Falls Road Curfew house-to-house area search and other similar incidents, and internment, where the tactical gain did not outweigh the strategic penalty. Finally, the Army fell short in developing an overall campaign plan, especially

in terms of civic action, psychological operations and the coordination of intelligence with all agencies.

Long Term Outcome

From 1975 until 1998, the PIRA maintained active insurrection in Northern Ireland and attacked targets in England and Europe. In J. Bowyer Bell's words, the PIRA conducted a "slogan strategy," a protracted campaign to maintain a sufficient level of intensity to eventually cause concession on the part of the British government through frustration and exhaustion (Beckett 2001b, 222). The PIRA has gone through a number of evolutions to carry forth this strategy. It has focused more on security and professionalization, and shifted from a strictly military strategy to a strategy recognizing the need for political action, quantified in the slogan "the bullet and the ballot box." In 1977, the PIRA reorganized from brigades to a cellular structure. It also initiated contacts with other European and North African terrorist groups (Asprey 1994, 1133). In 1976 and 1977, the IRA killed the British ambassadors to the Irish Republic and to The Hague, and Lord Louis Mountbatten was killed off the coast of the Irish Republic when a bomb exploded on his yacht. From 1981 to 1983, IRA prisoners conducted hunger strikes, in which ten died (Asprey 1994, 1134), including Bobbie Sands, who was elected to the British parliament. In 1985, violence flared in response to the Anglo-Irish agreement. From 1988 to 1990, the PIRA conducted attacks against British military facilities in Northern Ireland and in Germany (Asprey 1994, 1135), and 1991 and 1992, it started a new bombing campaign in England (Asprey 1994, 1134).

Successive British governments, on the other hand, have fully understood the need for a political settlement. There were political proposals in 1977 and the

establishment of the Northern Ireland Assembly from 1982 to 1986. In 1985, the Irish Republic and Britain negotiated the Anglo-Irish Agreement, which consisted of twelve articles, stating that a constitutional change of status in Northern Ireland would only occur by agreement and that a British-Irish Governmental Council would be formed (Bell 1993, 705). In December 1993, the Downing Street Declaration, stating that a settlement in Northern Ireland would be based on nonviolence and consent, was released by the British and Irish governments (Beckett 2001a, 171).

Secret discussions between the PIRA and the British government began in 1993. The PIRA declared a cease-fire that lasted from September 1994 to February 1996, and the Protestant paramilitary groups declared a cease-fire in October 1994. In May 1996, an all parties peace forum was elected, based on the conditions established by the Mitchell Commission in 1995. The PIRA declared another cease-fire in July 1997, which is still in effect, in order to allow the Sinn Fein to participate in the peace forum. (Beckett 2001a, 171). The Good Friday Accords were signed on April 10, 1998, "allowing for recognition of the principle of consent, by which Ulster will remain part of the United Kingdom so long as the majority willed it so, an assembly and a power-sharing executive, a North-South ministerial council, a so-called Council of the Isles, and a commitment to paramilitary disarmament (Beckett 2001b, 223)." The new executive began to function in 1999, and after political crises that almost ended the peace process, the PIRA announced on 23 October 2001 that it was to begin a process to put its arms beyond use (BBC News 2001). On 6 November 2001, David Trimble was elected First Minister. In response to calls for a unification vote from Sinn Fein and its President,

Gerry Adams, on 10 March 2002, Trimble announced that the unification vote should occur in 2003 (Kansas City Star, 10 March 2002).

Conclusion

The beginning of the Troubles in Northern Ireland witnessed the transition of a mass civil rights movement into a full nationalist urban insurgency. The PIRA was formed from scratch and attempted to force the end of British rule in Northern Ireland through military means. While the Provos failed to immediately force the unification of Ireland, they survived and began a protracted campaign. The British government realized that it could not destroy the PIRA, and that a political solution to Northern Ireland would have to be found. After more than thirty years of armed struggle, it appears that the population of Northern Ireland will be allowed to determine its fate in 2003.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

General Thesis Conclusions

The conduct of urban insurgency in the modern age is feasible. Eventual success, or at least lack of failure, in the post-World War II era for the urban insurgent stems from the ability to maintain legitimacy in order to persist and protract conflict, even in the face of military failure, while delegitimizing the government and its forces. The critical struggle of legitimacy between the insurgent and the government is a zero sum game whose objective is the sympathy and support of the target population or subpopulation. In order to create a committed mass movement and political base, the insurgency must carefully blend and apply its military and informational powers to establish a framework, which capitalizes on the advantages to the insurgent within the urban context. This requires the urban insurgent to attack not only the physical composition of the government, its forces, and any portion of the population militantly opposed to the insurgency, but also its will to resist. In doing so, the insurgents must attempt to persuade the uncommitted portion of the targeted population exoterically that the means were suitable to the incident, while reaffirming, esoterically, the same to the committed portion.

Specific Conclusions

Purposes of the Modern Urban Insurgencies

The purposes of modern urban insurgency fall into a paradigm containing two diametrically opposing categories: to gain power in order to rectify a perceived or actual deprivation of a population or subpopulation, or to maintain power in order to continue to

benefit from the deprivation of a population or subpopulation. An argument could be made historically for a strictly anarchical urban insurgency purpose, but no significant urban insurgencies of this type occurred during the period of study.

The paradigm of the diametrically opposing categories applies to all three cases studies examined in this thesis. In Algeria, the deprivation of the Muslim population by the colonial rule of France was the root cause. In Northern Ireland, the situation was somewhat more complex, since the insurgency was ignited by the deprivation of the Catholic minority by the Protestant majority, but reoriented on Great Britain, as a colonial power, maintaining Protestant domination. In Uruguay, the deprivation was primarily economic, created by a ruling oligarchy that was unable or unwilling to address the necessary economic or political reforms. In all three cases, the insurgencies gave rise to opposing extremist groups whose goal was to preserve the power of the ruling authorities.

Advantages and Disadvantages of the Urban Insurgent

In addressing the effective exploitation of advantages to promote the ends of the urban insurgency and sufferance of disadvantages to its detriment, basic differences in rural and urban techniques will be highlighted and possible future usage and enhancements will be discussed. The advantages and disadvantages that will be addressed are urban logistics, the use of underground infrastructure, infiltration and penetration, use of non-traditional, non-profile combatants, the mobilization of public demonstrations, propaganda and exploitation of the media, discriminate targeting, polarization of society, the establishment of insurgent influenced/controlled areas,

security requirements for urban insurgencies, and the use of extralegal techniques by the counterinsurgents.

Urban Logistics

The ability to sustain, fund and transport insurgents and supplies is greater in the urban environment. This, in turn, allows the urban insurgent to be less physically hardy than his rural counterpart. The relative abundance and ease of acquiring foodstuffs from merchants in the urban environment relieve the often-primary concern of the rural insurgent to insure that he can subsist. Additionally, potable water and medical care are also more abundant.

The urban insurgent, generally, has a greater access to funds. In addition to robberies, extortion or tax collection and kidnapping for ransom, there is also the possibility of obtaining loans, running businesses (legal or illegal), actually working for pay, and using stolen or forged checks or credit cards, either outright or through identity theft. Many Tupamoros were salaried workers or received government welfare payments. The IRA ran pubs that sold untaxed liquor and beer as part of their funding efforts. The urban insurgent can also frequently use existing transportation systems or can buy, hire or steal the required transportation with less risk of discovery due to a higher vehicle density in the urban environment.

Use of Underground Infrastructure

The use of underground infrastructure is primarily an urban advantage, though there are counterexamples, like the Vietnamese tunnel systems or Afghani cave systems. The Tupamoros were the only group under examination to use this advantage

specifically, and they used it extensively, both operationally and logistically. The FLN did, however, take steps to develop caches and hideaways in the Casbah. This is an advantage where future usage and enhancement is possible, particularly in attacking urban infrastructure in the areas of communications, power and information systems.

Infiltration And Penetration

Infiltration and penetration can be an advantage or disadvantage, but these are techniques that are more often used by counterinsurgent forces. A successful infiltration by the insurgents is more difficult, since there is a time requirement involved for the infiltrator to reach a position of usefulness, unless someone can be recruited that already holds an exploitable position. In a protracted insurgency, time may not be as important a constraint for an insurgent infiltration. In addition, to be successful, a potential infiltrator may require specific skill sets that are not available to the insurgents. The Tupamoros used infiltration effectively, particularly on their raid on the Montevideo Naval Training Center. This is another technique that will see continued use in the future, and will offer expanded opportunities for the insurgents, especially computer network attack and penetration.

Use of Nontraditional, Nonprofile Combatants

Nontraditional, nonprofile combatants, that is, women and children, were used to advantage by all three of the insurgencies examined. Though this is not a uniquely urban technique, there are reasons that such combatants will be used in increasingly greater numbers in urban insurgency. The first reason, as discussed in urban logistics, is that the urban insurgent is not required to be as hardy or as physically strong as his rural

counterpart. In regard to women, cities are usually the focal point for feminist activity. Cultural biases often lead either to protection, particularly of the young, or dismissal, particularly of women. Additionally, women and children can enhance the security of an organization by giving the appearance of the traditional family. This advantage should be anticipated for future usage and expanded upon. Though not used in the examined cases, another group that could exploit this advantage, if recruited, are the elderly.

Mobilization of Public Demonstrations

The mobilization of public demonstrations is primarily an urban advantage. This is due to population density and relative anonymity of people in the urban environment. The urban insurgent can play a direct instigation role, as in Algiers and Northern Ireland, or an indirect role, as with the Tupamoros. Direct instigation requires either an insurgent or antiinsurgent committed mass movement, and is facilitated by societal polarization, especially in a heterogeneous society. Public demonstrations can be effectively exploited as provocation to security forces, an economic tool, or a propaganda tool, as well as a cover for other insurgent operations. The PIRA used public demonstrations extremely well, particularly in overextending security forces, and as an economic tool, by extending demonstrations over long periods of time. The mobilization of public demonstrations will continue to be used with great effect in the future. From recent US Army experiences in the Balkans, one can assume that this will be enhanced through the use of modern communication equipment, such as cellular telephones.

Propaganda and Exploitation of the Media

While propaganda and exploitation of the media are not uniquely urban advantages, their application is facilitated in the urban environment, and will be exploited in the future with higher frequency and effect. Any insurgency needs to publicize its aims and deeds and attempt to enhance the public's perception of its strength. Additionally, it is critically important that the insurgency present itself in the most positive light in order to garner popular support. Propaganda and media exploitation are enhanced in the urban environment due to higher population density and greater media presence and focus. The advent of CNN and other competing news channels further enhances exploitation, as more media personnel jockey for stories and actions are broadcast in near real time and rapidly and cyclically repeated, generally without analysis. Another aspect that facilitates exploitation is the meteoric growth of the Internet with minimal policing. Insurgents in Chiapas and Chechnya have recently exploited the Internet with effect in the dissemination of propaganda.

Discriminate Targeting

Discriminate targeting will, for the most part, be an essential element of urban insurgency. Since the insurgent requires public support, careful analysis and execution to minimize collateral damage and manage unintended consequences will be necessary. Higher population density and greater interdependence of urban systems will continue to increase the refinement of targeting to maintain positive public opinion. All three insurgencies suffered a loss of public support when they resorted to indiscriminate attacks. The PIRA bombing campaigns in England are exceptions to discriminate

bombings, since they were deliberately intended to take the war to the British populace. However, these attacks cost the IRA in terms of international support, particularly funding from the United States. Discriminate targeting will continue in the future, though discriminate targeting will probably increase in effect, especially when it is the result of attacks against information infrastructure.

The Establishment of Insurgent Influenced or Controlled Areas

While not a solely urban advantage, establishing an insurgent-influenced or insurgent-controlled area can play a significant role in urban insurgency. The influenced or controlled urban area provides the insurgent operational and logistical advantages, since it can be used for staging, resupply, and sanctuary. More significantly, it provides an area for recruitment and indoctrination, which facilitates the establishment of power duality, a shadow government and the formation of a committed mass movement and political base. The FLN and PIRA both used such areas for significant advantage during the periods examined; in their cases these areas were created and supported by a committed mass movement. The Tupamoros did not. In the future, primarily due to technological advances, the establishment of insurgent influenced or controlled areas will be harder for insurgents, though not impossible.

Polarization of Society

The polarization of society is almost an inevitable and universal outcome during any insurgency and can be both an advantage and disadvantage. Polarization may help to mobilize the population or radicalize moderate elements. Polarization is more easily exploited in societies that are heterogeneous, such as Algeria or Northern Ireland, where

racial, cultural and religious differences were more apparent for discrimination. Northern Ireland is an interesting case, since it was the Protestants, and not the population of Britain, who were the stated enemy. In more homogenous societies, such as Uruguay, greater provocation is required to achieve similar effects. Additionally, societal polarization gives rise to opposing preservationist insurgencies, which add another security consideration that is difficult for the insurgents to template.

Security Requirements for Urban Insurgencies

The security requirements to conduct urban insurgency are a disadvantage, and are greater than rural insurgencies. Urban insurgencies normally require a cellular structure. Such a structure may, indeed, be functionalized by cell, but the structure may also be a hierarchical pyramid or flatter organizationally. A more developed hierarchy provides greater centralized control, but is vulnerable to decapitation, as was the case with the Tupamoros. A flatter organization requires greater independent operation and is more difficult to command and control, but provides greater security. Both the Tupamoros and the FLN used a hierarchical cellular structure. The FLN was functionalized at the cell level, and the Tupamoros were functionalized at the front level. While the IRA maintained its traditional brigade structure through the period of study, it converted to a cellular structure in 1977 for the added security. In the future, the cellular structure will be the most common organizational structure for the added security provided, but enhanced technological noncontact communications, such as cellular and satellite telephones and electronic mail, and personal encryption devices will ease command and control and allow the greater use of a flatter cellular organization.

Use of Extralegal Techniques by the Counterinsurgents

The use of extralegal techniques, such as the reduction or elimination of civil liberties and torture, by the counterinsurgents can provide assistance to the insurgent in the strategic sense by delegitimizing the government through propaganda, media exploitation and societal polarization, as illustrated in all three case studies, most especially in the Battle of Algiers. However, it provided the counterinsurgents an undeniable tactical advantage when properly executed and exploited. It led to the French tactical victory in the Battle of Algiers. Two British commissions sanctioned the use of "deep interrogation" in Northern Ireland, since it was highly effective in gaining actionable intelligence, with a minority opinion castigating its use on a moral basis. Extralegal activity in the form of deep interrogation returned to use in Northern Ireland during "Ulsterization," the transition from military to civilian police control, before being constrained again. The military's use of extralegal methods in Uruguay provided for the strategic victory over the Tupamoros. The use of extralegal techniques will continue to be used in the future against insurgents because it denies insurgents the opportunity to use the legal processes of society as cover for illegal action, despite its anathemazation by free societies. In the "Terrorism Viewed Historically," Dr. Douglas Johnson and Colonel John Martin (United States Army) state,

> The historical record demonstrates that counterterrorist campaigns are most successful when laws are adapted to address terrorist threats. Intelligence capabilities must be expanded first, *followed by elimination of any excessive concerns for due process that might impede direct action* [emphasis mine]--capture and prosecution, if possible; killing, if not--against terrorists. (2002, 2-3)

Recommendations for Future Research

The following subjects emerged from the current research as areas that required further and future examination.

The Differences Between the Urban Insurgencies in Open and Closed Societies

The differences in the conduct of urban insurgencies in free and closed societies should be researched. Particular focus should be placed on the causes behind the insurgency, the development of the organization, and the level of violence encountered. Policy decisions on the governmental response and employment of counterinsurgent forces should be examined. Relative success and the application of advantages and disadvantages should be evaluated in terms of effectiveness. If closed societies are found to be more effective in counterinsurgency, analysis should be conducted on determining the underlying causation, and tactics and doctrine should be examined to determine their utility in counterinsurgency conducted by a free society.

Examination of Urban Counterinsurgency

The conduct of urban counterinsurgency should be examined in detail. While the current research addressed some aspects pertaining to urban counterinsurgency, the subject requires research as the primary topic. Particular focus should be placed on the development of the counterinsurgency campaign. Planning assumptions, intelligence, restrictions, policy and objectives should be reviewed through campaign analysis to address their impact and determine deviations and changes. Political, economic and informational initiatives and action will require evaluation for effectiveness in their timing and in their impact on and coordination with the security campaign.

Develop Modeling Support for the Analysis of Urban Insurgency

Research should be conducted in order to develop a computer modeling analysis capability to address urban insurgency. First, a general societal database and urban terrain database would need to be developed, which would allow input of a specific conflict to be analyzed. This would allow the analysis of popular support by city region and conditions required to change that support. A critical task analysis on urban insurgency would be required. Detailed studies of the areas to be examined would then be input into the databases. The system itself would need to be developed as a complex adaptive system in order to allow a full range of interactions and permit the discovery of emergent behaviors.

The Future of Urban Insurgency

Urban insurgency will occur in the future. Global trends of virtually unconstrained population growth and urbanization (at their highest levels in the underdeveloped countries of the world), globalization and the information revolution create conducive environments for urban insurgency. From the research conducted, popular support is critical to the eventual success of the insurgents. Additionally, though urban insurgency is feasible, the cost has been high to the insurgents, as illustrated in the case studies. Future insurgents will increasingly apply sophistication in three primary areas: security, information operations, and discriminate targeting. These areas will also blend synergistically to the insurgents' advantage and the counterinsurgents' disadvantage.

Security will be greatly enhanced by technology. As discussed above, enhanced technological noncontact communications, such as cellular and satellite telephones,

electronic mail, and personal encryption devices, facilitate the command and control of flatter cellular organizations, providing higher levels of security. Additionally, the global growth and societal infusion of Internet technologies facilitate security. Examples include free electronic mail accounts not tied to users' physical location, virtually unrestricted access to Internet service providers through public facilities, like libraries and cyber cafes, delayed and instant text messaging, the ability to establish and maintain multiple internet accounts on multiple service providers, and real-time digital video teleconferencing and voice communication through computer networks. Besides personal encryption devices for telephones or cryptographic protocols for text messaging, steganography, literally covered writing, takes on a new power in the digital age. Free software is available that allows embedding a text message, encrypted if desired, into common file formats for graphics, sound or text, providing an almost unbreakable communication system. By exploiting these technologies for command and control, security can be enhanced to a greater level by allowing the insurgent organization to experience a higher level of geographical dispersion, even within the cell level, to the extent that cells could be dispersed within a country or even internationally.

The purpose of the insurgent's information operations is to gain and maintain popular support, domestically and probably internationally. These operations will serve to highlight the insurgents' strengths and accomplishments while attacking the legitimacy of the ruling authorities and their information systems. All insurgent operations will be integrated with information operations to gain the maximum effect from each of their actions. For example, in order to informationally exploit the media, the insurgents will deliberately attempt to provoke retaliatory action from security forces. The informational

value to the insurgent lies in the higher newsworthy potential of security force retaliation than in the insurgent provocation. Michael Goodspeed, in *When Logic Fails,* directly addresses this phenomenon when he states,

> In comparison to the actions of the security forces, terrorist actions fade rapidly from the public eye because they are anonymous and there is no accountability. Once the atrocity has been committed there is little marketable news beyond the horror of the event itself. There are no public relations officers with statements for the press, no questions are asked to the responsible minister in the House of Commons, there is no chairman of a board of inquiry to interview, and there is usually no trial or final report on the incident offered to the public. There is a serious danger in this, because the perception of the public mind of relative wrong doing is often directly proportional to the degree of media exposure surrounding the incident. In the fight for hearts and minds, publicity is often a more potent weapon than explosives. In this respect, terrorist incidents generate considerably less adverse publicity than do failings of the security forces. (2002, 52)

Future insurgencies should be expected to conduct computer network attacks. This act can take on several nonconcurrent purposes. Computer network attack can be used as a form of penetration for intelligence gathering, it can be used to deny or destroy information systems to the ruling authorities, and it can be used as a tool to embarrass and delegitimize the ruling authorities. Additionally, the insurgents will exploit the Internet as a means to create and disseminate propaganda. The Internet provides significant reach to an audience and is virtually unregulated.

Discriminate targeting is crucial to public support for the insurgency. This, in large part, is why Ian Beckett states, “while insurgents might routinely employ terror or intimidation in tactical terms, they have rarely done so at the strategic level” (2001b, vii). Indiscriminate targeting or the use of weapons of mass effect are unlikely in future urban insurgencies except in two incidents: societal polarization has reached such a level that settlement is virtually impossible, like the current Palestinian-Israeli conflict, or the

attacks are conducted against the population of an external actor, like the IRA's bombing campaign in Great Britain. Targeting becomes more critical for the insurgent, as urban systems increasingly become interdependent, in order to avoid unintended consequences that reduce popular support. Nevertheless, a higher level of economic targeting should be expected in the future, especially directed against the relatively soft target of information infrastructure, both physical and virtual. Selective control or destruction of such infrastructure is low risk, can produce or threaten catastrophic damage, and significantly lessen ruling authority legitimacy. However, security force members will continue to be the primary human targets for the urban insurgent. These groups will be attacked in order to form a provocation and retaliation cycle, as well as to affect security force morale and delegitimize the government at the grass roots level. Critical to discriminate targeting will be its careful coordination and integration with the conduct of the insurgent's information operations.

In response to these anticipated insurgent actions, the counterinsurgent forces will need to focus planning, intelligence and coordination, restraint, and information operations. The overall focus must be to gain and maintain popular support, and to do this the counterinsurgent force must win the information war. The key factor that must be understood by the counterinsurgent forces is that counterinsurgency is not primarily a military action, and there must be a coherent campaign plan, including fully integrated information operations, to address the underlying causes of the insurgency and, most importantly, convincingly demonstrate to the people that the causes are being addressed. Military action serves to provide a secure environment for the plan to be executed successfully. Intelligence and coordination will be critical for the successful conduct of

the counterinsurgency campaign. The collection of intelligence and the protection of critical infrastructure will require a previously unknown level of coordination between federal, regional and local governments, to include security forces at each level, private industry, and possibly international partners. Information must be gathered at all levels, seamlessly processed into actionable intelligence, and then distributed to the appropriate organizations for coordination and action. Intelligence operations must fully appreciate the level of sophistication in the use of modern technologies by the urban insurgents.

The use of extralegal procedures by governments should be anticipated and require detailed planning by counterinsurgent forces in order to be executed for the greatest positive impact on intelligence gathering and security. Critical factors in employing extralegal procedures include restraint, an established means to remove the procedures, garnering public approval prior to their implementation and the application of the minimum restrictions for the minimum duration to create the desired result. In applying extralegal procedures, the counterinsurgent force must recognize the higher potential of informational exploitation for misdeeds on its part, and take active precautions to gain support for the procedures before their implementation and prevent abuses while the procedures are in force.

In conclusion, it is critical that the counterinsurgent force develops a coherent campaign plan, recognizing the need to win the information war for popular support that addresses the underlying cause of the urban insurgency.

REFERENCE LIST

Allen, Charles. 1990. *The savage wars of peace*. London: Michael Joseph, LTD.

Asprey, Robert B. 1975. *War in the shadows: The guerilla in history.* 2 vols. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc.

_____. *War in the shadows: The guerilla in history*. 1994. 2nd ed. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.

BBC News. Northern Ireland: 1998-2001. 2001. Site at news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/uk/northern_ireland/newsid_539000/539391.stm#2001. Accessed on March 31, 2001.

Beckett, Ian F.W. 2001a. *Encyclopedia of guerilla warfare.* New York: Checkmark Books.

_____. 2001b. *Modern insurgencies and counter-insurgencies: Guerillas and their opponents since 1750.* London: Routledge.

Bell, J. Bowyer. 1983. *The secret army: The IRA 1916-1979.* Dublin: The Academy Press, 1979, 3d ed. Reprint, The MIT Press (page references are to the reprint edition).

_____. 1993. *The Irish troubles: A generation of violence 1967-1992.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Coogan, Tim Pat. 1993. *The Ira: A history*. Niwot, CO: Roberts Rinehart Publishers.

Debray, Régis. 1967. *Revolution in the Revolution?*. Translated by Bobbye Ortiz. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Fall, Bernard B. 1975. *Last reflections on a war*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Gilio, Maria E. 1972. *The Tupamoros guerillas.* Translated by Anne Edmondson. New York: Saturday Review Press.

Godfrey, F.A. 1985. The Latin American Experience: The Tupamoros Campaign in Uruguay 1963-1973. In *Armed forces and modern counter-insurgency*. eds. Ian F.W. Beckett and John Pimlott, 112-135. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Goodspeed, Michael. 2002. *When reason fails.* Studies in Military History and International Affairs, ed. Jeremy Black. Westport: Praeger.

Griffin, Samuel B. 1961. Introduction to O*n guerilla warfare,* by Mao Tse-Tung. Translated by Samuel B. Griffith. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Guevara, Che. 1985. *Guerilla warfare.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Guillén, Abraham. 1973. *Philosophy of the urban guerrilla.* Translated and edited by Donald C. Hodges. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.

Heggoy, Alf A. 1972. *Insurgency and counterinsurgency in Algeria.* Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.

Horne, Alistar. 1987. *A savage war of peace: Algeria 1954-1962.* Revised ed. New York: Penguin Books.

International Monetary Fund Staff. Globalization: Threat or Opportunity. April 12, 2000. Site at www.imf.org/external/np/exv/ib/2000/0412000.htm. Accessed on September 9, 2001.

Johnson, Douglas V., II and Martin, John R. Terrorism Viewed Historically. In *Defeating Terrorism: Strategic Issue Analysis.* ed. John R. Martin, 1-5, Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College.

Joint Publication 1-02. *Department of Defense dictionary of military and associated terms.* 23 March 1994 as amended through 1 September 2000.

London Sunday Times Insight Team. 1972. *Northern Ireland: A report on the conflict.* New York: Vintage Books.

Kaplan, Robert D. 2000. *The coming anarchy: Shattering the dreams of the post cold war.* New York: Vintage Books.

Kaufman, Edy. 1979. *Uruguay in transition: From civilian to military rule.* New Brunswick: Transaction Books.

Lenin, V.I. 1971. Partisan Warfare. In *Terror and urban guerillas.* ed. Jay Mallin, 17-30. Coral Gables: University of Miami Press.

Lin Piao. 1977. Encircling the Cities of the World. In *The guerilla reader: A historical anthology* by Walter Laquer, 197-202. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Mansfield, Don. 1980. The Irish Republican Army and Northern Ireland. In *Insurgency in the modern world*, ed. Bard E. O'Neill, William R. Heaton and Donald J. Alberts, 45-85. Boulder: Westview Press.

Mao Tse-Tung. 1961. O*n guerilla warfare.* Translated by Samuel B. Griffith. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Mao Tse-Tung. 1977. The Three Stages of the Protracted War. In *The guerilla reader: A historical anthology* by Walter Laquer, 189-197. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Marighella, Carlos. 1971. *Minimanual of the urban guerilla.* In *Terror and urban guerillas.* ed. Jay Mallin, 67-116. Coral Gables: University of Miami Press.

Miller, James A. 1980. Urban Terrorism in Uruguay: The Tupamoros. In *Insurgency in the modern world*, ed. Bard E. O'Neill, William R. Heaton and Donald J. Alberts, 137-188. Boulder: Westview Press.

Mockaitis, Thomas R. 1995. *British counterinsurgency in the post-imperial era.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Moss, Robert. 1972. *The war for the cities.* New York: Coward, McCann & Geoghegan, Inc.

O'Neil, Bard E. 1990. *Insurgency & terrorism: Inside modern revolutionary warfare.* Dulles: Brassey's (US), Inc.

Pearson, David. 2001. .Low-Intensity Operations in Northern Ireland. In *Soldiers in cities: Military operations on urban terrain*, ed. Michael C. Desch, 103-120. Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College.

Porzecanski, Arturo C. 1973. *Uruguay's Tupamoros: The urban guerilla.* Praeger Special Studies in International Politics and Government. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Shy, John and Thomas W. Collier. 1986. Revolutionary Warfare. In *Makers of modern strategy: From Machiavelli to the nuclear age*, ed. Peter Paret, 815-862. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Sloan, John W. 1979. Political Terrorism in Latin America: A Critical Analysis. In *The politics of terrorism*, ed. Michael Stohl, 310-322. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc.

Special Operations Research Office. 1962. *Casebook on insurgency and revolutionary warfare: 23 summary accounts.* Washington, DC: The American University.

Thompson, Robert. 1966. *Defeating communist insurgency: Experiences from Malaya and Vietnam.* Studies in International Security: 10. London: MacMillan Press, Ltd.

Trinquier, Roger. 1964. *Modern warfare: A French view of counterinsurgency*. With an introduction by Bernard Fall. Translated by Daniel Lee. New York: Frederick A. Praeger.

Wilkinson, Paul, ed. 1981. *British perspectives on terrorism.* London: George Allen & Unwin (Publishers), Ltd.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Combined Arms Research Library
   U.S. Army Command and General Staff College
   250 Gibbon Ave.
   Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2314

2. Defense Technical Information Center/OCA
   825 John J. Kingman Rd., Suite 944
   Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-6218

3. Clinton J. Ancker, III
   Combined Arms Doctrine Directorate
   USACGSC
   1 Reynolds Ave.
   Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-1352

4. Harold S. Orenstein
   Combined Arms Doctrine Directorate
   USACGSC
   1 Reynolds Ave.
   Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-1352

5. William W. Mendel
   Foreign Military Studies Office
   101 Meade Ave
   Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-1351

CERTIFICATION FOR MMAS DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT

1. Certification Date: 31 May 2002

2. Thesis Author: Major Thomas Erik Miller

3. Thesis Title: The Efficacy of Urban Insurgency in the Modern Era

4. Thesis Committee Members

Signatures: _____

_____

_____

5. Distribution Statement: See distribution statements A-X on reverse, then circle appropriate distribution statement letter code below:

A B C D E F X SEE EXPLANATION OF CODES ON REVERSE

If your thesis does not fit into any of the above categories or is classified, you must coordinate with the classified section at CARL.

6. Justification: Justification is required for any distribution other than described in Distribution Statement A. All or part of a thesis may justify distribution limitation. See limitation justification statements 1-10 on reverse, then list, below, the statement(s) that applies (apply) to your thesis and corresponding chapters/sections and pages. Follow sample format shown below:

EXAMPLE

Limitation Justification Statement	/	Chapter/Section	/	Page(s)
	/		/	
	/		/	
	/		/	

Fill in limitation justification for your thesis below:

Limitation Justification Statement	/	Chapter/Section	/	Page(s)
	/		/	
	/		/	
	/		/	
	/		/	
	/		/	

7. MMAS Thesis Author's Signature: _____

STATEMENT A: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited. (Documents with this statement may be made available or sold to the general public and foreign nationals).

STATEMENT B: Distribution authorized to U.S. Government agencies only (insert reason and date ON REVERSE OF THIS FORM). Currently used reasons for imposing this statement include the following:

1. Foreign Government Information. Protection of foreign information.

2. Proprietary Information. Protection of proprietary information not owned by the U.S. Government.

3. Critical Technology. Protection and control of critical technology including technical data with potential military application.

4. Test and Evaluation. Protection of test and evaluation of commercial production or military hardware.

5. Contractor Performance Evaluation. Protection of information involving contractor performance evaluation.

6. Premature Dissemination. Protection of information involving systems or hardware from premature dissemination.

7. Administrative/Operational Use. Protection of information restricted to official use or for administrative or operational purposes.

8. Software Documentation. Protection of software documentation - release only in accordance with the provisions of DoD Instruction 7930.2.

9. Specific Authority. Protection of information required by a specific authority.

10. Direct Military Support. To protect export-controlled technical data of such military significance that release for purposes other than direct support of DoD-approved activities may jeopardize a U.S. military advantage.

STATEMENT C: Distribution authorized to U.S. Government agencies and their contractors: (REASON AND DATE). Currently most used reasons are 1, 3, 7, 8, and 9 above.

STATEMENT D: Distribution authorized to DoD and U.S. DoD contractors only; (REASON AND DATE). Currently most reasons are 1, 3, 7, 8, and 9 above.

STATEMENT E: Distribution authorized to DoD only; (REASON AND DATE). Currently most used reasons are 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10.

STATEMENT F: Further dissemination only as directed by (controlling DoD office and date), or higher DoD authority. Used when the DoD originator determines that information is subject to special dissemination limitation specified by paragraph 4-505, DoD 5200.1-R.

STATEMENT X: Distribution authorized to U.S. Government agencies and private individuals of enterprises eligible to obtain export-controlled technical data in accordance with DoD Directive 5230.25; (date). Controlling DoD office is (insert).