

Keynote Address

LICs Revisited: From the Perspective of International Order

Akira Kato

Introduction

Irregular warfare, or low-intensity conflict (LIC), from the perspective of International order, is the armed struggle by a new (revolutionary) order against an established (legitimacy) order. Thus, from the times of ancient dynasties to the modern age, there have been countless LIC-like conflicts, from rebellions and popular uprisings to insurgencies and riots. However, this article is limitedly focused on the LICs which one of the actors in the conflict is a modern sovereign nation state. This is because the today's LICs are phenomena that arise out of the shift in the principle of the international order from a status system-based feudalistic order, in which religion and secularity are one, to the modern order consisting of individual freedom and equality and the separation of religion and secularity on the Godless ground, and out of the birth of modern sovereign nation states and the modern world system. The challenge of the modern order as new against the feudalistic order as established, gave rise to LICs, and now in the same vein, challenges by the new order against the modern order, which has become the established, are emerging in the form of LICs. Therefore, this article covers LICs since the late 16th century, when the modern world system consisting of modern sovereign nation states was about to enter into existence, and considers the causes of LICs in relation to the formation of the world order.

What are LICs? The term "LIC," which is less commonly used at present, is the generic term for irregular warfare, which came to be used on a full-fledged basis by the U.S. forces in the mid-1980s. The reasons the term "LIC" came to be used include, first, the sense of aversion in the U.S. forces from such terms as "people's war" and "guerrilla warfare," which were used in the Vietnam War ending in defeat for the United States, and second, the emergence of the new issue of how to deal with anti-U.S. terrorism by pro-Soviet forces in the Middle East and elsewhere in the 1980s, which was named "low-intensity conflict" in contrast to "high-intensity conflict," as nuclear war in the U.S. strategy against the Soviet Union, and to "middle-intensity conflict," as regular warfare.¹

As seen above, LICs were essentially conceptualized as part of the anti-Soviet military strategy during the U.S.-Soviet Cold War era. As such, with an end to the Cold War, the term "LIC" itself gradually fell into disuse. Instead, Military Operations Other Than War (MOOTW), which includes non-traditional security such as crackdowns on narcotics and piracy, and more general terms such as irregular warfare and Counterinsurgency (COIN) were revived.

This change in terminology amounts to a change in how such issues were perceived. The

¹ For the circumstances of this period, see Akira Kato, *Gendai Senso Ron – Posuto Modan no Funso LIC (Modern War Theory – Post-Modern Conflict LIC)*, Chuokoron-sha, 1993, pp. 21-22.

purpose of LICs during the Cold War era was dealing with guerilla warfare, the great weakness of the U.S. forces, specifically as part of its anti-Soviet strategy. On the other hand, the purpose of MOOTW and COIN was maintaining the hegemony of the United States, which became the sole hegemon after the end of the Cold War. Thus, much researches related to MOOTW and COIN consist of situation-responsive policy proposals regarding how to deal with LICs in order to maintain the American hegemony system.² However, if we aim to resolve this problem in the true sense, is it not necessary to shed light on the causes of LICs, or why the state of affairs requiring MOOTW and/or COIN came about?

Based on this awareness of the issue and the perspective of the modern world system theory made up of modern sovereign nation states, this article attempts to demonstrate that the causes of LICs are confrontations in the principles of the formation of the world order.

1. Globalization of the Modern World System

The frameworks of analysis in considering LICs are modern sovereign nation states and the modern world system made up of them. This is because, currently, irregular warfare, asymmetric war, LICs, MOOTW and COIN, etc. are tacitly deemed to be conflicts that should be tackled by regular military forces, which mean the states. More precisely, that state is the sovereign. Sovereign states that came into being in Europe in the late 16th century established the modern world system based on the concept of balance of power and non-intervention in internal affairs under the Peace of Westphalia of 1648. Sovereign states became sovereign nation states with the formation of national concept based on nationalism in the 18th century, and the modern world system spread globally as the European powers grew their national strength in the Industrial Revolution and competed to acquire colonies. On the contrary, since the beginning of the 20th century, these colonized countries escaped from the colonial rule of European powers and became independent as modern sovereign nation states based on the principle of national self-determination. LICs occurred as process of the foundation of modern sovereign nation states and the global expansion of the modern world system.

Whether they are “LICs,” “irregular warfare,” “asymmetric war,” “MOOTW” or “COIN,” the actual use of force that these terms evoke are acts of terrorism and guerilla warfare. The origins of the terms “terrorism” and “guerilla warfare” lie in the emergence of modern sovereign nation states and the modern world system.

The term “terror” is derived from the “Reign of Terror,” or “regime de la terreur,” the French Republic led by Maximilien Robespierre, which arose during the French Revolution of the late 18th century and adopted as a means to crack down on counterrevolutionaries. The state-sanctioned terror imposed by the revolutionary government to defend the new sovereign nation state is the origin of the term “terror.” The French Revolution helped to spread the ideas of freedom and equality and spawned nationalism, and later expanded into the concept of national self-determination, the political principle of the modern world system.

On the other hand, the term “guerilla warfare” is derived from small-scale battle, or

² For the tactics of MOOTW, see the following: Joint Pub 3-07, *Joint Doctrine for Military Operations Other Than War* (1995). For the tactics of COIN, see Joint Pub 3-24, *Counterinsurgency* (2013).

“small warfare (guerilla),” fought in dispersed areas by Spanish militias resistance against French rule in the Spanish war of independence at the beginning of the 19th century. In the Spanish war of independence, Spain and Portugal, which were former hegemony, completely fell from power to become mere sovereign nation states in Europe. In Central and South America, Latin American countries that were former colonies of Spain and Portugal became independent, and modern sovereign nation states and the modern world system had spread to the Southern Hemisphere.

2. Characteristics of Modern Sovereign Nation States

Modern sovereign nation states are characterized by the existence of sovereignty as the supreme right on the Godless ground. The premise for sovereignty are the separation of religion and secularity, as well as freedom and equality. Sovereignty is the right of the secular world separated from the holy world. Sovereignty is absolutely free from God and others and also absolutely equal to others. In the modern world system, freedom and equality, which are the premise for sovereignty, are expressed as the principle of non-intervention in internal affairs based on the absolute freedom of a state and as the principle of national self-determination based on the absolute equality of nation. Further, as sovereignty is the supreme right on the ground, a territory to which sovereignty extends is set by a boundary line. This makes sovereignty different from an empire or a feudal state whose territory expands or contracts simply by the strength or weakness of its power.

A modern sovereign nation state, whose order is founded on the separation of religion and secularity or the separation of religion and politics, and on freedom and equality, and is characterized by territoriality, has four functions.³

The first is the political community. The purpose of the political community is the realization of freedom and equality of nation. LICs have been fought as civil wars within sovereign states over how to realize this, that is, over political regimes, either a Republic, which is based on the principle that sovereignty resides in the people, or a monarchy, which is based on the principle that sovereignty resides in a monarch, and over the management of politics, either through a democracy or an autocracy.

The second is the economic community. The purpose of the economic community is the economic prosperity of the state and nation. With the end of the Cold War, the longstanding confrontation between the free market principle that emphasizes freedom and the communism that emphasizes equality, has been all but settled, with the free market principle winning and expanding globally. At present, however, free market principle has given rise to intolerable inequality in wealth globally, which caused global LICs that transcend national borders.

The third is the security community. The purpose of the security community is to guarantee the security of the political regime and nation. Due to nuclear missiles and LICs, however, it has become difficult for any state to guarantee the security of its nation any longer. As a strategy against nuclear missiles, there exists nuclear deterrence. On the contrary, there is no effective deterrence against LICs. There is no way to completely prevent suicide bombing,

³ Kato, *Gendai Senso Ron (Modern War Theory)*, Chapter 2 “LIC no Gen’in (Causes of LIC).”

even to deal with it. What strategies and tactics are effective against LICs? Security officials in countries around the world are struggling to cope with this very problem.

The fourth is the cultural community. The ultimate purpose is the formation of a national identity based on the equality of all community members beyond tribes, ethnic groups, race, and religion, etc. However, many countries are multiethnic, and thus it is difficult to form a national identity beyond tribes, ethnic groups, races, and religions. For this reason, numerous LICs are still being fought over identity.

3. The Impact of the Globalization of the Modern World System

Modern sovereign nation states that came into being in Europe expanded globally as European powers competed to acquire colonies based on the new principle order of freedom and equality premised on the separation of religion and secularity. In this process, the European powers destroyed original cultures around the world, from the Persian Empire, the Ottoman Empire and the Chinese Empire, which represented the established order, to ancient empires in Latin America, such as the Mayan, Aztec and Inca empires, North America, Africa and Asia, recast them into modern sovereign nation states and incorporated them into the modern world system.

What changes has the globalization of the modern world system as new order brought to the old order? The answer is fragmentation, subordination, and Westernization.⁴

First, fragmentation is derived from the territoriality of the sovereignty. As European powers competed to acquire colonies, the empires and cultures of the old order were segmented by the boundary lines of modern western nation states, and at the same time they were recast into modern sovereign nation states in the process of their incorporation into the modern world system. As a result, existing tribes, ethnic groups, races and religions were divided by national borders, multiethnic groups were locked up within boundary lines, or ethnic minorities were placed under the control of ethnic majorities. Currently, there still exist problems relating to ethnicity and minorities around the world, and the inability of modern sovereign nation states to fully perform their functions as cultural communities for the national formation and integration is resulting in LICs.

In Africa, for example, the arbitrary demarcation of national borders by the European powers segmented tribes in Africa, causing tribal confrontations within the states. Typical examples are the conflicts between the Dinka and the Nuer in South Sudan and the rivalry between the Tutsi and the Hutu in Rwanda. These conflicts have given rise to civil war in the scramble for power within the framework of modern sovereign nation states, as the natural tribal boundaries were segmented by the artificial boundaries of national borders.

Even if there are no tribal or ethnic conflicts, LICs could arise over what political regime should be adopted. Indeed, the resolution of this problem is the momentum for the birth of a nation state, as with the case of the French Revolution that accomplished the revolution from the old order of the monarchy to the new order of the Republic. What political regime should be adopted in a modern sovereign state, either a Republic based on the principle that sovereignty resides in the people or a monarchy based on the principle that sovereignty resides in the

⁴ Kato, *Gendai Senso Ron (Modern War Theory)*, Chapter 2 “LIC no Gen’in (Causes of LIC).”

monarchy, and either a democratic regime based on democracy or a dictatorship based on state autocratic rule? In Muslim states in the Middle East where the turmoil over democratization is continuing, LICs continue to occur over this problem.

Second, subordination means economic control by the suzerain states and subordination of colonized countries. In Colonial era, the colonized countries were exploited by the suzerain states, and even after gaining independence, they had long been plagued with the underdevelopment problems and the structural violence of poverty. Many LICs that occurred in Third World countries were caused by their failure to perform their function as economic communities because of this subordination, namely, the failure to correct the economic inequality between states and between nations. From the success of the Russian Revolution until the dissolution of the Soviet Union, LICs by communist forces spread around the world as means of confronting the free market principle and overcoming the economic inequality due to this subordination.

However, with the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, the ideal of realizing economic equality through communism went up in flames, and LICs by communist forces almost disappeared. Furthermore, the free market principle that defeated communism became globalized, justifying the cross-border dominance and subordination of rich and poor, not the state's dominance and subordination, and with the gap between rich and poor continuing to widen globally. There is still no concrete way to accomplish global equality, which counters to the freedom of free market principle. At present, resistance movements for equality against globalism are beginning to expand as the "Occupy" movement, even though it does not lead to the use of force.

The third is modernization. Modernization means the acceptance with the principle order of the separation of religion and secularity, or the separation of church and state in politics. As mentioned above, a modern sovereign nation state is premised on the separation of religion and secularity. Instead of assuming the transcendent existence of God, states must be based on the nation state sovereignty, which Thomas Hobbes argued as individual sovereignty or Jean-Jacques Rousseau argued as the general will. It was not easy for Western countries to accept the principle order of the separation of church and state. The conflicts between the church and secular states in medieval Europe sometimes led to devastating conflicts such as religious wars. Modern sovereign nation states were established as a result of the confrontation and fighting against the powers of the church adhered to the union of religion and secularity, and the European medieval monarchical states based on the legitimacy of rule of the divine right of kings.

Even at present, when many countries in the world accept the principle order of the separation of religion and politics, there are Muslim states such as Iran and Saudi Arabia, and Islamic powers such as the Taliban and the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) that uphold the union of religion and politics regarding God as the state's principle order. The conflict about the principle order between the separation of religion and politics and the union of religion and politics, has caused LICs both inside and outside the Islamic world since it was faced with the Western impact from the European powers.

The best example of this was the Iranian Revolution of 1979, which overthrew the order

concept of the separation of religion and politics, and formed the union of religion and politics since the French Revolution. LICs have proliferated in the Islamic world since then, mainly in the Middle East, as those aimed at the formation of the order of the union of religion and politics. Furthermore, since the 9.11 terrorist attacks in the United States in 2001, LICs have spread throughout Christian states in Europe, including France, the United Kingdom and Spain, based on the communities of immigrants and refugees formed in European countries.

4. Historical Transition of LICs

What changes have LICs undergone historically following the birth of modern sovereign nation states and the globalization of the modern world system? Below is a look back on the history of LICs, centered on the formation of principle order.

First, there was the era of transition from the old order of church's rule and the status system to the new order of freedom and equality which premised on the separation of church and state and rejected the political engagement of the church. In this era, LICs that can be seen in the modern age, were occurring as the struggles of Protestants and people against the old order.

One example is the Gunpowder Plot of 1605.⁵ This plot occurred during the transition from the old order to the new in the early 17th century was a failed assassination attempt against King James I by a group of Catholics who were repressed under the policy of favoring the Church of England. They placed a large amount of gunpowder in the basement of Parliament to attempt to assassinate the King in an explosion. This plot was the first ever large-scale terrorist bombing in recorded history. The incident was followed by a string of civil wars in Britain, including the Puritan Revolution, which were LICs that sought the separation of church and state and the reforms of the status system.

In the 18th century there are two LICs that have great influence on today's LIC. The first was the independence of the United States in 1776. The United States held up freedom and equality and fought an independence war from Britain. The American War of Independence was the forerunner of wars of colonial liberation that continued until the middle of the 20th century. In addition, the French Revolution of 1789 was also LIC held up freedom, equality and philanthropy and designed to establish Republic based on the sovereignty of the nation by overthrowing monarchy.

LICs over the political regime from the monarchy to the Republic were fought until the middle of the 20th century. For example, in the Middle East, military forces overthrew the monarchy and achieved Republican Revolutions in countries such as Egypt, Libya and Iraq. In Iran in particular, a civil revolution that was similar to the French Revolution overthrew the Pahlavi dynasty under Mohammad Reza Shah Pahlavi.

There may be many objections to regarding the civil wars and revolutions occurred in the 17th and 18th centuries as LICs. This is because that the viewpoint of considering the present LIC is only directed after the formation of the new order, that is, after the establishment of modern sovereign nation states and the globalization of the modern world system made up

⁵ For example, see Alan Haynes, *The Gunpowder Plot* (UK: History Press, 2017).

of them. However, assuming that LICs arose alongside the birth of modern sovereign nation states and can be traced to the principle order of the separation of religion and politics as well as freedom and equality, it would be necessary to look as far back as around the 17th century, when the concept of sovereignty was established. In other words, ever since modern sovereign nation states and the modern world system became the established order, LICs have represented challenges by the new order against established.

That said, however, since the birth of the modern order based on the principle order of freedom and equality premised on the separation of religion and secularity, LICs occurred within the modern order of modern sovereign nation states and the modern world system as a result of the globalization of the modern world system, and were caused by fragmentation, subordination and Westernization as mentioned above.

5. Four Waves of Modern Terrorism

This section examines the historical transition of LICs within the modern order while referring to David C. Rapoport's "*Four Waves of Modern Terrorism*."⁶ Rapoport classifies the historical transition of modern terrorism into four periods.

The first period was the "Anarchist wave." The beginning of modern terrorism was marked by acts of terrorism in the 1880s, when Russian anarchists sought the realization of the principle order of freedom and equality. Such acts of terrorism were grounded in dissatisfaction and antipathy towards the failure of the principle order of freedom and equality to be fully realized, as exemplified by the continued existence of serfs in Russia and the birth of the working class as a new exploited class following the Industrial Revolution in the United Kingdom and France.

In Russia at the end of 19th century, there was a young anarchist Sergey Nechayev, who was from the serfdom class and became a model of Fedor Dostoyevsky's novel, *Demons*. Nechayev continued the assertion "the end justifies the means," that leads to the modern terrorism, and it has great influence on the terrorism around the world such as the tactics and doctrines of terrorism.

Terrorism spread across national borders into the rest of Europe and the United States due to the development of transportation, communications and media as the time. Because of this, Rapoport regards acts of terrorism by anarchists as the first international terrorism in history. In the United States, for example, William McKinley, the 25th U.S. President, was assassinated by an anarchist in 1901. Then Vice President Theodore Roosevelt, his successor, denounced terrorism as "The Anarchist is the enemy of humanity, the enemy of all mankind."

The second wave was the "anticolonial wave," which began in the 1920s and lasted about 40 years. The principle order of freedom and equality became applicable among nation states as the principle of national self-determination under the Treaty of Versailles. This gave rise to LICs related to fragmentation and subordination as described above, which were fought

⁶ David C. Rapoport, "The Four Waves of Modern Terror: International Dimensions and Consequences," in Hanhimäki, Jussi and Bernhard Blumenau, eds., *An International History of Terrorism: Western and Non-Western Experiences* (London: Routledge, 2013).

around the world as national liberation movements based on nationalism against the rule and subordination by the suzerain powers. In addition, both the United States and the Soviet Union intervened in these national liberation movements, which resulted in the expansion of the U.S.-Soviet conflict over the principle order between Liberalism and Communism concerning domestic political regimes.

The third wave was the “New Left wave.” With the Vietnam War as a major turning point, LICs against the postwar American hegemony emerged around the world in the 1960s, led mainly by the so-called baby-boomer generation born after the end of World War II. Particularly noteworthy among these LICs were the struggles by Palestinians as a movement for recovery of lost territory and for national liberation. The extremists from such developed Western countries as Japan, West Germany, and Italy, etc. assembled in Palestine and carried out LICs around the world, including terrorist attacks, hijackings and suicide bombings. They aimed for an anti-U.S. and anti-imperialist movement with the goal of achieving the world communist revolution, in cooperation with same-goaled organizations such as the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) under the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO).⁷

The purpose of the PLO that led the Palestinian struggle, was the recovery of territory lost in the expansion of the modern world system. On the other hand, the purpose of the “New Left” extremists was the realization of the world communist revolution by defeating the hegemony of the United States, which controlled the world and subordinated Third World countries. The armed struggles by both forces were LICs aimed at the realization of the principle order of freedom and equality. With the end of the Cold War, the PLO abandoned its armed struggle in pursuit of problem-solving through negotiations with Israel. On the other hand, the “New Left” extremists that lost their bases in Palestine and supports from the Soviet Union and East Germany almost disappeared by the end of 20th century.

Rapoport points out that the wave of these LICs would come to an end in about one generation, that is, 30 years. In fact, the first Anarchist wave that began in the 1880s came to an end by the mid-1910s, when the second wave of anti-colonialism emerged, and the second anticolonial wave came to an end of the 1960s, when the third New Left wave emerged. These developments may attribute to the aging of actors who drove the respective waves.

According to “*Why Did the Arab Revolution Occur?*,” written by French historical demographer Emmanuel Todd,⁸ countries with the largest populations of people aged between 15 and 30 are prone to the outbreak of conflicts due to dissatisfaction with the established order. Thus, as people in those population zones grow older, conflicts tend to recede. In fact, the periods around the 1970s when the baby-boomers generation born after the end of World War II occupied the population zones from 15 to 30 saw the occurrence around the world of so-called “student power” of student activists and terrorism by the New Left.

Just as Todd sought to comprehend the causes of LICs amid changing demographics,

⁷ For the transition of modern terrorism after the third wave, see Akira Kato, *Tero – Gendai Boryoku Ron (Terrorism – Theory of Modern Violence)*, Chuko Shinsho, 2002.

⁸ Emmanuel Todd, translated by Harumi Ishizaki, *Arabu Kakumei wa Naze Okitaka – Demography to Democracy (Why Did the Arab Revolution Occur? –Demography and Democracy)*, Fujiwara-Shoten, 2011.

Rapoport, referred to his one-generation theory, predicts that the fourth “Religious wave that emerged in 1979” (the year of the Iranian Revolution) would come to an end and emerge a new LIC around 2025 (Rapoport 47).

However, the cause of the fourth wave cannot be found in the biological or social factors such as changing demographics and intergenerational confrontations. The fourth wave can be traced to the conflict between the modern order premised on the separation of religion and secularity that shelves God and places human beings at the center, and the Islamic order premised on the union of religion and secularity that regards Allah as the ultimate principle order. Therefore, unless the conflict between the differences of the principle order, or between the separation of religion and secularity and the union of religion and secularity, is resolved, the fourth Religious wave will not come to an end.

In the first place, the Religious wave did not come to the fore in the Iranian Revolution of 1979, but was instead already evident in the process of the incorporation of the Islamic world into the modern world system. While many countries in the Islamic world saw anticolonial movements based on the modern order of nationalism, there was also resistance from Islamic forces that sought to protect the Islamic order.

One example is Afghanistan, where LICs are still ongoing. In 1919, Afghanistan King Amanullah Khan embarked on efforts to modernize the country based on nationalism. However, Islamic conservatives pushed back, sending the King into exile in Italy in 1929 and revived a restoration regime based on Islamic fundamentalism. In the subsequent confrontation between Islamic conservatives and pro-modernists continued, and pro-modernists were backlash with the Republican Revolution in 1973 and the establishment of the communist government in 1978. However, following the military interventions by the Soviet Union in 1979 and by the United States in 2001, the conflict between Islamic conservatives and pro-modernists is still continuing today in the form of a chaotic civil war.

Like in Afghanistan, some confrontations between pro-modernists and Islamic conservatives, and LICs caused by these confrontations, are now almost daily occurrences in the Islamic world. For example, in Iran, Turkey and Egypt, such confrontations occurred between the modern order of nationalism and Islamism in the course of anticolonial struggles. The Islamist forces in Iran won this confrontation in the Iranian Revolution of 1979. As a result, LICs by Islamic forces upholding the principle order of Allah intensified in the Islamic world. Even in Turkey, which was believed to be the most modernized nation in the Islamic world, Islamist forces supporting President Recep Erdogan are making a comeback. Furthermore, the democratization movement known as the “Arab Spring” was also a struggle for the modern order of freedom and equality. In Egypt, Libya and Syria, however, these movements broke down due to the counteroffensive by Islamic conservatives, such as the Muslim Brotherhood, Hamas, ISIS and al-Qaeda.

The Religious wave is not limited to the Islamic world. After the end of the Cold War settled the conflict between Liberalism and Communism and the era of “Grand Narratives” also came to an end, people turned to religion seeking new narratives. This gave rise to Buddhist fundamentalism, Jewish fundamentalism and Christian fundamentalism, which aimed at the order based on their own transcendent existence and sometimes resorted to acts of terrorism.

For example, in the United States in 1993 a barricaded incident took place in Texas by a new cult religion the Branch Davidian, which in turn led to the bombing of a federal government building in Oklahoma City in April 1995 by a former U.S. Army soldier influenced by Christian fundamentalism. A month ago, in March 1995 in Tokyo, the Aum Shinrikyo Buddhist fundamentalism cult group dispersed sarin gas on the subway. In February 1994, there was a gun shooting incident by the Jewish fundamentalist at a mosque in Hebron on the Israeli-occupied West Bank.

Religions are not directly linked to the changing demographics or social problems of intergenerational confrontations. They concern the perspective of the world recognition in relation to people's identity. Thus, LICs based on religious fundamentalism can arise at any time and beyond generations.

6. LIC and the World System

There are several attempts to analyze LICs from the level of the world system. Albert J. Bergesen and Omar Lizardo, in their co-authored thesis, *International Terrorism and the World-System*,⁹ organize their researches about international terrorism from the viewpoints of the three world system theories. They research what causes international terrorism, applying the first approach of World-System, which emphasizes the disparity in economic development and subordination, the second approach of World-Society/Polity, which ascribes to the difference in society and political regime, and the third approach of Blowback Theory, which finds the cause of terrorism in the counteroffensive against excessive intervention by empires.

Organizing these approaches, the causes of LICs can be summed up as the confrontation between the principle orders in the world system, as argued by this article. In this last section, I would summarize the historical transition of LICs in the modern world system from the perspective of confrontations between the principle orders.

The Confrontation in the principle orders arises as challenges to hegemonic powers that form the established order. The feudalistic order based on the union of religion and secularity and the status system in the Spanish and Portuguese Empires, transformed to the modern order of the British Empire with the principle order of freedom and equality premised on the separation of religion and secularity due to the defeat of the Spanish Armada by the British Navy. The principle order of freedom and equality premised on the separation of religion and secularity brought modern sovereign nation states and the modern world system, and, among the Western powers, the British Empire reigned as the hegemon based on its economic and military power, and spread the modern order globally. In the course of the globalization of the modern world system, the struggles against the modern order and the battles for freedom and equality within the modern order gave rise to LICs, including revolutions, rebellions, acts of terrorism and guerilla warfare, and the interstate conflicts over Communism and Liberalism in the East-West Cold War.

In the confrontation over the principle order of freedom and equality within the modern

⁹ Albert J. Bergesen and Omar Lizardo, "International Terrorism and the World-System," in *Sociology Theory*, Volume 22, Issue 1, March 2004, pp. 38-52.

world system, the United States, which embraced freedom, surpassed the Soviet Union, which embraced equality, and the principle order of freedom ultimately gained triumph. As Francis Fukuyama argued, we witnessed the “End of History,” or more precisely, the history of the modern world system came to an end, and the victorious United States became the “Liberal Empire.”

The United States, the Liberal Empire, controlled the world economically with the free market principle, supported the democratization of Eastern European countries, and tried to democratize Afghanistan and Iraq, resorting even to the use of its military power. The excessive intervention by the United States, the Liberal Empire, invited a blowback or reprisal from Islamic forces, giving rise to LICs around the world, particularly in the Islamic world.

Currently the principle order of freedom premised on the separation of religion and secularity as embraced the Liberal Empire, the United States, is being challenged by Islamic fundamentalism forces which are trying to establish an Islamic Empire based on the union of religion and secularity and the status system, such as ISIS, al-Qaeda and the Taliban, and also by China. Based on the world views expressed in the new Confucian thought of Zhao Tingyang’s Tianxia (All under Heaven)¹⁰ and the Hua-Yi Order, China is seeking the revival of a new feudalistic order with the status system of philosopher politics and elite politics. In addition to the challenges by the new (revolutionary) feudalistic order of the Islamic forces against the established (legitimacy) modern order symbolized by the United States, the challenge by China’s new (revolutionary) feudalistic order may result in new causes of LICs in the future.

¹⁰ Zhao Tingyang, *Tianxia Tixi: Shijie zhidu zhaxue daolun (The Tianxia System: An Introduction to the Philosophy of a World Institution)*, Renmin University of China Press, 2011.

