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Abstract

September 11th, 2001 was a turning point in the trajectory of the United States military strategy and tactics. The United States had to quickly adjust to a new enemy consisting of insurgents and terrorists that perpetrated various types of tactics and attacks. As a result, the United States quickly found itself conducting counterinsurgent operations in both countries and counterterror missions throughout the world. The United States has employed its counterinsurgent and counterterror strategies for over ten years but current conflicts have shifted to Hybrid warfare. With that being said, the United States will need counterinsurgency and counterterrorism strategies, as well as many others to combat Hybrid warfare. The United States is currently facing Hybrid warfare and must be able to identify it and respond accordingly, potentially with counterinsurgency and counterterrorism, as well as various other strategies.
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Introduction

September 11th, 2001 was a turning point in the direction of the United States military strategy and tactics throughout the world. Prior to 9/11, the United States was engulfed in the Cold War, Operation Desert Storm, and various peacekeeping missions throughout the 1990’s, the United States had to quickly adjust to a new type of enemy, insurgent and terror organizations. Initially, the United States used unconventional means to eliminate the Taliban, swiftly changing gears to a conventional invasion in Iraq. Shifting focus to Iraq, the United States’ initial push consisted of a large conventional force that rapidly destroyed the Iraqi Army, ended the Saddam Hussein regime, and took control of the country. The remaining combatants, in both Iraq and Afghanistan, formed an insurgency that perpetrated various types of tactics including terrorism. As a result, the United States quickly found itself conducting counterinsurgent operations in both countries and counterterror missions throughout the world.

The United States has employed and honed its counterinsurgent and counterterror strategies for over ten years, but conflicts have shifted to hybrid warfare and will continue to do so into the future. With an increase in unmanned aerial vehicle strikes, an increase in the Special Operations Command budget and personnel, and an increase in deployed conventional and special operations forces, the United States is capable of fighting terrorism. The United States has learned valuable lessons in counterinsurgency since 2006 and has continued to update the doctrine to better reflect the operational environment. The United States has found value in counterinsurgency and counterterrorism strategies in the past and will continue to build on the framework and utilize the two within hybrid warfare. The United States must be able to identify hybrid warfare and respond accordingly, potentially with counterinsurgency and counterterrorism, as well as various other strategies. If the United States is unable or does not
identify hybrid threats and warfare there is the possibility that the wrong strategy is employed, which can cause the significant loss of life and money.

My thesis will look to answer if the United States will be able to use the lessons learned in the post 9/11 conflicts to combat current threats. Focusing on counterterrorism and counterinsurgency, which the United States has used in depth since 9/11, and determining if the United States is currently facing the threat of hybrid warfare. Each chapter will dive into various aspects of counterinsurgent, counterterrorism, and hybrid warfare. The culmination of each chapter will assist in proving whether the United States is currently facing hybrid warfare and if it can use counterterrorism, counterinsurgency, along with other capabilities to combat it.

Chapter 1

The first chapter of this paper focuses on the 2006 version of the United States military doctrine, Field Manual (FM) 3-24 Counterinsurgency and several of RAND Corporation’s studies regarding counterinsurgent strategy. A counterinsurgent strategy was formulated from the various RAND Corporation publications – initiated by the Department of Defense to study counterinsurgency – and is titled the “RAND Strategy.” The “RAND Strategy” studied various types of insurgencies but for the purposes of this paper the focus is on Type III insurgency due to the nature of the insurgencies in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The research examines the “RAND Strategy” to compare the recommended strategies, objectives, and understandings in the RAND Corp publication, War by Other Means, to cases that exhibit Type III Insurgency. Does the “RAND Strategy” ensure success against a Type III Insurgency? Should FM 3-24 be amended or changed to incorporate the “RAND Strategy?” Case studies is used to determine whether FM 3-24 should be changed is case studies with
specific parameters. The parameters that will define case selection are a Type III insurgency, which has concluded and occurred between 1945 to present. No ongoing conflicts will be examined. The conflict must have one of three strategies, carrot-and-stick, winning hearts and minds, or transformation, present during the conflict. The cases selected to test the “RAND Strategy,” determining if it should update or change FM 3-24, are the Dhofar Rebellion and Darul Islam. Testing the cases will determine if at least one strategy, in some form, should be incorporated into FM 3-24. It should be noted that in one paragraph FM 3-24 discusses winning hearts and minds, but the section is directed towards building trusted networks and does not explicitly address hearts and minds. For that reason, and due to the fact winning hearts and minds is a fundamental part of the “RAND Strategy” it is being incorporated as one of the strategies.

After completing the research and testing it was concluded that there was not enough evidence to incorporate any additional “RAND Strategy” strategies into FM 3-24. Answering the research questions directly, there was not enough cases available to study in order to determine whether the “RAND Strategy” should be created or even incorporated into FM 3-24. Of the two cases examined, one was not favorable to the hearts and minds strategy, while the other case was favorable because it also incorporated a transformation strategy. While comparing the two it is important to keep in mind winning hearts and minds yet execute on the strategy that is most favorable to the population.

Chapter 2

The second chapter of this paper focuses on the United States counterterror efforts in the post 9/11 era. The research looks to answer how the United States has applied counterterrorism strategy since 9/11? To better determine how counterterrorism fits into the United States’ foreign policy, the research examines policy in a post 9/11 world and focuses on the deployment of
counterterror strategy and tactics. In doing so, various counterterror strategies are studied to determine truths and trends that occur throughout the United States approach.

The chapter will test different cases where the United States has been conducting counterterror operations. The cases will be tested against the strategies and expectations dictated in the Literature Review. The testing will determine what type of approach is being employed and if the literature meets expectations in regards to the deployment of special operations forces, unmanned aerial vehicles, and intelligence unit.

To test the literature’s expectations, three case studies where the United States is overtly or covertly involved were selected. Using the case study method, cases where the United States is involved in counterterror operations will provide data that will ultimately determine how counterterrorism fits into the United States foreign policy. Each case is evaluated to determine how it fits within the literatures expectations of counterterrorism and the United States foreign policy strategy. With that being said, the parameters set for case selection include a conflict occurring post 2001, where the United States is overtly or covertly involved, and conducting counterterror operations.

After conducting the case study, the research found that the strategies present in the three cases proved the scholars were correct in their expectations of counterterrorism operations. The research also found that it was true regarding the units that were employed for counterterror purposes. The United States has applied counterterrorism in several different strategies, including targeted killings, stability operations, and training, advising, and assisting also known as the indirect approach. The United States, while employing targeted killings, the indirect approach, or stability operations, deployed special operations forces, unmanned aerial vehicles, and intelligence units in support of its counterterror application. Additionally, in some instances,
more than one strategy was applied, and some units were deployed in more than one capacity to accomplish the United States foreign policy objectives.

Chapter 3

The third chapter studies hybrid warfare in attempts to identify that the United States is facing it now and will need to continue to prepare for the type of warfare into the near future. The chapter will examine the current state of hybrid threats from conflicts that have a state or non-state actor using hybrid warfare in which the United States is passively or aggressively involved. Is the United States currently facing hybrid warfare? Can the United States leverage its counterterrorism and counterinsurgent strategies when facing hybrid warfare? Depending on the degree of hybrid warfare present in each instance, it will prove that the United States is in fact currently facing hybrid war. The United States, in the present and into the future, will face hybrid warfare from state and non-state actors. With that being stated, it is important to identify the threats as hybrid because of the various types of conflict – irregular, conventional, and cyber to name a few – that occur within hybrid warfare. The United States has refined its counterinsurgent and counterterror strategies since 9/11 and it would beneficial to be able to utilize the two when countering hybrid threats.

The case study method will be used to test the expectations and trends set in the Literature Review in regards to hybrid warfare. The data collected from the three cases will ultimately determine whether the United States is currently facing hybrid warfare threats from state and non-state actors. Using a state and non-state actor that is conducting hybrid warfare within a conflict zone, as well as a state that is not in any conflict will give insight into who and what kind of hybrid tactics are employed.
Scholars have correctly identified hybrid warfare through various characteristics they have assigned to the strategy. The chapter accepts the definition that has been illustrated by the scholars and dictated within the Literature Review. Using the accepted definition to identify the test cases to prove hybrid warfare is present in the modern battlefield and the United States must identify and respond accordingly. After testing the cases, the expectation and trends should hold true. The one expectation is during a conflict, where hybrid warfare is present, conventional, irregular, and one other tactic or strategy will simultaneously be present. The reality of each case, or conflict, will prove whether the scholars are correct in their expectation and trends.

After conducting the research and analyzing the case studies it was determined that all of the cases meet the one truth set by the literature. The United States is currently facing hybrid warfare from state and non-state actors. Out of the three cases the United States can use the counterinsurgent and counterterror strategies to combat the hybrid threat. All of the cases have exhibited hybrid warfare by meeting the one truth and having different trends occur simultaneously during the timeframe of each case. Also, it is important to recognize that the cases have shown that hybrid threats include several different types of warfare. The United States is currently facing hybrid warfare and cannot use a simple label of counterterrorism or counterinsurgency. Hybrid warfare must be identified as such so it can be combated with the correct combination of strategy and tactics.
Chapter 1: Counterinsurgency

Introduction

Insurgent warfare has become a mainstay on today’s modern battlefield. There are numerous approaches to fighting insurgencies. Throughout history, many insurgencies have occurred each with similar characteristics. On the contrary, there are other insurgencies which have been met with a plethora of different strategies, some successful others not, but all in attempt to achieve success. The U.S. Military began using Field Manual (FM) 3-24 in late 2006 in attempt to alter the pace of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Initially, the doctrine was deployed in Iraq, and a result of its success led to broadening its use into Afghanistan. After FM 3-24’s deployment, the Department of Defense contracted RAND Corporation to study the current counterinsurgent (COIN) doctrine and provide any recommendations to hone the strategy. The research examines the “RAND Strategy” to compare the recommended strategies, objectives, and understandings in the RAND Corp publication, War by Other Means, to cases that exhibit Type III Insurgency. Does the “RAND Strategy” ensure success against a Type III Insurgency? If so, should FM 3-24 be amended or changed to incorporate the “RAND Strategy?”

Before examining FM 3-24 and the “RAND strategy” in depth, there are several definitions that must be examined, which include counterinsurgency, insurgency, Type III insurgency, “RAND Strategy,” victory, and defeat. For the purposes of this paper, the definitions outlined will provide the framework which will allow for better understanding of counterinsurgency, Type III insurgency and historical cases that accompany it, Field Manual 3-24, the RAND strategic recommendations,” and whether aspects of the “RAND Strategy” should be incorporated into FM 3-24.
Continuing with the relevant literature on the topic, specifically the origins of counterinsurgency, the four types of insurgencies, and the two approaches – contemporary and classic – and counterinsurgency. Following the Literature Review, the theory of Field Manual 3-24 will be examined.

Subsequently, the methodology and parameters for the cases will be addressed followed by the data; the “RAND Strategy” and historical cases. The historical conflicts selected will be the cases on which the “RAND Strategy” will be tested against. Furthermore, this section, after stating the “RAND Strategy,” will specifically examine the supplementary differences with FM 3-24. This will supply the needed data to test the theory against the historical cases, which will determine the validity of the “RAND Strategy.” Finally, the results will be analyzed and discussed. All implications that pertain to FM 3-24 or the “RAND Strategy” will be analyzed and discussed. The objective is to discuss how successful the “RAND Strategy” is and if any parts of it should be incorporated into FM 3-24. The analysis will ultimately determine if FM 3-24 should stay the same, be updated, or if an entirely new counterinsurgent strategy should be created.

**Definitions**

The definition of counterinsurgency, insurgency, victory and defeat were extracted from FM 3-24 in order to keep a uniform interpretation and understanding. Counterinsurgency is “military, paramilitary, political, economic, psychological, and civic actions taken by a government to defeat insurgency.”\(^1\) Insurgency is defined as “an organized movement aimed at overthrow of a constituted government through the use of subversion and armed conflict.”\(^2\) The

---

2 Ibid, Glossary-5.
Field Manual defines victory for counterinsurgent forces as “strategic and tactical success of achieving political goals, and various goals in counterinsurgency.”\(^3\) In other words, victory would be to achieve the objectives and goals set by the counterinsurgent government and forces. The opposite would be the definition for defeat, as it is not specifically defined in the Field Manual. Defeat would entail the counterinsurgents not accomplishing the intended goals or objectives it set forth.

It should be noted that victory and defeat do not solely relate to the conflict in its entirety, the counterinsurgent force achieves objectives through a specific strategy or tactic. A counterinsurgent force may be defeated in the overall conflict but achieve strategic and tactical success employing a particular strategic. A strategy or tactic is used in order to accomplish an objective. Objective is what is being accomplished and strategy is how it is being accomplished. An example of an objective would be the following: counterinsurgents must understand the environment, and a strategy can be implemented to accomplish that objective. It should be noted that not all insurgencies are alike, the type of insurgency depends on the situation, this chapter the research revolves around Type III insurgency. Type III insurgency is defined as a global-local insurgency. It begins on a local scale but has the potential to become regionally or globally influenced.\(^4\) Lastly, the “RAND Strategy” has several objectives, which includes creating security for civil counterinsurgency and local governance, protecting the civilian population, reinforcing law and order, protecting key leaders, infrastructure and other assets, controlling territory and borders, and containing and defeating insurgent forces.\(^5\) The objectives within the

---

\(^3\) Ibid, 1-1 – 1-28.
\(^5\) Ibid, 236-237.
“RAND Strategy” are accomplished with various strategies, which are carrot and stick, transformation, and winning hearts and minds.

**Literature Review**

There are many strategies to counter insurgencies. Many insurgencies have occurred throughout history, and they all have different characteristics and are categorized as such. Since 2006, the U.S. Military has been using FM 3-24 *Counterinsurgency* to turn the tide of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. After the implementation of FM 3-24, RAND Corporation was commissioned by the Department of Defense to conduct several studies, which subsequently produced four publications on counterinsurgent (COIN) warfare. In the publication, *War by Other Means*, RAND gave several strategic recommendations to employ a successful COIN strategy. Before addressing the modern insurgency and counterinsurgent strategies, a better understanding of the origins should be examined.

**Counterinsurgency**

The origins of counterinsurgency link to an strategy used by the French in the 1830’s. Two tactics that were implemented by the French are known as ‘razzia’ and ‘bureaux arabes,’ which was a substantial step in modern military campaigns. As Thomas Rid states, the two were precursors to what is now known as war ‘among the people’ or also called an insurgency. Razzia was derived from the pre-Islamic Bedouin Societies and adopted by the French. The French modified it to meet their colonial warfare needs and was particularly seen in Algeria. A ‘Razzia’ is described as a military raid against enemies, consisting of an attack using a

---

7 Ibid, 617.
8 Ibid, 617-618.
substantial force, which overwhelsms the enemy and allows them to flee usually resulting in low casualties yet seizing goods, livestock, and prisoners.9 In 1840 Thomas-Robert Begeaud became commander-in-chief in Algeria and implemented ‘Razzia.’10 The tactic produced the desired effect of intimidation, logistical supplies needed to fuel the army and capturing of prisoners.11 The ‘booty’ – supplies, livestock, food, and prisoners – as Rid labeled it was used as a negotiating tool to force the enemy into submission. The officers viewed this as an essential adaptation of tactics to the local situation.12 Having the ability to adapt to the situation on the ground in order to achieve victory is a primary goal that counterinsurgency attempts to accomplish in the modern era. Bugeaud was eventually appointed governor-general of Algeria, and he recognized that war was not only about deterrence and destruction, but it required a constructive element.13 Bugeaud recognized the need to use raids to address combative enemies and the necessity to govern, protect, and provide institutions for the compliant citizens. The constructive element that he implemented was the latter, which is also known as ‘bureaux arabes’ or ‘The institutions.’14

During a conflict, the situation tends to be quite unstable and the military, not the civil establishment, was necessary in order to address the situation. This is where the ‘bureaux arabes’ came into play. The establishment of various institutions led to the development of indigenous affairs officers. It was something that had never been seen before in previous conflicts.15 The French tried to emulate the local society’s tribal structures. The principle was to allow for better

---

9 Ibid, 618-619.
10 Ibid, 620.
11 Ibid.
12 Ibid.
13 Ibid, 625.
15 Ibid.
intelligence gathering on the country’s topography as well as the social and political structure. The tactics were derived out of necessity for the colonial tasks, but the collective of qualities was uncommon to this era.\textsuperscript{16} As warfare continued to progress throughout history, counterinsurgency became more refined, and it was ultimately redefined and brought into the modern era by David Galula, who was a Colonel in the French army. Galula was heavily influenced by the colonial warfare theorists, and ultimately published a book on counterinsurgency warfare.\textsuperscript{17}

In Galula’s book, \textit{Counterinsurgency Warfare: Theory and Practice}, he identifies eight operational steps to defeat an insurgency and in some form, relate to ‘razzia’ and ‘bureaux arabes.’ The eight steps, in order are the destruction or expulsion of the insurgent forces, deployment of the static unit, contact with and control of the population, destruction of the insurgent political organization, local elections, testing the local leaders, organizing a party, and winning over or suppressing the last guerillas.\textsuperscript{18} No book was as influential or important to the updated version of Field Manual 3-24 than Galula’s.\textsuperscript{19} The underlying theory in Galula’s book drove the United States’ counterinsurgency doctrine that was used in Afghanistan and Iraq. When the French first implemented the two tactics in the 1830’s the type of insurgency they faced was similar due to the colonial aspect. In today’s modern warfare insurgencies have evolved through technology and other factors, forcing the counterinsurgent force to define each situation accordingly.

\textbf{Types of Insurgencies}

There are two significant parts within an insurgency, and that is the insurgent and counterinsurgent forces. In an insurgency, the insurgents must be defined so the

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid, 754.
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid, 755.
\textsuperscript{19} Rid, \textit{The Nineteenth Century}, 730.
counterinsurgents can implement the correct strategy to accomplish the desired objectives. RAND defines four different types of insurgencies. They are labeled from I to IV and recognize that all insurgencies have common characteristics, yet they also have distinct features that make each one different. Type I is classified as a local insurgency, which is internal to any particular country and does not have any external actors involved. It makes up nearly sixty percent of all insurgent conflicts and are the most common of all insurgencies. The assumption is counterinsurgent capabilities cannot ignore stand-alone Type I insurgencies.

Continuing onto Type II, classified as a Local-international insurgency. It is similar to Type I except it recognizes that insurgents will seek external support, whether that is funding, training, weapons, fighters, and any other beneficial backing. It is an evolution of Type I; it makes up thirty-five percent of insurgencies. The insurgents still want their grievances addressed within the state, but have gained support from an outside actor. Counterinsurgent forces have to disrupt any outside support forcing the insurgency to remain local to stop Type II.

Type III classified as a Global-Local insurgency, and it occurs when a local insurgency, which is receiving external aid, becomes a part of a regional or global struggle. Type III can evolve from Type II insurgencies as religion becomes involved mostly within Muslim countries where “Islamic militancy has considerable resonance and resources.” If addressed as local grievances and not a regional or global issue it can cause counterinsurgents to fail in defeating

---

20 Gompert, *War by Other Means*. xxix.
21 Ibid, 25.
22 Ibid.
23 Ibid, 26.
25 Ibid.
26 Ibid.
27 Ibid, 27.
28 Ibid, 28.
the insurgents, allowing the conflict to gain jihadist characteristics. The last is Type IV titled Global Insurgency. Type IV exists over a region where insurgents can form transnational relationships. The pivotal point revolves around the success of Type III insurgencies and recognition of global ambitions.

Classic versus Contemporary; Enemy-Centric versus Population-Centric

Counterinsurgent strategy is needed to defeat an insurgency, there are many different approaches, but they fall into two categories, classic or contemporary. The two categories can also be characterized as enemy-centric and population-centric. The Classic concepts or enemy-centric, includes pacification, legitimacy, “crush them”, and border control. The enemy-centric COIN focuses first on killing the enemy and secondly on protecting the population.

Contemporary COIN concepts or population-centric are FM 3-24, clear hold and build, “beat cop,” “boots on the ground,” and “put a local face on it.” The population-centric approach focuses first on partnering and protecting the population at all costs, while destroying the enemy is vital, it is second to protecting the population. Each approach to COIN has similar characteristics, yet there is enough distinction between them that presents each as a different concept.

FM 3-24, although characterized as contemporary, is a hybrid approach to counterinsurgency. FM 3-24 has attempted to execute a balanced strategy that uses both enemy

---

29 Ibid.
33 Springer, Stabilizing the Debate, 5.
34 Paul, Paths to Victory, 114.
and population-centric aspects, known as the hybrid approach.\textsuperscript{35} It incorporates both classic and contemporary concepts of counterinsurgency and fits a specific niche in fighting insurgent conflicts, Type III, giving an opportunity to succeed in the modern counter insurgent campaign. Also, RAND put forth recommendations to counter Type III insurgencies. The “RAND strategy” consists of Civil COIN, use of Cognitive Information, Local Security Services, US Forces, Multilateral Operations, and International Organizations.\textsuperscript{36} Although some have characterized FM 3-24 as a hybrid approach several scholars believe that the strategy focuses on a population-centric COIN approach.\textsuperscript{37} Specifically stated, “population-centric counterinsurgency, has become the only operational tool in the Army’s repertoire to deal with problems of insurgency and instability throughout the world.”\textsuperscript{38} With that being said, the author continues on to state that there are limitations and flaws that must be considered, which could lead to the incorporation of enemy-centric tactics to round out the approach.

The publications by RAND were to address Type III insurgencies, although they examined all the insurgent types and COIN concepts, the primary focus was to benefit the US Military in counterinsurgent conflicts. It’s an encompassing strategy and not so much a concept but rather a theory that uses several COIN approaches. Type III insurgency and FM 3-24 relate to one another through the elements of the conflict and the strategy that is employed in FM 3-24, which was updated by General Petraeus to counter this type of warfare.\textsuperscript{39} RAND classifies FM

\textsuperscript{35} Springer, Stabilizing the Debate, 89.
\textsuperscript{36} Gompert, War by Other Means, 366-368.
\textsuperscript{38} Gentile, A Strategy of Tactics, 6.
3-24 as a hybrid contemporary concept to COIN but the way it is interpreted, it is more of a strategy or theory that encourages the use of different COIN approaches depending on the situation on the ground. It fits better with the “RAND strategy” as a theory that has overarching objectives but employs various concepts and strategies. FM 3-24 outlines a strategy of Combat Operations/Civil Security Operations, Train Host-Nation Forces, and Supporting Economic and Governance Development. Following the strategies are several approaches including Clear, Hold, Build that was outlined as a COIN concept by RAND. Type III insurgency fits into this equation because of the type of conflict it is. Largely recognized in the Muslim world by Jihad, it has become more prevalent, dangerous and dynamic with globalization. Comparing the “RAND strategy” with FM 3-24 it will allow for a better understanding of how similar the theories are and how effective they are against the type of insurgency they are supposed to be able to defeat.

Theory

The theory that is pertinent to the research question is FM 3-24 because it is necessary to understand the doctrine to be able to evaluate the data and results derived from the testing. Although FM 3-24 is not directly being tested, it is being compared to supplementary strategies and objectives that could be added to the counterinsurgent theory. For this paper, only the relevant parts of the theory will be discussed, which includes the premise of the doctrine, objectives of the United States counterinsurgency doctrine, and strategies to achieve the objectives.

40 Ibid, 5-11 - 5-16.  
41 Ibid, 5-18.
The purpose of the Field Manual is to establish doctrine for military operations that will employ counterinsurgency. The United States military has commonly neglected counterinsurgent operations since the end of the Vietnam War. Field Manual 3-24 is intended to bridge the gap between the thirty years of neglect as well as combine the traditional approaches with modern realities. Too often Western militaries have neglected to study insurgencies, in the false belief that armies who expert in fighting conventional warfare are spontaneously prepared to do the same with a low intensity, unconventional conflict. Time and time again the United States military has had to retrain itself in counterinsurgency warfare in the midst of operations against insurgents. The doctrine, authored by General David Petraeus, realized the need to institutionalize COIN understanding for future conflicts. The intent of FM 3-24 is to shorten the learning curve for future leaders that find themselves embroiled within an insurgency.

The intent is distinguished by the objectives outlined within the theory. The United States Army and Marine Corps intended purpose is to strictly fight the country’s conflicts, yet history has dictated that they have taken on a multitude of roles besides unadulterated combat, which have included COIN operations. The aspects of the United States counterinsurgent operations include offensive, defensive, and stability operations, which allow for the accomplishment of the desired objectives. The objectives include legitimacy, unity of effort, political solution, understanding of the environment, generating intelligence, and isolation of the insurgents from their cause and support. Each objective of the Field Manual will be explored in further depth.

43 Ibid.
44 Ibid, ix.
45 Ibid.
46 Ibid.
47 Ibid.
48 Ibid, 1-19.
Legitimacy is asserted as the primary objective of all COIN operations, and can be achieved by a legitimate government who develops effective governance.\(^{50}\) A legitimate government allows a state to conduct its fundamental day-to-day tasks needed to function. Legitimate governments generally can develop the capabilities to manage, coordinate, and maintain security in conjunction with political, economic, and social development.\(^{51}\) There are six indicators of legitimacy and they are the ability to protect the population, frequent and fair elections supported by the majority of the population, high level of support or participation in the political process, culturally accepted level of corruption, culturally accepted rate of political, economic, and social development, and a high acceptance level of the regime by major social institutions.\(^{52}\) In some societies all of these categories must be achieved to support legitimacy, whereas in others providing basic services and protection to the population may suffice. The categories needed to achieve legitimacy are dependent on what the country has seen from prior regimes. It is vital for the counterinsurgent forces to establish what the host nation population defines legitimate governance.\(^{53}\)

Unity of effort is an integral part of COIN operations and should be present at every level.\(^{54}\) Without unity of effort well-intended actions can become uncoordinated and either cancel one another or provide weaknesses for the insurgents to exploit. It is important that a single counterinsurgent leader has authority over all government agencies involved in COIN operations, subordinates and military leaders use liaisons with leaders of other nonmilitary agencies.\(^{55}\) Nonmilitary agencies oppose being explicitly involved with the military, but it is

\(^{50}\) Ibid, 1-21.  
\(^{51}\) Ibid.  
\(^{52}\) Ibid.  
\(^{53}\) Ibid.  
\(^{54}\) Ibid, 1-22.  
\(^{55}\) Ibid.
essential to form some sort of liaison. It is especially important with the joint, interagency, multinational, and host nation organizations. The significance for unity of effort is to guarantee objectives are shared and actions coordinated, in other words achieving synergy is vital.

Political solutions and factors are a priority in counterinsurgent operations. At the start of an insurgency, military action related to COIN operations may seem principal to political factors as combat is conducted to secure the population and kill insurgents. Nevertheless, political goals and objective must guide military action, for example, commanders must contemplate how particular operations contribute to the host nation government’s legitimacy and United States’ political goals. This is where the unity of effort is vital and how military and political solutions are intertwined, as political leaders must participate throughout the planning and execution of COIN operations. As a result, actions performed without examining the political ramifications can be counterproductive to the overall objective, and as such it is crucial that COIN operations do not get in the way of accomplishing the political solution.

To successfully undertake operations the counterinsurgents must have a cultural and societal understanding of the population in their particular area of operations (AO). There are several understandings that the counterinsurgents must grasp in their AO, which include the organization of key groups in the society, relationships and tensions among groups, ideologies of different groups, values and motivations of groups and tribes, how groups and tribes communicate, and the society’s leadership system. In most insurgencies the insurgents hold an

---

56 Ibid.
57 Ibid.
58 Ibid.
59 Ibid.
60 Ibid.
61 Ibid.
62 Ibid.
63 Ibid, 1-22 – 1-23.
advantage over the COIN forces because of their local knowledge. Effective counterinsurgent operations demand a greater emphasis on language and cultural understanding. The nature of counterinsurgency warfare requires involvement with the population to accomplish victory.\textsuperscript{64} If the COIN forces lack understanding of the environment, the use of intelligence can be hindered due to misinterpretation of cultural and societal norms.\textsuperscript{65}

It is important to understand the environment so intelligence is applied properly, it is intelligence that drives operations. Successful COIN operations are created by timely, specific, and reliable intelligence that is obtained, analyzed, and disseminated throughout the counterinsurgent force.\textsuperscript{66} The counterinsurgent actions are key to obtain reliable intelligence, as operations generate intelligence, which leads to successive operations.\textsuperscript{67} The need to maintain a satisfactory rate of active operations pushes the requirement to generate and distribute intelligence.\textsuperscript{68}

It is difficult to kill all the insurgents. Instead, they must be separated from their cause and main line of support. Isolating the insurgents from the support and resources is easier than killing all the insurgents, although it is necessary to kill or capture insurgents if the insurgency is an ideologically extremist group.\textsuperscript{69} An insurgency with a significant amount of support can quickly replace losses. Thus, counterinsurgents must sever the sources that regenerate the insurgents power.\textsuperscript{70} Addressing the economic, social, or political grievances that fuel the insurgency can eliminate support as well as using population control and increasing border
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security to reduce physical support.\textsuperscript{71} Victory is permanently achieved when the host nation government continues to gain legitimacy and the people actively support the government.\textsuperscript{72}

All the objectives could be achieved through different counterinsurgent strategies and approaches. Depending on the political goal set by the counterinsurgents it would be vital to achieve objectives. Each strategy outlined in FM 3-24 will be studied. Prior to examining the strategies, a brief overview of all the understandings within the theory will be briefly mentioned.

Each understanding is essential to the strategies and objectives of the United States counterinsurgent theory. The first understanding is the use of the appropriate level of force. It is vital that the use of force is justified and not overwhelming. Overwhelming use of force can be counterproductive to winning the populations support.\textsuperscript{73}

The next understanding is supporting the host nation. The United States long-term goal within an insurgency is to hand over responsibility to the host nation government so they can achieve victory on their own.\textsuperscript{74}

The more one protects their force, the less secure they may be. Success is gained through protecting the population and if the military force remains in their bases they lose touch with the people and relinquish the advantage to the insurgents.\textsuperscript{75}

The more successful the counterinsurgency campaign is less force can be used and more risk must be accepted. As violence drops, the military force may be faced with stricter rules of engagement and have to exercise more restraint including increased risk to sustain a connection with the population.\textsuperscript{76}
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Sometimes doing nothing is the best reaction. Insurgents will carry out a terror attack or ambush to force the counterinsurgents to overreact. A course of action must be evaluated for the effect it may cause and if it is deemed to be negative then it may be best to do nothing.\textsuperscript{77}

One of the best weapons for counterinsurgents is do not shoot. In general, gaining public support and legitimacy for the government does not always involves actions that do not involve killing insurgents. Security is the initial stage set for progress but victory becomes permanent with a successful economy and political involvement.\textsuperscript{78}

The last four understandings are self-explanatory starting with if the host nation doing something doing something tolerably is normally better than the United States doing it well, if a tactic works this week it might not work next; if it works in this province it might not work in the next, tactical success guarantees nothing, and many important decisions are not made by generals. All of the understandings can be traced to lessons learned from past and present conflicts, but they are important considerations to grasp when fighting an insurgency.\textsuperscript{79}

The strategies that encompass FM 3-24 are a mix between classic and contemporary counterinsurgency approaches. FM 3-24 dictates that there are more strategies available to be used but the three examined in the doctrine have proven to be effective.\textsuperscript{80} The strategies in the doctrine are clear-hold-build, combined action, and limited support. Clear-hold-build is used when the counterinsurgents are facing overt insurgent attacks in a high priority area.\textsuperscript{81} The objectives include establishing firm control of the population and area, and gaining the populace’s support.\textsuperscript{82} The first phase is clearing the area, which requires removing all of the
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insurgents in the AO by killing, capturing, or forcing the insurgents to retreat. The second phase is holding the area with security forces. It is best if the host nation forces undertake this part of the strategy. The goal is to protect the population, continue to eliminate the insurgents, improve basic services, and restore the host nation government authority. The final phase is building support and protecting the population. In this phase the continued protection of the population is required but it is necessary to implement political reforms. In this phase the actives that are most crucial are conducted by nonmilitary agencies.

Combined action entails the United States and the host nation troops operating in a small single unit, usually of platoon size. This strategy is used to hold and build an area while providing presence within the population. These particular units also have the ability to establish support among villages, which can secure a wider area. The close working relationship that combined action units form helps demonstrate the commitment and competence to the local population, which in turn builds trust and enhances the host nations legitimacy.

Limited support is used when large combat formations are not needed. In this strategy, the United States focuses on advising and providing fire support missions. An example of limited support is the United States relationship with the Philippines. The focus on limited support revolves around building the capabilities of the host nation forces.

There are several tactics outlined in the doctrine that help accomplish the strategies, which include conducting combat operations and civil security operations, train and employ host nation security forces, establish or restore essential services, development of better governance,
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and economic development. The tactics can contribute in one way or another to a strategy or more than one. They also could be viewed as a strategy if they are attempting to achieve an objective.

**Hypothesis**

FM 3-24 addresses insurgent conflicts, after studying the cases and evaluating them against the “RAND Strategy,” it will be determined that some form of the “RAND Strategy should be incorporated into FM 3-24. Using the cases selected based on the parameters, the “RAND Strategy’s” three different approaches – carrot and stick, transformation, and winning hearts and minds – should, in some form, be incorporated into FM 3-24. Although FM 3-24 discusses winning hearts and minds it is only briefly in one paragraph. The section is directed towards building trusted networks. For that reason, and due to the fact winning hearts and minds is a fundamental part of the “RAND Strategy” it is being incorporated as one of the strategies.

**Methodology**

In today’s world of modern warfare, the U.S. Army doctrine FM 3-24 *Counterinsurgency* has become the theory to emulate in fighting insurgent conflicts. The best way to determine if the recommendations or “RAND Strategy” would be successful is to use the Case-Study Approach. First by comparing the “RAND Strategy” to FM 3-24 *Counterinsurgency* and determining the differences, then proceed to use any strategies or recommendations from the “RAND Strategy” that differ from FM 3-24 *Counterinsurgency* and examining them against selected insurgencies.
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The case of this paper is counterinsurgent strategy. Alongside the case being counterinsurgent strategy, the theory that will be tested is FM 3-24 *Counterinsurgency* and the “RAND Strategy” and it will be examined against historical Type III insurgent conflicts, which will determine if the recommendations and strategies should be in FM 3-24 *Counterinsurgency*. These two definitions give a baseline that allows for further analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of case studies.

The parameters that will define case selection are a Type III insurgency that has concluded and occurred between 1945 to present. No ongoing conflicts will be examined. The conflict must have one of the three strategies, carrot-and-stick, winning hearts-and-minds, or transformation, present during the conflict. The strategy does not have to be employed throughout the entire conflict. The outcome of the conflict would not influence the success or failure of the strategy unless it was used as the main approach throughout. After setting parameters and selecting cases, there were two cases that met the parameters, Darul Islam, which exhibited hearts and minds and the Dhofar Rebellion, which displayed both winning hearts-and-minds and transformation. There was a total of five cases that exhibited a Type-III insurgency, two that are being studied, two that are ongoing – Iraq and Afghanistan – and one that also exhibits hearts-and-minds, so it was deemed redundant and not selected.

**Data**

Within this section, the “RAND Strategy” will be studied, followed by the examination of the differences between the “RAND Strategy” and FM 3-24, and the selected case will be described. Starting with the “RAND Strategy” there are several objectives, which include creating security for civil COIN and local governance, protect the civilian population, reinforce
law and order, protecting key infrastructure, leadership and other assets, control territory and borders, and contain and defeat insurgent forces.90

Some of the objectives have concrete characteristics while others just have examples of the objective. The data from the objectives with defining characteristics will be presented. Starting with creating security for civil COIN and local governance, there are several specific tactics that are distinguished. They encompass knowing the local culture, communicating in the local language, develop sources of information, collaborate with civil COIN providers, and protect civil COIN providers and projects.91 There is one specific characteristic under protecting the civilian population and that is coordinate with community leaders and local authorities.92 Control territory and borders have specific tactics within the objective. The tactics are patrol and clear urban areas, patrol and clear remote and rugged areas, isolate and search insurgent strongholds, and keep border areas under surveillance.93 Lastly, the objective, contain and defeat insurgent forces has three tactics that include developing intelligence on insurgents, conduct raids, and disrupt sources of support.94

“RAND Strategy”

Within the “RAND Strategy,” there are three strategies that are used to defeat an insurgency. They are carrot-and-stick, winning hearts and minds, and transformation; these strategies are not incorporated into the 2006 version of FM 3-24.95 Counterinsurgency discusses winning hearts and minds but it is not significant enough within the doctrine to be defined as a strategy of FM 3-24. The section is directed towards building trusted networks. Due to the fact
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winning hearts and minds is a fundamental part of the “RAND Strategy” and of no large significance in FM 3-24, it is being incorporated as one of the strategies. The carrot-and-stick strategy uses incentives to gain the support of the population and the insurgents. Punish the bad and reward the good, it allows for the population to be persuaded to side with the government and avoid all connections with the insurgents. The strategy embraces the logic of consequences in an attempt to influence practical choices. The military and civil forces play entirely different roles. The military force is used to punish while the civil force is used to reward.96

Winning heart and minds has been associated with the United States counterinsurgency doctrine, but it was explicitly discussed and incorporated into the 2006 version so for the purposes of this paper it will not be viewed as associated with the United States doctrine. The strategy’s goal is to win the allegiance of the population. The belief is that if the government provides the necessary things the population wants, the population will support the government and reject the insurgents. The counterinsurgents put a heavy emphasis on civil instruments to influence the population’s decision to support the government. Hearts-and-minds are difficult to implement particularly for the United States because the recognition of aid and assistance is not given to the host nation government. It can have adverse effects if the host nation government is doing a poor job in comparison to the United States.97

Transformation is the last approach outlined in the “RAND Strategy.” The goal of the strategy is to change the underlying structure of governance and the society.98 The idea is such transformation will make the insurgency irrelevant to pursuing its intended grievances. Using transcendence to change the framework in which the society addresses grievances makes the
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conflict obsolete. Transformation is similar to winning hearts-and-minds, but transformation includes the involvement of reform. An example would be reforming the justice system within the society.100

**Darul Islam**

The insurgency in Indonesia was a politically religious motivated revolt to challenge the policies of the newly independent government and implement Sharia law.101 Darul Islam began its campaign in West Java and was becoming increasingly successful, eventually threatening to spread to other parts of Indonesia and the region. Initially, the Indonesian Army tried to protect the population but was unable to raise the manpower to secure every area and defend against the night raids Darul Islam employed from their bases in the mountains.102 In 1959, under increasing pressure the Indonesian government shifted the direction of the conflict. The government developed the Planning Guidance for Perfecting Peace and Security (P4K) strategy. Part of this strategy included widespread pacification, which emphasized the engagement of local militias and citizens to secure villages and stop the insurgency. The other part of the strategy was to win the hearts-and-minds of the population.103

The PK4 strategy revolved mostly around pacification and search and destroy or as the Indonesian Army called it pagar betis. Pagar betis or “fence of legs,” used civilians from local villages to surround insurgent held territories and mountains, signaling the army when rebels attempted to leave the area.104 The program required a significant amount of intimidation to enforce because the locals were given any weapons to defend themselves. To win hearts and
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minds the army implemented a combination of civic action and psychological operations. The activities included the portrayal of the insurgents as brutal bandits and implemented a code of conduct based on Islamic principles for the army so they were observed as devout and effective. The targeted civic action and psychological operations helped win the population. Subsequently, pagar betis and pacification accompanied with the civic and psychological activities led to the defeat of the insurgents within three years and the ability to suppress other regional insurgencies.

The counterinsurgents attempted to employ hearts and minds, one of the strategies in “RAND Strategy,” although COIN forces were victorious and the population sided with the government it was essentially forced to support the government due to the PK4 strategy and because the counterinsurgent forces were less brutal than the insurgents. The one issue with the case of Darul Isalm is they did not have outside support. Barring the outside support it was a Type III insurgency.

**Dhofar Rebellion**

The Dhofar Rebellion in Oman, was a separatist movement that pursued independence from the oppressive Sultan. The insurgency adopted a communist ideology after South Yemen saw the rise of a Marxist government. After the adoption of the communist ideology, the conflict manifested into a regional conflict with several external actors on both sides. The United Kingdom, Iran, and Jordan supported the sultan and South Yemen, China, and the Soviet’s supported the insurgents. Circumstances within the conflict led to the Sultan’s son, Qaboos, to forcefully take power. Qaboos coup led to a new counterinsurgent strategy that combined
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conventional tactics, civil activities, and political reform, ultimate leading to a counterinsurgent victory.\(^{109}\)

After Qaboos took power his first action were to address the deficiencies of the conflict through social and military reform. The strategy was reflective of the British approach of conventional operations, political reform, civil reform, and efforts to win hearts and minds.\(^{110}\) Within a month Sultan Qaboos new strategy, which included amnesty had led to over two hundred rebels handing over their weapons and defecting. The amnesty program also helped build a tribal militia by allowing defected insurgents to return to their tribes and fight as irregular forces under the British SAS detachments.\(^{111}\)

The Sultan’s political reforms began after recognizing Dhofar as a province that would be ruled by a governor. The region saw an increase in development and civil affairs teams began building schools, repairing mosques, drilling wells, and providing medical services.\(^ {112}\) In addition, local government centers were built to sustain a presence in the region. By focusing on civil action, political reforms, and addressing the population’s grievances, the Sultan was able to delegitimize the insurgents and win the battle of hearts and minds of the Dhofari.\(^ {113}\)

In conjunction, Qaboos was able to appeal to external states to assist in building and training the military to squash the insurgency. Subsequently, Qaboos new strategy and newly trained and equipped military were able to launch a successful campaign that resulted in the defeat of the insurgents. Qaboos counterinsurgent strategy utilized two of the three aspects of the “RAND Strategy,” winning hearts and minds and transformation.
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**Boko Haram**

It should be noted that the Nigerian’s have currently implemented a carrot-and-stick strategy against Boko Haram but because of the ongoing nature of the conflict there is not enough data to determine its effectiveness. Since the outset of the conflict the COIN forces have been the preferred the stick approach against the insurgents.\(^{114}\) All of the attempts to reward or have peace talks with the insurgents have not manifested to be conducive to the Nigerian government.\(^{115}\)

The selection of data has strengths and weaknesses. The glaring weakness is the lack of cases that meet the parameters to test “RAND Strategy’s” three approaches. This can be contributed to the recent increase in Type III insurgency, where most of the conflicts are ongoing or recently ended but did not employ one of the three strategies. The strength of the data was how relevant the “RAND Strategy” was to FM 3-24. Both recognize the need to have an effective counterinsurgent doctrine to combat Type III insurgencies.

**Analysis**

The data speaks for itself in this case, there are not enough cases available to study to be able to determine whether the “RAND Strategy” should be created or even incorporated into FM 3-24. Addressing the research questions and hypothesis directly, there were not enough cases available to study in order to determine whether the “RAND Strategy” should be created or even incorporated into FM 3-24, which makes the hypothesis not true and the answer to the research question no. The “RAND Strategy,” should not be incorporated into FM 3-24 due to a lack of
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available cases that exhibit Type III insurgency. Hearts and minds could be incorporated into FM 3-24 under the stipulation that a favorable strategy to the population is also included. The two cases that could be examined, I would argue one was not favorable to hearts-and-minds while the other was due to another strategy that was incorporated, transformation. With the two cases in mind, I would venture to say, that it is important to incorporate winning hearts and minds of the population, but to accomplish that one must have other strategies favorable to the population. With that being said other studies would have to be done to determine if transformation and carrot-and-stick are successful against Type III insurgencies. Although the counterinsurgents won in both cases, during the Darul Islam insurgency the people faced brutality from both the insurgent and COIN forces and in Oman in took a coup to put the counterinsurgent forces on the victorious path.

To win the hearts and minds of a population there must be another part of the strategy incorporated, whether it is carrot-and-stick, transformation, or any other type of counterinsurgent strategy. Determining what strategy to accompany winning hearts and minds would depend on the situation and cultural background of the conflict. In the Dhofar case, there were political grievances that the Sultan was able to address, but had the coup not occurred I do not think the former Sultan would have won the hearts and minds of the population.

Although Nigeria and Boko Haram is still an ongoing conflict and falls outside the parameters of the case selection, I would like to address the situation. Carrot-and-stick is currently being employed by Nigeria against Boko Haram, but the conflict is still ongoing, so there is not enough data to determine whether it is successful or not. As it has been clarified in Agbiboa’s piece, the Nigerian’s are accustom to using the stick – punishment – opposed to the
This may be a result of the nature of the conflict, or that Boko Haram is playing both sides of the fence, saying they want to negotiate and partaking in the carrot but continuing to carry out terror attacks.

The “RAND Strategy” seems to have refined particular parts of FM 3-24, specifically objectives, tactics, and characteristics. It appears RAND was attempting to shrink the scope of certain actions, for example, patrol urban areas for the objective of controlling territory and borders. In contrast, FM 3-24 did not micromanage the tactics of ground commanders involving controlling territory and borders. The “RAND Strategy” almost appears more like a recommendation to strategies and tactics than a particular theory or doctrine that could be adopted, but that is without being able to test all of the approaches.

RAND needs to define a concrete counterinsurgency doctrine to revolutionize future approaches to insurgent conflicts. In doing so, the new doctrine must be supported by historical cases to prove its effectiveness. The only way to see if the “RAND Strategy” has forced a shift or update to FM 3-24 would be to analyze the updated versions of the doctrine. With the evidence from the two case studies and after comparing the “RAND Strategy” to FM 3-24, there should not be any changes made to the latter. With that being said, it is important, depending on the situation, to incorporate winning hearts and minds but in doing so, one must have other strategies favorable to the population. If changes were going to be made hearts and minds could be incorporated. The “RAND Strategy” does not provide any more valuable knowledge in regards to strategy, objectives, and tactics in the current doctrine.

One large difference that was unable to be tested and that has not been discussed throughout the paper is capabilities. FM 3-24 does not directly discuss United States capabilities.
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but only what capabilities are needed to carry out the doctrines strategies and tactics. On top of addressing strategy, objectives, and tactics the “RAND strategy” examines the United States capabilities. Although they found that the United States is not capable of countering a Type III Islamic insurgency because of its heavy reliance on large-scale military power, the paper did not examine capabilities to determine the factuality of RAND’s findings\textsuperscript{117} The jury is still out since Type III insurgency is seeing a resurgence in the modern era, this study may be better suited to be tested in a decade when several Type III insurgencies have concluded. I was not able to determine if the “RAND Strategy” should amend or update FM 3-24 due to the lack of cases available. Consequently, the answer to the research question is no, which makes the hypothesis not true. The “RAND Strategy,” should not be incorporated into FM 3-24. With that being said, hearts-and-minds could be incorporated into FM 3-24 as long as it is combined with another strategy that addresses the population’s grievances.

**Conclusion**

Referring to the research question does the “RAND Strategy” ensure success against a Type III Insurgency? If so, should FM 3-24 be amended or changed to incorporate the “RAND Strategy?” The findings from the data do not answer the question. There was only enough data from two case studies that did not provide concrete evidence to determine whether the hearts-and-minds strategy would be effective against a Type III insurgency. As a result of the data and findings, there should no update or adjustment to FM 3-24.

There were only a few differences between FM 3-24 and the “RAND Strategy.” The differences were distinct the three strategies in the “RAND Strategy” were not remotely close to
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anything outlined in FM 3-24. The objectives and characteristics were similar but the “RAND Strategy” seemed to have a smaller scope compared to FM 3-24.

Further research could be done to determine if the United States military has adopted any of the recommendations, strategies, or objectives outlined in the “RAND Strategy.” Comparing the FM 3-24 doctrine from 2006 to the updated versions would shed light onto any changes that have been made and if they follow along the lines of RAND’s recommendations. Another aspect that could be researched is if the United States capabilities against Type III insurgency were lagging behind, as the RAND publication studied the capabilities and found that they were behind. The “RAND Strategy,” should not be integrated into FM 3-24. Furthermore, the answer also deems the hypothesis false. In lieu of the findings, hearts and minds could be incorporated into FM 3-24 as long as it is combined with another strategy that addresses the population’s grievances.
Chapter 2: United States and Post 9/11 Counterterrorism

Introduction

In 2012, John Brennan, the assistant to the President for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism, delivered a speech at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars on “The Ethics and Efficacy of the President’s Counterterrorism Strategy.” Brennan specifically discussed the counterterrorist fight the United States’ faces and what must be done to secure the homeland and protect the American people. He said:

In this fight, we are harnessing every element of American power—Intelligence, military, diplomatic, development, economic, financial, law enforcement, homeland security and the power of our values, including our commitment to the rule of law.

The assets of national power Brennan cites are interesting, and the remarks seem to be a comprehensive approach to counterterrorism. His ideas also foreshadows a portion of President Obama’s speech, “The Future of our Fight against Terrorism,” at the National Defense University in May of 2013, when he said:

Nevertheless, this ideology persists, and in an age in which ideas and images can travel the globe in an instant, our response to terrorism cannot depend on military
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or law enforcement alone. We need all elements of national power to win a battle of wills and ideas.\textsuperscript{120}

President Obama further explains the national powers cited in Brennan’s speech: intelligence, military, diplomacy, and more national powers.

In the context of Mr. Brennan and President Obama’s remarks, how is counterterrorism applied in the United States foreign policy since 9/11? What strategies and tactics does the United States employ to counter the terrorist threat? Both sets of remarks relate to one another and together summarize the administration’s approach to counterterrorism. Further, the remarks the President and Brennan made relate to the comprehensive approach, which scholars identify as the way that the United States should employ counterterrorism. To better determine how counterterrorism fits into the United States’ foreign policy, this research examines policy in a post 9/11 world and focuses on the deployment of counterterror strategy and tactics.

Terrorism is hard to define. While some use the terms terrorists and insurgents interchangeably, they are not the same thing. Terrorism, for the purpose of this paper, is the unlawful use of violence or threat of violence against combatants and non-combatants that are and carried out by sub-state actors.\textsuperscript{121} Insurgents can carry out terrorist attacks as a tactic, but an insurgency is a struggle between a government and non-ruling group, which uses violence and political measures in a protracted conflict.\textsuperscript{122} Furthermore, counterterrorism is the actions and
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operations used to neutralize terrorists to prevent the threat or use of violence. To clarify, counterterror actions or operations are taken against terrorists but can also be used against insurgents who employ terrorism as a military or political tactic.

**Literature Review**

The literature surrounding counterterrorism outlines the personnel, tactics, and strategy that should be used and points out a truth and trends. Scholars have collectively defined a single truth throughout all of the literature regarding what personnel should be utilized. They all harbor the same beliefs regarding personnel use for counterterrorism actions; they include intelligence units, special operation forces, and or unmanned aerial vehicles. Although the scholars believe in similar personnel being deployed, they differ in how the counterterror forces should be used, which influences and illustrates differences in the strategy and tactics. The varying schools of thought or counterterrorism strategy outline several trends within the literature, which includes a comprehensive strategy, SOCOM and JSOC targeted killings, stability operations, and an indirect approach.

**Targeted Killings**
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Scholars have similar views on targeted killings as a strategy and tactic for counterterrorism. Targeted killings are the elimination of terrorists in particular leadership and key support factors like recruiters and bomb makers that can weaken the organization. Targeted killing advocates resonate around the direct or hard power approach. The hard power approach can also be employed with soft power, which constitutes a comprehensive strategy. It is important to define soft power before proceeding. Soft power entails a population-centric approach consisting of economic development, capacity building, and counter-radicalization and or de-radicalization of terrorists. In contrast, the hard power strategy revolves around an enemy-centric doctrine that is offensive in nature. Emphasizing the use of special operation forces in kill or capture missions and predator drones strikes, while using these actions to gain and further intelligence and policing missions. When hard power is employed alone, it is a targeted killing strategy.

Unmanned aerial vehicles, special operation forces, and cyber capabilities are of particular importance to the United States and should be applied in direct action. The effort is based on an aggressive action that finds, tracks, and eliminates terrorists with drones and Joint Special Operation Command (JSOC) missions, as Magnus Nordenman puts it, “Swift, but very limited, attacks using drones or special forces against high-value targets.” The scholars view the United States counterterror units within the targeted killing strategy, as a low intensity global

127 Ibid.
128 Ibid.
policing force with the ability to degrade groups like al Qaeda preventing future terror attacks.\textsuperscript{131} Targeted killings are seen as a way to destroy al Qaeda-like groups and to reduce the risk of terrorist attacks. The one glaring difference for scholars is the determination that the use of drones and special operation forces is a tactic and not a strategy.\textsuperscript{132} Although the targeted killing approach can be seen as a tactic, it can still be utilized in a stand-alone capacity in the same manner. As a result, it may be seen in use throughout the globe regardless of the strategy.

The other aspect of a targeted killing strategy is air power. Scholars recognize the growing reliance not only on fighter jets but unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) for intelligence and missile strikes. Drones are shifting the counterterrorism model, as they are a force multiplier for special operation and intelligence forces.\textsuperscript{133} Unmanned aerial vehicles can conduct intelligence, surveillance, target acquisition, and reconnaissance (ISTAR), which lead to drone strikes of terrorists in regions inhospitable to special operation units and ultimately denying the development of training camps and safe havens to terrorists.\textsuperscript{134} The growing ease and cost efficiency of deploying drones makes it hard to resist exploiting actionable intelligence inside and out of designated conflict zones when presented with a small window of opportunity.\textsuperscript{135}

Drones do not place military personnel at risk, and without a footprint the United States government has plausible deniability, especially in undesignated combat zones.\textsuperscript{136} The use of drones revolves around intelligence gathering and follow-on strikes to eliminate terrorists, their training camps, and safe havens. It is a cost effective way to counter the threat of terrorist attacks
that does not put lives at risk while projecting power throughout the world. Targeted killings, as outlined above, revolve around finding and capturing or killing terrorists in their safe havens, gathering any information that benefits the intelligence units with continued emphasis on ISTAR for follow-up missions, which helps in global policing operations and other counterterror missions. Drone strikes may shift the paradigm of counterterrorism strategy but in some cases, there will still be a requirement for the deployment of land units specifically Special Operations Forces.137 Also, when there are not any drones available to be tasked onto a high-value target and fighter jets or bombers can be used.138 In some instances, a target could be too fortified for a direct action raid. Instead, the operators on the ground may opt for a two thousand pound GPS guided bomb. Similar opportunities are presented when Special Operation Forces use the assets at their disposal, which include AC-130 Specter gunships, B-52s, or A-10 Warthogs, to eliminate a target.139 Targeted killing uses a conjunction of units and intelligence to conduct precise strikes on terrorists. Scholars view it as an ample strategy or tactic to counter terrorists and their organizations.

Comprehensive Strategy

The next trend within the literature is the comprehensive strategy, which is defined by several scholars as using intelligence, diplomacy, military, law enforcement officers in a homeland defense setting, financial, and in some cases other aspects of national power.140 All of the strategies have agreed on the use of units, but within the comprehensive approach, additional units are desired besides special operation forces, UAVs, and intelligence units. The
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comprehensive strategy includes a combination of hard and soft power. Although the hard power approach was examined as a stand-alone strategy above, when combined with soft power it becomes a comprehensive strategy. Soft power entails a population-centric approach consisting of economic development, capacity building, and counter-radicalization and or de-radicalization of terrorists. The latter focusing significantly on root causes and grievances within the state that allows for terrorists to flourish. The use of soft power goes even further into depth focusing on de-radicalization and how the local government should aid individuals attempting to leave terrorist groups with programs that facilitate separation and rehabilitation. With the combination of hard and soft power, albeit not as wide ranging as others nonetheless, its characteristics make it a comprehensive strategy. The mix of hard and soft power differs from how other scholars define a comprehensive strategy. The soft power approach, by itself, aligns more with the indirect strategy.

The other comprehensive strategies have many things in common, particularly the use of intelligence, diplomacy, military, law enforcement officers in a homeland defense setting, democratic reforms, and financial sanctions. One theme throughout the comprehensive strategy group is that intelligence is the core for successful counterterrorism. With that being said, there are two significant caveats attached. Most notably the United States’ liaison partnerships with the Muslim world will produce the most valuable assets and the coordination between its allies ensuring intelligence that is provided to the U.S. is complete and accurate. The next part
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of the strategy consists of military force in particular targeted killings and the training of allies. Targeted killings have been discussed above as a stand-alone strategy or in this case a tactic part of a broader approach. The training of partners takes part of the burden off of the United States in giving the host country the ability to fight terrorists. Diplomacy emphasizes the importance of allies in the counterterrorism fight. What the United States asks of a particular country may differ from a conventional war, but partners are needed nonetheless. Homeland defense requires coordination and integration into the national security establishment to ensure vital targets are protected, and information is disseminated to the population to keep it secure when an attack occurs. Lastly, democratic reform can benefit counterterrorism efforts through building institutions, which can strengthen the pro-US stance. Furthermore, if a country is enduring a democratic transformation, the United States should support and empower the rise of a democratic republic that supports the United States.

Diplomacy and democratic reforms are an important part of a comprehensive strategy for the United States, especially when they continue to support democracy and attempt to increase its leverage throughout the world with incentives and assistance. Counterterrorism depends substantially on intelligence and law enforcement because the majority of terrorists operate within functioning states, and if these countries are friends of the United States, kinetic force cannot be used. In conjunction, large-scale military efforts and ground troops give the terrorists targets to attack, can hone their battlefield skills, and gain new recruits. Instead of overt military operations, the United States must use covert capabilities. The need for covert
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capabilities is to deny terrorist safe havens and freedom of movement in areas across the globe, emphasizing the use of highly mobile and lethal counterterror forces and operations.\(^{152}\)

Additionally, the United States must help others, developing countries in particular who have seen an increase in terrorist activity. By maintaining military relationships, the United States can train and strengthen the capacity of other nations to fight terrorists.\(^{153}\)

The fight against terrorists must involve every tool available because each has something to contribute but also have limitations.\(^{154}\) The fight requires not only professional diplomats but also cooperation with foreign counterparts. Combating terrorists require the cooperation of countries with similar goals of eradicating the threat.\(^{155}\) Using intelligence will help determine where threats exist.\(^{156}\) Moving into financial controls, there is two ways the United States can utilize them. First, through the freezing of assets that belongs to terrorists or their supporters. Secondly by preventing the procurement of material support to terrorists.\(^{157}\) The ability to prevent funds and material from reaching terrorists will hinder them from perpetrating any attacks. The United Nations resolution 1267, which established a sanctioning committee who oversees the execution of decrees like freezing of assets of persons suspected of being associated or involved in terrorism.\(^{158}\) The development differed from targeting leaders of countries or terrorist groups it gives the committee the breadth to sanction any suspected terrorist.\(^{159}\) Ultimately the practice prevents terrorists from obtaining funding and materials, which inevitably will hinder the organization from carrying out future attacks.
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Lastly, the use of law enforcement and the criminal justice system can help thwart future terrorist attacks. When incarcerated, terrorists cannot commit attacks, if not imprisoned the prospect of being caught and punished can dissuade other terrorists from acting. The comprehensive strategy uses many national tools that are at the disposal of the United States, including military, intelligence, diplomacy, law enforcement, and financial controls. The comprehensive strategy has many moving parts to it but emphasizes military and intelligence forces, which is similar to the targeted killings strategy.

**Indirect Approach**

The indirect approach, as stated above, is similar to the soft power approach. The primary focus is on institution and capacity building. The supporters of terrorist organizations are typically deprived of economic and educational opportunities. It is vital to build institutions for the people to be able to gain opportunities to build a life. It begins with infrastructure, governance, the rule of law, and economic stability. Special Forces are trained during Robin Sage to deal with institutional and capacity building. During Robin Sage Special Forces “candidates are placed in an environment of political instability characterized by armed conflict, forcing Soldiers to analyze and solve problems to meet the challenges of this ‘real-world’ training.” The institutional building is a defining part of the indirect approach, yet capacity building must be done first. The host nation must be able to protect itself before rebuilding itself. Training host nation forces, and building capabilities needed to protect the population and have
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the power to back the ruling government. This approach is quite similar to soft power. The indirect approach is population-centric and emphasizes economic, governance, and security force development. As hard power can be used as a targeted killing strategy when employed stand-alone, soft power when deployed alone can be a part of the indirect approach.

**Stability Operations**

There are several different types of strategies that can be associated with stability operations; contingency operations, village security/stability operations, and the infamous counterinsurgency or COIN operation. Conventional forces conduct the majority of these large-scale operations, which is a change from the previous strategies that employ Special Operation Forces. Stability operations have three tasks: train, advise, and assist, support provincial reconstruction teams, and conduct partnered counterterrorism operations and provide ISR (intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance) from the maneuvers.

Part of stability operations is similar to capacity building within the indirect approach. They both are population-centric, but stability operations tend to be more overt with an emphasis on conventional forces. Stability operations are a significant part of counterinsurgency operations and counterterrorism forces, to achieve the intended objective, must support them. As the counterinsurgent forces are focused on protecting the population first and eliminating the terrorists second, it is imperative to have a counterterror force to focus primarily on the destruction of the terror network.
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Within stability operations and COIN in particular to stop terrorism the conventional forces must have a revolving relationship with the counterterrorism units. The conventional forces are stationed at various Forward Operating Bases (FOBs) and known as the Battle Space Owners (BSOs), due to the fact they are tasked with that particular Area of Operations (AO).\textsuperscript{171} The conventional units are used to police and patrol every day throughout the community for protection and to win the population’s “hearts and minds.” As the BSOs foster relationships with the locals, intelligence gathering becomes easier and is shared with the counterterror force that uses the information to carry out raids.\textsuperscript{172}

When employing counterinsurgency operations, it is imperative to have forces with two different tasks, one focusing on the protection of the population and one eliminating the terrorists. It’s not to say the BSOs cannot conduct offensive operations to secure new territory and stabilize their AO, but it is not their primary task. It is the BSOs task to occupy territory to deny the enemy areas to operate within. When BSOs employ offensive tactics, it is typically the search and attack tactic or move to contact.\textsuperscript{173} It is important to note that there is a difference between policing patrols and move to contact. The former is to foster relationships in the community to gain support for the host nation government while the latter is to find and eliminate the enemy. Search and attack are used when the enemy begins to have freedom of movement within the AO, making it easier to launch ambushes.

Move to contact has four principles, deny the area to prevent the enemy from functioning uncontested. Destroy the enemy to render them combat ineffective in the BSOs AO. Collect information about the enemy to gain better knowledge and understanding that can lead to follow-
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on raids. Lastly, protect the force by eliminating the enemy it prevents them from massing for an attack.\textsuperscript{174} With that being said within the greater scheme of stability operations the majority of the time the counterinsurgent forces are conventional units and the counterterror forces are Special Operation units.\textsuperscript{175} Another instance of stability strategies, on a smaller scale but similar to COIN, is Village Security/Stability Operations (VSO), which revolves around Special Operation Forces.

Scholars view counterinsurgency as a broader scale stability operation employing conventional and unconventional units. VSOs are on a smaller scale solely using Special Forces and indigenous forces.\textsuperscript{176} VSOs consist of four distinct phases; shape, hold, build, and expand and transition.\textsuperscript{177} During the shape phase, the Special Forces team is assessing the human elements within the village, understanding the local history and culture, and attempting to create a relationship with the locals to receive an invitation to live and embed within the village.\textsuperscript{178}

Following the shape phase, the Special Forces team goal during the hold stage is to decrease direct threats to the village though building the local’s capabilities to protect themselves.\textsuperscript{179} The build phase establishes a bottom-up approach by fostering a relationship with the district government and beginning development within the village, which strengthens the locals with small projects that are beneficial to the community and promote stability.\textsuperscript{180} Lastly, the expand and transition stage begins when there is a positive rapport between the village and
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the district government. At this point, it is important to expand the successes to other villages, where eventually the entire district takes part in counterinsurgency and protects itself from the terrorists.\textsuperscript{181} It is imperative the Special Forces team establish an honest and trusting relationship with the tribal elders. The success ultimately relies on the villager’s acceptance and participation.\textsuperscript{182}

Throughout the literature, there are four schools of thought or takeaways regarding counterterrorism strategies and tactics, which include truth and several trends. The one truth present, that special operation forces, unmanned aerial vehicles, and intelligence units should be a part of all counterterrorism strategy. The trend dictates that there should be one or several of the counterterror strategies – the comprehensive strategy, targeted killings, indirect approach, and stability operations – present during operations. The cases studied in detail shed light on where actuality fits into what should happen according the different schools of thought. If the literature holds true then in all three cases there should be special operations forces, unmanned aerial vehicles, and intelligence units involved, and one trend or a combination of them should be present.

\textbf{Hypothesis}

To better determine how counterterrorism fits into the United States’ foreign policy, the research examines policy in a post 9/11 world and focuses on the deployment of counterterror strategy and tactics. Particularly, the paper will test different cases, where the United States has been conducting counterterror operations, against the strategies dictated by scholars and stated in the Literature Review to determine what type of approach is being employed and if there is
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special operations forces, unmanned aerial vehicles, and intelligence unit involved as well as one trend or combination of them. At the conclusion of the testing there should be at least one counterterror strategy present supported by special operations forces, unmanned aerial vehicles, and an intelligence unit.

**Methodology**

Case studies are used to test the literature’s expectations regarding counterterrorism strategy. Case studies are a good way to evaluate the literature’s expectations because they can provide context as well as data on real world applications of theoretical concepts. The literature’s expectations emphasize modern day combat, and the concept cannot be tested in a lab or as a controlled experiment. To test these ideas an evaluation of selected modern conflicts provides the best opportunity to determine whether what occurs in combat matches theoretical ideas.

To test the literature’s expectations, three cases where the United States is overtly or covertly involved are studied. Each case selected is described to determine if the tactics and strategy that are employed match what the literature says should occur. The data gleaned from the cases will ultimately determine how counterterrorism fits into the United States foreign policy. Each case is evaluated to determine how it fits within counterterrorism and United States’ foreign policy strategy, and whether literature’s expectations match reality. With that being said, the parameters set for case selection include a conflict occurring post 2001, where the United States is overtly or covertly involved, and conducting counterterror operations.

The disparity between conventional and special operations units operating in differing conflict areas will give insight into how strategies are applied, particularly with conventional forces compared to Special Operation units outside of a designated conflict zone. The three cases
are the United States involvement in Yemen, the Philippines, and the war in Afghanistan. Each case is chosen for a specific reason. First, Yemen provides an opportunity to study United States Special Forces operations outside of a conflict zone. Second, the Philippines also occurred outside a designated conflict zone but more than special operation forces were used. Third, Afghanistan has all three elements present: it is a conflict zone and both conventional and Special Operations forces were deployed. Additionally, the three cases are in three regions—Africa, the Middle East, and Asia—so regional variants might be discovered. Lastly,

**Data**

**Yemen**

The United States acknowledged its redeployment of ground forces to Yemen to support the Saudi and the Yemeni government’s fight against al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP). This is not, however, the first time Special Forces have been present in Yemen.\(^{183}\) Although the United States had knowledge of al Qaeda operating in the region, Yemen was thrust to the forefront of international terrorism in October 2007, when the USS Cole was bombed.\(^ {184}\) Nearly a year later 9/11 occurred. Subsequently, the United States sought an increase in anti-terrorism efforts in Yemen, particularly against al Qaeda.\(^ {185}\) In November 2002, the United States began its counterterror efforts when the CIA conducted drone strikes. Abu Ali al-Harithi, the mastermind of the USS Cole attack and senior leader of al Qaeda in Yemen, was
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For the next several years, al Qaeda continued its attacks, but in a limited manner, Instead of U.S. military targets, al Qaeda conducted attacks against tourists, Yemeni’s infrastructure, Yemen security officials, and the U.S. Embassy in Yemen. Even as the United States began its counterterrorism operations with its first drone strike, its partnership with Yemen increased. Counterterrorism strategies in Yemen included airstrikes by both U.S. and Yemeni forces, monetary and material military aid, and the deployment of U.S. Special Operation Forces to train, advise, and assist Yemen’s counterterrorism policies beginning in 2005. While drones were still in use, they were being used strictly for surveillance and targeting missions. Between 2002 and 2009, no drone strikes were carried out in Yemen. Prior to the deployment of Special Operations forces, drones provided Yemeni forces with ISR in conjunction with the material aid they were receiving.

In 2006, Al Qaeda in Yemen regrouped from the 2002 drone strikes after 23 of their jihadists escaped from a military intelligence prison in Sana’a. Included among the escapees were Nasir Al-Wahishi and Qasim al-Raymi. Wahishi was the personal assistant to Osama bin Laden and was responsible for reconstructing al Qaeda in Yemen and served as the emir until being killed in an air strike in 2015. Al-Raymi served as the chief military commander until
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Wahishi’s death and subsequently took over as the emir. Their escape was a severe blow to the counterterrorism efforts in Yemen and almost immediately, attacks, especially those targeting security officials, infrastructure and the American embassy increased. In 2009, al Qaeda’s attacks reached their pinnacle when the Yemen and Saudi offshoots merged to create AQAP.

Also in 2009, following an attempt to bomb a Detroit-bound plane and continued influence and attacks within Yemen, the United States designated AQAP as a terrorist organization. At the same time, the United States began to take a more expanded and active role in counterterrorism operations in Yemen. As drone strikes intensity substantially increased, the United States continued its training mission with the Yemeni Army to combat violent extremism. Since 2009 when President Obama was sworn in as president, the counterterror strategy has increasingly revolved around the use of drones to degrade and eliminate AQAP. Figure 1 shows the number of air strikes by the United States in Yemen since 2002.
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As figure 1 shows, the drone program has continued to perpetrate strikes throughout the 2000’s. The intelligence gleaned from drones and Special Forces units on the ground provide the necessary information to carry out aerial strikes. There are two types of strikes that can be utilized, the “personality strike” and “signature strike.”

Until 2012, “personality strikes” were the only type of strikes carried out in Yemen. A “personality strike” is authorized by the president and carried out against individuals identified as enemy combatants, usually U.S. citizens like Anwar al-Awlaki. In early 2012, President Obama authorized the use of “signature strikes,” unlike a personality strike, signature strikes were based on possible target
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groups and patterns of movements.\textsuperscript{204} It allows for targeting a wider parameter of individuals, a faster response time, and a lower authorization level for the subsequent strike.\textsuperscript{205} The United States still relies heavily on the Yemeni armed forces to fight al Qaeda on the ground, while UAVs target and destroy other members of AQAP, all of this is in conjunction with the foreign assistance throughout the decade that included $346 million in 2012.\textsuperscript{206} United States Special Forces has continued its train, advise, and assist mission up until 2014 when the Yemeni government was unable to contain Houthi rebels, which forced the Special Operations troops to pull out, they have since returned to support the ground operations in conjunction with continued air strikes against AQAP.\textsuperscript{207}

\textit{Philippines}

The Philippines and the United States have been long time allies. Recently, they have faced terrorist threats from three Islamic and one communist group.\textsuperscript{208} The main threat is from the Abu Sayyaf Group (ASG), which has ties to al Qaeda and drives the main counterterror efforts in the country.\textsuperscript{209} Before 9/11, the United States had an understanding of the terrorism originating from the Philippines, as a result of several kidnappings of US citizens perpetrated in 2000 and 2001 by the ASG.\textsuperscript{210} Subsequently, the Philippines Special Forces lacked the capabilities to conduct counterterror operations, in particular hostage rescue missions.\textsuperscript{211} Because of its interests in the region, the United States recognized the need for counterterror and hostage
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rescue capabilities. The belief was the Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP), could build the necessary counterterrorism capabilities, with increased support only the United States could provide. In September 2000, Admiral Dennis Blair, commander of USPACOM, spearheaded the effort to stand up an elite counterterror unit within the AFP, known as the Light Reaction Company (LRC). The United States’ 1st Special Forces Group (Airborne) assumed responsibility for the training and advising mission where they developed the equipment requirements and a six-month training program that would provide comprehensive counterterror capabilities to the LRC and AFP. In March 2001, the mission officially began and the LRC completed training in early June. After training the LRC immediately started its initial operation in Basilan, along with their advisors, the (US) 1st Special Forces Group.

After 9/11, the US initially wanted to conduct combat operations as part of the Global War on Terrorism. The direct combat role would have been compromised of elite U.S. maritime forces partnered with the AFP, who would lead the operations, but this was out of the question because of the Philippine Constitution, which prohibits direct operations by other nations within the country. The one exception to this law came in February 2012 when the United States conducted its only drone strike in the Philippines, targeting and eliminating leaders of ASG.

---

212 Ibid.
214 Ibid.
217 Ibid.
The Filipino and the United States government decided on a noncombat role for the American forces. The U.S. units would advise and assist the AFP in operations against ASG on Basilan, while training was conducted on Zamboanga, the U.S. forces could not engage in combat, unless it was in self-defense, and the mission would last for six months and be known as Operation Freedom Eagle. Before 9/11, the conventional forces from the United States had conducted annual training exercises with the AFP, titled Exercise Balikatan, which was and still is the largest joint exercise between the two countries. In conjunction with Exercise Balikatan 2002-1 set to begin in January, PACOM activated Joint Task Force (JTF) 510 to begin Operation Freedom Eagle. Shortly after, Operation Freedom Eagle was renamed Operation Enduring Freedom – Philippines (OEF-P) and with the deployment of 1,300 troops on January 15th of 2002, the United States’ began its advising, assisting, and training mission.

During the six-month exercise JTF 510 took part in three key operations, Operation Liberty, the Burnham Rescue, and Targeting Abu Sabaya. During Operation Liberty, the U.S. forces provided support in the form of advice, communications, medical, and ISR. U.S. Forces also determined shortfalls in the AFP’s small-unit tactics and use of intelligence, which would be the focus of subsequent training. Another important mission for the United States was to rescue the Burnhams, a couple kidnapped by ASG. U.S. Special Operations forces trained the
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Filipino Marine units that eventually found the hostages, but due to the rules of engagement they were unable to accompany the Marines on the rescue operation.226

Following the Burnham rescue, JTF 510 targeted ASG spokesman Abu Sabaya. JTF 510 supported the AFP with operational advising, ISR, and secure communication equipment and helped formulate and execute the plan to pursue Sabaya.227 The Philippine Navy accompanied by U.S. Navy SEALs located and trailed a boat that had Sabaya in it, eventually coming under attack the Philippine forces returned fire killing him.228 Although the conclusion of Exercise Balikatan 2002-1 and departure of U.S. Forces including JTF 510 raised uncertainty for the counterterror mission in the Philippines, both governments agreed on the need for a residual force to build on their successes.229

As a result, several Special Forces teams remained on Basilan to carry on the training mission with the AFP and in late 2002 formed Joint Special Operations Task Force - Philippines (JSOTF-P).230 The JSOTF-P mission was for “foreign internal defense” and “to defeat terrorist groups in the Philippines.”231 The primary focus was in three areas, full spectrum embedding and engagement, operations and intelligence fusion, and military transition of internal security responsibilities to the police.232 Within those focus areas, there were five modules JSOTF-P supported, LRC training, night-vision aviation training, creation of a new operations and intelligence fusion center, light-infantry battalion training, and formal schooling for an NCO
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team leader course. Throughout 2003 and 2004, the initial success in increasing the AFP’s tactical and operational level’s and victories in Basilan gave the United States the belief the AFP’s improved capacity could lead to the destruction of ASG. Due to the degradation of ASG on Basilan the terrorist organization relocated to other parts of the country forcing JSOTF-P to pursue.

In pursuit of ASG, JSOTF-P continued its mission on Jolo. At the beginning of 2006, 250 U.S. troops arrived in Jolo as part of a larger contingency taking part in Exercise Balikatan, and conducted Civil Military Operations (CMO) in the form of building roads, schools, and wells. In August 2006 JSOTF-P executed Operation Ultimatum with its AFP counterparts. The operation ended up being a series of missions with the aim to destroy the ASG on Jolo. Throughout Operation Ultimatum, the AFP with U.S. advice obtained a new competence in planning and conducting large-scale operations and embraced CMO as a major part of its campaign. The mission concluded in October 2007, the outcome was significant degradation of ASG with the killing of key leaders Abu Aolaiman and Khadaffy Janjalani and the increased military capabilities and embrace of CMO by the AFP.

Beginning in 2008 and continuing into 2010 JSOTF-P shifted to a decentralized approach, delegating authority in operational planning and resource allocation to three newly created subordinate Task Forces (TFs), TF Sulu, TF Archipelago, and TF Mindanao. The ongoing support continued to increase the AFPs capabilities, in particular expanding its CMO
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and Intelligence Operations (IO) began to produce benefits regarding threat conditions and civilian support. JSOTF-P also launched initiatives to provide AFP with precision targeting capabilities to find and destroy high-value targets (HVTs), all the while enhancing intelligence support and increasing the capacity of the Philippine Air Force (PAF) resulting in new advancements, which include executing forward air control and Casualty Evacuations (CASEVAC). With continuing decreases in ASG initiated attacks and the increased capacity of the AFP, in 2010 JSOTF-P began the process to enable the Philippine government to sustain the progress and institutionalize the Filipino security forces capabilities in anticipation of an expected transition and end to the U.S. mission. During this period JSOTF-P integrated its plans with the U.S. embassy and the Philippine government to achieve greater cooperation during the transition. Subsequently, JSOTF-P began making reductions in its staff, shifting the capacity building from the tactical level to the headquarters and institutional level. It was important to develop high-level planning and intelligence capabilities to sustain the AFPs tactical and operational capacity gains. To achieve this, JSOTF-P established operations centers, schools, courses, and doctrine for CMO. At the discretion of the Philippine government, JSOTF-P also began training, advising, and equipping national police special units for transfer of responsibility from the security forces to the police.

In 2013, As JSOTF-P prepared for a complete drawdown and end to OEF-P two events occurred, an uprising and hostage crisis known as the Zamboanga Siege and Typhoon Yolanda.
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slowing the transition process.\textsuperscript{247} The siege demonstrated the Philippine Security Forces (PSFs) capabilities to conduct complex operations in a dense urban environment, in particular, the Philippine Special Operation Forces and the Police Special Action Force. It highlighted the proficiency achieved by the Police Special Action Force and Philippine Special Operation Forces.\textsuperscript{248} JSOTF-P continued its high-level institutional training while decreasing its numbers and eventually transferred responsibilities to the PACOM Augmentation Team (PAT), completed the transition, and officially ended its mission in February 2015.\textsuperscript{249}

Training, advising, and assisting was not the only aid the Philippines received, their military assistance increased substantially from $10.5 million in 2001 to $56 million in 2002.\textsuperscript{250} In conjunction with the increase in military aid, assistance from U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) nearly doubled between 2001 and 2007.\textsuperscript{251} The majority of USAID was for economic development in the southern Philippines, with the largest program, Growth with Equity, totaling $180 million from 2002 to 2012. In conjunction with the program ending, a grant of $127 million began in 2012 to support the Peace and Development Program.\textsuperscript{252} Aid has continued at a high level, in the fiscal year 2015 USAID has provided the Philippines with $163 million in foreign assistance.\textsuperscript{253}

\textit{Afghanistan}
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The war in Afghanistan or Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF-A) began after the terrorist attacks on 9/11 as a part of grander U.S. policy known as the Global War on Terror (GWOT). Initially, the CIA implemented an unconventional warfare strategy to deploy CIA paramilitary units and U.S. Special Forces to engage in direct action, foreign internal defense, and to mark targets for air strikes. From October 2001 through spring 2002, the United States employed a fast-paced, low-cost campaign consisting of small numbers of Special Operation Forces in conjunction with air power to topple the Taliban regime and destroy al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden (OBL). During the period two significant events occurred, the Battle of Tora Bora and the Special Forces partnering with a group that opposed the Taliban, the Northern Alliance.

The Battle of Tora Bora consisted of a group no larger than 100 CIA and Special Forces units who were in pursuit of OBL; intelligence had led the counterterror force to the most wanted man in the world along with an estimated 2,000 fighters. Throughout the 16 day battle, the U.S. force constantly bombarded the Tora Bora cave complex in attempts to kill OBL and as many al Qaeda fighters as possible. The battle ultimately ended in OBL escaping into Pakistan, but not without severely degrading al Qaeda’s safe haven in Afghanistan and capacity to execute attacks.
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At the same time, other Special Forces team had partnered with the Northern Alliance and began engaging in direct combat with the Taliban to topple the regime.\textsuperscript{259} By March 2002, the United States initial offensive had dismantled al Qaeda and the Taliban, beginning a slow shift to stability operations to build an Afghan government and ultimately destroy the Taliban and al Qaeda.\textsuperscript{260} During the offensive, the Taliban and al Qaeda saw a significant decrease in its operational capacity due to the U.S. military’s success. Forcing the remaining Taliban and al Qaeda members to seek refuge in the FATA region of Pakistan.\textsuperscript{261}

The United States recognized the shift in strategy to stability operations or counterinsurgency (COIN) would require a significantly greater numbers of conventional troops to help the Afghan government win the support of the population.\textsuperscript{262} A complex situation marred the period; the war in Iraq, a lack of resources, guerrilla warfare that included improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs) and small-scale ambushes, which ultimately took years to address and correct the strategy.\textsuperscript{263} Throughout 2002 and 2003 force numbers continued to increase with the core mission of disrupting the capabilities of al Qaeda and the Taliban to execute operations, denying sanctuaries, and destroying enemy forces when engaged in conflict.\textsuperscript{264} Several missions were carried out across the country by air assaulting conventional forces into an area to conduct a cordon and search to find and destroy the enemy.\textsuperscript{265} Although these missions were seen as a success, Special Forces teams in certain parts of the country believed the tactics used
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undermined the rapport they had built with the local populace.\textsuperscript{266} Later in June 2003, still attempting to deny sanctuary and prevent cross border attacks, Special Forces teams established small combat outposts (COPs) along the border with Pakistan. The tactic did not stop all movement across the border, but it increased presence in the area and helped foster better relations with Pakistan in the GWOT.\textsuperscript{267}

In conjunction with the beginning of offensive actions in OEF-A the United States also began CMO and creating the Afghan National Army.\textsuperscript{268} In December 2001, the 96\textsuperscript{th} Civil Affairs Battalion deployed to conduct CMO and establish relationships with the population by improving communities through internal development and humanitarian aid.\textsuperscript{269} The Civil Affairs units were successful in the efforts and by the beginning of January 2003, the humanitarian cells were renamed Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs), which extended its mission to include developing and strengthening local governance.\textsuperscript{270} While the Civil Affairs units were conducting CMO, in the spring of 2002 U.S. Special Forces partnering with the French began to train Afghan infantry units.\textsuperscript{271} Training continued to progress until March 2003 when Operation Iraqi Freedom began, and all Special Forces units were needed for the invasion and the subsequent conflict. As a result, the United States could not afford to deploy active duty forces to train Afghan units and instead sent the National Guard to carry on the mission.\textsuperscript{272}

The United States shift from CT to COIN did not take hold until late 2003 under Lt. General David Barno, the commander of Combined Forces Command – Afghanistan (CFC-
Through 2003, U.S. Forces were still participating in kinetic operations and did not have significant manpower to accomplish COIN. Lt. General Barno emphasized “five pillars” for operations: population-centric counterinsurgency, building the Afghan Army and Police, establishing area ownership for specific coalition forces, building good governance and extending the influence of the Afghan government, and engaging regional states: Pakistan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan. The difficulty of the strategic shift was the lack of resources and manpower due to the Iraq War; regardless of the shortcomings operations were conducted in support of the new strategy.

Throughout 2004, conventional forces used the traditional “oil stain” tactic, where soldiers pushed out from larger bases to establish smaller forward operating bases in contested areas, expanding the initial “oil stain.” By 2005, the United States had made significant inroads in Afghanistan since the beginning of OEF-A, however, al Qaeda and the Taliban, after being removed from power, regained leadership, resources, and began to escalate attacks. The insurgency was not able to seize and hold territory, but they had the capability to conduct attacks with a resurgence of personnel consisting of foreign fighters, weapons, and money. Continuing into 2006, the violence increased substantially as al Qaeda and the Taliban made a resurgence. At the same time the United States expanded the “oil stain” strategy by building remote COPs to fight the insurgents while attempting to build relationships with the locals.
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From 2006 to 2009, conventional forces attempted to foster relationships with the locals by living near them at remote COPs while continually clearing towns and villages in military operations only to find after the mission was over the Taliban returned. Through the years, violence steadily increased, and casualties for the United States began to mount, due to a resurgent Taliban.

As the Iraq War was winding down in 2009, the United States refocused its efforts on Afghanistan; Barrack Obama began his first term as President and appointed General Stanley McChrystal as Commander of all U.S. and ISAF forces in Afghanistan and launched a new strategy. McChrystal embraced General Petraeus’ Counterinsurgency doctrine and viewed the current strategy’s key weakness as not defending the Afghan population aggressively enough. As a result, McChrystal implemented a population-centric strategy that would reverse Taliban momentum and help the Afghan government control contested areas. The strategy revolved around closing the remote COPs and refocusing forces where they could have more influence on the battlefield; coupled with a 30,000-troop surge to help protect the large population centers and win “hearts and minds” as well as continue to train the Afghan National Army (ANA)
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The strategy also included stepping up attacks on al Qaeda by conducting night raids on kill/capture missions and to building security capacity among villages, which focused on Special Operations units embedding within villages.\textsuperscript{285} The strategy also saw a growing deployment of UAVs, similar to the expanded use in Yemen after President Obama’s election. The U.S. military began taking advantage of its ISR capability to spot roadside bombs as well as persecute targets with precision strikes when troops came under fire.\textsuperscript{286} Continuing through 2011 the new counterinsurgency strategy proved effective, as a result, President Obama announced the withdrawal of the surge forces by the summer of 2012.\textsuperscript{287}

By late summer 2012, the surge forces had all been redeployed to the United States, while VSOs and night raids continued to be executed by Special Operations units, conventional units continued to train the ANA and drones settled into an everyday role of surveillance and intelligence gathering. As both night raids and VSOs were proving to be successful, night raids were coming under increased scrutiny due to the number of civilians being killed. As a result, the Afghan government put a ban on them beginning in 2013.\textsuperscript{288}

At the beginning of 2013, the United States took a step towards ending its combat role in Afghanistan, with an agreement to accelerate the withdrawal of the remaining U.S. forces.\textsuperscript{289} The goal was to withdraw all units by the end of 2014 leaving a small residual force to continue the
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training mission and eliminate remnants of al Qaeda. Throughout 2014, the U.S. began handing over control of the security environment to the ANA and by January 1, 2015, the United States ended its combat mission. Transitioning from Operation Enduring Freedom to Resolute Support, with a residual force of 12,000 troops, the mission revolved around training, advising, and assisting Afghan forces. In conjunction with the train and advise mission the Afghan government lifted the ban on Special Operations night raids, resuming in 2015, partnering with the Afghan Special Forces the raids are seen to be the most important tactic in the fight because they can strike enemy leaders anywhere.

Throughout Operation Enduring Freedom, the United States has not only deployed military forces to Afghanistan but also a substantial amount of aid in the form of military equipment and reconstruction projects. By September 30th, 2014, the United States had spent $104 billion dollars on relief and reconstruction efforts. The majority of the funding, $66 billion, came from the Department of Defense with the next closest amount being $18 billion coming from USAID. In addition, $7.7 billion has been paid directly to the Afghan government agencies through trust funds. All of the aid provided to Afghanistan has culminated in almost double the amount of money spent on the reconstruction of Iraq.
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The funds have been dispersed throughout different sectors, but security has garnered 70 percent of U.S. dollars, while the remaining 30 percent was spent on governance and development projects, humanitarian assistance, civilian operations, and counter narcotics. The projects included programs to strengthen the local justice system, expanding power generation, the building of roadways, and the building of schools. The United States has also been equipping the ANA for the fight ahead. The United States has provided nearly 80,000 AK-47’s and other non-standard issue U.S. equipment procured from Warsaw Pact countries.

**Analysis**

The United States has employed counterterrorism strategies in several different ways since 9/11 including, Targeted Killings, Stability Operations, and material support along with training, advising, and assisting also called the Indirect Approach. In conjunction with the United States employing Targeted killings, the Indirect Approach, and Stability Operations, they also deployed special operations forces, unmanned aerial vehicles, and intelligence units in support of its counterterror application.

**Yemen**

The strategy in Yemen was a ‘hybrid’ approach due to the fact tactics from two strategies were meshed together. Not a single approach was used, but rather parts from two of the four were incorporated. Throughout the Yemeni conflict drones and attack aircraft were employed to carry out targeted airstrikes against al Qaeda members, constituting the Targeted Killing strategy. Targeted Killings employ air strikes and or kill-capture missions to disrupt and eliminate
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terrorists and in this case, the former was conducted. There was a seven-year hiatus between
airstrikes, but nevertheless, they were carried out along the lines of a Targeted Killing strategy
and have grown exponentially over the years.

The other tactic of the ‘hybrid’ strategy consisted of U.S. Special Forces deploying to
train, advise, and assist the Yemeni forces that were fighting AQAP. Training, advising, and
assisting is one tactic in the Indirect Approach. Although the training mission in Yemen was not
a part of the original strategy, once it began it became an integral part of the mission. The Special
Forces only acted in an advisory role to the Yemeni forces, which make this particular tactic of
the United States strategy an Indirect Approach. Although there was more than one strategy
used, according to the literature, the expectations matched what occurred in reality. The
approaches outlined above did not differ from the strategy in Yemen.

The other expectation that was met in regards to the literature is the forces that were
employed to carry out the mission. Special Operations units were used in an advisory role to
train, advise, and assist the Yemen forces in combatting AQAP. The Special Operations units
were also used in an intelligence capacity in conjunction with UAVs. In addition to their primary
mission, both units were employed as an intelligence unit to conduct ISR. Drones were used in
several capacities in Yemen, not only for intelligence and ISR missions to assist ground forces.
UAVs were also used to conduct airstrikes against al Qaeda members in support of Yemeni
forces. The expectations held true for both the strategy and units employed. Although the
approach was not a standalone strategy, it was a combination of two strategies, but it did not
differ from the approaches found throughout the literature regarding counterterrorism.
The United States counterterrorism strategy in Yemen was a combination of Targeted Killing and the Indirect Approach. The United States, in support of their strategy to counter the terror threat, included special operations forces, unmanned aerial vehicles, and intelligence units.

**Philippines**

In the Philippines, the strategy the United States employed was the Indirect Approach despite the one instance of Targeted Killing. The approach would not be classified as a combination of strategies because the United States knew they could not conduct direct action in the Philippines due to the law in the Filipino Constitution. The drone strike that occurred in 2012 was an isolated strike that has not been repeated. It was not Stability Operations because OEF-P was conducted covertly opposed to overtly, which constitutes one of the differences in Stability Operations and the Indirect Approach. The Indirect Approach is generally conducted covertly. The United States strategy throughout OEF-P was the Indirect Approach not for a lack of commitment but rather due to the Filipino law. Initially, the United States wanted to use direct action to eliminate the terrorist threat on the island. As a result, the United States primarily relied on a TF of Special Operations Forces that trained, advised, and assisted, as well as a contingent of conventional forces that either supported JSOTF-P year round or trained annually with the AFP in Exercise Balikatan. The United States also injected a significant amount of money for economic development in the embattled Southern Philippines. The assistance that USAID provided for the country was a substantial amount of money for economic development, and it aligned with one of the goals of the Indirect Approach, which is institutional building to afford citizens the opportunities to live a prosperous life. As mentioned in the Indirect Approach section the defining part of the strategy is institution building, but that cannot be accomplished until there is significant capacity building. The United States began significant capacity building in
2002 with the JSOTF-P and continued it throughout the entire mission. The United States was able to accomplish capacity and institutional building, which are the two pillars of the Indirect Approach.

The United States also met expectation by employing Special Operations Forces, UAVs, and intelligence units. Even though there was only one instance of drone deployment in the Philippines, it still meets the expectation of what units should be used due it being deployed to conduct a strike in 2012. Special Operations Forces were used throughout OEF-P as trainers and advisors to the LRC and AFP. The primary goal of the Special Operations units was to train and assist the AFP in counterterrorism, furthering their capability to complete complex operations. The Special Operations Forces also served in an intelligence role conducting ISR to provide the AFP with actionable intelligence to carry out operations against the ASG. In conjunction with Special Operations Forces, there were intelligence units deployed in support of JSOTF-P and the AFP to analyze and assess data gathered during operations. Expectations were met in this case, one of the strategies was used, the Indirect Approach, and the three different units, Special Operations Forces, UAVs, and intelligence units, were employed in support of OEF-P.

The United States used the Indirect Approach as their counterterrorism strategy in the Philippines. In conjunction with the United States Indirect Approach, there was also the deployment of unmanned aerial vehicles, intelligence units, and special operations forces to carry out the Indirect Approach implemented by the United States to counter the terror threat.

Afghanistan

Operation Enduring Freedom saw several strategies throughout the conflict. The initial strategy consisted of Targeted Killings and the Indirect Approach for the first several months of the war as the United States tracked OBL and toppled the Taliban. As the initial objectives were
achieved, the conflict carried on and took a backseat to the Iraq War, shifting the strategy to Stability Operations. Throughout the next seven years of the conflict, the approach stayed as Stability Operations until 2010 when a change in command added Targeted Killings back to the strategy, which continued through the end of OEF and into Resolute Support.

Throughout the conflict there was an emphasis on winning the population’s support or “hearts and minds,” training the ANA to take over security responsibility, dismantle and eliminate al Qaeda and the Taliban, and rebuild the Afghan government. Whether it was fighting at remote COPs while interacting with the locals or protecting large population centers to show the United States’ commitment to the Afghanis security, the strategy remained Stability Operations. Even in 2010 with a shift in strategy the United States still attempted to protect the population and win “hearts and minds,” which is a major stalwart in Stability Operations.

At the same time, conventional forces continued to train the ANA while the Special Forces teams were fighting in Iraq. The conventional forces also attempted to disrupt and dismantle the various terror organizations to the best of their capabilities. All of the above tactics align with the Stability Operations strategy; training the ANA, protecting the population, and fighting to disrupt al Qaeda and the Taliban.

As Iraq came to an end, Special Operations teams were deployed to Afghanistan and took part in VSOs to train locals to protect their villages. In conjunction with VSOs, the Special Operations units worked has hunter-killer teams executing kill or capture night raids, which is a Targeted Killing tactic. Due to the fact the Special Forces were overtly training the village locals, it remains a Stability Operation tactic. While the kill or capture missions they were taking part is a tactic within Targeted Killings, making the strategy in Afghanistan a combination of Stability Operations and Targeted Killings. As combat operations came to end the United States kept a
residual force that participated in kill or capture missions as well as training and advising the ANA, both of which fall under Targeted Killings and Stability Operations.

In conjunction with the three strategies that were present in OEF-A, the conflict also saw the three unit expectations, Special Operations Forces, UAVs, and intelligence units. Special Operations were used at the beginning of the conflict to train the ANA, find OBL, and topple the Taliban regime. Rotating back into Afghanistan at the end of the Iraq War they took part in kill or capture missions against High Value Targets and trained locals in the VSO program. UAV usage expanded in the later years of the war and was not only used in a Targeted Killing manner but also as an intelligence platform for ISR. Drones became an everyday asset to provide intelligence and surveillance to ground forces. UAVs represented two of the expectations as they were employed, one belief, and used as an intelligence unit, second belief. Expectations aligned with reality, in this case, three of the strategies were used, and two different units, Special Operations Forces and UAVs, made up the three types of forces that needed to be deployed with UAVs constituting two of them. Intelligence units were most likely used in Afghanistan in a number of different aspects but there was no data that could prove this assumption.

In Afghanistan, the United States utilized several counterterrorism strategies since 9/11. The strategies the United States employed were Targeted Killing, the Indirect Approach, and Stability Operations. The United States, in support of their strategy to counter the terror threat, included special operations forces, unmanned aerial vehicles, and intelligence units.

Throughout all three cases, the United States counterterrorism strategies include Targeted Killings, Stability Operations, and the Indirect Approach. While the United States employed Targeted Killings, the Indirect Approach, and Stability Operations, they deployed special
operations forces, unmanned aerial vehicles, and intelligence units to carry out its counterterror missions.

**Conclusion**

The United States has faced a dynamic threat since 9/11. Instead of traditional nation-state enemies, the post-9/11 enemy has consistently been terrorist organizations located in multiple sovereign nations. President Obama and John Brennan, the assistant to the President for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism, have recognized the threat posed by terrorist organizations particularly al Qaeda and affiliated organizations and the need for counterterrorism strategy tailored to a particular conflict or environment.

This paper has evaluated the United States’ approach to counterterrorism through case studies on Yemen, Afghanistan, and the Philippines. The counterterrorism strategies that have been prevalent in scholarly circles – indirect approach, targeted killings, comprehensive approach, and stability operations – were evaluated to determine their relevance to real world counterterror operations. The military units that scholars believe should be employed in accordance with counterterrorism strategies were also examined to determine their importance in the fight against terrorism. The strategies present in the three conflicts proved the scholars were correct in their application of counterterrorism strategy. It was also true of the units that were employed for counterterror purposes. In some instances, more than one strategy was applied, and some units were deployed in more than one capacity to accomplish the United States foreign policy objectives.

The United States will need to continue to be at the forefront of the Global War on Terror and continuously refine its strategy and tactics to protect its interests domestically and
Chapter 3: Hybrid Warfare: The Now of U.S. Engagements

Introduction

The United States has fought increasingly modern warfare since the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. The focus of Operation Iraqi and Enduring Freedom has been on counterterrorism and counterinsurgency actions. Over the past fifteen years, the fight has been complicated, with the enemy using conventional and unconventional weapons and tactics, and the response has been strictly counterterror and counterinsurgency. As the two wars have concluded, and new security concerns emerged, albeit in the same countries but also in other parts of the globe, the enemy has become more sophisticated and includes state and non-state actors conducting Hybrid warfare. As Former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates stated, “The categories of warfare are blurring and no longer fit into neat, tidy boxes. One can expect to see more tools and tactics of destruction -- from the sophisticated to the simple -- being employed simultaneously in hybrid and more complex forms of warfare,” the lines are blurring, and Hybrid warfare is employed due to its destructive and sophisticated nature.

Hybrid warfare is not entirely new to the United States, as parts of it include terrorism and insurgency, which the United States has been combatting since the early 2000's. The threat the United States faces in the future is not from a particular part of Hybrid Warfare but rather it in its entirety. Since 2014, the United States has faced a growing number of Hybrid threats from state and non-state actors to include, Russia, Daesh (ISIS), China, Houthi rebels, and Iran. Is the United States facing Hybrid warfare from state and non-state actors? Can the United States

---

utilize the counterterror and counterinsurgent strategies refined since 9/11 and discussed in chapters one and two? It is important to identify the threats as hybrid because of the various types of conflict – irregular, conventional, and cyber to name a few – within Hybrid warfare. If the United States does not correctly identify Hybrid warfare there is the possibility that the wrong strategy or combination of them could be employed, which could be extremely costly. Although the United States has cited Hybrid warfare throughout various strategic documents, including TC 7-100 Hybrid Concepts, it has not been incorporated into military doctrine. The United States must address the problem in its entirety not as a singular strategic problem. If the United States does not identify and respond accordingly there could potentially be drastic consequences that could cause adverse effects to the US homeland.

This paper will examine the current state of hybrid threats drawing on case studies from conflicts that have a state or non-state actor using Hybrid warfare in which the United States is passively or aggressively involved. The conflicts include Ukraine, Crimea and Russian involvement, the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria, and China in the South China Sea. Subsequently, each case will be analyzed to determine the extent of Hybrid warfare not how the United States is involved. Depending on the degree of Hybrid warfare present in each instance, it will prove that the United States is in fact currently facing Hybrid war and if counterterror or counterinsurgent strategy could be employed. Before examining and analyzing the cases, Hybrid warfare must be defined and placed within the context of the literature.

There is not a universal definition for Hybrid warfare, for that reason and the purposes of this paper the definition will be drawn from Frank Hoffman. Frank Hoffman, a leading proponent of the Hybrid warfare theory, defines the term as, "any adversary that simultaneously
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employs a tailored mix of conventional weapons, irregular tactics, terrorism, and criminal behavior at the same time and battlespace to obtain their political objectives,“302 in addition to the definition, illustrating various characteristics will aid in further understanding of hybrid warfare. A combination and employment of a broad range of weapons, tactics, and strategy within the same campaign including, high-end military operations to cyber-attacks, terrorism, criminality, insurgency, and any other means to target an enemy’s vulnerabilities to achieve strategic objectives.303 Hybrid warfare marries a broad range of tactics and strategies with conventional warfare. Simply put, integrating guerrilla and other irregular forces and operations with conventional ones.304 As such, in this paper, when referencing hybrid warfare it will refer to Frank Hoffman's definition that was mentioned above as well as the other outlined characteristics.

**Literature Review**

Hybrid warfare has become an increasingly common type of fighting in modern warfare. Due to the recent emergence of Hybrid warfare there is a lack of academic research, as a result this literature review will piece together the available literature to provide a better understanding of the subject. There are several tactics and strategies that scholars believe belong within the realm of hybrid warfare, which includes; Conventional warfare, Irregular warfare, Diplomacy,
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Cyber-attacks, and Economic warfare.\textsuperscript{305} Some scholars believe that all of the tactics of hybrid warfare could be displayed simultaneously within the same battlespace,\textsuperscript{306} while others see a handful occurring at the same time.\textsuperscript{307} Even though scholars split on how many characteristics or tactics simultaneously occur during hybrid warfare, they all agree on the fact that it consists of Conventional warfare, Irregular warfare, and one or more tactics associated with it.\textsuperscript{308}

\textit{Conventional Warfare}

Conventional warfare will consist of traditional challenges that any state may face from another state. It includes challenges that other countries may pose through their available military capabilities and forces that have proven themselves in war games or actual conflict.\textsuperscript{309} Scholars see the use of Conventional tactics within hybrid warfare in different ways, but it all revolves around the use of regular military forces and capabilities. Some view the conventional capacity as the ability to build a military force that can deter and fight internal and external threats.\textsuperscript{310} Other scholars see the use of conventional forces in a traditional military manner fighting against enemy forces and targets while attempting to achieve control of the battle space's local populace through security and stability.\textsuperscript{311} The literature on conventional tactics within hybrid warfare
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relates to one another it is essentially the ability to combat state on state conflict, which is the standard use of regular forces.\textsuperscript{312} With that said, all of the scholar's views on Conventional tactics may seem similar to the general usage of conventional forces, but it must be stated that hybrid warfare is a degree of unity and synergy between each characteristic. Each tactic, including Conventional, make up hybrid warfare and can utilize the same capabilities as it does in a standalone capacity.

\textit{Irregular Warfare}

Irregular warfare is viewed by scholars as a particular type of warfare, with several different types of forces – Special Operations Forces, Indigenous Forces, Terrorists, Proxy Forces, and the Local Populace – who carry out various actions that include guerrilla-type tactics, advising and assisting, supporting local unrest, criminality, and terror attacks just to name a few.\textsuperscript{313} It can be a violent struggle for legitimacy and influence over a population most notably using indirect methods, but it could also use the full range of hybrid capabilities to affect the people and the adversary's power, will, and influence.\textsuperscript{314} Some scholars also view Irregular warfare as consisting of several other strategies or tactics, which include Foreign Internal Defense, Counterterrorism, Unconventional, Counterinsurgency, and Stability Operations.\textsuperscript{315} Although all it is possible to utilize all of the tactics, Unconventional operations would be most visible with state sponsorship of non-state actors including covert forces and advanced weaponry, which would allow for unity between conventional and irregular forces when waging hybrid warfare.\textsuperscript{316}
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State sponsorship is not where it ends, Irregular forces and militias could support the state, for example, the Kurdish Peshmerga in Iraq.\textsuperscript{317} Non-state sponsorship of state governments leads into the realm of criminality and organized crime. As scholars point out militias can sponsor states but so can organized crime organization, who help the state wage hybrid warfare and in return look to increase their power and wealth.\textsuperscript{318} A terrorist organization may take part in criminality to gain funds to give to the state or for operations in support of the state and vice versa in regards to organized crime groups. The lines are blurred between criminality and terrorism. As some organized crime groups, may practice terror attacks, while still exploiting their criminal enterprise; the terrorist organization may exercise criminality, while still carrying out terror and guerrilla-style attacks. Even when incorporating all the different strategies it does not change the irregular warfare tactic within hybrid warfare, the same Irregular forces that are a part of a standalone operation are being utilized in the same manner.

\textit{Diplomacy}

Diplomatic measures are an important piece in hybrid warfare, especially when countries look to not declare war on one another or engage each other in direct conflict but rather through diplomatic means. Scholars view diplomacy use as a way to build international coalitions and assist in government reforms within specific countries. Diplomacy is also used to resolve internal and external conflicts through peaceful means.\textsuperscript{319} In particular cases within hybrid warfare scholars would call it "coercive diplomacy," which is where diplomatic negotiations are used in conjunction with military threats and limited support that rely on persuasions and rewards.\textsuperscript{320} Breaking down the combination of "coercive diplomacy," coercion being the punishment and
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diplomacy being the reward.\textsuperscript{321} The tactic occurs when resolving saber-rattling and potential conflicts that could result in full-scale war, better known as the carrot and stick strategy. Within coercive diplomacy, scholars outline it is imperative to balance military threats of force and preparations with diplomatic efforts to resolve political issues.\textsuperscript{322} When diplomatic measures occur in hybrid warfare, the country negotiating diplomatic terms must not overstep with military threats and have their bluff called, but at the same time be firm when negotiating political matters.

\textit{Cyber}

Cyber occurs in several ways within hybrid warfare. In the eyes of scholars, cyber exploits informational, financial, and kinetic effects.\textsuperscript{323} Other scholars view it as a way for insurgents and terrorists to utilize the Internet for propaganda, recruitment, and a means of communication.\textsuperscript{324} Utilization of the cyber realm can occur in several different ways. Cyberspace allows for informational warfare, to gather intelligence through electronic means, communication through cell phones, and battlefield communication.\textsuperscript{325} Countries can use cyber-attacks to shut down electric grids, steal personal data from government employees, and even take over highly destructive weapons systems, including Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles armed with nuclear warheads.\textsuperscript{326} In general, employment of cyber capabilities is in a nonmilitary manner for gathering or molding information. Cyber infiltration, when targeting a particular country or organization, can convey political messages to the intended individuals or expose
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state sponsorship of terrorists.\textsuperscript{327} Depending on a country or organizations capabilities they can put out propaganda or gather intelligence without any consequences due to not being caught or plausible deniability, which makes cyber warfare an important tactic within hybrid warfare because it allows various capabilities without the fear of military retaliation or the need start a conflict.

\textit{Economic}

Economic warfare pairs with diplomacy as scholars point out that it can be used to provide a country with economic assistance to allow the government to provide the adequate services and infrastructure to the local population.\textsuperscript{328} Shifting to the other side of Economic warfare, scholars focus on financial sanctions and trade embargoes. Scholars see the United States using financial sanctions as a noticeable tool in the national security strategy.\textsuperscript{329} Financial sanctions include targeting and freezing the assets of state sponsors of terrorism and members of non-state terror organizations.\textsuperscript{330} Sanctions can have different purposes, to compel an adversary to do something or deny and contain an enemy. The former would be similar to what the United States did to Iran to make them comply with its demands, whereas the latter is to deny particular organizations and groups the access to the funding needed to carry on as a terrorist organization.\textsuperscript{331} Trade embargoes and restrictions are also a tool in the arsenal of Economic Warfare. These prohibitions can include luxury goods imports, necessity exports (oil, food, and other items that sustain the economy of a country), and small arms and light weapons. The
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embargo on weapons can significantly hurt a targeted regime because they are unable to legally obtain necessary supplies to counter internal and external threats, which can lead to political unrest and reform or revolution.\textsuperscript{332} The goal of Economic Warfare is prescribed to help a regime better their country and government or hurt a targeted regime without using military force. As noted, there are several ways a state can target and assist or damage a regime or non-state actor.

Regarding hybrid warfare and the tactics used to employ the strategy within a conflict several takeaways are present, including a truth and a couple of trends. Hybrid warfare continues to gain more traction within the academic community as the type of conflict becomes more prevalent, resulting in several characteristics that relate between scholars. The characteristics may vary between scholars, but they are generally accepted themes or trends. The combination of conventional and irregular combat, in conjunction with the concurrent deployment of several different dimensions that include economic, diplomatic, political, and subversive.\textsuperscript{333} The grouping of military and non-military operations with an emphasis on cyber warfare.\textsuperscript{334} Throughout the conflict, there is a constant battle to win over the population within the battle space.\textsuperscript{335} By polarizing the population, covert and clandestine operations or proxy forces can assist in the destabilization of the state while hiding any armed aggression.\textsuperscript{336} Throughout a conflict that consists of hybrid warfare, there is no declaration of war.\textsuperscript{337} Both state and non-state actors can carry out hybrid warfare, and some countries may resort to terrorist tactics or organized crime.\textsuperscript{338} Hybrid warfare can be carried out by state or non-state actors to achieve their
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objectives and interests.\textsuperscript{339} Using nonlethal action allows for the utilization of strategic cyber information campaigns using the internet or news cycle.\textsuperscript{340} Scholars also state, motives differ depending on whether the aggressor is a state or terrorist/organized crime organization. The former attempts to develop its irregular warfare capabilities while continuing to increase its conventional capabilities to address the hybrid threats better.\textsuperscript{341} The latter tries to gather the skills and abilities to counter state militaries, the capabilities to counter cyber war, drones, and other weapons systems not available to the terrorist or criminal organization.\textsuperscript{342} While hybrid warfare is still gaining traction, using the available scholarly articles, due to the lack of academic research, scholars were able to determine Hybrid warfare is made up of several strategies and tactics that have been in use for years and even decades.

Through all of that, scholars have set one expectation or truth that during a conflict where hybrid warfare is present, Conventional, Irregular, and one other tactic or strategy will simultaneously be present. The cases studied will help determine whether the literature holds true in regards to the many trends and one truth. The reality of each case, or conflict, will prove whether the scholars are correct in their expectation and trends. If the scholars are right then in the three cases there will be an aspect of Conventional and Irregular warfare tactics or forces, and one or more other tactics associated with hybrid warfare. If the scholars are incorrect, the case may still have tactics of hybrid warfare, but conventional, irregular, and another tactic may not be present simultaneously, or there probably could be a different group of tactics present within the hybrid conflict.
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Hypothesis

Scholars have correctly identified hybrid warfare through the various characteristics they have assigned to the definition. This paper is accepting the definition that has been illustrated by the scholars and dictated in the Literature Review above. Using the accepted definition to identify the test cases to prove hybrid warfare is present in the modern battlefield. Additionally, counterinsurgency and counterterror strategies the United States has used since 9/11 can be utilized to combat hybrid threats.
Methodology

The case study method will be used to test the expectations and trends set by the literature in regards to hybrid warfare. Using case studies is the best way to assess the scholars’ expectations and trends of hybrid warfare because it allows the comparison of context and data from real world events to theoretical concepts. Throughout the literature, the scholars have emphasized real-world situations, tactics, and strategies so the test must use real-world cases, which would not allow for the testing for complete testing in another manner. Selecting three cases from modern conflicts that exhibit hybrid warfare is the best way to determine whether the expectations and trends are true and to prove the hypothesis true or false.

Three cases were selected to test the expectation of the literature. The cases are any ambivalence where there is a perceived hybrid conflict present. Currently, select policymakers and scholars recognize hybrid warfare but not an adequate amount to which hybrid warfare exists in the world. Each case chosen has a particular purpose to assist in giving a complete test. The data collected from the three cases will ultimately determine whether the United States is currently facing hybrid warfare threats from state and non-state actors. Each case is evaluated to determine how it fits within the hybrid warfare strategy and the literature's expectation of reality.

State and non-state actors can use hybrid warfare in destructive and nondestructive manner. Using a state and non-state actor that is conducting hybrid warfare within a conflict zone, as well as a state that is not in any conflict will give insight into who and what kind of hybrid tactics are employed. The three cases are Russia in Ukraine and Crimea, the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria, and China in the South China Sea. First, Russia in Ukraine and Crimea provides the opportunity to study a state conducting hybrid tactics within a combat zone. Second, the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria allows for the study of a non-state actor conducting hybrid
warfare in a conflict area. Third, China in the South China Sea affords the prospect of a state actor that is not embroiled in direct conflict or any type of combat area. Additionally, the three cases are in three separate regions of the world – Asia, Eastern Europe, and the Middle East – so there is a possibility that regional variables to the hybrid tactics and warfare may be present and discovered.

Data

Russia

The Russian annexation of Crimea has raised serious concerns about the nature of hybrid warfare and its prevalence in modern conflicts, as well as its potential use by Russia throughout the world. Russian activity in Crimea began on February 21st, 2014 after the Ukrainian President Yanukovych fled the country, Russian Special Forces entered the Crimean Peninsula. With the Russian Black Sea Fleet based in Sevastopol, Crimea, units of the 810th Marine Brigade in conjunction with the 3rd Special Forces Brigade – although the use of the Special Forces Brigade was for a separate purpose – moved into the Peninsula to protect the Naval Base. After alleged negations with Crimean politicians, the members of the 3rd SF Brigade began to organize pro-Russian rallies against the Ukrainian and Crimean governments and instigate and support an insurgency.

Rallies continued and on February 27th and 28th members of the Special Forces of the Main Intelligence Directorate concealed as civilians began operating with pro-Russian groups
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that included irregular and criminal groups. The group seized strategic objectives that included
the Parliament and Council of Ministers buildings, the Simferopol International Airport and
Belbek Airport, television stations, Ukrainian air defense installations, and they blockaded the
Ukrainian military units at the naval base in Balaklava Bay.\textsuperscript{346} The Special Forces and criminal
groups did not stop there, they cut off all lines of communication and interrupted the internet and
radio connections. As other Special Forces Brigades – \textsuperscript{2}nd, \textsuperscript{10}th, \textsuperscript{16}th, and \textsuperscript{22}nd – arrived the units
continued to falsify the discontent of the Crimean population culminating in Crimea being
completely cut off from communications with Ukraine leading to de facto control of the
Peninsula by the Russian army. Russia cut off Crimean communications to Ukraine due to the
control they exhibited over the communication infrastructure as well as cyber-attacks that
targeted the news, internet, and social media platforms.\textsuperscript{347}

In coordination with the Special Forces Brigade activities on Crimea, additional Russian
military forces, including Spetsnaz, naval infantry Marines, and airborne divisions from the
Russian Rapid Reaction Forces were deployed to the Peninsula and referred to as "little green
men," as they stripped all insignias off their green uniforms giving Russia plausible deniability
that it had forces operating in Crimea.\textsuperscript{348} Initially, Russia denied the involvement of Russian
Special Forces, stating they were "self-defense forces," but later recanted, dictating that Putin
had ordered the head of Special Forces to prepare plans to annex Crimea.\textsuperscript{349} Subsequently, the

\textsuperscript{346} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{347} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{348} Ibid; and Foxall, Andrew. \textit{Putin’s Peninsula: Crimea’s Annexation and Deterioration}, publication no. 4 (London,
Peninsula.pdf.
\textsuperscript{349} EROL-Şafak and Seyfettin, "Hybrid Warfare Studies."; and Putin Contradicts claims on annexation of Crimea,
the new York times 09 March 2015.
"little green men" appeared in Crimea around the strategic objectives like the Parliament Buildings and airports to portray peaceful forces looking to protect the local populace.\textsuperscript{350} During the Russia’s occupation of Crimea irregular forces including criminal organizations integrated and operated with Russian Special Forces and intelligence troops, and it was Russia who controlled the operations of the irregular forces.\textsuperscript{351} Sometime between the initial Special Forces operations on February 27\textsuperscript{th} and March 1\textsuperscript{st} the Supreme Council disbanded the Council of Ministers and appointed the Sergey Aksyonov, who was the leader of the minority Russian Unity Party that only held three seats in Parliament, as the Prime Minister while also voting to hold a referendum to become autonomous from Ukraine.\textsuperscript{352} On March 1\textsuperscript{st} newly appointed Prime Minister Aksyonov declared his full control over the Crimean government, its military, and police while engaging with Putin for help in ensuring peace in Crimea. That same day Putin had received authority from the Russian Federation Council to intervene militarily in Ukraine and by March 2\textsuperscript{nd} Russian troops, still operating as “little green men” had mobilized from the Sevastopol Naval Base to control the entire peninsula.\textsuperscript{353} Finally, on March 16\textsuperscript{th} Crimean voted on the future of the state, which resulted in an overwhelming 97% vote to integrate into Russia. Shortly after on March 18\textsuperscript{th} representatives from both Russia and Crimea signed the Treaty on the Accession of the Republic of Crimea to Russia and three days later the Russian Federal Assembly ratified the Treaty.\textsuperscript{354} In less than a month Russia had annexed Crimea from Ukraine without declaring war or starting a global conflict.
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In conjunction with the annex of Crimea, the Russian's began other conventional movements along the eastern border of Ukraine. Using snap exercise to flex their conventional capability muscles from February 26th to March 3rd, Russia completed the exercise while amassing a total of 150,000 troops on the Ukrainian border. Furthermore, on March 13th another exercise occurred near the border of Ukraine with 1,500 paratroopers parachuting and deploying 8,500 artillery pieces, rocket launchers, howitzers, anti-tank guns, and other various weapon systems. Other exercise took place in Russia, particularly in the Kaliningrad region and Russian forces stayed on the border while the situation in Crimea concluded.
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355 EROL-Şafak and Seyfettin, “Hybrid Warfare Studies.”
356 ibid.
Russian activities did not end there, and they also took part in the Ukrainian civil war, supporting the Separatist forces with advanced weaponry, equipment, clothing and military support.\textsuperscript{357} The poorly led units in the East have been restructured by Russian officers and are also commanded by them from the battalion level up, while former commanders act as deputies.\textsuperscript{358} Russia forces, at the discretion of Putin, while denying extensive Russian involvement, are commanding on the front lines, supplying the separatists with Russian-made tanks and armored personnel carriers to solidify the line of separation.\textsuperscript{359} While the Ukrainians believe without any further Russian help they could defeat the rebels in three weeks, Russian forces massed on the border provide fire support to the separatists, which prevents Ukrainian forces from establishing control over border areas to stop the flow and delivery of Russian arms to the insurgents who favor Russian rule.\textsuperscript{360} Although Russia denies its involvement with insurgents and separatists in Eastern Ukraine, there is no denying their involvement when insurgents shoot down a plane at an altitude of 21,000 feet, which requires sophisticated weapons systems to reach that height. Also, the separatists have attacked and seized several heavily defended areas with advanced tactics indicating training and coordination from an outside source.\textsuperscript{361} While Russia has annexed Crimea, they continue to support and use the separatists in Eastern Ukraine as a proxy force due to their support of Russian rule.

\textit{Islamic State}
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The Islamic State polarized the world as it captured large swaths of land in Iraq and Syria and proclaimed an Islamic caliphate. From 2008 to 2011 in the outer belts of Iraq, the remnants of Al-Qaeda in Iraq (AQI) conducted small guerrilla attacks mainly IEDs and SVBIEDs to continue to demonstrate its presence within the region.\(^{362}\) After the withdrawal of US forces, AQI continued to build capacity, capabilities, and access to resources, eventually, in 2013, declaring the expansion of AQI to the Islamic State of Iraq (ISI) and finally to the Islamic State of Iraq and al-Sham (ISIS).\(^{363}\) After the reemergence of AQI whom was perceived to be defeated in 2008, and the transition to the Islamic State, in 2014 ISIS began demonstrating new capabilities and seizing control in Iraq and Syria.\(^{364}\) ISIS demonstrated the ability to employ conventional military tactics, acquire and use sophisticated heavy military weaponry, and develop ways to demoralize Iraqi military personnel, while not giving up on irregular warfare and terrorist type tactics.\(^{365}\) ISIS began an offensive campaign in the summer of 2014 using captured military equipment from Mosul, Fallujah, Ramadi, and Raqqa – cities that had already been taken in urban assaults – to further its control over areas in Northern Iraq and Syria, outlining ISIS’ simultaneous campaigns and capabilities to claim territory in the region.\(^{366}\)

The Islamic State has used several different tactics to take control of the vast swaths of land, the tactics include, conventional maneuver warfare, guerilla warfare, terrorism, propaganda and cyber operations, and criminality.\(^{367}\) ISIS has used artillery, armored personnel carriers,
tanks, and small arms to attack and destroy enemy forces and seize terrain, which is all associated with traditional conventional warfare. They have used indirect fires, small arms, targeted assassinations, and psychological operations to carry out guerilla tactics by attacking indirectly to cause disruption and degrade the enemy all while isolating the locals in attempts to mobilize the population. The Islamic State carried out terror attacks with IEDs, VBIEDs, and Suicide Vest bombings and car bombings in attempts to intimidate the enemy and insight fear and insecurity within the local populace. The cyber operations carried out by the Islamic State help recruit new fighters, using social media and other Internet and communication networks they can promote their ideology and radicalize potential new recruits. The Islamic State utilized criminal activities to obtain resources and fund combat operations, government services and power, and its recruiting and training process using several different means to obtain cash flow. The Islamic State has used captured oil fields bringing the oil trade to the black market where it can flourish along the porous borders surrounding the Islamic State. As a result of their land grabs, ISIS has territory under its control that has valuable antiquities that they sell for profit, sales of antiquities were the second largest source of revenue behind illicit oil sales. The other large amount of resources the Islamic State has obtained comes from looting Iraqi banks of cash assets including gold bullion worth over $1.5 billion.
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The operations ISIS has carried out show its ability not only to deploy and engage conventional forces in combat, but it shows their use of combined action tactics with conventional and irregular forces. The Islamic States primary combat capability is supported by small groups that carry out guerrilla and terror tactics. Using artillery to soften up defenses and feint's to confuse, which culminate in movements of Iraqi or Kurdish troops away from the main objective, allowing ISIS fighters to capture and defend a newly secured area with ease. Another combined tactic that is employed uses SVBIEDs, Suicide attackers, and armed soldiers
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dressed in local security uniforms to attack and create mass chaos and or breach a security perimeter allowing for a follow-up attack by the main combat force to inflict casualties or overrun a base.\textsuperscript{375} Emphasizing the armed fighters they are known as the Islamic States Special Forces, who are elite "shock troops" that fight to the death, working in groups of 20, they are proficient in close quarters combat and usually follow the SVBIED attacks to help break defensive lines and capture fortified positions.\textsuperscript{376}

Throughout the Islamic States offensive campaign in Iraq and Syria, they have employed conventional, irregular, criminality, terrorism, and cyber-attacks simultaneously to remain a fluid and capable fighting force. As the Islamic State's territory continues to shrink and they begin to fortify defensive positions, they will have to utilize defensive strategies to continue to control their territory. It is still yet to be seen how ISIS will fortify and defend critical territories, but when defending Mosul, they emplaced IEDs to force the attacking forces into choke points.\textsuperscript{377} They used harassing attacks on the incoming forces, which included ambushes, small arms engagements, and vehicles mounted with heavy weapons.\textsuperscript{378} Within their defensive perimeter, they deployed armored vehicles and artillery pieces along with tactical combat units and paramilitary groups.\textsuperscript{379} Vital to their survival, the Islamic State will continue to be in a defensive posture to protect its caliphate, which will shed more light on its use of hybrid warfare within its defensive strategy.

\textit{China and the South China Sea}
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As early as 2014 China has begun building artificial islands on coral reefs and atolls in the South China Sea, mainly within the Spratly Islands. China is attempting to expand not only its 200-mile exclusive economic zone (EEZ) but also the security zone that would extend far from its coast. China wants an area that is theirs where they can operate and conduct military exercises along with patrolling police vessels, without worrying about intervention from US, Philippines, or Vietnamese naval forces. The new islands that China has built show deep water harbors for navy vessels and airstrips for military aircraft. They also show surface to air missile batteries and powerful radar facilities that could extend the range of China's anti-ship ballistic missile located on the mainland. The fortifications are not what worry global leaders, what concerns them is if the buildup goes unchecked and affords China de facto control over the area and with military superiority over neighboring countries it could bully other states out of rightful claims to the waters, leading to a regional arms race and increasing the chance of conflict.

China claims that since these islands are now its territory, they own the surrounding Sea, strengthening their assertion with the threat of economic sanctions against states who object to China's actions in the region and intimidate any vessel that strays into the area. The Chinese use navy vessels to block ships from reaching certain disputed areas and parts of the Sea, not allowing for freedom of navigation through international waters. As a result, the United States began freedom of navigation patrols to show they do not recognize the area as China's. China has responded by stating these patrols cause more militarization of the Sea. In what could be
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\textbf{Figure 5: Disputed Territory in South China Sea}

\textit{Source:} adapted from BBC. "Why Is the South China Sea Contentious?," BBC News.
Beginning in May 2014 Chinese and Vietnamese naval ships collided in the South China Sea, the confrontation occurred when the Vietnamese were attempting to prevent the Chinese from building an oil rig in a region claimed by both states. Similar actions took place throughout 2015, and in January of 2016, China ordered South Korea to surrender a large part of its EEZ in the Yellow Sea, even while a Korean marine research facility is located within, with the justification that China is a larger country, with a bigger population. In March 2016 a Chinese fishing vessel was operating within Indonesia’s EEZ and was being boarded by Indonesian authorities before a Chinese coast guard vessel rammed the fishing ship back into the South China Sea with the justification that it was traditional Chinese fishing grounds. In May, China began annual war drills in the South China Sea, and the operations included submarine reconnaissance exercises and simulation on breaking an enemy blockade. Several guided missile destroyers and a frigate took part in the activities. Another incident in May, when U.S Navy destroyer sailed within 12 nautical miles of a disputed island in a freedom of navigation patrol resulted in the Chinese scrambling fighter jets and shadowing the destroyer with three warships encouraging the ship to leave.

What has come to be called the China's militarization of the South China Sea, the dispute does not seem to have an end in sight. The South China Sea, has over $5 trillion in trade pass through it by ship every year, and with the continuing incidents could pose a major economic

issue with countries who use the shipping lane, but it is not only a significant trading route it is vital to strategic regional security. Until the Chinese state the reason for staking claims in the South China Sea, which could help foster a decrease in tensions, the hybrid warfare tactics and saber rattling will continue. Although one may conclude that the Chinese want to prevent the maritime vulnerability from the South China Sea and reap the benefits of the sea through fishing and hydrocarbon until China states it, there are only assumptions, and those currently relate to the EEZ.

**Analysis**

**Russia**

Russia's endeavor in Crimea and Ukraine displayed several different tactics of hybrid warfare. Russia's tactics met the expectation by using conventional, irregular, diplomacy, and cyber. Russia deployed conventional forces to Crimea to act as a security force after the Peninsula had its communication and the internet cut off from Ukraine. Although the conventional forces wore uniforms that did not have any insignias, they still were used first to protect their naval base, then as the situation unfolded patrolled and protected strategic infrastructure and objectives.

The irregular forces were a combination of Spetsnaz, Special Forces, and organized crime groups. The Special Forces initially dressed as civilians to insight dismay and rally pro-Russian support to show, and seized strategic objectives around Crimea, including two airports, the Parliament and Minister buildings, air defense installations, communication, and radio stations and blockaded the Ukrainian forces on the peninsula. The irregular forces continued by
displaying fake discontent, primarily to portray that Crimea did not want to be part of Ukraine any longer. The false dissatisfaction, if Crimea was not annexed could have potentially led to an insurgency on the Peninsula, instead of an insurgency occurring Russian Special Forces used criminal elements and unconventional tactics to help annex Crimea.

The cyber tactics that the Russians used correlated with the seizing of the communication and radio infrastructure. Russia was able to cut off Crimea from all internet and radio communications to Ukraine, through the capture of the infrastructure but also as a result of Russian cyber-attacks and hacking news and social media platforms.

The diplomacy used in Crimea relates more to political mischief when less than a month after the appointment of a pro-Russian as the Prime Minister there was a vote for Crimean autonomy and incorporation into Russia. It concluded with Russian Federal Council approval within days, ending the situation in Crimea, while annexing the Peninsula for Russia. In the Russian case, they met the expectation scholars had of hybrid warfare, the use of conventional, irregular, and one or more other tactics.

The United States is currently facing hybrid warfare from Russia, as a state actor, in Crimea and Ukraine. The situation in Crimea occurred quickly, as a result the United States would not have been able to use a counterinsurgent strategy in attempts to prevent the individuals aligned with the Russian’s to secede from Ukraine. If Russia was acting more covertly, there was time available, and the United States decided to act, they could have used a counterinsurgent strategy to deal with the criminality and criminal gangs. The United States would not have employed a counterterror strategy in Crimea due to the fact the situation did not have terror threat, but rather a criminal component that could be dealt with through counterinsurgent strategy. One may think that Stability Operations, one of the counterterror
strategies, would be needed with the counterinsurgent forces, but as noted above there are two aspects, focusing on the population and focusing on destroying the terror network. Due to the fact that there is no terror network to be destroy the counterterror strategy would not be necessary for employment. The United States would need to use other capabilities – diplomacy and cyber – to counter the hybrid threat in Crimea.

The United States is facing Hybrid warfare, which includes cyber, criminal, and diplomatic threats in Crimea. Although the United States could employ a counterinsurgent strategy it would not be advisable to use either a counterinsurgent or counterterror strategy but rather utilize a different combination of strategies to counter the hybrid threat.

*Islamic State*

The Islamic State in Iraq and Syria has exhibited several tactics of hybrid warfare including conventional, irregular, and cyber. The Islamic State's tactics met the expectations set forth by the scholars of the literature. The Islamic State have gained many recruits that have allowed it to amass a conventional military capability, where it uses stolen armored vehicles, tanks, artillery, and small arms in maneuver warfare to gain territory and defeat Iraqi Security Forces in conventional style warfare.

The irregular warfare used by ISIS included SVBIEDs, IEDs, Terrorism, Criminality, Special Forces "Shock Troops," and guerrilla type tactics. Accompanied with its conventional tactics, the Islamic state used guerilla attacks to capture fortified position and as a precursor to conventional attacks to cause chaos and confusion. Using SVBIEDs to breach security perimeters and shock troops to move fluidly throughout the battlefield into the security perimeter fighting to the death as a cover for the conventional advance. The Islamic State has also used terror tactics to insight insecurity within the population. The criminality that they exhibit is on
the level of a global organized crime group, having looted Iraqi banks, taken oil from captured
rigs to the black market, and selling antiquities to foreign buyers has allowed them to fund all of
their operations.

ISIS exhibits a sophisticated cyber tactic. They can post jihadi material online that is
nearly untraceable. The material is not only published on social media platforms but also on
forums as propaganda to promote ISIS and recruit. The material is used to recruit, radicalize, and
embolden individuals to either travel to the caliphate or train persons on how to carry out lone
wolf attacks. The cyber campaign has been difficult to target because deleting one account or
forum leads to the creation of a new account or forum, so there is always a constant flow of
online material for potential jihadists. In this case, the Islamic State has met the expectations set
by the literature, they simultaneously conducted conventional, irregular, and one other – cyber –
tactic.

The United States is currently facing Hybrid warfare from ISIS in Iraq and Syria as a
non-state actor through cyber, conventional units, criminality, terrorism, and other forms of
irregular forces. ISIS has deployed conventional forces and irregular forces, which include
“shock troops,” armored formations, maneuver warfare, artillery fire support, and terror attacks
and guerilla ambushes against the population. The United States can use its counterinsurgent
strategy, employing the Limited Support strategy utilizing fire support missions through air and
artillery strikes. The counterinsurgent strategy can also incorporate Stability Operations in
conjunction with counterterror forces and strategies to protect the population. Utilizing the
conventional units acting as the counterinsurgent force to protect the population during Stability
Operations, the counterterror forces will be employed to degrade and destroy the Islamic State
fighters who seek to insight fear into the populace. Additionally, the counterterror strategy could
employ Targeted Killings with special operation forces raids to kill or capture high value ISIS targets and a combination of the Indirect Approach and Stability Operations by training, advising and assisting local forces along with joining the local forces on combined raids and missions.

The United States is facing Hybrid warfare from the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria. The Islamic States strategies include cyber, criminal, irregular, and conventional threats. The United States can use both its counterinsurgent and counterterror strategy against the Islamic State to combat the hybrid threats. The United States, in conjunction with the counterterror and counterinsurgent strategy, would also want to employ an additional strategy to counter the other hybrid threats posed by the Islamic State.

**China and the South China Sea**

China in the South China Sea is a compelling case for hybrid warfare as it takes place in the ocean and there is currently no combat occurring. China met all the expectations with conventional, irregular, and diplomacy. China exhibited a form of coercive diplomacy by threatening economic sanctions on countries that did not agree with or recognize the part of the South China Sea they have attempted to control. It is not economic warfare because there has not been a sanction imposed, it is just a threat that China has placed through diplomatic channels. If China implemented sanctions or asset freezes it would then be economic warfare, regardless of the tactics association – economic or diplomacy – it is within hybrid warfare.

The irregular warfare exhibited is different than seen in the other two cases. China used criminality by building artificial islands on reefs that are outside of their EEZs, violating the intentional maritime law. They have also violated the international maritime law by restricting countries freedom of navigation through the South China Sea. In conjunction, they have allowed
their naval vessels to enter foreign EEZs to protect their fishing boats, doing all of this in violation of the international maritime law.

The conventional tactic that China has employed revolves around using its Navy and Coast Guard vessels to protect the islands they are building as well as the waterways through the South China Sea. Using ships blockade other countries from entering the South China Sea or around the islands they have built. China has also used its vessels to ram other boats that have managed to navigate into the waterway around the islands, even sinking some. Blockading and ramming is a tactic used in naval warfare to stop other vessels from entering certain areas.

The United States is currently facing Hybrid warfare in the South China Sea from China as a state actor. China has exhibited conventional tactics, criminality, irregular warfare, and diplomacy. The Chinese have deployed conventional naval forces, violated international maritime law, and employed coercive diplomacy. The United States cannot use a counterinsurgent or counterterror strategy due to the fact they are not facing insurgents or terrorists. The United States would need to utilize conventional forces and irregular forces in a varying capacity, employing a different strategy to counter the hybrid threat posed by the Chinese.

The United States is facing a hybrid threat from the Chinese in the South China Sea. The Chinese strategies include criminal, irregular, and conventional threats. The United States is unable to use its counterinsurgent or counterterror strategy against the Chinese to counter the hybrid threats. The United States would want to implement a strategy that includes the use of naval forces in a conventional capacity to counter the hybrid threats posed by the Chinese in the South China Sea.
Not only did all three cases meet the one truth set by the literature but each case also met some trends that were present by the scholars as well. All three cases have exhibited hybrid warfare by meeting the one truth and having different trends occur simultaneously during the timeframe of each case. Also, it is important to recognize that the cases have shown that hybrid threats include several different types of warfare. The United States cannot just put a simple label of counterterrorism or counterinsurgency. Hybrid warfare must be identified as such so it can be combatted with the correct strategy.

The three cases answered both research questions, the United States is currently facing Hybrid warfare from state and non-state actors and the counterinsurgent and counterterror strategy could only be used in one of the three cases. Although the United States could only employ its counterinsurgent and counterterror strategy in one of the cases, it still shows that the knowledge learned since 9/11 can be put to use in countering Hybrid threats. Due to the fact the United States can only employ its counterinsurgent and counterterror strategies under particular circumstances, they will need to refine other capabilities to counter all hybrid threats.

Conclusion

The United States is facing hybrid warfare. The United States, involvement in all three cases has a significant challenge to counter the threats. The United States is currently facing hybrid warfare and threats from state and non-state actors throughout the world. It is apparent, with the evidence from the cases that the United States faces hybrid warfare in conflict and non-conflict regions of the world. Hybrid warfare is made up of several different tactics making it difficult to counter when facing an enemy that has the fluidity to utilize all the tactics
simultaneously. The cases of Russia and ISIS are different than the case of China. Maritime hybrid warfare has the same tactics but used in a different manner.

Although this paper did not investigate the United States involvement in any of the cases, it is certainly fair to say that the U.S. is involved in some manner, whether it is material support and training to the Ukrainians, bombing the Islamic State and advising the Iraqis, or patrolling through the South China Sea. The United States full involvement in countering the hybrid warfare threats can be answered another day within another paper.

Not only is hybrid warfare here to stay but so is maritime hybrid warfare. In the future, maritime hybrid warfare has the potential to be more violent than it currently is. With swarming boats attacking fishing vessels armed with torpedoes and machine guns, and deploying underwater mines, so other nations naval and coast guard vessels are damaged or destroyed by when they navigate to assist. There is no trace of who has perpetrated the attack, but assumptions can point to neighboring states who may have a dispute over the area. The United States will continue to face hybrid threats on land in the water, while it is still yet to be investigated how the U.S. is currently countering the threats in the three cases or how it will be in the future. The United States is currently facing Hybrid warfare throughout the world from both state and non-state actors. The United States is also able to use the counterinsurgent and counterterror strategies it has refined since 9/11 to combat hybrid threats in particular situations. The United States will need to continue to advance its other capabilities – diplomacy, cyber, economic, conventional, and other irregular warfare strategies – to further counter hybrid threats.
Conclusion

The findings from the data in Chapter 1 do not answer the question. There were only two case studies that did not have concrete evidence to determine whether the hearts and minds strategy would be effective against a Type III insurgency. As a result of the data and findings, there should be no update or adjustment to FM 3-24. With that being said, it is important, depending on the situation, to incorporate winning hearts and minds but to accomplish it, one must have other strategies favorable to the population. If FM 3-24 was to be updated, hearts and minds could be included if it was associated with another strategy.

The shortcomings are the lack of cases available for study, if there were more cases it is possible that the research question could have been better answered. Further research could be done to determine if the United States military has adopted any of the recommendations, strategies, or objectives outlined in the “RAND Strategy.” Comparing the FM 3-24 doctrine from 2006 to the updated versions would shed light onto any changes that have been made and if they follow along the lines of RAND’s recommendations.

The counterterrorism strategies examined in Chapter Two were evaluated to determine their relevance to real world counterterror operations. The strategies present in the three conflicts proved the scholars were correct in their application of counterterrorism operations and the particular units that should be deployed. In some cases, more than one strategy was applied, and some units were deployed in more than one capacity to achieve the objectives set forth by the United States foreign policy. The United States will continue to be at the forefront of counterterrorism and continuously need to enhance its strategy to protect its interests domestically and internationally.
Further research could be done to investigate the role each individual unit contributes to the particular counterterror strategy or tactic. It would be interesting to determine how special operations forces and unmanned aerial vehicles are used depending on the strategy. I think, depending on the strategy, the drone would be used to transmit intelligence or provide situational awareness to special operations forces prior to night raids. In other circumstances, the special operations forces could provide on the ground intelligence and laser designate targets for air strikes persecuted by unmanned aerial vehicles. Essentially the two operate in tandem, switching roles depending on the strategy or tactic.

It is apparent, with the evidence presented in Chapter 3, the United States faces hybrid warfare in conflict and non-conflict regions around the world. Hybrid warfare’s composition of varying strategies and tactics makes it difficult to counter when facing an enemy that has the fluidity to utilize all of the strategies. Not only is hybrid warfare here to stay but so is maritime hybrid warfare. Maritime hybrid warfare has the potential to be extremely violent. The United States will continue to face hybrid threats on land and in the water.

While it is still yet to be investigated how the United State is currently countering the threats in the three cases, further research can be done to determine their full involvement in countering hybrid warfare threats. In the three cases presented, further research could present how the United States has combatted hybrid warfare. Additionally, research could be done to determine how the United States intends to counter hybrid warfare in the future and what capabilities they view as necessary. The United States also, in the case of the Islamic State, could use a counterterrorism and counterinsurgent strategies to counter the threats. FM 3-24 has several strategies that could be employed, in particular combined action or limited support to minimize risk. In conjunction with the counterinsurgent strategy, the United States could employ a
counterterror strategy consisting of a combination of targeted killing and indirect approach that could compliment limited support or combined action.

As the United States has fought insurgencies and terrorists throughout the twenty first century, the battlefield has shifted to a different type of warfare. Although the type of warfare has shifted, it will include the strategies and tactics that have been adapted and employed by the United States in Iraq, Afghanistan, and across the globe since 9/11. It is important that the United States recognizes hybrid warfare when it is occurring and reacts accordingly, with the correct strategy. When the United States does not correctly identify hybrid threats and warfare, they are susceptible to employing the incorrect strategy, which in turn could cost a significant amount of money and lives. When the United States correctly identifies hybrid threats, it can leverage the capabilities learned post 9/11, in particular counterterrorism and counterinsurgency, to help in combating hybrid threats. With that being said, it is important for the United States to not only employ counterterror and counterinsurgent approaches but also utilize other strategies to ensure victory when countering hybrid threats in the modern era.

Counterinsurgency and counterterrorism has been intertwined since 9/11, fighting alongside each other in Iraq and Afghanistan against insurgents and terrorists with overlapping strategies and tactics. The two strategies have been continuously refined and used extensively, and with the changing nature of conflicts they can still be employed in a standalone capacity as well as incorporated into a hybrid warfare strategy.

The topic of hybrid warfare spurs the discussion regarding the current and future utilization of counterinsurgency, counterterrorism, and other capabilities. Similar to Gian Gentile’s belief, when a conflict concludes there is a tendency for policymakers to focus on a new type of warfare, in this case hybrid. The shift in focus often results in the deterioration of
military units and capabilities. The deterioration is due to policymakers pushing the “old” strategy to the side in favor of a “new” strategy; leading the military to shift its training, discarding current capabilities for new capabilities, resulting in the decline of current capabilities.

Atrophy and decline of counterinsurgent and counterterrorism capabilities is the last outcome that needs to occur due to its prevalence within hybrid warfare. The United States will also need to refine its other capabilities to counter the full realm of hybrid threats. With that being said, there should not be a weakening of counterterrorism and counterinsurgency capabilities because of its need within hybrid warfare. It is important to point out that the United States has not wasted time, money, and lives attempting to perfect their counterinsurgent and counterterror strategy since 9/11, as they can still be utilized against current hybrid threats.

The nature of hybrid warfare has allowed the United States to continue to utilize their counterterrorism and counterinsurgent strategies. Essentially, the United States has not wasted over fifteen years of refining the capabilities to fight insurgents and terrorists. The United States should not allow the two strategies to deteriorate due to a belief by policymakers that they will not be needed for current and future conflicts. It is important to distinguish that the same thinking must occur for other hybrid warfare capabilities. The United States must continue to use and advance its counterterror and counterinsurgent strategies, but it must also develop and refine the other strategies needed to combat hybrid threats.
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