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Abstract

Clear classification provides the pathway to understanding different types of secular insurgent groups. Based on group objectives, eight different types of secular insurgent groups have been examined. Each of these types of groups has been categorized according to commonly used tactics, group size, and the correct level of chosen response to be used against each type of group. Although the classification of terrorist groups provides for much rebuttal and opportunities for debate, it is a necessary step in countering future terrorism. This paper is intended to illustrate the commonalities among terrorist groups. With an understanding of their objectives, their tactics, and similar groups past success and downfalls it is believed that effective responses can be developed and applied to counter the actions of future terrorist groups.
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Introduction

In order to determine an appropriate response to an insurgency, the type of insurgency needs to be understood. According to Bard O’Neill, author of Insurgency and Terrorism: From Revolution to Apocalypse, “An insurgency is essentially a political-legitimacy crisis of some kind.” The insurges that will be examined are all secular and all fall into one of eight categories - anarchists, apocalyptic-utopian, egalitarian, pluralist, commercialist, preservationist, reformist, or secessionist. The first four groups - anarchists, apocalyptic-utopian, egalitarian, and pluralist - are revolutionary insurgent groups that hope to significantly alter a current political system. The last four insurgent groups - commercialist, preservationist, reformist, and secessionist - all have specific goals. Traditionalists have been excluded from this examination since they are mainly religious in nature. This examination focuses on secular insurgencies and their emphasis on: group strategy, overall success, group size, and response. The insight on the types of terrorists groups has been borrowed from O’Neill.

There are many possible strategies that an insurgent group can utilize. These include: Mao Zedong’s popular protracted warfare strategy, the military focus strategy, a conspiratorial strategy, an urban warfare strategy, and a simple fear strategy. A brief explanation of each of these strategies appears below. The remainder of this paper features a more complete explanation of these strategies.

Popular protracted warfare strategy consists of three overlapping sequential phases. These phases are: strategic defensive, strategic stalemate, and strategic offensive. This strategy seeks to gain popular support while overthrowing a government. Victory can occur any time the enemy fails to respond to insurgent pressure by switching to another phase of the strategy.
Variations of this strategy have become popular because of its ease of adaptability in different political, cultural, and geographic situations.

Military focus strategy is similar to the popular protracted warfare strategy except that the insurgents believe that popular support for their insurgency is already sufficient or will be the byproduct of their military victories. In this way, military force is the primary focus of their efforts instead of having an added emphasis on gaining popular support.

Conspiratorial strategy is a coup often led by military officers or civilians who seek to remove the ruling party from power through a limited but swift use of force. The insurgents view the ruling leader or party as corrupt, inefficient, or as an illegitimate form of power that needs to be removed for progress to occur.

Urban warfare strategy is a series of actions developed by insurgents in highly populated areas with an aim to turn political crisis into armed conflict. In this strategy, insurgents believe that by performing violent actions, they will force the government to transform the political system into a militarily dominated situation. In turn, this will alienate the masses who will then revolt against the government to the benefit of the insurgency.

Simple fear strategy aims to eliminate or induce fear into specific targets thereby stopping the group from their ultimate objective(s). Adherents of the simple fear strategy do not have a complex political agenda. Instead, they seek immediate results. Their aim is to preserve the status quo, change a policy or system, or acquire power.

The overall success of an insurgency varies greatly. An insurgency cannot always win or always lose. It follows that certain types of insurgent groups have been more successful than others. Success occurs when the objectives of the group are met. However, insurgent groups often change their goals or profess ambiguous goals. A split in the group can develop which further complicates the notion of success because of the potential for different goals.

The size of insurgent group membership may vary from tens of individuals to tens of thousands. The actual size of insurgent groups is difficult to determine since membership may include active members, inactive members, supporters, sympathizers, and those who anonymously aid the group. Reliable numbers are difficult if not impossible to obtain.

The above categorizations will aid in determining a chosen response. Possible responses can be legal, local, national, and/ or international. A legal response consists of laws, rules, and regulations that hope to halt the group’s actions. A local or national response involves the use of police work, government agencies, or other means of force within the state. An international response involves the use force by multiple countries that cooperate to stop the actions of an insurgent group.

Placing an insurgent group into a specific category can also be highly debatable and is not definitive. Groups can arguably fit into several categories and may use different strategies. The success of a group is not black and white either. The changing or conflicting goals of an insurgency along with misleading rhetoric and potentially ambiguous goals further complicates easy classification.

Anarchists

To an anarchist “all authority patterns are unnecessary, political systems should be destroyed but not replaced.” (O’Neill, 20) Anarchist terrorist groups maintain the most far-reaching goals and are the most unlikely to succeed. The enormity of their ambition is kept in check by the reliance of the overwhelming majority of the world on organized government,
whether voluntary or involuntary. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Politics defines anarchism as a cluster of doctrines and attitudes centered on the belief that government is both harmful and unnecessary. The actions of anarchist terrorist groups reflect this primary ideology which is espoused by its members.

Anarchists believe that cooperation is preferable to competition in the promotion of social harmony and that the cooperation they seek is only authentic when it is voluntary. Anarchists believe that societies are capable of spontaneous order which renders government authority unnecessary at best or harmful at worst. From this line of thinking (infoshop.org), groups such as the New Revolutionary Alternative in Chechnya, 17 November in Greece, and the international anarchy movement in Spain have all attempted to create anarchy through terrorism.

In the late 1980s, an anarchist group known as the New Revolutionary Alternative (NRA) formed as a Chechhyan anti-government leftist organization in Russia. The group sought extreme nationalism and was anti-government after the fall of the Soviet Union in 1989. Although not much is known about the group, it is considered to be the terrorist organization credited with implementing multiple bombings in the Moscow region between 1996 and 1999. After bombing a federal security building, the Russian government proceeded to go after the group and with several arrests ended the group’s effectiveness. Since the arrests in 1999, the group has not accepted responsibility for any new actions. Since the Russian economy has been on the upswing since 1998, the appeal of this terrorist group has diminished. (START, NRA)

17 November was a Greek Marxist anarchist group established in 1975. The group’s name refers to the end date of a 1973 student uprising against the Greek government. The goals of the terrorist group included the removal of: US military bases from Greece, the removal of the Turkish military from Cyprus, and the removal of Greece from NATO and the European Union (EU). To achieve these objectives, 17 November assassinated US officials, Greek politicians, and bombed buildings. The group also attacked EU facilities and foreign firms in an attempt to pursue their goals. (Byman, 338) 17 November has since become inactive after 19 arrests in 2002. 17 November has since been replaced in ideology and in terrorist actions by The Revolutionary Struggle. (cfr.org)

In Spain, several hostile anarchist actions occurred in the early to mid 20th century. The anarchists resisted the government through implementation of kidnappings, assassinations, the bombing of government infrastructure, riots, and revolts. The revolts that occurred throughout the country were carried out by multiple anarchist factions using different tactics which all had the same goal of a social revolution. Most of the insurrections occurred within city limits which gave the government forces the advantage and consequently crushed the anarchist uprising. When Spanish dictator Francisco Franco defeated the anarchists and won the Spanish Civil War in 1939, all social reforms ended and most of the anarchists were executed. This effectively ended the widespread anarchy movement throughout Spain. (Bookchin, 95)

Overall, the anarchist groups mentioned, as well as unmentioned anarchist groups, have not been particularly significant. There has been much less participation in anarchist groups than in other forms of secular terrorism. This may or may not be a significant variable in their overall success. The groups have utilized urban warfare or conspiratorial strategies to undertake assassinations and bombings of infrastructures. It is worthy of note that government responses which have neutralized anarchist leadership seem to have effectively ended the group. As a whole, this type of secular terrorist group has not attained significant progress in achieving their overall goals.
Apocalyptic Utopian

The apocalyptic utopian groups are religious cults with political aims that transcend the confines of the state. These groups envision establishing a world order as a result of an apocalypse precipitated by their acts of terrorism.\(^{(O\text{\textsuperscript{Neill}, 23})}\)

Although this paper focuses on secular terrorist groups, apocalyptic utopian groups are worthy of mention as a special case. These groups use religious ideas for motivation and recruitment but are not religious in the traditional sense. Notable examples include Aum Shinrikyo in Japan, Mahdaviyat in Iran, and the American Christian White Supremacist Patriot movement.

Followers of Aum Shinrikyo, or the Supreme Truth, believe that a depraved and wronged world needs to be ruined in order to bring about spiritual salvation. Their message contains selected passages or ideas from Hinduism, Christianity, Buddhism, Shintoism, and mysticism. With such a wide range of philosophic appeals, Aum has found many followers among Japan\(^{s}\) intellectuals. Bruce Hoffman, author of \textit{Inside Terrorism}, states that Aum \(\text{n}\)s a mass religious movement motivated by a mystical, almost transcendental, divinely inspired imperative.\(^{(Hoffman, 119)}\)

Like other apocalyptic-utopian terrorist groups, Aum needed to create an apocalypse to achieve their sought-after utopia. In 1995, the terrorist group used sarin gas to attack the Tokyo subway system. In addition, they committed assassinations, kidnappings, extortions, thefts, and mail bombings in an attempt to destroy the current world to prepare for a new world order. Once authorities apprehended the leader of Aum, Shoko Asahara, and the group\(^{s}\) supplies, the group was significantly stalled.

Similar to Aum Shinrikyo, the Mahdaviyat or Last Imam group in Iran, believes that the mahdi or savior will not appear until the world is filled with cruelty and injustice. This being so, it is necessary to facilitate and expedite the spread of cruelty and injustice by destroying and removing institutions and people that foster justice.\(^{(O\text{\textsuperscript{Neill}, 24})}\) Through this line of thinking, the Islamic-influenced group believes they need to create cruelty and injustice so that the world can be saved.

Yet another secular based terrorist group with religious undertones is the American Christian White Supremacist Patriot movement. Organizations that fall under this movement act on a less comprehensible line of logic. These terrorist groups proscribe to a mixture of seditious, millenarian, paranoiac, racist, and antigovernment beliefs. (Hoffman, 82) Included in this is a belief in Christianity which attempts to give the group some sort of legitimacy. This mix of beliefs has led followers to wage a campaign of bombings and assassinations in the US towards an unclear end.

The above groups can be considered religious in nature only because there is an element of religion in their ideas but do not fully adhere to the teachings of any particular religion. The ideas of the apocalyptic-utopian terrorist groups may include religious connotations but they lack a way to transition from the apocalypse to utopian society without divine intervention. These groups or cults should be handled in a way similar to urban gangs. In this sense, police or government investigations should be conducted. The groups should be apprehended and disbanded. Lacking a clear goal, these terrorist groups do not utilize a single strategy but rather use a fear-based approach in an attempt to bring about the apocalypse.

Egalitarian
Egalitarian terrorist groups seek to impose a new system based on the ultimate value of distributional equality and centrally controlled structures designed to mobilize the people and radically transform the social structure within an existing community. Many egalitarian groups began to appear after the rise of 20th century communism. The egalitarian values appeals to communists and socialists alike. The egalitarian ideal of equal treatment for all and the sharing of the same political, economic, social and civil rights is unlikely to disappear and therefore there will always an appeal towards egalitarian ideals.

Some noteworthy egalitarian groups are: the Malayan Communist Party (MCP); the Huks in the Philippines; the Popular Front for the Liberation of Oman; the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front in El Salvador; the Vietcong in South Vietnam; the Thai National Liberation Front; and the Fedayeen i-Khalq in Iran. The geographic diversity of these groups indicates that this type of terrorist group is not regionally located but is instead founded on the egalitarian ideals spread from Karl Marx’s works.

The first egalitarian group for consideration is the Malayan Communist Party (MCP). Founded in 1930 the MCP advocated an end to British domination of their islands. To achieve this goal, the group formed unions in an effort to combat the actions of the British. During the Japanese rule of Malaysia (1942-45), the MCP again waged guerilla warfare by establishing unions against their new occupiers. Like the Huks in the Philippines (1946-54) and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Oman (1968-76), the MCP had the same goal in mind: to free themselves from foreign/ oppressive rule and to enjoy equal rights for their nation and their people. In 1960, the MCP was defeated by the British which essentially ended the MCP. A similar fate awaited the Huks and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Oman. Strong governments or smart politics effectively ended these terrorist groups.

In more recent times, there have been more successful egalitarian groups. Two such groups are the Shining Path or Sendero Luminoso in Peru and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Columbia (FARC). The Shining Path was a Maoist guerilla organization. The group members aimed to replace the current Peruvian leadership with leadership that would support more communist and socialist values. The Shining Path used a military focus strategy including narco-trafficking, kidnapping for ransom, indiscriminate bombings, and assassinations. The FARC has proven to be one of the most successful egalitarian groups. The group has used a variation of Mao’s popular protracted war strategy to advance their Marxist-Leninist ideology. The group operates and has supporters in rural as well as urban areas. They have been known to regularly conduct terrorist type attacks and fight against the government forces of Colombia. Although egalitarian groups are formed on the basis of equal distribution of wealth, they seldom employ this practice after achieving their goals. Once they have achieved power, the established regimes become authoritarian, repressive, and elitist.

The egalitarian groups reviewed above utilized either a variation of Mao’s popular protracted warfare strategy or a military focus strategy. This has led to differing amounts of success based on internal and external factors. In cases where the terrorist group was violently struck down or the goals of the group ceased to be relevant, then external factors played a significant role in their success. Likewise, internal factors such as leadership or organizational structure also played an important role in the success of egalitarian terrorist groups.
The last of the revolutionary groups for examination are the pluralists. This insurgent group seeks to "establish a system that emphasizes the values of individual freedom, liberty, and compromise and in which political structures are differentiated and autonomous." (O'Neill, 24) This group is neither authoritarian nor apocalyptic. Instead, it is revolutionary and seeks to create a better system. The new political system envisioned by pluralists is more desirable and beneficial to members of the state than the current political system because of better ethnic, religious, or cultural tolerances. Pluralist groups have included the African National Congress (ANC) in South Africa, the National Council of Resistance of Iran (NCRI), and Narodnaya Volya in Russia.

The ANC or Spear of the Nation was a social democratic organization that opposed apartheid in South Africa in the 1970s and 1980s. The aim of the organization was to redress socio-economic differences stemming from colonial and apartheid policies that discriminated against non-whites in matters of land ownership, housing, and job distribution. In the 1980s, the Pentagon described the ANC as a terrorist organization because of its violent actions against apartheid supporters. Today, the ANC is the recognized political party in South Africa.

Founded in 1981, the NCRI is in political opposition to the current Iranian government. The goal of the NCRI is "to replace the traditional theocracy in Iran with a democratic, secular and coalition government." (ncr-iran.org) The NCRI is an umbrella organization to other Iranian political opposition groups such as Mujahidin-e Khalq (MKO) and encourages ethnic, religious, minority, and gender equality throughout Iran. Although the NCRI is not a terrorist organization, the MKO is designated as a foreign terrorist organization by the US. The MKO has committed assassinations and terrorist operations inside Iran against the current political leadership. They have used a conspiratorial strategy in an attempt to remove the current political party.

In Russia, one of the influencing groups in the transformation to modern terrorism is Narodnaya Volya also known as the People's Will. Originally formed in the 1870s as a social revolutionary organization, group members attempted to motivate the people to rise up against the Russian government. Narodnaya Volya organized selected attacks against the ruling party and its officials through a military focus strategy. This group, composed of a few hundred members, opposed taking innocent lives and halted several attacks so that bystanders would not be harmed. After the assassination of Czar Alexander II the Russian government cracked down on the group and Narodnaya Volya ceased to be effective.

Pluralist groups often use a combination of tactics to achieve their goals. They prefer military focus and conspiratorial strategies. They employ violent actions upon selected persons who represent a system they abhor. Overall, the success of pluralist groups may be considered moderate. Some pluralist groups have attained their objectives while others have achieved small steps toward the process of revolution. Pluralist insurgent groups require popular support necessitating membership in the hundreds or thousands. Since pluralists seek state political or legal change, the preferred response to pluralist terrorists should also be legal in nature. Force at the national level, if required, is also most likely to be used against this type of insurgent group.

Commercialists

The acquisition of wealth is the goal of commercialist terrorist groups. The political agenda of a commercialist group is material wealth and, by association, coercive power. Commercialists do not seek actual recognized political power through any type of legitimate legal process. Instead, self-styled chiefs or warlords lead this type of insurgency. Operated on a
tribal or clan-like basis, commercialists acknowledge friendship, loyalty, and personal actions to be of primary significance. Their main aim appears to be nothing more than the acquisition of material resources through seizure and control of political resources. (O’Neill, 28)

It is more common for commercialist groups to form in developing countries. In locations where governments cannot meet the psychological needs of their populations, especially a sense of meaning during the stressful periods of rapid change associated with development, frustration and insurgency will occur. (Metz, 5) In poor countries where any type of material wealth is highly valued it follows that the acquisition of more material wealth would bring about power. Therefore, a terrorist’s goal may be the attainment of power through the acquisition of wealth via a commercialist insurgency. Geography and political structure also influence the development of commercialist insurgencies. Two such commercialist insurgent groups are the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) of Sierra Leone and the pirates of Somali.

Formed in 1991, the RUF was opposed to the government of Sierra Leone. While waging war against the government, the RUF committed terrible atrocities. The group has burned civilians alive, disemboweling them, or hacking off their limbs making them helpless, unemployable, and compliant. (O’Neill, 40) Although the RUF was successful in toppling the government of Sierra Leone, the newly-formed government lacked direction. The RUF promised the people equal distribution of wealth but never delivered on this promise. The RUF’s failure to establish a responsible government resulted in the need for international assistance in order to re-establish Sierra Leone politically, economically, and socially.

The pirates of Somalia are another commercialist terrorist organization. The only goal of this group is the acquisition of wealth. The group has armed themselves with an array of guns, rocket propelled grenades, and small boats originally sought to ensure the sovereignty of Somali’s territorial waters. The pirates quickly realized that they could acquire money by hijacking vessels off their coastline and demanding ransom for cargo or passengers. Soon, they expanded their operation farther away from their coastline and began attacking more potentially profitable ships. Like the notorious 18th century pirate, Blackbeard, the Somalia pirates have been quite successful.

Commercialist terrorist groups pose serious security threats and their efforts have been quite successful. They operate in countries that have weak national governments which are unable or unwilling to stop them. To counter commercialist terrorist groups, a strong government is necessary along with nation building programs.

Two positive indicators of national development are the strength and number of political institutions. Therefore, if a developing nation advances its infrastructure, the response on the national level should increase. In addition, the nation’s participation in the international community will also increase. These actions will help to combat the threat of commercialist terrorist groups. In the short term, the national government must address the problem of commercialist terrorists. If the nation is unable to successfully deal with the commercialist terrorist group then the international community should provide assistance to overcome this threat to peaceful co-existence.

Preservationists

As the name suggests, preservationists are against change and attempt to maintain or preserve the status quo. In this way, preservationists differ from the aforementioned terrorist groups that carry out acts of violence against non-ruling groups and authorities that are
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attempting reform or change. Instead, preservationists seek to maintain the status quo because of the relative economic, social, and political privileges they derive from it. (O’Neill, 27)

Preservationist groups have included the Wyoming Stock Growers Association, the Ku Klux Klan (KKK) in the US, and the Afrikaner Resistance Movement in South Africa.

The primary mission of the Wyoming Stock Growers Association (WYSGA) as stated on their homepage (wysga.org) is to serve the livestock business and families of Wyoming by protecting their economic, legislative, regulatory, judicial, environmental, custom, and cultural interests. In 1972, the WYSGA formed a strong quasi-government on the principle of protecting the interests of the residents of Wyoming. Members of the WYSGA killed or intimidated selected individuals who threatened their goals. This included homesteaders, shepherders, and political opponents.

A much more notorious preservationist terrorist group is the KKK. The KKK is considered a member of the Christian Patriot Movement. The KKK is slightly religious as mentioned earlier in the apocalyptic utopian section but is considered a Christian white supremacist group that opposes blacks, Jews, Roman Catholics, and parts of the national government. The tactics of the KKK have included lynching, murder, and destruction of private property. These actions aim to oppress and intimidate others in the hopes of maintaining the status quo or white power.

Similarly, the several thousand members of the Afrikaner Resistance Movement in South Africa attempted to sustain apartheid through terrorism. Similar to the KKK in America, this white supremacist group opposed blacks and implemented similar intimidation tactics. Like the KKK, this group has caused problems and created conflict but has not achieved their goals.

The stated preservationist groups as well as state sponsored Latin American death squads and violent religious groups that seek to maintain the status quo have been moderately successful. In some cases, local law enforcement has been able to contain the problem. As the group’s size and activity level has increased so did the need for attention and response at the national level. The international community remains mostly unaffected by preservationist groups. Thus, there has not been much international action taken against preservationist groups.

Depending on the extent of their ambitions, these groups can range in size from hundreds to thousands of members or supporters. The preservationist groups do not hope to change anything or build a new government or political system. Thus, their tactics are designed to influence the opinions of those who seek change and therefore do not fit into one of the above strategic categories.

Reformist

This type of terrorist group seeks to reform current political systems or current policies in an effort to increase equality. Reformists use violence to bring about much needed attention to their cause. Through the use of violence, reformists hope to gain enough public support to change current policies. Reformists target policies that determine distribution of the economic, psychological, and political benefits that society has to offer. (O’Neill, 26) These terrorist groups range from animal rights activists to racial minority proponents. They also include organizations with members who are on the political far right (conservative) as well as the far left (liberal).

In Britain, there are more than 3,000 animal rights groups that espouse different levels of violence in order to protect their animal brothers and sisters. These groups have bombed
corner drugstores, laboratories, woolen mill shops, kennels, slaughterhouses, refrigerator trucks, fishmongers, butchers, and animal breeding farms. These far left groups practice terrorism in the hope of intimidating policy makers into changing laws concerning animal testing and the treatment of animals.

Reformist groups that search for policy changes should not be confused with liberation or secessionist movements. Groups like the Sudan Liberation Army (SLA) in Darfur and the National Liberation Army in Macedonia are two such examples. Although the names of these groups imply liberation, they are both reformist organizations.

Opposed to the current government party in Sudan, the SLA wishes to create a free, secular, democratic State in Sudan, based on equal civil rights, the rule of law, and market economy. The Justice and Equality Movement (JEM), also in Sudan, mirrors the actions and goals of the SLA. Both groups were created in response to General Al-Bashir’s 1989 coup and installment of a new authoritarian government in Sudan. In response to the lawlessness committed by the new military leader’s troops, the SLA and JEM responded with actions that they believed were in the best interest of the people. These groups intended to defend the people of Sudan by attacking government troops, buildings, and supplies. Their reformist movement has been using a military focus strategy. The SLA and JEM claim to have the support of millions of people as well as the attention of the international community.

Likewise, reformist movements have occurred in Eastern Europe. According to the National Memorial Institute for the Prevention of Terrorism, the National Liberation Army of Macedonia is not an army but rather a loosely-organized terrorist group which calls for the unification of ethnic Albanian areas of the Western Balkans, including part of Macedonia. The insurgency dissolved after the signing of the 2001 Ohrid Agreement which agreed to provide the Albanian minority with greater rights.

Reformist groups seek to change policies such as better rights for workers, animal rights, minority rights, government change, and/or policy change. Depending on the policy and the group, reformists have used widely different strategies.

Single issue terrorist groups can be dealt with through the apprehension of individuals on a local level, through laws that restrict their actions or small changes in policy. Groups that attempt greater policy change or governmental change employ more force against a wider range of targets and need to be responded to with increased police or military force. This may even include national or international response to help alleviate the problem.

Secessionist

Secessionists are among the most notable and well known insurgent groups. Members of secessionist groups seek to renounce and withdraw from the state and political community (state) of which they are formally a part. The desire to secede has occurred repeatedly around the world throughout history. Members of secessionist movements may maintain profoundly different ideas about the political system they hope to establish. This can lead to tension within the group which may lead to the development of separate factions of the group. Among the reasons for secessionist group development are regional, ethnic, racial, religious, and ideological differences or a combination thereof. Whatever the reason for development of a secessionist group, the members usually consider themselves nationalists, and by no means terrorists.
Throughout history, there have been secessionist groups across the globe that have attempted to separate from either an unwelcome oppressor or from a state to which they do not want to belong. A prime example of a secessionist movement occurred during the American Civil War (1861-1865). The Southern states wanted to secede from the United States. In this well-known case in American history, it is unlikely that the Confederates (Southerners) would be considered terrorists. Rather, the Confederates were viewed as unsuccessful secessionists.

There have also been many instances in which groups have fought for freedom from imperial control by a foreign oppressor. Among the list of anti-colonial national-liberation movements are: the Vietminh in Indo China which sought independence from France and later Japanese occupation (1941-1949), the National Liberation Front in Algeria (1954-1962) which also attempted to gain independence from France, and the Mau Mau ethnic group in Kenya (1952-1960) which opposed British colonial rule. Similar movements have occurred in Canada, Ethiopia, France, India, Italy, Morocco, Namibia, Sri Lanka, Spain, and Thailand.

There are also ethnic peoples who span national borders of established states seeking to establish their own state. This is the case for the Kurdistan Workers’ Party (PKK) in Turkey, Iran, and Iraq; the Baluchistan National Liberation Front spanning Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Iran; and the Basque Homeland and Liberty Organization (ETA) in Spain and France; and the Jammu Kashmir Liberation Front in Pakistan and India.

The groups mentioned above have used the popular protracted warfare strategy, the military-focus strategy, and the urban warfare strategy. Their success has varied across the spectrum. Groups like the Eritrean Liberation Front seceding from Ethiopia as well as East Timor seceding from Indonesia have been quite successful whereas groups like the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam from Sri Lanka and the Basque Homeland and Liberty Organization from Spain have not been successful to date.

A secessionist movement requires substantial popular support. Therefore, secessionist groups usually have thousands of members and supporters. The response to a secessionist movement is a difficult decision for an outside observer – namely the international community. A secessionist movement generally entails ideas that are easily understood and justified such as wanting a separate nation for ethnically diverse people or persons who want to free themselves from foreign rule. The international community’s decision to provide aid to either the government or the secessionists depends on the perceived legitimacy of the grievance and the international relationships of the country. If a response is to be taken against a secessionist group, then it should initially occur at the state level. If a secessionist group spans several states than a collective effort by the states involved should be made.

Conclusion

The importance of properly identifying an insurgent group is tantamount to determining a proper response by local, national, or international forces. Differences in the goals and ambitions of the types of groups define not only the current group but also provide insight in responding to current and future groups of a similar nature. The conclusions explained below can be found in a simpler form as Tables 1–4 in the appendix.

It is evident that types of insurgent groups vary as much as the tactics they employ. While bombins and assassinations kill, the motives behind these actions and the intended effect of this violence can differ dramatically. There was not found to be any one type of group that always
employed a certain tactic. There was also not found to be any one response that applied to a certain tactic. Therefore, the response to terrorism must occur on a case by case basis. This leads to the overall success of an insurgent group. Most of the groups mentioned fall into the category of moderately successful. This implies that the groups may have achieved some of their goals but not all. This is due to the fact that some groups of a certain type are much more successful and others were not successful at all. At the extremes on the success scale are the anarchists that were wholly unsuccessful and the commercialists that were wholly successful. For the anarchists to achieve an apocalypse is a very ambitious goal. For the commercialists to achieve some increase material wealth is an easy to obtain goal. In both cases, the overall success of the group had a strong correlation to the groups intended goals.

The size of insurgent groups also varies. Most groups consist of hundreds or thousands of members. This is not surprising since most groups need popular support to effect the change they desire. The only group to only have tens of members was the anarchist group. They were also the only group to have minimal overall success. There may be correlation between group type, group size, group tactics, and group success. That correlation is beyond the scope of this paper. Lastly, and most importantly, is the chosen response. After analyzing the preferred type of response to all of the insurgent groups some conclusions can be ascertained. For example, for all the group types, there was a necessity for a national level response. This may be either a political response, investigation by national authorities, or force used by the national government. This is not surprising considering all of the groups analyzed were secular and usually have goals that extend only to the state level. With most groups ranging in the hundreds to thousands and posing national security threats, it follows that a response at the national level would be expected. Most likely, the national government would be the most knowledgeable about the day to day operations of the group. It is hoped that the national government would have access to the resources needed to combat the insurgents.

For the commercialists and reformists, an international response is expected. The success of the groups warrants a multi-national response. Once commercialists overthrow a national government, international intervention would be required. Likewise, the success of reformist insurgents requires an international response. If a secessionist group extends over established borders, than an international response may be required by the states in the immediate vicinity. In addition, legal responses are effective for some insurgent groups. It can be concluded that groups that seek some kind of political change - egalitarians, pluralists, preservationists, reformists - are more responsive to political and legal measures against them than groups that exist and have goals outside the law.

Overall, the differences among insurgent groups and the tactics they employ are crucial to the response chosen. The size of a group, the popular support it receives and particular external and internal factors also play a significant role in determining the appropriate response to an insurgent group.

The information gathered and the conclusions found are beneficial. If a government understands their enemy better then they can prepare a better response. The conclusions gathered also show that a stronger response on the national level is the best front line defense against any type of secular insurgency. The fact that there are different types of secular terrorism is important to realize because different responses are required. There is no one blanket strategy that will work against all incidents of terrorism.
Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Pop Pro War</th>
<th>Mil – Focus</th>
<th>Conspiratorial</th>
<th>Urban Warfare</th>
<th>Fear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anarchist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apocalyptic Utopian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluralists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservationists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secessionist</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Success</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>Group Dependent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anarchist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apocalyptic Utopian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluralists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservationists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secessionist</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Size</th>
<th>10s</th>
<th>100s</th>
<th>1000s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anarchist</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apocalyptic Utopian</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluralists</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercialist</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservationists</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformists</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secessionist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anarchist</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apocalyptic Utopian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluralists</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservationists</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformists</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secessionist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
References


