Seven Pillars of Small War Power

“...We have to diminish the idea that technology is going to change warfare. . . .
War is primarily a human endeavor.”

—General James N. Mattis, U.S. Marine Corps, Commander, U.S. Joint Forces and NATO Supreme Allied Command

The world seemed to breathe a collective sigh of relief at the end of the long Cold War. That momentous event, however, did not mark the end of global armed conflict. While the number of armed conflicts worldwide has been declining since peaking in the early 1990s, and a conventional war between two large states seems unlikely to occur in the foreseeable future, community conflicts and a “growing number of increasingly disorderly spaces” that may facilitate even more such conflicts now characterize the global security environment.

Citizens of our globalized community may no longer need to lie anxiously awake in their beds at night, wondering if the world will be there in the morning, but the current climate of disorder may cause death by a thousand small cuts. These are “small wars,” insurgencies, localized intrastate civil conflicts that emerge from disruptive political, economic, and social problems. Nearly 80 percent of the surges in armed violence over the past decade were recurring conflicts, which should remind us—if we needed further reminding—that attending to post-conflict transitions is an integral part of any intervention.

These conflicts have most often involved failed or failing states, or anocracies—a purgatory-style regime that blends elements of democracy and autocracy, without the stabilizing benefits of either. Nearly three out of every four post-Cold War international crises have involved failed or failing states, and according to the Failed States Index (sponsored jointly by Fund For Peace and Foreign Policy magazine) the number of countries on “alert” status has shown a modest but steady increase for the past four to five years. Anocratic regime states are more than twice as likely to experience instability and violent conflict.

This violence involves competing militias, warring ethnic groups, warlords, illicit transnational networks, and informal paramilitary organizations not bound by conventional “laws of war.” The illegitimate offspring of criminal combatants dominate gray zones and lawless “no-go areas,” using their ill-gotten gains to fund conflict and buy operational and logistical support. This is the reality of the nightmarish nexus of crime and terror.
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These ugly struggles typically have complicated—if not chaotic—origins, and they tend to last for a long time. They are notoriously difficult to end, and it is always difficult to determine who won. Their enduring character is due, in part, to the indiscriminate nature of their violence, which seeks to break the will of the adversary by destroying homes, institutions, and infrastructure, which breeds a “never forget” mentality in their enemies.

Warring factions may have either little choice or little incentive to end the conflict. Some want it to continue because of “greed rather than grievance,” since it provides them power, status, or money they would not have in its absence. Some continue just because it is what they have always done. Child soldiers are increasingly lured into these struggles, creating a generation that knows only how to fight and has virtually no other skills, experience, or prospects. They fight because that’s all they know how to do—driving what some have called “supply-side war.”

Small wars are not a new development, and America is certainly no stranger to fighting them. However, fighting them effectively requires more than just experience. The U.S. Armed Forces have put tremendous effort into learning lessons from past conflicts to help them adapt to new contingencies, but as the transition from Iraq to Afghanistan demonstrated, the next conflict is not like the last one.

The history of insurgency and small wars—including contemporary ones—tells us that understanding the human dimension of a conflict is critically important. There is much more to the human dimension than knowing an adversary’s culture. Even a deep grasp of culture and social dynamics is not sufficient to win a war (though a deficient understanding may be enough to lose one). Strategy should place less emphasis on national-level planning and more on the local community level. The state remains relevant as a basic unit in the international system, but today’s
fragmented, complex conflicts often require us to dig deeper. Insurgencies and movements of resistance become living systems.\(^\text{15}\) They—almost literally—take on lives of their own.

Ultimately, insurgencies usually do not win, but their degree of strategic success certainly exceeds their disadvantaged size, military strength, and sophistication. They do this by leveraging their strengths in an asymmetric way. The resulting dynamics—some of which are obvious—work in their favor. Of course, insurgent movements must address the fundamental problems facing all armed groups, regardless of their history, motivations, or goals. Anthony Vinci describes these as the three basic problems of mobilization.\(^\text{16}\) The insurgent needs people who want to fight (motivation); the means of force, including weapons and survivability (logistics); and the ability to exercise direction (leadership, organization, and communications).

The basic tasks themselves are relatively straightforward, but how militants approach them determines whether they are successful in the political and psychological spheres of conflict. Those spheres serve as the insurgents’ fulcrum for exerting asymmetric power.

In the sections that follow, I outline seven significant sources of power for insurgencies and resistance movements:

- The power of rising expectations.
- The power of the people.
- The power of the underdog.
- The power of agility.
- The power of resistance.
- The power of security.
- The power of belonging.

Understanding them can help explain how and why some insurgencies succeed while others do not, and help shape strategies for countering them. This article is a heuristic, not a historiography. The nature and mechanisms of power are dynamic and often context dependent. Exceptions exist for nearly every rule. With that caveat, I offer my thoughts on the following pillars of small war power.

**Power of Rising Expectations**

“While poverty has rarely been a driving force for revolutionary movements and wars, rising expectations often have.”—Joint Operating Environment, 2008.

Insurgency offers the hope of advancement, ascension, or freedom. By definition, insurgencies are aspirational. Insurgents do not have a defensive “bunker mentality”; revolutionary calls to action advance the cause—to make life better, to gain essential freedoms. “Without rising aspirations and expectations, society would not make the effort and take the risks to acquire new forms of behavior to achieve greater results.”\(^\text{17}\) In that sense, rising expectations empower regime resistance.\(^\text{18}\)

For centuries, the impoverished and oppressed, especially in undeveloped areas of the world, suffered profoundly from “want,” but resigned themselves to their fates. Many of the “have-nots” had no notion of the lives of the “haves.” They may have wished for things to be different, but with no knowledge of anything beyond their own communities, they had no sense of what different might look like, much less that it might be attainable. Globalization and technology have changed that.

Today, the competitive aspirations of communities may become even more intense than those of nations. Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, in
comments to the U.S. Global Leadership Campaign on 15 July 2008, forecast that “Over the next 20 years and more, certain pressures—population, resources, energy, economic and environmental climates—could combine with rapid cultural, social, and technological change to produce new sources of deprivation, rage, and instability . . . [such that] the most persistent and potentially dangerous threats will come less from ambitious states than failing ones that cannot meet the basic needs—much less the aspirations—of their people.” The power of rising expectations in fueling conflict is likely to get worse before it gets better.

Early conflict theories advanced the idea that poverty and deprivation were “root causes” of political violence. Subsequent evidence has demonstrated quite clearly that poverty alone is neither a substantial cause nor a robust predictor. (Some suggest a more nuanced idea, that perhaps the dynamic is one of relative deprivation.) Research does not support the idea that discontent is sufficient to inspire collective political violence. However, discontent is one thing and injustice is quite another. Framing a problem as an injustice permits the insurgent to transform the people’s expectations into action.

Most theories of radicalization and extremist ideology have some element of grievance as a foundational element. But why do some grievances incite action while others do not? One key reason seems to be that those affected view the grievance as an injustice. The contrast between the way things are (what the people have) and the way they think things should be (what they should have) fuels these perceptions. Rising expectations heighten that gap, creating a climate that engenders grievances of inequity. This, in essence, is where relative deprivation leads to perceptions of absolute injustice.

When the aggrieved see that others do not suffer, or have overcome suffering—perhaps through revolutionary violence—what once was annoying now seems unfair. Because people do not regard injustices as random events, it is not difficult to place blame on a certain target—a policy, person, or nation. The blamed party is then vilified—often demonized—which inspires the aggrieved to take action to remedy the injustices against them.

**Power of the Underdog**

“The underdog often starts the fight, and occasionally the upper dog deserves to win.”—Edgar Watson Howe

An insurgent movement is nearly always viewed as an underdog. We generally identify and define an underdog in relation to a more favored entity—a “top dog.” We regard the underdog as being or having “less than” the top dog. People like to root for the underdog—especially when there is some glimmer of hope that the aspirations of the disadvantaged party will prevail. Although we widely recognize the underdog’s appeal, the mechanisms by which it happens are complicated.

Not surprisingly, a great deal of research shows that people do not like to identify themselves as losers. So what accounts for the urge to root for or join the underdog? It’s a question that social scientists have only recently started to untangle. A couple of lessons are starting to emerge from research in marketing and social psychology. Bear in mind that most of the research done on the underdog phenomenon has considered fans of different sports teams or consumers of certain product brands, not insurgencies.

First, while most people try to view themselves positively and wish others to do the same, top dog supporters focus on the outcome of performance, while underdog supporters focus on the positive and attractive qualities of the “players” themselves and on the importance of the domain in their own lives. Second, sustained support does not require the underdog to put in a stellar performance, but there must at least be intermittent glimmers of hope. Stated differently, “underdogs need to come close upon occasion or at least show flashes of potential in order to merit support; otherwise they are just losers and nobody expects anything from them.” Two additional points are worth mentioning about the underdog’s appeal. One is his perceived persistence and tenacity in the face of adversity, a quality others admire and with which many wish to identify. In addition, support for the
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**Framing a problem as an injustice permits the insurgent to transform the people’s expectations into action.**
underdog seems to be rooted in people’s perceptions of fairness and justice. Underdogs are at a disadvantage in competition with top dogs. If the disadvantaged can succeed, then success—in the grand scheme of things—seems more attainable, fairer, and more equitable. If even some of these dynamics apply in armed civil conflicts, the power of the underdog is potentially quite important for insurgent movements. For the past 35 years, psychologists have investigated a phenomenon they call the “bask in reflected glory” effect. Basically, this occurs when a person associates himself with a group or institution that has status, a reputation of popularity, or success (even though the person has had nothing to do with that success). Consider how some sports fans (a term derived from the word “fanatic”) discuss their favorite teams using the pronoun “we,” and you get the idea. This effect is quite possibly a major factor driving the success of an insurgent or terrorist “brand” and the reason why more hangers-on seem to associate themselves with such groups than the groups themselves would recognize as associates.

Power of Agility

Rule 1: “Many and small” beats “few and large.”—John Arquilla

One of the great challenges in countering insurgent movements is that they are moving targets. Their structure, organization, and tactics are fluid. They are constantly adapting, evolving, and morphing. Although some insurgent groups historically have had a more centralized, paramilitary structure, the insurgencies of the 21st century are predominantly decentralized, dynamic, and agile. Agility is a force’s ability to adapt, to learn, and to change (in a timely way) to meet the threats it faces. Effective insurgent movements are both structurally and culturally agile. Agile insurgent movements are not only resilient to adversity and change, but they also are responsive to it, and they adapt accordingly. Setting aside for a moment the debate about whether Al-Qaeda is a global insurgency movement, consider its agility and evolution. What began as a “services support bureau” for Afghans resisting Soviet occupation subsequently became a “base” for operations by existing terrorist groups, then the notional hub of a global network of
new “affiliate” organizations, then a kind of social movement, and ultimately, a “brand” or inspirational hub for a virulent and violent ideology.36

Being agile and adaptive has advantages. Agility is perhaps the single most important factor in organizational learning. The U.S. Army, of course, has invested millions of dollars in developing repositories for “lessons learned” and has assessed and identified critical changes necessary for it to adapt to the current global security environment.37 But these extensive efforts do not guarantee actionable adaptations.38 By nature, if not by design, conventional forces tend to be large, heavy, and slow. That posture works well in conventional theater operations but not so well in insurgencies or small wars.39 A lean, flexible, and decentralized organization can move much more quickly from idea to action. It can maintain greater compartmentalization to enhance operational security and reduce risks from extensive, prolonged communications. It can shift quickly between kinetic attacks and psychological or political activity. It can move money, mobilize personnel, and replenish losses in leadership more easily. The counterinsurgent is typically running to catch up, only to find that when he figures something out, it has changed or is no longer important. Agility is a highly effective force multiplier, especially against a large, plodding adversary.

### Power of the People

*The richest source of power to wage war lies in the masses of the people.*—Mao Tse-tung

Contemporary insurgents have a clear home-field advantage, which they often exploit to great effect. Because insurgents, particularly revolutionaries, take up the mantle of resistance, they ostensibly represent the people. The extent to which the population perceives their rhetoric as reality drives its support.40 Chairman Mao referred to a style of small wars as “people’s wars.”

In population-centric counterinsurgency doctrine, the people are the counterinsurgent’s focus of effort and the prize for success.41 Accordingly, many have come to regard insurgencies and attempts to counter them as essentially “battles for the hearts and minds” of the people.42 What may not be immediately apparent, though, is that this battle does not begin at a zero baseline for each side. At the outset, the insurgency proclaims itself as the justice-seeking voice and representative of the people. The counterinsurgent must earn, cajole, and maneuver to win the population to his side. The insurgent arguably already has them, and needs only to retain or not alienate them. Consider in-group and out-group distinctions (“us” and “them”).43 Two common dynamics that tend to drive in-group-out-group (intergroup) relationships are in-group favoritism (a tendency to evaluate and behave more favorably toward in-group members) and out-group derogation (a tendency to evaluate and behave more negatively toward out-group members).44

Popular support is not only the “richest source of power” but also the richest source of energy and momentum for the insurgency. Popular support is not a sufficient condition for success, but it is necessary for resistance to thrive. From a psychological perspective, both the insurgent and the counterinsurgent would like the population to identify with their group and oppose the other group.45

To draw persons into the in-group, the insurgency crafts its narrative with an “insider voice,” while embedding itself physically and unobtrusively throughout the civil population. Insurgents follow Mao Tse-tung’s maxim that “the guerrilla must move amongst the people as a fish swims in the sea.” They aim to be indistinguishable from the people, becoming their voice and amplifying the threat posed by the out-group counterinsurgent with persistent propaganda and misinformation. This has the dual effect of making the in-group (that they have created) more cohesive and increasing opposition to the regime.

Gaining the support of the people is both the insurgents’ primary strategy and their primary objective. Chairman Mao said, “Weapons are an important factor in war, but not the decisive factor; it is people, not things, that are decisive. The contest of strength is not only a contest of military and economic power, but also a contest of human power and morale. Military and economic power is necessarily wielded by people.”
Power of Resistance

All conditions are more calculable, all obstacles more surmountable than those of human resistance.

— Sir B.H. Liddell Hart

Insurgents do not just use asymmetric tactics; they do so in the context of asymmetric strategies. The insurgent’s most fundamental objective is simply to thwart the counterinsurgent’s objectives. We may think of this as “monkey wrench power.” Throwing a monkey wrench is a form of sabotage. The purpose of sabotage is to interfere with a competitor’s goals and interests and to create disorder. Disorder is the strategic friend of the insurgent and the foe of the regime.

Insurgent movements often do not aim for decisive victory, but rather to prevent the counterinsurgent from achieving victory. They seek to be winning, not necessarily to be victorious. To be winning, the insurgent need only to disrupt, break, and resist. He does not have to build, create, or sustain. In nearly every way, the insurgent’s burden is much easier than that of the counterinsurgent. Henry Kissinger noted nearly a half century ago, “The guerrilla wins if he does not lose. The conventional army loses if it does not win.” This asymmetry is the essence of resistance and it gives the insurgent an enormous advantage.

The asymmetries of constraint further multiply the insurgency’s power. The insurgent has much more tactical latitude to resist than the state has to quell the resistance. Insurgent tactics are constrained only by the ethos and popular support of the people. As long as the insurgent is able to take the people’s side, he can largely use any means they wish.

The insurgent’s grand strategy of “not losing” involves persistently provoking, disrupting, and exhausting counterinsurgent forces. The insurgents provoke the state, hoping counterinsurgent forces will overreact with excessive force. The resisters then flaunt and leverage that regime’s response in order to mobilize their own popular support.

They disrupt the counterinsurgent with every demonstration of active resistance (since the counterinsurgent’s goal is to stop the resistance) and by showing the populace that the state cannot ensure the security of its people. Few tactics are more effective in this regard than intermittent, indiscriminant acts of violence. Creating a climate of fear and general disorder further undermines the regime’s legitimacy.

Finally, insurgents exhaust regime forces by draining their fiscal and personnel resources, compelling them to protect “everything” and rebuild what the insurgent has destroyed, while thwarting their ability to capitalize on any success or to gain any momentum. Few forces and certainly few nations have the political will to persist against such prolonged adversity.

Power of Belonging

Comradeship makes a man feel warm and courageous when all his instincts tend to make him cold and afraid. — Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery

Insurgent movements offer a way to belong, to be part of something bigger than oneself, to experience the bonds of affiliation, and to be empowered with a role that has meaning and purpose. These are powerful—if intangible—rewards for the most vulnerable subgroup of prospective members. The promise of belonging draws them in, and if properly managed, keeps them engaged and loyal.

Loyalty is most often built on a platform of connectedness, a shared identity, and a shared sense of belonging. Observations on recruitment within terrorist and violent extremist organizations show that many people join to gain solidarity with family, friends, or acquaintances. “For the individuals who become active terrorists, the initial attraction is often to the group, or community of believers, rather than to an abstract ideology or to violence.” As is true for many forms of collective violence, from terrorism...
to conventional combat, individuals are more often mobilized to act because of their commitments to other people rather than commitments to causes and abstract ideals.

While some people participate in or support an insurgency because of a principled dedication to the cause, for many others being part of the insurgency is basically an end unto itself. It gives them a sense of purpose and an identity. The psychological motive is primary, while the ideological/political motive is secondary. However, even for those who are “true believers,” the feeling of belonging often has a powerful pull.

It is no coincidence that the wellspring of most resistance movements flows from a pool of alienated and angry young men. Modern small war conflicts capitalize on identity-based security threats, which are particularly incendiary issues for that demographic category. Steven Metz and Raymond Millen of the Strategic Studies Institute note, “Insurgents inspire resistance and recruitment by defiance, particularly among young males with the volatile combination of boredom, anger, and lack of purpose. Insurgency can provide a sense of adventure, excitement, and meaning that transcends its political objectives.” With the global “youth bulge,” about 87 percent of world’s populations between the ages of 10 and 19 now live in developing countries, many of which are furnaces of political instability stoked by curtailed modernity and an ethos of nonstate belonging and boundaries.

This suggests perhaps that the highest risk group for an uprising—demographically and psychosocially—is now densely concentrated in the world’s riskiest and most volatile spaces.

**Power of Security**

*Most people want security in this world, not liberty.*—H.L. Mencken

Budding insurgents often find within the movement an essential sense of physical, social, and emotional security. Physically, there is strength in numbers. Socially, mutual accountability and trust breeds loyalty. Emotionally, the ideology, doctrine, and rules of the group provide a reassuring sense of structure.

Virtually every briefing these days on the character of insurgency or irregular warfare includes a pyramid graphic illustrating the “hierarchy of needs.” In the first half of the 20th century, psychologist Abraham Maslow developed a theory for understanding human motivation, which he
based on a hierarchical constellation of human needs. Most fundamental are basic physiological needs like food and water. Just above that lies the category of “safety” needs. As a practical matter, those combined categories comprise the essence of human security—freedom from want (physiological needs) and freedom from fear (safety needs).

Insurgents create fear and disorder, then use them to mobilize support. A climate of disorder undermines confidence in the regime’s ability to protect its citizens. Disorder can enhance fear even more than increases in crime or actual risk of harm. Civil conflicts, ethnic/religious tensions, and drug trafficking all contribute to a community’s sense of fearful insecurity. “This sense of insecurity has led to a growing realization that the provision of security itself as a public good—the very raison d’être of the states system—can no longer be guaranteed by that system.”

Fear often works as a tactic when the fear-inducing message includes a proposed solution or an option for security. Between the regime and the counterinsurgent, whoever appears to be in control—or appears uncontrollable by the other—will have an upper hand in managing the climate of community safety and the security of the populace. The state that does not govern, secure, or take care of its people abdicates its power to those who will.

A wrinkle in the contemporary challenge is that insurgent groups now not only seek to manipulate and dominate the threats to community security, but also increasingly seek to offer services and solutions. Hezbollah has been an exemplar of this approach, though it is certainly not the only group to use it. Hezbollah is perhaps best known in the West for its persistent and horrific acts of terrorism, including its association with the pivotal suicide bombings of U.S. Marine Corps barracks in Beirut, which arguably ushered in the modern era of suicide terrorism. Hezbollah also has a significant network of social and medical services, which it creates and sustains in areas with great need and deficient infrastructure. When illness or crisis threatens, victims often have little choice but to turn to Hezbollah and its facilities for help. Hezbollah will help with a generous spirit, without requiring allegiance or demanding reciprocity. It does not impose services on the population or tell the citizens what they need. Rather, Hezbollah identifies the needs and gaps neglected by the state, builds capacity, and attracts those in need. (The idea of using attraction rather than promotion is a subtlety often lost on counterinsurgents.) Hezbollah has learned that securing the population from want also secures their loyalty and support.

**Conclusion**

We should take a step back from our current obsession with “terrorism” and the next “big attack” and keep an eye on disorderly, ungoverned spaces; the evolving character of armed groups and nonstate collectives; and the erosive, insidious damage rendered to global security by the thousand small cuts of community conflict.

Wars are “primarily human endeavors.” Small wars are less amenable, however, to nation-centric analysis. Neither our adversary nor his armed forces are monolithic. We may need to modify our traditional “center of gravity” analysis to accommodate multiple centers of gravity in an asymmetric diffusion of power. Insurgencies and movements of resistance are dynamic, living systems powered by social dynamics. Successful insurgent movements leverage their available sources of power to gain the sympathy of the broader population and to mobilize a small cadre of armed forces. For the insurgent, these dynamics—the power of rising expectations, the power of the people, the power of the underdog, the power of agility, the power of resistance, the power of security, and the power of belonging—become the pillars of small war power. For the counterinsurgent, each of these pillars presents both a potential hazard and an exploitable vulnerability.

General James Mattis said of the U.S. effort in Iraq, “Sometimes wars are won by the side that makes the fewest mistakes, and the enemy made mistake after mistake after mistake. And we, on our side, when we saw we made a mistake, we corrected ourselves. And so the enemy is working amongst the population, and eventually the people identified that we were the ones doing things right and that the enemy was working against the people’s best interest. So they turned on them.” In Iraq, U.S. forces arguably prevailed by undermining and toppling the insurgency’s pillars of power.