Since AP has been posting articles on the evolution of the American Maoists’ tactics over time, I’d like to share some of my own thoughts on what Boogaloo will be like.

Thought #1: The Battle for Suburbia

This will probably be something of a surprise at first, but it’s not so illogical in retrospect: boogaloo will be a suburban phenomenon for the short- to mid-game (the late-game will be in the cities if the forces of light win, and in the rural areas if the forces of darkness win). America is not dominated by urban or rural areas, but by its suburbs, and has been so since the late 1940s. The suburbs are unique because they have many of the connectivity benefits associated with towns and urbanism, but are spread apart and harder to centrally control. This is why the left desperately wants them eliminated: like the jungle, they’re neutral terrain, and that means any attempt by the left to fight there requires that they win without the deck stacked in their favor. The left’s ranks, like those of the KKK during both Civil Rights Eras, are filled with men who are only brave when they can’t lose.

Fighting in the suburbs will not be fun. There are few bulletproof or fireproof structures, plenty of space for the enemy to maneuver, and defending forces will constantly be understrength. Yet, there are also many advantages: freedom for the enemy to maneuver is freedom for the forces of light to maneuver, and the former don’t have any more bulletproof protection than the latter. Defense in depth is possible, crossfires/defilade are easy to achieve between houses, and sniper hides are plentiful. Bicycles will be extremely valuable in this environment as they are quiet, speedy, can carry baggage, and are able to traverse ground that automobiles cannot. Thus, even the most fanatical porch sniper should possess a bicycle and ride it often to avoid obesity. Another benefit of the suburbs is their space for gardening. If the supply chain collapses, suburban yards can readily be converted into permaculture gardens, which will provide sufficient sustenance on a shoestring budget. It won’t be perfect or convenient, but it will prevent starvation or malnourishment. Fences and chicken wire will be indispensable for preserving this system from animals, while also
providing the benefit of inhibiting attackers’ free movement

On the flip side, the notion that boogaloo will take place in the wilderness is less plausible. The left isn’t afraid of people in the hills because they can be safely ignored. Scattered bands of men hiding in the hills with no plan aren’t an existential threat, and the lack of resources and infrastructure will mean many will starve or freeze to death before striking any meaningful blows. The Maoists can afford to wage scorched-earth tactics on any poverty-stricken
rural regions they find uncomfortably close, and can counter infiltration with wire and blockhouses since the hill men possess no artillery. Nor are the hills indispensable to controlling most of the nation: the left controls the coastal ports and can thus utilize rivers for transportation instead of roads, forcibly urbanizing small towns along these secure routes or abandoning them to starve. Considering that the Mississippi River dominates the continent, the Rockies/Appalachians now appear sandwiched, rather than the coastal
Thought #2: Police and Military Resources

So if boogaloo is taking place in backyards rather than backwoods, then that changes the equation dramatically. Now, instead of fleeing the golden horde, the overarching strategy is to turn the suburbs into the Teutoburg Forest: let the Maoists enter, ensure they don’t leave alive. Sharpshooter-spotter buddy pairs are the backbone of such a strategy, but these must be combined with good intelligence. As such, many patriots will necessarily join a larger organization like the Oathkeepers at the national or state level. This winnowing will separate the liabilities from the worthies: refusal to submit to a hierarchy will demonstrate that one cannot be relied on in a life-or-death situation.

As locales defund their police forces, former officers can supply a source of recruits for political pushback, and attempts should be made to encourage remaining officers to mutiny if they are given unlawful orders. Remember: from the officer’s perspective, if he refuses to follow an unlawful order today he’ll simply be arrested and someone else will do it in his place. In a mutiny, the officer now has a way to eliminate the source of his unlawful orders and their ability to ruin his life for doing the right thing. Right-wingers should also look into joining reservists (both police and military) to get formal training. Without formal training, any attempts at using force will be a massive gamble. With formal training, however, right-wingers can supplement their existing level of training and get paid to do it.

Thought #3: Offensive vs Defensive Shooting

At the tactical level, the first step is to counter the swarm tactics currently being employed. Once these are defeated, the Maoists will likely shift to a strategy of assassinations and raids, and step 2 will be to defeat these, along with any sympathetic county/state governments. It is in this first stage that we will talk about the difference between offensive and defensive
Kyle Rittenhouse is a perfect example of defensive shooting. He was trying to leave the area, waited until he was attacked, and stopped shooting the instant his attackers stopped attacking. This is appropriate for many circumstances, and has the advantage of retaining the moral high ground as far as the courts are concerned. Since Americans overall are highly neutralist by temperament and attitude, the principle of non-aggression is easier to argue when shooting defensively. The main drawback, however, is that it allows the Maoist aggressor(s) to maintain the initiative. Eventually, circumstances will arise in which ceding the initiative is the worst possible response.

Offensive shooting is much more violent and aggressive than its defensive counterpart. Jeff Cooper recounts a story in his book “Principles of Personal Defense” of a student who had very little situational awareness and was ambushed by 4 men with revolvers, but aggressively turned the tide by firing 22 shots in 20 seconds, scaring them off. An aggressive shooter in Kyle’s situation would have fired many more shots than he did, in quicker succession, and tactically counterattacked even as he made a strategic withdrawal. After shooting pedo-man in the genitals and Glock-man in the arm, an aggressive shooter would have continued shooting: he likely would have followed up his arm shot with a headshot, killing the third Maoist, and he would have continued shooting, likely targeting the cameramen if no one else charged at him. Since mobs’ reaction to gunfire nowadays is to pull out their cameras rather than flee, the camera-wielding Maoists would be considered fair game. A traitor with a camera is still a traitor, and their pseudo-defiant “standing their ground” inspires those around them; thus, they are contributors to the mob’s psyche, even if passively. A sudden, violent spray of bullets at such close range is loud and frightening, and when the camera-wielders realize that they are being deliberately targeted by men shooting to kill, they will feel this same fear and run. In other circumstances, the fat feminists providing human shields to the soyboys throwing rocks and fireworks would be gunned down without hesitation, and the shooters’ only mental efforts would be to try hitting multiple bodies with one bullet. The only ones who will be deliberately spared by an aggressive
shooter are those that run away. One of the biggest drawbacks of relying on numbers (as all evil forces do) is that crowds are prone to mass panics. The students at Kent State did not run when tear gas was fired at them, they ran away when the National Guard fired 69 shots into the mass, killing only 4 students. Instead of charging the National Guard, the students fled. A mass casualty event in a BLM/Antifa protest would send even bigger shockwaves, and all it takes is for one man to break and run: his fear with be infectious.

Thought #4: Aim for the Earbuds

During the revolutionary war, a common order given to riflemen acting as sharpshooters was “aim for the epaulettes.” The epaulettes, of course, were the mark of an NCO or officer, who played critical roles in ensuring fire discipline and unit cohesion. By deliberately targeting these men, the American rebels were able to take away the biggest advantages possessed by professional soldiers (i.e., being able to function smoothly under fire). In the 21st century, the Maoists do not wear epaulettes, but their thrall masters rely on radio communications to coordinate an otherwise uncontrolled mob. Their officers/NCOs will be recognizable by earbuds and other communication devices, as well as leadership-style actions such as pointing. Sharpshooters should therefore focus their fire onto these individuals once more immediate dangers are killed, because killing the thrall-masters will destroy the mob’s ability to move and act as a single unit. Actions will become piecemeal and confused. Moreover, when the cowards see their inspirational leaders killed in front of them, they will flee 9 times out of 10. Killing these men and women will also gut the Maoists’ core cadre, and the quality of replacements will decline over time.

On the operational level, offensive tactics to counter the Maoists would be to target their picket lines rather than the central mob. A typical riot has vehicles, guns, and radio operators acting as sentries for the main body, and can provide a handy cutoff force should their targets wander inside the perimeter. However, if these units can be spotted and wiped out
from afar, then the Maoists lose their eyes and ears, as well as their backup. Picket duty will become a death sentence, and present a lose-lose situation: either sacrifice lives or protection. Even worse, these men and women on sentry duty will be picked from better-quality recruits, and the loss of these will ensure the Maoists’ best and brightest are killed first, before moving on to the disposable hordes. The Thebans defeated the Spartans using this very same principle at Leuctra.

Conclusion:

In short, boogaloo will be a suburban phenomenon, and the authors of “A Failure of Civility” were right to focus on it. Wilderness skills are not useless in a suburban environment (quite the opposite), but they are not the complete picture. Bicycles will be as important as rifles, and if we’re really lucky the police/military will mutiny rather than enforce illegal orders against us. Whether they do or don’t, as many patriots as possible should volunteer to join their local police/National Guard forces to get formal training.

*Michael Gladius is the pseudonym for a budding commentator in the fields of military history and theory. His goal is to blend the lessons of history, principles of human behavior, and practical wisdom in order to draw upon a wide array of factors for optimized solutions and problem-solving. He is currently studying in Europe. Some examples of his work include Small Wars Journal and RealClear Defense.*
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