



# SMALL WARS JOURNAL

[www.smallwarsjournal.com](http://www.smallwarsjournal.com)

## Indigenous Forces and Sanctuary Denial: Enduring Counterinsurgency Imperatives

*LTC ROBERT M. CASSIDY*

**SWJ Magazine -- INTERIM  
New! & Improved? 😊 (BETA)**

This is an interim edition of an article that has been peer-reviewed for its content and quality, and accepted for publication in SWJ Magazine.

The article, its author, and its audience deserve better editing and formatting than we have provided at the moment, i.e. none. It is being released in this format because the Small Wars Community of Interest needs this material, and this is the way we can get it out without further delay (which, in some cases, has already been substantial).

The throughput of our publishing has not kept pace with the enthusiasm of our audience and the productivity of our contributing authors. We're working on that, but the author's ideas are ready now. So this article is provided "as is" for the moment. Revised versions of this article for edits, format, and presentation will be posted when they are available and as site improvements are made.

[SWJ Magazine](#) and [Small Wars Journal](#) are published by Small Wars Journal LLC.  
COPYRIGHT © 2008 by Small Wars Journal LLC.

Permission is granted to print single copies for personal, non-commercial use. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution - Non-Commercial -Share Alike 3.0 [License](#) per our [Terms of Use](#). We are in this together.



No FACTUAL STATEMENT should be relied upon without further investigation on your part sufficient to satisfy you in your independent judgment that it is true.

Contact: [comment@smallwarsjournal.com](mailto:comment@smallwarsjournal.com)

Visit [www.smallwarsjournal.com](http://www.smallwarsjournal.com)

Cover Price: Your call. [Support SWJ here.](#)

## **Indigenous Forces and Sanctuary Denial: \ Enduring Counterinsurgency Imperatives**

LTC ROBERT M. CASSIDY

U.S. Army officer and fellow with the Center for Advanced Defense Studies

**ABSTRACT:** This article examines the twin imperatives to employ indigenous forces and to deny sanctuary in order to succeed in counterinsurgency. It examines American counterinsurgency doctrine from the Vietnam era and from the current era to glean enduring tenets for these two essential components of any counterinsurgency campaign. The article concludes with a distillation of some best practices for using indigenous forces to deny sanctuary and suggests some operational concepts for denying sanctuary in this long war.

“Learning from experience is a faculty almost never practiced.”

- *The March of Folly*<sup>1</sup>

The war against Al-Qaeda and other non-state armed groups is a perennial and global counterinsurgency. However, history shows that insurgents require sanctuary and external support to succeed. The converse is also most often true – counterinsurgents cannot prevail if they allow the existence of insurgent sanctuaries. U.S. and coalition partners are fighting a war against insurgents animated by ideas stemming from a fundamentalist interpretive Islamist ideology. Non-state groups affiliated with al Qaeda are indeed leveraging a paradigm shift in irregular war to supply trained fighters across borders to fight as insurgents in Afghanistan and Iraq. This article sets out to briefly examine past U.S. counterinsurgency doctrine and present U.S. counterinsurgency doctrine to glean the practices and principles for employing indigenous formations to help deny sanctuary. I focus on two American eras of great ferment in counterinsurgency doctrine – the Vietnam era and the current era of

counterinsurgency. This quick glimpse at the doctrine from these two periods will, to be sure, reveal more congruence than incongruence, even though forty years have elapsed between that era and this one. More saliently, this article concludes by associating enduring doctrinal imperatives with historical best practices to illumine some more successful and aggressive counterinsurgency methods, ones which are germane to denying the enemy sanctuary in this perennial struggle. If American-led coalitions cannot deny or eliminate the sanctuaries of the global insurgent network and its supporters, we will not prevail in this conflict.

### **Past and Present U.S. Counterinsurgency Doctrine on Indigenous Forces**

Inspired by the German Army's World War II *jagdkommando* anti-partisan doctrine, the U.S. Army's 1951 *FM 31-20, Operations Against Guerrilla Forces*, prescribed the organization, training, and functions for a prototypical indigenous counter-guerrilla unit of platoon size. Intended to operate independently for prolonged periods, specialized anti-guerrilla units were to be armed with light automatic weapons and radios for night operations such as raids and ambushes. This manual also recommended that anti-guerrilla units should consider masquerading as guerrillas to deceive irregular adversaries. *FM 31-20* included indigenous formations in a separate category of forces and encouraged U.S. commanders to employ local civilians as intelligence agents, propagandists, administrators, guides, policemen, and special anti-guerrilla units. This manual further observed that indigenous forces were invaluable because, in addition to freeing U.S. forces for other duties, local forces' familiarity with

the population, terrain, and language “endowed them with a unique ability to uncover enemy guerrillas.”<sup>2</sup>

In 1961, the U.S. Army published a new chapter of counterinsurgency doctrine, entitled “Military Operations against Irregular Forces,” as Change 1 to its *FM 100-1, Doctrinal Guidance*. This addition to the then evolving doctrine essentially cascaded from the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations (OCOPS) handbook on counterinsurgency entitled, “Counterinsurgency Operations: a Handbook for the Suppression of Communist Guerrillas and Terrorist Operations.” This chapter recommended the maximum use of indigenous forces and manpower as Soldiers, policemen, and militiamen. It likewise advocated employing and maintaining troops in the same general operational area as much as possible, over time, to reap benefits that come from the knowledge and familiarity of local political and military topography. The 1963 *FM 31-22, U.S. Army Counterinsurgency Forces* also prescribed several major roles for indigenous paramilitary forces. Among these were the protection of villages, the performance of security functions at fixed and static sites, the enforcement of curfews, and the prosecution of food denial measures. Moreover, the doctrine considered that any employment of local forces would yield political, military, and intelligence advantages. The 1963 U.S. Army *FM 31-16, Counterinsurgency Operations*, also assigned native police and paramilitary forces the functions of population control and pacification. This manual deemed these functions as the best use of the local knowledge and linguistic skills that inhered in indigenous troop contingents.<sup>3</sup>

During the course of the Vietnam War, the United States Army experimented with a variety of techniques and approaches for improving the pacification effort by

prudently employing indigenous forces. During the late 1960s, several U.S. Army units provided operational training and assistance to their counterpart organizations in the Army of the Republic of Vietnam (ARVN), and to other paramilitary forces. For example, during 1968, the 4th Infantry Division used 27 civic action teams, which lived in hamlets and helped train Popular Force (PF) units and helped generate skills and support toward the goal of self-help and security. During 1967, the 173rd Airborne Brigade created Security Training Assistance Group teams that trained local troops and conducted combined operations with People's Self-Defense Force Units.<sup>4</sup>

The U.S. Army's and Marine Corps' 2006 doctrine (*FM 3-24*) for counterinsurgency also emphasizes the requirement for training and employing indigenous security forces. This manual stresses that "helping others to help themselves is critical to winning the long war" and prescribes the development of indigenous security forces that "can take over primary responsibility for combating the insurgency." Although it may seem quicker for American forces to counter insurgents themselves, the doctrine in *FM 3-24* avers that it is better to strengthen and to assist local forces. This most current counterinsurgency doctrine underlines the need for assistance from the military, along with other government agencies and coalition partners, to organize the host nation security forces required to establish and maintain security and stability within their borders. This assistance may include developing, training, equipping, and employing indigenous security forces and it entails the combined employment of coalition and local security forces to help prosecute the counterinsurgency. This latest U.S. counterinsurgency doctrine underscores the importance of training the host nation to conduct counterinsurgency, declaring that

training indigenous forces for counterinsurgency is a required competency for reserve and regular formations, from all the services. Training indigenous forces therefore is a critical path to success in counterinsurgency.<sup>5</sup>

There are three chapters in *FM 3-24* that emphasize the importance of local forces in the context of countering insurgents. The very first chapter observes that “nothing is more demoralizing to insurgents than realizing that people inside their movement or supporters are deserting or providing information to government forces.” One highlighted successful practice is to embed advisors and Special Forces. Further still, the manual identifies the development of host-nation security forces as an example of a Line of Operation (LOO) for a counterinsurgency campaign and within that LOO it lists the identification, recruitment, training, and employment of indigenous forces as an objective. Among the considerations described for the host-nation security force LOO is the establishment of mobile training teams and the training of leaders to serve as the cadre to train units and Soldiers. *FM 3-24* also lists for consideration the ideas of encouraging insurgents to change sides and of establishing amnesty and repatriation programs. Other considerations within this LOO are to create specialized units; to train local paramilitary security forces to arm and to integrate into operations against insurgents; and to establish host-nation security forces among the populace to identify, disrupt, and eliminate insurgent leadership.<sup>6</sup>

*FM 3-24* also includes a section that explains the role and relevance of combined action units. Combined action is simply a method that couples American troops with local troops in single units, typically a platoon or company, to prosecute counterinsurgency. It was most manifest in the form of the USMC Combined Action

Program (CAP) during the Vietnam War. By operating and living among the population, combined action elements show the commitment and competence of the counterinsurgents, build trust, and foster host-nation legitimacy. Commanders may opt for a combined action approach to hold and build while maintaining a persistent presence among the people. In Appendix A, "A Guide for Action," the importance of indigenous forces is readily discernible as this appendix stipulates that U.S. forces should work closely with local forces to train and build a host-nation security capability. This appendix, apparently taking a lesson from Vietnam, warns not to develop host-nation forces in the image of the U.S. Army, but, instead to develop forces which "mirror the enemy's capabilities and seek to supplant the insurgent's role." Local forces should organize, equip, and move like the insurgents, but, they must be under the firm control of the host-nation government and have access to U.S. support.<sup>7</sup>

Another crucial piece of counterinsurgency is the development of effective indigenous forces with missions aimed at both internal and external threats, including border security. The emphasis on this in the current doctrine is clear as it dedicates an entire chapter to the subject. *FM 3-24, Counterinsurgency* clearly stresses the importance of assigning the best qualified and the highest quality Soldiers to advisory and training missions. The training of indigenous formations, *FM 3-24* explains, should focus on counterinsurgency skills and techniques, as well as the integration of military capabilities with the local, regional, and national police. It also mentions the potential utility of home guards, which it describes as lightly armed and part-time local security forces that can provide security for government buildings, businesses, and small villages. Finally, this chapter emphasizes the need to train, develop, and support

effective indigenous police because police are, in fact, often the primary frontline counterinsurgency forces. Good police units may often acquire better actionable intelligence than military units, and, because they are in frequent contact with the people, they are sometimes the best option for countering small insurgent elements supported by the people. Among the various types of police which *FM 3-24* describes are border police, criminal police, transport police, and “specialized paramilitary strike forces.”<sup>8</sup>

### **Past and Present U.S. Counterinsurgency Doctrine on Sanctuary Denial**

The 1951 *FM 31-20, Operations against Guerrilla Forces* also emphasized that, to be successful, guerrillas require a secure base or cross-border sanctuary, external material aid, and an external clandestine network of intelligence and support personnel. As a logical and necessary counter to the above, *FM 31-20* prescribed that a main objective in counterinsurgency, after isolating the insurgent from the population, was to deny him access to external support. But the manual also stated that eliminating external aid was largely a function of diplomatic, military, and geographic conditions specific to the conflict. Ten years later, the U.S. Army’s newly published chapter of counterinsurgency doctrine, entitled “Military Operations against Irregular Forces,” as Change 1 to its *FM 100-1, Doctrinal Guidance*, emanating from and mirroring the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations (OCOPS) handbook on counterinsurgency



entitled “Counterinsurgency Operations: a Handbook for the Suppression of Communist Guerrillas and Terrorist Operations.” “Military Operations against Irregular Forces,” stipulated that the first step of any counterinsurgency campaign was to isolate the guerrilla from all sources of internal and external support, including civilian supporters and any covert apparatus. It further emphasized the military imperative to seal the nation’s border, to blockade guerrilla base areas, and to clear areas sympathetic to the insurgency.<sup>9</sup>

Again in 1961, the U.S. Army followed this with *FM 31-16, Counter guerrilla Operations*, the next generation counterinsurgency doctrine which emphasized that experience had proven “that insurrections rarely achieved their full potential without access to external sanctuaries and sustenance.” This field manual included an additional section on border control operations. To address the border control issue, *FM 31-16* called for a vigorous surveillance program involving observation posts, intelligence agents, electronic sensing devices, and air and ground patrols. The subsequent 1963 edition of *FM 31-16, Counter guerrilla Operations* had a section on border operations that endorsed the establishment of restricted zones where the Army would remove entire populations to establish a buffer zone along the border. In this ‘no-man’s land,’ the military was to remove only the disloyal indigenous population and permit the trusted indigenous population to stay on to create a hostile environment for guerrilla infiltrators.<sup>10</sup>

In sum, on the topics of external support and sanctuaries, the doctrine of the 1960s attempted to glean from historical experience the important roles that foreign aid and safe havens played in successful insurgent movements. As a consequence, this

corpus of Army doctrine had made the isolation of the guerrillas from external assistance one of the three principal objectives of counterinsurgency warfare, along with the isolation of the guerrillas from the population and the destruction of guerrilla forces. To reinforce this anecdotally, in Greece and Korea, successful border operations caused indigenous guerrillas to wither on the vine. However, during the Vietnam War, the insurgents enjoyed the benefit of an endless influx of men and material from North Vietnam, a flow of support that significantly offset much of the Western support and military assistance to the government of the Republic of Vietnam.<sup>11</sup>

The 2006 *FM 3-24, Counterinsurgency* similarly emphasizes the imperative of denying or interdicting sanctuaries and external support. According to this manual, access to external resources and sanctuaries has always influenced the effectiveness of insurgencies. Historically, the manual notes, sanctuaries in neighboring countries have provided the insurgents places to rebuild and reorganize without fear of counterinsurgent interference. *FM 3-24* also declares that “the issue of sanctuaries cannot be ignored during planning.” Working to eliminate sanctuaries must be a component of any effective counterinsurgency operation because insurgent movements often rely heavily on freedom of movement across porous borders. Experience has also generally shown that insurgencies cannot sustain themselves without substantial external support. The manual expounds that insurgents may train in one state and conduct operations in another state. Islamist extremists also tend to use entities such as religious schools and mosques to propagate ideology that animates and proselytizes

support and recruits for local and distant insurgencies. However, the movement of insurgents across borders, as well as their support, is also vulnerable to interdiction.<sup>12</sup>

Access to external resources has always had a significant influence on the effectiveness of insurgencies. External support can provide political, psychological, and material resources that otherwise might be limited or unavailable. This type of external assistance, moreover, is not limited only to neighboring states – countries from outside the region that seek political or economic influence may also support insurgencies. One very crucial point, one that *FM 3-24* correctly stresses is that it is much easier to separate the insurgency from its external resources and to let it die from atrophy, than it is to kill every insurgent. Population control and border security are two methods that this manual identifies for cutting off external material support. A region internal to a state may also serve as a sanctuary if the insurgents have established firm control over the region. In this instance, counterinsurgent efforts must eliminate the insurgent politico-administrative apparatus in such a region or area. That *FM 3-24* emphasizes the importance of sanctuary denial is also manifest in one of the example it offers for a Line of Operation (LOO) and among its list of successful operational counterinsurgency practices. “Secure national and regional borders” is in objective within the combat operations LOO and “deny sanctuary to insurgents” appears among successful practices.<sup>13</sup>

## **Conclusion**

“Look upon the former revolutionary wars as shopping lists of techniques that have worked and can work in similar situations. Many are staples. Many are luxuries. It is necessary to match them up and improvise.”

- *The Art of Counter-Revolutionary Warfare*<sup>14</sup>

Among the host of articles written about this war and counterinsurgency, there are some that argue that this is a new form of insurgency, quite distinct from the revolutionary wars of the twentieth century and the guerrilla wars that predated them. Ipso facto, these same authors have questioned or refuted the salience of lessons derived from those wars. While it is important to heed the caveat to not lift one model from one successful past counterinsurgency and apply it in its totality to twenty-first century counterinsurgency, there is merit in prudently borrowing select best practices from previous counterinsurgencies, from ones, in fact, with both successful and unsuccessful outcomes. In this context, I have visited past and present American doctrinal imperatives for employing indigenous elements to deny sanctuary and to secure frontiers. Both past and present American counterinsurgency doctrine urges counterinsurgents to maximize the employment of indigenous regular and irregular paramilitary forces to help deny the global insurgents and their Islamist support networks sanctuary and external support.

The enduring relevance of these crucial requirements suggests that we might look to history for better ideas of how to use indigenous forces to interdict the cross-border movement of insurgents and supplies. The implications for Afghanistan and Iraq are obvious – we must organize and adapt new methods and manpower to deny cross-border sanctuary and infiltration. This is as true of the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) on Afghanistan's border and of Iraq's border with Iran and Syria as it was true of the Ho Chi Minh Trail on Vietnam's border. It is general knowledge, consistently available through main stream media, that insurgent operations in

Afghanistan and Iraq benefit from the flow of technology, techniques, and recruits stemming from sources of external support and the sanctuary the coalition forces afford the enemy by not securing the borders and by not acting against the insurgents' perfidious supporters. Worse still, there have been many open source reports that have described the migration of lethal explosive device technology, as well as the very notion of suicide bombing, from Iraq to Afghanistan. A *sine qua non* for any counterinsurgency to meet with success must be to deny the insurgents access to sanctuary and external support.<sup>15</sup>

A Frontier Nomad Force is a concept for organizing indigenous forces with coalition forces to deny sanctuaries on the borders of Afghanistan and Iraq. 'Nomadization' was a past successful counterinsurgency method of territorial offense whereby independent task forces continuously patrolled throughout zones to reconnoiter, interdict, and pacify. A combined Frontier Nomad Force in a border security and sanctuary-denial role would help fulfill the enduring doctrinal counterinsurgency imperatives to employ local forces and to eliminate sanctuary but it would also build on past successful practices with indigenous forces to conduct offensive, defensive, and cross-border interdiction and disruption operations. Frontier nomad formations would have three explicit roles: border denial and offensive external 'nomad' operations to deny border infiltration and to provide early warning; a combined action force of coalition and indigenous conventional forces with the dual role of internal border mobile defense operations and mobile strike force operations; and combined coalition-indigenous units comprising paramilitary and former insurgent forces, with the roles of gathering intelligence, targeting enemy leadership

infrastructure, and conducting cross-border raids to expunge enemy support nodes. Essential to the organization of this force would be its composite nature, comprising U.S. SOF advisers, general purpose forces, former insurgents, and friendly tribal formations with relevant and usable knowledge of the area's human and geographic terrain. A quick review of past best security practices with indigenous forces in counterinsurgency reveals salient benchmarks to glean, adapt, and apply in this war.<sup>16</sup>

The American military, during the Philippine Insurrection and the Vietnam War, employed Macabebe Scouts and former Viet Cong as irregulars to hunt down and eliminate the insurgent leadership in their sanctuaries, which offered the additional value of eroding enemy morale. The Philippine Scouts originated from irregular fighters raised from the Macabebes for employment against the guerrillas in the swamps of central Luzon. Combined American forces comprising American soldiers and Filipino scouts hunted insurgents. The need for mobility and knowledge about the terrain and enemy led the U.S. Army to establish special detachments of mounted scouts and infantry. What's more, The 5th Special Forces Group also trained and led Civilian Irregular Defense Group (CIDG) Mobile Strike Forces (Mike Forces) that were manned by indigenous ethnic minority tribes from the mountain and border regions of Vietnam. The Strike Forces conducted reconnaissance by employing small unit patrols in the border areas, by denying them to the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese regular units, and by serving as a buffer for early warning intelligence against Viet Cong border infiltration. Another early CIDG program included the training of indigenous trail watchers, whose mission was to identify, locate, and report Viet Cong movements near the border. Other CIDG-type forces, called mobile guerrilla forces, raided enemy base

areas, and employed hit-and-run guerrilla tactics against regular enemy units.

American Special Forces in Vietnam ultimately led Mike Forces and mobile counter-guerrilla forces to locate and target the Viet Cong in their own sanctuaries.<sup>17</sup>

The British employed indigenous counter-guerrilla forces in Malaya where they imported Dyak tribesmen as trackers and scouts whose tracking skills helped the counterinsurgency campaign by locating the insurgents for destruction. In particular, in the last two years of the counterinsurgency, a force of 300 Senoi Pr'ak tribesmen was able to track and kill more insurgents than all the rest of the security forces combined. More significantly, ex-guerrillas, known as Surrendered Enemy Personnel (SEP), were employed very effectively as guides and counterinsurgents who were able to lead combat patrols into jungle sanctuaries that they knew well from their service on the insurgent side. Many of these turned guerrillas ultimately joined the government's Special Operational Volunteer Force where they proved their worth to the government, both as intelligence sources and as psychological warfare agents. In Rhodesia, the security forces also employed former guerrillas as counter-guerrillas to locate insurgents in their safe havens and to eliminate insurgent leaders. The Selous Scouts, whose skills in tracking, survival, reconnaissance, and counterinsurgency were unequaled, became a lethal and effective instrument. Their role was to eliminate the African insurgents and their leadership, without any compunction about crossing international boundaries. Likewise, during the counterinsurgency in Oman, 22 SAS soldiers trained and led indigenous Firqat Forces to conduct nomad-like operations on the Jebel to locate and engage guerrillas in their areas and sanctuaries.<sup>18</sup>

The French also experienced some success in Indochina and Algeria with the employment of indigenous troops in nomad operations. By the end of the war in Indochina, the French had eighteen mobile groups who performed reasonably well as intervention formations. The French also developed mobile counter-guerrilla groups that relied on indigenous irregulars. Their composite airborne commando groups, or GCMA, had the role of mobile counter-guerrilla forces operating in the sanctuaries areas of the Viet Minh. The French also contrived new concepts, including nomad operations, to prosecute their counterinsurgency in Algeria. Their operations in Algeria witnessed the use of *commandos noirs* (black commandos), or lightly armed detachments of guerrilla-like troops assigned the role of nomad roaming within the Muslim populations in the countryside. In one example, French ethnologist Jean Servier had been granted permission to create light companies from some one thousand trustworthy and able-bodied defectors, former enemy combatants from the FLN. Servier's *harkas* quickly proved very resilient in hunting down the ALN, partly because these troops were familiar with every path in their local areas.<sup>19</sup>

Frontier nomad forces would harvest and adopt the best practices of formations such as those reviewed above. The American employment of the Philippine Scouts, the British use of Diyak tribesmen in Malaya, the Selous Scouts in the Rhodesian War, the French-led Composite Intervention Groups (GMI) in Indochina, French-led *harkas* "Nomad" operations in Algeria, the American Special Forces Civilian Irregular Defense Group elements in Vietnam, and the British SAS-advised indigenous 'firqat' forces in Oman all helped fulfill the requirement to train and employ combined Western and local forces to conduct offensive nomad counter-guerrilla operations to deny sanctuary, both



inside and outside borders. Notwithstanding some of the unique nuances of twenty-first century counterinsurgency, frontier nomad forces comprising orthodox and unorthodox coalition and indigenous forces remain salient and useful modalities for fulfilling the aforementioned doctrinal imperatives of sanctuary denial and border security, imperatives which are still essential for the counterinsurgencies in Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere to succeed.

## NOTES

---

<sup>1</sup> Barbara W. Tuchman, *The March of Folly: From Troy to Vietnam* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1984), 383.

<sup>2</sup> The sections on the U.S. Army counterinsurgency doctrine before and during Vietnam rely heavily on the recent and excellent work by Andrew J. Birtle, *U.S. Army Counterinsurgency and Contingency Operations Doctrine 1942-1976* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Army Center of Military History, 2006), 139.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 169-170 and 248-249.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 169-170 and 400-401

<sup>5</sup> *FM 3-24, Counterinsurgency* (Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army, December 2006), 1-26, 1-29, 5-13-5-14, and 6-1-6-18. The U. S. Marine Corps co-authored this manual with the U. S. Army and doubles as *Marine Corps Warfighting Publication (MCWP) 3-33.5*.

<sup>6</sup> *FM 3-24*, 1-19, 1-29, 5-3, 5-5, 5-13, and 5-19-5-20.

<sup>7</sup> *FM 3-24*, 5-23-5-24, and A-7

<sup>8</sup> *FM 3-24*, 6-1, 6-3, 6-6, 6-8, and 6-19.

<sup>9</sup> Birtle, *U.S. Army Counterinsurgency and Contingency Operations Doctrine 1942-1976*, 134, 137, 169-170.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 242-243.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 362-363.

<sup>12</sup> *FM 3-24*, 1-16-1-18.

<sup>13</sup> *FM 3-24*, 1-16, 1-23, 5-1, 5-3, 5-5.

<sup>14</sup> John J. McCuen, *The Art of Counter-Revolutionary Warfare* (St. Petersburg, FA: Hailer Publishing, 1966), 323.

<sup>15</sup> For a discussion of on Iranian perfidy and support with weapons for Iraq, see Arnaud de Borchgave, 'Iran's Strategy,' *Washington Times*, 18 August 2005, 14; Steven Coll and Susan B. Glasser, 'The Web as Weapon,' *Washington Post*, 9 August 2005, 1; or Michael Ware, 'Inside Iran's Secret War for Iraq,' *Time*, 22 August 2005, 26. Suicide bombing was unheard of during the Soviet-Afghan War.

<sup>16</sup> In both Indochina and Algeria, the French employed 'Nomad Operations' as a method of territorial offense to pacify zones, counter insurgents, and deny insurgent control through persistent patrolling. See McCuen, 206-225. Previous work and ideas appeared in Robert M. Cassidy, "Regular and Irregular Indigenous Forces for a Long Irregular War." *RUSI Journal* 152 (February 2007): 42-47.

<sup>17</sup> For a summary of the use of indigenous irregular forces during the Philippine Insurrection and the Vietnam War, see Robert M. Cassidy, *Counterinsurgency and the Global War on Terror: Military Culture and Irregular War* (Westport, CT: Praeger Security International, 2006), Chapter 6. For in-depth analyses of the American counterinsurgency lessons during the Philippine Insurrection and the Vietnam War, see Jeffrey J. Clarke, *Advice and Support: The Final Years* (Washington: U.S. Army Center of Military History, 1988); Brian McAllister Linn,

---

“The U.S. Army and Nation Building and Pacification in the Philippines,” in *Armed Diplomacy: Two Centuries of American Campaigning* (Fort Leavenworth, KS: U.S. Army TRADOC and the Combat Studies Institute, 2003); and Francis J. Kelley, *U.S. Army Special Forces 1961-1971* (Washington, D.C.: Department of the Army, 2004).

<sup>18</sup> See Cassidy, *Counterinsurgency and the Global War on Terror* for a distillation of the use of indigenous irregular forces in Malaya and Rhodesia. Dr. Kevin Stringer provided the portions of the book that address Malaya and Rhodesia. For the use of indigenous irregular forces by the SAS in Oman, see Tony Jeapes, *SAS Secret War* (Great Britain, Harper Collins, 1996), 162-175 and 226-243.

<sup>19</sup> For a synopsis of indigenous irregular force employment in Indochina and Algeria, see *Counterinsurgency and the Global War on Terror*. GMI is from the French *Groupes Mixtes d’Intervention*. The FLN, or the *Front de Libération Nationale*, was the Francophone term for the National Liberation Front, which was the political entity that directed the Algerian insurgents’ operations. The ALN acronym is from the Francophone term *Armée de Libération Nationale*. For in-depth studies that cover the French counterinsurgency lessons of Indochina and Algeria, see Bernard B. Fall, *Street without Joy* (New York: Schocken Books, 1961); John J. McCuen, *The Art of Counter-Revolutionary Warfare* (St. Petersburg, FA: Hailer Publishing, 1966); Alistair Horne, *A Savage War of Peace* (London: Macmillan, 1977); and Douglas Porch, *The French Foreign Legion* (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 1991).