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Cultural Property Protection and Preservation during Counterinsurgency Operations

Abstract

Committee Chair, Dr. Kelly Dixon, Ph.D.

This dissertation is dedicated to an applied archaeological approach as stated in the mission declaration of UMDA’s Ph.D. program in Cultural Heritage and Applied Anthropology: “An overlapping concern of the Ph.D. program is applied anthropology, the use of the anthropological perspective to solve real-world problems, including cultural heritage, medical anthropology, and a host of international development issues. At the heart of our program is a strong commitment to employ anthropological theory to engage contemporary relevant issues with focused research for communities. While some that [sic] are awarded a Ph.D. in Anthropology from [sic] University of Montana will look toward teaching careers, a goal of the program is to produce applied anthropologists who will serve in government agencies, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), tribal and ethnic associations, and businesses”.

The following dissertation mirrors the above the University of Montana’s Department of Anthropology mission statement and does so in an applied archaeological framework. It is also an analytical product of focused research involving data and information collection as well as real-world experience on archaeological undertakings conducted during counterinsurgency operations. This dissertation provides solutions to solving real-world problems (the looting and destruction of cultural property) while engaging contemporary relevant issues (armed conflict) whose ultimate purpose is to save human life on the contemporary battlefield.
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Preface

The applied nature of the analysis\textsuperscript{1} contained herein is inspired by the University of Montana Department of Anthropology’s Ph.D. program in Cultural Heritage and Applied Anthropology\textsuperscript{2}. This program’s objective is to produce applied anthropologists to serve outside of academia versus those who use the Ph.D. to teach anthropology at a college or university (UMDA 2016: 1). In accordance with the program’s objective, the following dissertation is an applied archaeological effort which is designed for application during counterinsurgency\textsuperscript{3} operations in support of the Global War on Terrorism.

This dissertation and its content may seem unfamiliar to an archaeological audience in that it is of a military nature. This is necessary as it is designed to familiarize archaeologists with the women and men of the American Armed Forces. It is also designed for American military personnel who wish to work with archaeologists and

\textsuperscript{1} “Analysis can be as simple as writing up some notes on why we’re convinced that what we’ve found is a five or six-year-old bovine corpse, or it can be a very complex undertaking that involves a wide range of specialists, lots of special technical studies, and often, many years of work” (King 2005: 76). For the purposes of this dissertation, the analyst (author) will use the latter part of King’s definition.

\textsuperscript{2} Although anthropology and archaeology are considered separate disciplines throughout most of the world, American archaeology is one of the four subfields of anthropology; therefore, American archaeology is dedicated to furthering “the aims of anthropology” (Binford 1962: 224; See Wiley and Philips 1958). Whenever the term archaeology is used in this dissertation, the analyst is referring to the Americanist form of the discipline, which means any examples herein associated with the term “anthropology” are germane to archaeological research and application.

\textsuperscript{3} Counterinsurgency consists of military, paramilitary, political, economic, psychological, and civic actions used to defeat an insurgency (FM 1-02 2004:1-47).
familiarize themselves with archaeological history, ethics, theories and methods and how it can be applied to military training exercises and operations. The format of this dissertation is similar in style to formats of doctrinal publications, manuals and handbooks of the American military (i.e. Petraeus et al. 2007). Therefore, this dissertation is designed and written in said format.
Section 1
Introduction

Most governments have their hands full combating terrorism, with few resources left to spare for tracking down stolen artifacts. Most international organizations are content to issue proclamations, preferring to hit the conference center rather than the streets. Many cultural organizations and foundations are equally content to issue a call for papers rather than a call to action (Bogdanos 2008: 121).

1-1. This dissertation is a call to action and is dedicated to an applied archaeological approach as stated in the mission statement of the University of Montana Department of Anthropology doctoral program in Cultural Heritage and Applied Anthropology:

An overlapping concern of the Ph.D. program is applied anthropology, the use of the anthropological perspective to solve real-world problems, including cultural heritage, medical anthropology, and a host of international development issues. At the heart of our program is a strong commitment to employ anthropological theory to engage contemporary relevant issues with focused research for communities. While some that [sic] are awarded a Ph.D. in Anthropology from [sic] University of Montana will look toward teaching careers, a goal of the program is to produce applied anthropologists who will serve in government agencies, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), tribal and ethnic associations, and businesses (UMDA 2016: 1).

1-2. The design and intent of this dissertation mirrors the above University of Montana Department of Anthropology doctoral program mission statement and does so in an
applied archaeological context. It is also an analytical product of focused research involving data and information collection as well as real-world experience on archaeological undertakings conducted during counterinsurgency operations. The analyst has created this product by providing solutions to solving real-world problems (the looting and destruction of cultural property) while engaging contemporary relevant issues (armed conflict). While the penultimate objective of this undertaking is to safeguard and preserve cultural property during warfare, the ultimate objective is to save human life.

**Applied Archaeological Research: Accomplishments of the Analyst**

1-3. As an archaeologist-intern at the U.S. State Department’s Cultural Heritage Center, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, the analyst conducted information and data collection which was crucial to the successful completion of the Congressionally mandated *Babylon Site Damage Assessment Report*. The report illustrated the history and damage to the site—including damage by U.S. and Coalition Armed Forces during Operation Iraqi Freedom. This undertaking was based on the analyst’s observations during combat operations as a Marine Corps Force Reconnaissance **5** platoon

---

4 The analyst wishes to emphasize the intent of safeguarding and preserving cultural property does not include the removal of said cultural property from the people and/or nations to whom it belongs.

5 Marine Corps Force Reconnaissance is a military intelligence asset. The mission of Force Reconnaissance is to conduct amphibious reconnaissance, surveillance, and raids in support of Marine Corps forces. Force reconnaissance uses specialized insertion such as military free-fall and combatant diving, patrolling, reporting, and extraction techniques to carry out reconnaissance and surveillance tasks and maintains the capability to perform special operations capable tasks (MCWP 2-25 2015: 1-6; 2-3).
commander and time spent during the initial stages of the military occupation of Babylon. The report is on file at the State Department in Washington D.C. (file:///E:/Recovery/Desktop/School&Work/PH.d%20Guide1/Portfolio/babylondamagereport.pdf)

1-4. Next the analyst served as a forensic archaeologist and as the security/safety officer with the Army Corps of Engineers\(^6\) Mass Graves Investigation Team in Iraq. The Mass Graves Investigation Team was subordinate to the Justice Department’s Regime Crimes Liaison Office whose main duty was to provide forensic evidence in the trial of Saddam Hussein, Chemical Ali and other Ba’athist Regime members for war crimes against the people of Iraq. As the security officer, the analyst was responsible to advise and liaison with the security team in all aspects of security and protection for the Mass Graves Investigation Team’s personnel, archaeological expeditionary camp, excavation sites, and during archaeological reconnaissance missions. As an archaeologist, the analyst was tasked with conducting forensic archaeological survey, mapping, and excavation. The analyst also served as the deputy logistics officer. This applied archaeological experience provided the skillsets necessary for conducting archaeological operations (i.e. cultural property protection and preservation operations) in hostile, wartime environments.

1-5. As the Cultural Property Liaison Officer for the Utah Army National Guard and Utah Air National Guard, the analyst served as the Utah National Guard liaison officer to the Utah Cultural Property Team in support of cultural property identification, assessment

\(^6\) The analyst was hired by a private contractor and assigned to the Army Corps of Engineers.
and protection in the event of state and/or federal emergencies. This effort provided the
development, design, and submission of the Mobile Archaeological-Arts Assessment
Team (MAAT) guidelines for integrating Utah National Guard assets to assist the Utah
Cultural Property Team during above mentioned emergencies. These guidelines can
also be applied to cultural heritage preservation and protection in areas of armed
conflict as well.

1-6. As the Cultural Heritage and Preservation Advisor at the Institute for Military
Support to Governance, U.S. Army Special Warfare Center and School, the analyst was
called to serve an Active Duty Operational Support tour to advise and recommend
policies to the institute’s Director in order to implement and sustain the U.S. Army’s new
Cultural Heritage and Preservation Officer specialty. As a result of this active duty tour,
the analyst provided vital inertia to develop the Cultural Heritage and Preservation
specialty within the new 38G Military Government Officer Area of Concentration by (1)
laying the intellectual and relational foundation to restore the heritage of the
"Monuments Men" (and Women) in the U.S. Army and (2) transform a concept to an
actual U.S. military capability\(^8\). As a result of this effort, the analyst was designated a
Cultural Heritage and Preservation Officer (Monuments Man) in the Reserve

\(^7\) “38” is the Army numeric designator for the Civil Affairs Military Occupational Specialty. Civil Affairs is the military occupational specialty responsible for enhancing the relationship between military forces and civil authorities (FM 1-02 2004: 1-30). “G” is the alpha designation for “Government”.

\(^8\) While the Cultural Heritage and Preservation Officer specialty is currently organic to the U.S. Army, the intent is to expand this specialty to the Coast Guard, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.
Component of the U.S. Army. This accomplishment was made possible by integrating the analyst’s previous mentioned efforts in stateside academic settings and during periods of armed conflict as an archaeologist.

1-7. Most recently, the analyst served as the Headquarters Marine Corps Cultural Resource Manager and Archaeologist. While overseeing and managing cultural property on Marine Corps Installations world-wide, the analyst’s assistance was requested by the Office of the Secretary of Defense to work with the Special Assistant for Stability and Humanitarian Affairs to assist in the development of a Cultural Heritage Protection response force for the American Armed Forces. This research is ongoing.

1-8. The analyst is currently a Marine Corps infantry and Reconnaissance officer in the Selected Marine Corps Reserve. His new objective as a Marine is to create an additional military occupational specialty of Cultural Heritage and Preservation Officer in the Marine Corps. The analyst also has the additional duty in serving as a cultural heritage and preservation advisor for his upcoming deployment to Afghanistan in early 2020.

9 While this specialty was developed as a U.S. Army capability, the goal of the analyst is to expand this specialty to the Coast Guard, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

10 On 21 October 2019, the Smithsonian Institution and the U.S. Army announced a 21st-Century Version of the Monuments Men to Protect Cultural Heritage in War-Torn Regions (Cascone 2019: 1).

11 The analyst recently left the Army Reserve and was reappointed back into the Marine Corps as an Infantry and Reconnaissance Officer.
1-9. The analyst has taught and presented numerous periods of instruction to anthropological (undergraduate and graduate) and military audiences—this included both stateside and overseas (Iraq) periods of instruction on cultural heritage awareness. The analyst has also been published as a chapter co-author in an archaeological textbook entitled: *Cultural Heritage in the Crosshairs: Protecting Cultural Property during Conflict*. The chapter’s title is Cultural Heritage in Time of Conflict: A Tool for Counterinsurgency.

**Background**

1-10. The genesis for this applied archaeological undertaking is the analyst’s experience as a Force Reconnaissance Marine during the opening days of Operation Iraqi Freedom in 2003. During the invasion phase, the analyst witnessed the I Marine Expeditionary Force Headquarters Group occupy the ancient site of Babylon. Babylon had already been occupied for decades by the Ba’athist dictator Saddam Hussein, his henchmen, and the Iraqi armed forces. Following the Marine Corps occupation, the analyst observed a water purification system installed, a military headquarters added, and sandbags filled with potsherd-laced sand. Upon notifying a senior officer of the above-mentioned issues, the analyst was colorfully reminded he was in Iraq not as an archaeologist, but as an officer of United States Marines. He was then told to “get back to work”. It was at that time the analyst thought to himself, why couldn’t he be both an officer and archaeologist? Here the analyst decided his life mission was to protect cultural property during periods of armed conflict as an archaeologist while serving alongside the American Armed Forces. One of the analyst’s inspiration for this life mission is the following:
Anthropology was made for man; not man for anthropology. In peacetime, we labor to increase anthropological knowledge, to construct a systematic picture of how human culture works, to provide the scientific basis for building an everbetter world. In wartime we have three courses—to retire into ivory towers, protect our scientific reputations, and wait, on the chance that peace will come without our help and leave us free again to go back to our patient labors; or we can do something non-anthropological, satisfy our patriotic consciences by becoming air-raid wardens, working in an area where no colleague will review our works. Or, we can say quite simply, with such knowledge and insights as we have, we will now do what we can, as anthropologists, to win the war (Mead 1942:13-14).

1-11. Since the events at Babylon, the analyst’s research, experience, education, and training has directed his efforts to focus on the looting of archaeological sites in areas of armed conflict. More specifically, the analyst is concerned with the looting of archaeological sites in American Military areas of responsibility and the subsequent illicit sale of cultural property which is used as a funding mechanism for international terrorist organizations.

1-12. The development of this effort is rooted in scholarship, focused research and analysis. It is important to emphasize the effort is based on the real-life military undertakings (including combat experiences) of the analyst as both a United States Marine and as an archaeologist in the context of applied military archaeology and cultural property protection. The illicit sale of antiquities for the purposes of funding terrorist organizations happens in the real-world and requires real-world solutions.
Therefore, this effort should be examined from both academic perspectives as well as realistic and scholarly applied archaeological practice and standards that are effective in the engagement of real-world issues. In short, this effort is written by a warfighter\(^\text{12}\), for warfighters in addition to anthropologists and archaeologists wanting to serve alongside and as part of the American Armed Forces.

1-13. This dissertation product is inspired by the doctoral program mission statement of the University of Montana’s Department of Anthropology and will be designed and published as a military style handbook based on the analyst’s efforts thus far. The handbook will be a “living document”—meaning it will be updated and amended as the analyst (and others) gain experience and application of protecting and preserving cultural property during military operations. With the formation of a new era of military “Monuments Men and Women”, the purpose of the handbook is to galvanize and inspire the archaeological and military communities to work together in order to protect and preserve cultural property during counterinsurgency operations.

**Bridging the Academic-Military Divide**

1-14. In a discipline that has minimal presence beyond the campuses of established universities (Green 2006: 119), the goal the University of Montana’s Department of Anthropology to produce applied anthropologists to serve outside of academia is a worthy cause—especially in the context of government entities such as the American Armed Forces. It is therefore important to offer alternative perspectives in the kind of

\(^{12}\) The term “Warfighter” is a common American military reference to any member of the United States Armed Forces, especially those who serve and or support those who serve in the context of combat.
work anthropologists can do in military contexts (Rush 2013: 9). These contexts include armed conflict and war. This dissertation will focus on the application of anthropology and archaeology to one of the most significant issues of the 21st century—global armed conflict.

1-15. Wars are often controversial, and the asymmetric nature of the Global War on Terrorism is no different—especially when cultural heritage is involved. The looting of archaeological sites is one of the most alarming and destructive types of cultural property destruction (Bowman 2008: 1). During periods of armed conflict, the looting of cultural property has not only resulted in irreparable damage to museums and the archaeological record (Zottin 2008: 236), but it has also generated support in the form of cash and/or weapons to fund insurgent and terrorist organizations around the world (Charney et al. 2012: 1, Meyers and Kulish 2016: 1).

1-16. Despite this data, there has not been consistent professional oversight dedicated to protecting cultural heritage during American military counterinsurgency operations. This is because some archaeologists refuse to coordinate with the military on ethical grounds (Wegener 2008: 165). In contrast to those who wish to decline to cooperate with the military, there are those ethically informed and open-minded individuals within the anthropology and archaeology communities who want the opportunity to employ their archaeological skillsets\(^\text{13}\) to assist in military operations. This dissertation will examine the following subjects in order to accomplish this effort:

\(^{13}\) Archaeological skill sets include but are not limited to survey (Collins and Molyneaux 2003: 205-237; King 2005:65); excavation (McIntosh 1999: 74-75; King 2005:71); and curation (preservation) (King 2005: 81) of cultural, biological, archaeological, and traditional cultural properties.
(1) Examine how military ethics can serve as a plausible alternative to the ethical codes of anthropological professional organizations when conducting applied archaeology in the Global War on Terrorism.

(2) Examine applied archaeology in the context of past and contemporary military conflicts and their effects in protecting and preserving cultural property.

(3) Establish the concept of operational archaeology.

(4) Examine archaeological theories in the context of applying archaeological skillsets during military operations.

(5) Examine the applied methodologies that can be employed during military operations.

1-17. As previously stated, the heart of the University of Montana’s Department of Anthropology doctoral program is a strong commitment to apply anthropological theory and research that engages contemporary, real-world and relevant issues (UMDA 2016: 1). Contemporary warfare is a real-world human condition where relevant engagements of anthropology and archaeology can make positive impacts in saving human life as well as safeguarding cultural property. This dissertation (and future military handbook) will provide inspiration and motivation for the archaeologist wishing to serve with the American military in the quest to save cultural property during armed conflict and most importantly, save human lives.
Section 2
Applied Archaeology and Military Ethics:
A Plausible Alternative

A spectre haunts anthropology— the spectre of ethics (Stoczkowski 2008: 345).

2-1. This section is the most robust as it directly addresses the debate regarding anthropologists and archaeologists\(^{14}\) working with the American military in the Global War on Terrorism. The debate emanates from individuals within the anthropology community who hold the position that it is unethical for anthropologists and archaeologists to serve with the American military—unfortunately, this position is based on negative stereotypes of the American Armed Forces, its mission, its culture, and the women and men who serve in its ranks. Moreover “some anthropologists speak negatively of the [American] military from their position outside of the community both to disavow and decline opportunities to develop a relationship with the military; preserving distance is critical to these individuals, to whom proximity to the military may even be distasteful because they disagree vehemently with military missions or employment” (Harrell 2003: 9). While disagreement with national defense policy is a matter of opinion.

\(^{14}\) Although anthropology and archaeology are considered separate disciplines throughout most of the world, American archaeology is one of the four subfields of anthropology; therefore, American archaeology is dedicated to furthering “the aims of anthropology “(Binford 1962:224; See Wiley and Philips 1958). Whenever the term archaeology is used in this paper, I am referring to the Americanist form of the discipline, which means any examples herein associated with the term “anthropology” are germane to archaeological research and application.
(informed or otherwise), the aforementioned stereotypes are based on ignorance, misinformation, and in some cases outright bigotry towards those who serve in uniform—this section will engage these inaccuracies head-on. That being said, the goal of this section is not to generate confrontation, but instead foster understanding and appreciation for the American military, its personnel, and their families and embrace those with whom we have disagreements. This understanding and appreciation will promote a sincere environment of dialogue for all concerned parties and will lead to long term partnerships and associations for solving real-world problems from anthropological perspectives and approaches in military contexts.

2-2. This section will examine the role and history of ethics as it relates to the controversial milieu of applied archaeology and its application during military operations. This section will also explore the appropriateness of applying anthropological (and archaeological) skillsets to assist military and intelligence organizations in achieving security and stability—which includes preserving cultural property on the asymmetric \(^{15}\) battlefield (to be discussed later in the dissertation). In applying these skillsets, "ethical thinkers need to think deep and answer difficult questions about what sort of people we should be, what kinds of acts we should perform or avoid, and how we should treat our fellow human beings" (Scarre and Scarre 2006:1). Before this in-depth examination of military ethics and archaeology, it is important to have a familiarization with American military culture in order to better understand the ethical standards the American

---

\(^{15}\) Asymmetric warfare are dissimilarities in organization, equipment, doctrine, and values between other armed forces (formally organized or not) and U.S. Forces (FM 1-02 2004:1-15).
warfighter follows in his or her everyday undertakings, on and off the battlefield. It is important to note that the analyst is not attempting to suggest directly nor imply that American military culture is perfect. Quite the contrary, American military culture, like every culture, is a product of its people, and people as we all know, are not perfect.

**The American Military and Anthropology**

It is curious that in the discipline of military sociology there should be no commonly accepted anthropology of war, no comprehensive explanation of why men fight and how we reached this stage in our evolutionary development where we came to be equipped with the means to destroy the entire species. The works that exist on the origins of war have been written mostly by cultural anthropologists, biologists, and others with little in the way of military background or experience (Gabriel 1990: XV).

2-3. After all, war is the legacy the ancient world bestowed to the contemporary world (Gabriel 2007: 21) and “by adopting a cultural approach to the study of war and combat, we better appreciate the variety and change that have typified military institutions, thought, and practice over the ages” (Lynn 2008: 12). The American military is a rich and relatively unexplored anthropological subject (Harrell 2003: 9) and anthropology remains the only social science with no branch devoted to the study of warfare or the military (Simons 2012: 1). Anthropologists must recognize the need to engage a powerful entity like the American military and propose ways in which its strengths in understanding social institutions and cultural beliefs can be applied to important issues in a contemporary and globalized world (Frese 2003: 149). This engagement may at times need to be addressed in both anthropological and/or military contexts.
If twenty-first century anthropology is going to be truly relevant in the engagement of real-world issues such as armed conflict, it must reach out to and engage the American military. Furthermore, anthropology, as a discipline and community must facilitate its own anthropological sphere of influence within the American military’s thinking, doctrine, and approaches to current and future overseas military combat and humanitarian operations. A great way to do so is to learn about the culture of the women and men who serve in the American Armed Forces. Before delving into archaeological (and military) ethics, this section will first examine the anthropology community’s overall rejection of American military culture and propose approaches for archaeologists to foster a more solid understanding of said culture. It will do so by emphasizing the anthropological axiom that a culture should always be examined on “its own terms” (Honigmann 1963: 9). This axiom includes American military culture.

“If American military personnel attended an American Anthropological Association meeting and heard the negative attitudes about the military, many of which were misinformed, American military personnel would wince at the idea of working with anthropologists. This is not because American military leadership and personnel shirk away from criticism, but because they would not appreciate the lack of information upon which many negative and irrational opinions by anthropologists appear to be based” (Harrell 2003: 7). Moreover, anthropology may well be the most politically-correct of the social sciences and it is not easy to be an anthropologist who partners with and/or studies the American military (Simons 2012: 1). Far too often, many anthropologists believe working with the military or even worse, working for the military is tantamount to associating with war mongers (Harrell 2003: 7). Some anthropologists have gone so far
as to make bigoted statements about the American military whereby they fail to understand American military culture (see Gonzalez 2010, 2007; Lutz 2005; Lutz 2001) and have even suggested that American anthropologists who work for the American Armed forces are mercenaries for hire (Gonzalez 2007: 14, 19). Many anthropologists (as well as many in academia) believe this because they are politically opposed to the American military and its mission (Harrell 2003: 7: Van Creveld 2008: xii)— especially since the events of September 11, 2001. Even anthropologists who choose to study the people and institutions that form the American military and defense communities have been regarded with suspicion by other anthropologists (Rubenstein 2003:16). This is puzzling since many anthropologists, especially in academia, are unfamiliar with what the military does, especially when in the field (Simons 2012: 1). Such predispositions against anthropologists studying American military institutions (Rubenstein 2003: 16) more than likely illustrate why there has been no comprehensive anthropological study of warfare and how it relates to the military (Gabriel 1990: xv) and society.

2-6. Anthropology has long championed cultural relativity including the principle that non-Western cultures or societies should not be understood in comparison to Western cultural perspectives and standards (Lassiter 2009: 18). In maintaining this principle, American military culture and its institutions should not be understood in comparison to an “elite university sector”\textsuperscript{16} of academic perspectives and standards— especially when these sectors are void of a military cultural influence. Many scholars (including archaeologists) with no experience in the military or understanding of the military profession of arms often criticize the American military despite their lack of experience

\textsuperscript{16} The term “elite university sector” is used by Green in her chapter (Green 2006: 119).
and understanding (Bogdanos 2005a: 200-201). This unfortunately includes many in the anthropology community who have chosen to not abide by the anthropological principle of examining a culture “on its own terms” (Honigmann 1963: 9). The American military represents a distinct cultural group with unique features of communication, manners, norms of behavior, and belief systems (Reger et al. 2008: 21). Anthropologists have failed to treat American military culture as a serious ethnographic subject and as a result, anthropologists have failed themselves as anthropologists (Rubenstein 2003: 16).

2-7. The events of September 11, 2001 made the American Armed Forces stop and realize the importance in understanding the culture and language of the enemy (Fujimura 2003: 145), as well as the populations they are charged to protect. “The military is changing in a dramatic way and it is reevaluating itself not just to make war but to fix some profound deficiencies” (Bender 2007: 1). Since September 11, 2001 the American military has reached out to anthropology for assistance, but it has instead received resistance from many within the anthropological community. This is because many anthropologists are not fond of the American military and there have been very few who have spent time studying American military organizations—let alone the organizations that actually engage in combat (Simons 2012: 1). This approach is counter to the concept of cultural relativity as there is no comprehensive or holistic examination of American military culture.

2-8. In order to understand other cultures unlike our own, it is imperative to examine these cultures from their own world-view—and to ensure this takes place the anthropologist must live with and experience other cultures firsthand (Lassiter 2009:
18). For American military culture this could be accomplished by anthropologists spending as much time as possible with American warfighters in order to understand and appreciate their environment and other “cultural contexts” (Honigmann 1963: 9). These cultural contexts (especially those fighting in the Global War on Terrorism) are best mastered by spending time with American warfighters—which means moving among them and sharing their lives as much as possible17 (Honigmann 1963: 9).

2-9. In order to bridge the divide between the anthropology community and American military, it is necessary to dispel inaccurate depictions of the American military as an institution and a culture, and more importantly, the women and men who serve in uniform. This must take place in order to ensure anthropologists reading this section can appreciate American military culture without preconceived notions based on false characterizations, which unfortunately have been exacerbated by anthropologists beginning with Franz Boas’ depiction of “soldiers as murderers” (Boas 1919: 1) during World War I to the portrayal of American warfighters in the Global War on Terrorism being described “Nazi-like” (Harrell 2003: 14) to the extreme of an anthropology professor encouraging the enemy to inflict mass casualties and death to American warfighters serving in Iraq and Afghanistan (CNN 2003: 1; Donaldson-Evans 2003:1). This depiction and treatment of the American military and its culture by individuals from the anthropology community contradicts the strength of anthropology in that it espouses

17 Honigmann's comments are not directed toward American military culture specifically, but rather, the “other” cultures that exist outside the western paradigmatic sphere. The analyst is simply applying Honigmann’s concepts so anthropologists can better understand the importance in treating American military culture like any “other” culture.
an appreciation of a myriad of perspectives and worldviews (Rapport and Overing 2007: 119), particularly how they differ from culture to culture (Taylor 1976: 256).

Addressing the Academy’s Inaccurate Stereotypes of the American Military

2-10. The American Armed Forces has created an effective and cohesive fighting force from amongst a diverse heterogeneous civilian population (Evans 2003: 2). Despite this “the military, like other cultures, has been stereotyped” (Fennel 2008: 1) as an inferior organization when it comes to equality and justice (Hsia 2010: 1). Negative preconceptions have assisted in facilitating the stereotype in that military culture is considered inferior to that of other groups (Van Creveld 2008: xiii). There is no logical basis for this stereotype, especially since the Global War on Terrorism began. Here the attitudes and actions of contemporary American warfighters have changed due to the necessity for military readiness at all times:

American military culture has moved sharply from a Cavalier to a Roundhead conception of social mores. The hard-drinking, chain-smoking, womanizing “Alpha male” has, to a considerable degree—especially in the officer corps—been replaced by the teetotaling, nonsmoking, family-man paragon of virtue. (Indeed, a drunk-driving arrest and conviction will ruin an officer’s career.) The absence of drinking and smoking relates to the need for constant readiness to go to war and the associated need for physical health and endurance, which mirrors similar trends among the more educated classes in American society (Goldich 2011: 66).

Therefore, cultural competence that has been traditionally applied to the treatment of ethnic and racial minorities is just as essential in the treatment and depiction of
American warfighters and military culture (Reger et al. 2008: 21).

2-11. Since the Global War on Terrorism began many in academia (including anthropologists) have been quick to point out that the American military is uneducated, racist, sexist, homophobic, and conspicuously lacking in wealthy White Americans whose fathers allegedly started and/or escalated the Global War on Terrorism in order to profit from it (Lowther 2010: 75). This depiction of the American military is not based on facts, but a failure to understand the American Armed Forces and its culture. The American military has aptly demonstrated the ability to maintain its great traditions yet innovate and lead the rest of American society in social movements (civil rights in particular) twenty years ahead of American mainstream society (Harrell 2003: 2). The American military's unique culture promotes a diverse and cohesive force via the concept of uniformity (Harrell 2003: 2) and comradeship; and unlike American civilian society, the American military has maintained a peaceful and harmonious working relationship amongst its diverse and cultured membership since the late 1970s (Lawrence and Kane 1998: 315). In working to transform civilians into warfighters, the American Armed Forces “strives to forge a shared sense of purpose and inculcate service members with collective values, norms and culture in the pursuit of common goals” (Evans 2003: 3).

2-12. Those who have been so quick to suggest that today's wartime recruits represent lesser quality and/or come from lower socio-economic classes are incorrect; rather, a much clearer set of evidence indicates lower income recruits are proportionally underrepresented in recent years (Kane 2006: 1). Since the events of September 11, 2001, the percentage of recruits from high-income households has increased while the
percentage from low income households has declined (Lowther 2010: 76). Overall the American military is better educated than the rest of civilian society in that 98 percent of American warfighters hold at least a high school diploma while the American civilian national average is 75 percent (Lowther 2010: 76).

2-13. Regarding skin color and service to the country, American military bases and ships are much more integrated than the self-imposed segregation found in many colleges and universities (Moskos 1991: 16). In fact, Black Americans whose parents served in the military and grew up on American military bases experienced bigotry for the first time when they lived and worked in civilian communities as adults (Hall 2011: 6; Wertsch 2011: 1059). That said outsiders of American military culture have failed to recognize how American warfighters view themselves when it comes to their ethnicity. When American warfighters are asked about their ethnicity, it is not uncommon to hear the response “We are all green” (Soldiers and Marines) or “We are all blue” (Sailors, Airmen, and Coastguardsmen) (Fennel 2008: 1). Once in the military, many American warfighters stated they are part of a culture that values honor and morality (Lewis 2007: 380). In other words, it’s not a matter of skin color, ethnicity, sexual orientation or socioeconomic class; rather it’s all about the person on your left or right flank and how well they can shoot, move, and communicate.

What really keeps you going is the guy next to you. The one counting on you to do your job, just as you are counting on him to do his. You have his “6” (his six o’clock, his back) and he has yours. It is a refusal to let your buddies down. In

18 Department of Defense uses terms African-American and Black interchangeably for official demographic data.
writing in his experiences as a Marine in Okinawa, William Manchester observed that any man in combat who lacks comrades who will die for him, and for whom he is willing to die is not a man at all. He is truly damned—and the guy’s race, skin color, religion, gender, or sexual orientation are not even close to being relevant…we (that is, those who have rifles in our hands) do not care (Bogdanos 2005a: 78).

To echo this sentiment, Republican United States Senator Barry Goldwater said it best: “You don’t have to be straight to be in the military; you just have to be able to shoot straight” (Hsia 2010: 1). It is important to note the American military demanded Congress repeal “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” via Congressional testimony from American military leadership, including Republican Secretary of Defense Robert Gates19. To facilitate the repeal of Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell, American military leadership also conducted opinion surveys and discussion groups (DoD 2010: 49) and the vast majority of American warfighters are satisfied with the repeal—especially during intense combat situations where most warfighters were not concerned with the sexual orientation of a brother or sister comrade-in-arms (DoD 2010: 66). Unfortunately, not all Americans have the right to serve without restrictions. While there are Transgender Americans who serve in today’s American military, there are limits to their military service that some would argue keep many patriotic Americans who happen to be Transgender from serving outright. As stated earlier, the purpose of this section is not to paint a rosy picture of American military culture (or policy for that matter). The American military, like

19 Secretary Gates was appointed by President G.W. Bush and retained by President Obama.
other cultures, has preconceptions of population groups just like any other. In this vein, it is the analyst’s hope that American military leadership, in its policy on limiting Transgender American military service, does not inadvertently bar a future transgender personification of Alan Turing\textsuperscript{20} from serving—as that could have dire consequences in a current or future military conflict. The analyst, however, is optimistic that eventually, the correct decision will be made.

\textbf{2-14.} Women have served in the American military in every war. While we know that more and more women are entering the military, the culture of the American military has historically been a very “male” culture (Hall 2011: 15). In order to clarify, it is important to understand however that the military is not a “male” or masculine culture in and of itself. This is an outsider’s perspective. While it is true there are mostly men in the military, and the vast majority of them are masculine, masculinity is not a necessity for mental and physical toughness and competence in battle. The military does not actively or passively encourage or discourage feminine or masculine qualities in its warfighters. It does however demand mental and physical endurance combined with competent technical and tactical proficiency.

\textsuperscript{20} Alan Turing, a gay man, was the lead Code Breaker for British Intelligence during World War II. Turing personally broke the German Enigma (the German military’s typewriter-like cipher machine) code that was used by the U-boats preying on the North Atlantic merchant convoys. If the U-boat code had not been broken, and World War II had continued for another two to three years, a further 14 to 21 million people might have been killed (Copeland 2012: 1). After the war, Turing was arrested for being homosexual, was sentenced and chemically castrated, he died at age 41 (Pease 2012: 1). “Turing stands alongside Churchill, Eisenhower, and a short glory-list of other wartime principals as a leading figure in the Allied victory over Hitler. There should be a statue of him in London among Britain’s other leading war heroes” (Copeland 2012: 1).
2-15. One lesson the Global War on Terrorism has taught is there are no front lines in asymmetric warfare and counterinsurgency. The end of the Cold War and the need for large and mechanized conventional forces has become anachronistic and profoundly changed American military culture (Goldich 2011: 63)—especially the attitudes that only men should command and serve in combat units. The Global War on Terrorism has made it abundantly clear that women in combat are becoming a necessary reality and because there are no front lines, women have proven (as in every other war) that they are just as capable and competent as men to fight and lead in combat. In an effort to determine how to expand the role of women in battle, the Marine Corps began the process of soliciting female volunteers to attend the Infantry Officer Course which previously had been only open to males (Hlad 2012: 1) and the U.S. Army began to plan for female Soldiers to attend Army Ranger School, an intense 60 day combat training regimen that would put them on equal footing with male counterparts (Kuo 2012: 1). As of this writing, the Army now has female Army Rangers (Meyers 2015: 1) and the Marine Corps had its first female graduate of the Infantry Officer Course (Schogol 2017: 1) and has female infantry Marines (Schogol 2017) as well. The American military is also one of the few employers in the country who guarantees and enforces equal work for equal pay regardless of gender (or sexual orientation) (DFAS 2013: 1).

2-16. The United States military is one of the most colorblind institutions in the entire world, and most American warfighters today do not think of one another in terms of skin color, gender, or the religion they follow (Hsia 2010: 1) but more of an extended family of brothers and sisters or siblings-in-arms. This harnesses a bonding and level of
respect that only those who have been in combat can relate to—and one which 
unfortunately most anthropologists cannot. The analyst hopes to change this reality.

**The Culture of the American Military: A Brief Introduction**

2-17. There are a number of anthropological schools of thought and definitions when it 
comes to defining culture and there are various explanations in how culture is produced 
and reproduced (Lewis 2007: 3; Lewis 2011: 67).

Culture is what makes us human, and what makes us think of ourselves as 
different kinds of humans—members of families, communities, nations, and 
organizations. It includes ideas and beliefs in our heads and the way they’re 
expressed in speech, songs, stories, dances, and ways of organizing ourselves 
to live together, find or produce food, make war, build and maintain our 
communities (King 2005: 20).

The American military, like other military organizations around the world, is held 
together by a culture of war (Van Creveld 2008: 359). Anthropologists need to 
understand that the culture of war cannot be fully understood unless one experiences it 
firsthand, but it is possible to be aware of its existence and how it is a part of American 
military culture.

2-18. “Within any cultural group there is always a wide range of beliefs. However, a 
specific cultural group is defined, in part, by a shared set of beliefs that affect the 
thinking and behavior of many members of the group” (Reger et al 2008: 27). The same 
applies to American military culture as it constitutes a separate and distinctly different 
culture from American civilian culture (Wertsch 2011: 24). This culture is comprised of 
the most significant internal attitudes and mindset in the identity of the American Armed
Forces (Goldich 2011: 59) and like other cultures consists of the shared attitudes, values, practices, and goals as well as being deeply rooted in long-held beliefs and customs (FM 22-100 1999: 3-14). American military culture is learned via socialization training (boot camp, officer candidate school or the Military Service Academies); it is broadly shared by its members (i.e. saluting); it is adaptive to changing conditions (integration of minorities and acceptance of women and homosexuals into its ranks); and it is symbolic in nature (rank, vernacular in military contexts) (Dunivin 1994: 533).

From the first day of a warfighter's induction into the American military, each one is responsible for building a bond of cohesion strongly within the framework of the hierarchy of rank, chain of command, required duties within his or her unit, and the proud tradition of customs and courtesies (U.S. Army 2009: 162).

2-19. American military culture is fundamentally historical in nature where each warfighter reveres the history of their branch of service (Army, Navy, Marines, Coast Guard, and Air Force) —especially their combat history. They preserve the American military’s cultural memory through ceremonies and through customs (FM 7-21.13 2003: 2-2). Each branch of the Armed Forces has a myriad of well-established customs still in use today (U.S. Army 2009: 129), some of which have been handed down from early in the Nation’s past while others are of comparatively recent in origin (FM 7-21.13 2003: 4-1).

Often it is these customs and traditions, strange to the civilian eye but solemn to the soldier, that keep the man in the uniform going in the unexciting times of peace. In war they keep him fighting at the front. The fiery regimental spirit fondly polished
over decades and centuries possesses him in the face of the enemy. [The soldier] fights for the regiment, his battalion, his company, his platoon, his section, his comrade (FM 7-21.13 2003: 4-1).

This worldview may seem strange as most Americans who are not in the military get their war experiences from television, news, and movies (Gabriel 1987: 14). It could also be the result of interpreting the customs of the American military in terms of one’s own cultural background (Taylor 1976: 317)—or a combination thereof. In the anthropologist’s attempt to understand American military culture in the context of the Global War on Terrorism, it is important to recognize the cultural divide between the tiny minority of the American populace who serve in uniform and the vast majority who do not (Gegax and Thomas 2005: 1). It is this divide which facilitates the isolation of the American military from the rest of society (including academia) (Gegax and Thomas 2005: 1) and contributes to the development and evolution of American military culture. One of the reasons this cultural divide exists is because the Global War on Terrorism is not a national effort. In the years since the end of the Vietnam War, the American military has included only 0.5% of American households (Lewis 2007: 377) and less than one percent of the American people have served in uniform since September 11, 2001 (Gegax and Thomas 2005: 1; Lewis 2007: 377). This isolation contributes to a distinct American military culture and has even contributed to American military culture having a vernacular of its own (Fennel 2008: 1). This vernacular is often spoken in acronyms and other idiosyncratic terms (Hall 2011: 9), which many civilians have a difficult time understanding. The challenge of understanding idioms and slang in an unfamiliar culture can be a challenge to any anthropologist (Hall 2011: 9) and American
military culture is no different; if anything, the challenge of the American military vernacular is rendered even more difficult if one is attempting to understand American military culture in the context of a combat environment. Thus, for someone to understand the American military in every context, it is important to have interactions with American military personnel before, during, and after a unit deploys overseas.

2-20. The American military offers an incredible richness in culture which includes history, formality, and tradition (Harrell 2003: 2). Cultural continuity (Honigmann 1963: 321-322) is ensured as these attributes are passed down from one generation of American warfighters to the next (MCA 2009: 29). The American Armed Forces is a highly diverse organization and although cultural, religious and ethnic diversity are prevalent within the military, the American military is a culture in its own right (Fenell 2008: 1) in that it is a professional fighting force with its own unique system and set of values, ethics, and beliefs (Lewis 2007: 377).

2-21. Even within American military culture, there is organizational culture. The concept of organizational culture is also important because it enables anthropologists to examine differences between each branch of the armed services and between units within the same uniformed service. “Each branch of the U.S. Military has its own definition of culture, sometimes more than one, and each serves critically, well or otherwise, how that branch approaches the problem of culture in its training, doctrine, and operational application” (Lewis 2011: 68). For example, U.S. Army culture (land based) is different from that of U.S. Navy culture (maritime based) (FM 22-100 1999: 3-14), and all military services have differences based upon their histories and experiences. These insights can help explain to anthropologists interested in learning
about American military culture how each branch of the American military addresses vital issues such as warfighting, leadership, and technology, as well as explain why various units may perform differently in roughly the same circumstances (English 2004: 6). Within organizational cultures there are climates. Climate relates to the specific environment of small unit organizations within the larger American military cultural framework (U.S. Army 2008: 58) and comes from warfighters’ shared perceptions and attitudes on what they believe about the day-to-day activities of their unit (FM 22-100 1999: 3-12). Organizational cultures of the American Armed Forces are particularly strong because these establishments have a closed career principle whereby warfighters spend their careers almost exclusively in these organizations (i.e. infantrymen in infantry units, supply personnel in supply units etc.) (Cassidy 2008: 39).

2-22. [American military culture like any] culture is continuous in both time and space (Honigmann 1963: 321-322) and the American military understands this. They ensure [American military] cultural continuity (Honigmann 1963: 321-322) by recruiting and training new members centered on their core mission and requirements that spans many generations of American military personnel (Cassidy 2008: 39). Like other cultures, American military culture is transmitted temporally through social learning where each generation of warfighters learns from the previous generation of warfighters (Swartz and Jordan 1976: 56). The daily life of the American warfighter connects him or her to the past (and future) via the warfighter’s uniform, the military music that begins and ends the warfighter’s day, the way the warfighter salutes, the warfighter’s rank and organization’s history, and the American military values system (i.e. ethics) (FM 22-100 1999: 3-14). These personnel encompass and shape the attributes which form
American military culture. Attributes include but are not limited to: Customs and Courtesies; Ceremony and Ritual; Hierarchy and Rank; Military Art; Military Music; and even Military Funerary Rites.

**Customs and Courtesies**

2-23. American military customs are “those time-honored practices and outward signs of military courtesy that create a formal atmosphere of respect and honor” and courtesies are “the respect and honor shown to military traditions, practices, symbols and individuals” (U.S. Army 2009: 129). Specifically, military courtesies are the outward signs of respect toward the nation, flag, comradeship, military heroes, and fallen warfighters (U.S. Army 2009: 129). One of the most important manners in which warfighters show respect is through the courtesy of the military hand salute (MCA 2009: 29).

2-24. The hand salute is a formal military gesture of respect in which a junior warfighter acknowledges a senior officer by bringing the hand to the brim of the cap or slightly above the right eye. Warfighters salute in greeting, leaving, reporting and other military situations to publicly show respect for officers who are senior to them in rank (U.S. Army 2009: 131). The origin of the military salute is not certain. It is believed to have begun as a gesture to demonstrate that an approaching warrior was not holding a weapon (U.S. Army 2009: 131). The warrior did so by shifting his weapon from his right hand to the left and then raising his right hand to indicate there was no intention to attack (Palm 2009: 29; Estes 1996: 344). During the Middle Ages armored knights raised their helmet visors with their right hand when meeting with a comrade (Estes 1996: 345; FM 7-21.13 2003: 4-3). This practice gradually became a way of showing respect and by 1820, the
motion was modified to touching the hat. Since then it has become the hand salute used today (FM 7-21.13 2003: 4-3).

**Picture 1: Marines salute one another during change of command ceremony**

2-25. In today’s professional American military, saluting is a military courtesy observed by men and women who follow the profession of arms (Estes 1996: 344). In the American military all officers rate a salute from lower ranking warfighters (officer or enlisted). The hand salute is widely misunderstood by many in civilian society who consider it to be a gesture of servility and thus signifies inferiority and subservience between junior and senior military personnel (Estes 1996: 345; FM 7-21.13 2003: 4-3). Saluting however is a two-way exchange between junior warfighters and officers who are senior to them in rank. The salute is initiated by a warfighter toward an officer senior in rank. The officer is then required to acknowledge the warfighter by returning a salute. The salute may also be initiated while walking or marching, but never while running (FM 22-5 1986: 3-6). There is also a time not to salute, such as guarding enemy prisoners of war, training, or under battlefield conditions (Palm 2009: 30). Other personnel who
warfighters salute are civilians such as the Commander-in-Chief (President of the United States), Secretary of Defense, and Congressional Medal of Honor recipients (regardless of the rank). When the *Star-Spangled Banner* is played and whenever the American flag is raised or lowered, it is proper to salute in the direction of the position of the flag or from where the music originates (Palm 2009: 31).

**Ceremony and Ritual**

2-26. All cultures have incorporated ritual and ceremony into their way of life, and the American military is no different. A ritual is the recurring performance of a standardized set of acts which maintain the status quo and/or to achieve specified end states (Hoebel 1966: 478) and a ceremony is a complex set of rituals (Hoebel 1966: 478). American military ceremonies are representative of American military culture’s pride, discipline, and teamwork and are important in developing and maintaining unit pride, esprit de corps, and preserving tradition (FM 7-21.13 2004: C-1). American military rituals comprise of all types including preparations for battle such as group prayer before a combat mission (Van Creveld 2008: 88) and the procession of flag-draped caskets when American warfighters bring home their war dead (Whitlock 2010: 1). Examples of formal American military ceremonies include Dining Outs and Military Balls (events where American warfighters wear dress uniforms and bring guests, usually a spouse or significant other) and Dining Ins (formal events for American warfighters only).

2-27. One example of a formal ceremony is the Marine Corps Birthday Ball. The Marine Corps Birthday Ball is a formal ceremony where both officer and enlisted Marines wear formal dress uniforms (Estes 1996: 444-445). One of the highlights of the Marine Corps Birthday Ball is the cake cutting ritual where the most senior-in-rank Marine present
(usually the commanding officer) cuts the birthday cake with a Marine Corps sword and then presents a slice to the oldest and youngest Marine present while the band plays *Auld Lang Syne* (Estes 1996: 478). The significance of this ritual is the symbolization of the connection of one generation of Marines to the next and the passing of honor, courage, commitment, and tradition in the context of cultural continuity (Honigmann 1963: 321-322). Other formal military ceremonies include the military promotion ceremony. Promotion ceremonies are an important tradition that enables American warfighters to reinforce their core values as well as an opportunity to thank senior and junior leadership who mentored, trained, educated and motivated the warfighter advancing to the next higher rank (Gale 2007: 1).

![Picture 2: Marine Corps Cake Cutting Ritual at a Marine Corps Ball Ceremony](image)

**American Military Culture Hierarchy and Rank**

**2-28.** The history of military hierarchy and rank has existed for thousands of years (U.S. Army 2009: 121). For example Sargon of Akkad had an army that numbered over 5,000 men that was organized into nine battalions and was commanded by a colonel or *gir.nita* (Gabriel 2007: 232-233). The Roman legions also had colonels who were in
charge of a *columna*— or column of warriors (U.S. Army 2009: 121). Like any other culture, the American military requires social organization in order to function efficiently. Ability, responsibility and authority all come together in the form of military rank and hierarchy (Palm 2009: A-6).

The military remains hierarchical and, ultimately, authoritarian (although there is much more give and take, especially in combat units and environments, than most civilians might believe). It emphasizes organizational and collective effectiveness, discipline, and commitment rather than individual rights, prerogatives, and liberties (Goldich 2011: 62).

American military hierarchy starts with the individual warfighter and eventually ascends above military ranks and answers ultimately to the appointed and/or elected American civilian leadership. This includes the Secretary of Defense and the President of the United States (FM 6-22 2006: 2-1). At the top of the military hierarchy are the commissioned officers who hold their grade and office under a commission issued by Presidential authority (FM 6-22 2006: 3-1). Below the commissioned officers are enlisted personnel who do not have a commission but form the backbone of the American military and run its day-to-day activities. Military ranks identify who is in charge, indicating different levels of leadership and responsibility to guide and assist in decision making and problem solving (U.S. Army 2009: 121). Military ranks also provide members of the Armed Forces a legal means to accept responsibility and be equipped with the necessary authority to carry and issue lawful orders (Palm 2009: A-6) and also play a fundamental role in communication between enlisted, noncommissioned officers, warrant officers, and commissioned officers (Regal et al 2008: 25).
2-29. The American military is maintained by a rigid authoritarian structure (Hall 2011: 8) and within this rigid structure, the United States has made great strides to affirm the importance of and equalize the differences in available services between ranks (Hall 2011: 10). This is because while the American military rank structure and system is authoritarian, it is by no means totalitarian. The spread of equality has led more American warfighters to expect to be commanded not by their social superiors but rather led by their social equals (Van Creveld 2008: 101), where billet and responsibility determines who gives orders and who follows orders. This attitude is prevalent in that Western armies often fight with and for a sense of legal liberty and are frequently products of civic militarism or constitutional governments overseen by those outside religion and the military itself (Hanson 2001: 21).

2-30. The most profound change in American military culture, however, has taken place since the end of the Cold War where “the paradigm of long periods of peace interspersed with apocalyptic mobilizations for war, involving the accession of huge numbers of draftees into the force, has been replaced by one of fairly continuous operational deployments” (i.e. the Global War on Terrorism) (Goldich 2011: 63). Since the Global War on Terrorism began, hierarchy in the American military has undergone a transformation, as the military has shifted its focus from conventional warfare to counterinsurgency operations. Rank matters far less than talent in asymmetric warfare (counterinsurgency included) and a few good men (and women) led by an intelligent junior enlisted warfighter can succeed in counterinsurgency whereby hundreds of well-armed warfighters under a mediocre senior officer will fail (Kilcullen 2010: 34). This attitude is especially prevalent amongst the generation of American warfighters since
Despite the American military’s transformation from conventional war to counterinsurgency, rank still has its privileges. There are privileges for higher ranking officers and senior enlisted warfighters. These include parking spots reserved at commissaries (military base grocery stores) for generals, admirals, and sergeants major (senior enlisted rank). A military organization’s commanding officer and senior enlisted warfighter have designated parking spots outside of their headquarters building. During working hours at base barber shops, chairs are designated for officers and senior enlisted personnel. Of course, warfighters of higher rank make higher pay and allowances. That being said, junior in rank military personnel are also afforded privileges. In the Army and Marine Corps, the most junior person in the unit eats first, while senior officers and senior enlisted personnel in the unit eat last (Harrell 2003: 2). Junior enlisted personnel are often given first choice on weapon systems and equipment. Rank, responsibility, and authority in the American military are centered on the understanding there is equality amongst warfighters at the human level whereby one’s status (socio-economic, skin-color, gender) is “neutral” (Hoebel 1966: 310) when one enters the military. There is however a sense of recognition and respect for the differences in rank, responsibility, and authority between junior and senior military personnel. The goal of this recognition is to take care of the warfighters, their families, and accomplishment of the mission.
Military Art

2-32. While writing has only been in existence for a few thousand years, the arts are much older (Van Creveld 2008: 209) and the relationship between art and war goes back almost as far as art does (Van Creveld 2008: 227). [Anthropologists] have insisted on a relativistic approach to culture (which includes art) whereby it should be examined in relation to the cultural context in which it was shaped and what it means to the people (i.e. warfighters) who created it (Taylor 1976: 274). Military art became increasingly prevalent during ancient state-level civilizations and depicted the battles as well as the people who fought them in various styles, including Egyptian tomb paintings and Sumerian steles (Klish 2011: 1). For example, an Egyptian tomb relief illustrates a uniformed military archer and an infantryman (Douherty 2008: 28) and the Sumerian Stele of the Vultures depicts helmeted warriors from Lagash trampling over the corpses of warriors from Umma. The Stele of Vultures also illustrates the King of Lagash fighting from his battle wagon as he leads his warriors into the fight (Roaf 1990: 194).

2-33. Visual commemorations of American warfighters by combat artists are a part of America’s military heritage and its historical patrimony (Klish 2011: 265). Many civilians
are amazed to learn about the longstanding tradition of artists documenting the American military and its warfighters (Klish 2011: 1). The American military has a long tradition in commemorating its history, mission, and warfighters through artistic expression. Today the Global War on Terrorism is commemorated with specific American military artistic organizations and programs where all five branches of the Armed Forces have combat art programs (Kino 2010: 1). Many contemporary paintings on combat art not only include the Global War on Terrorism, but humanitarian efforts by the American military as well. Military combat artists have depicted scenes from contemporary humanitarian operations in Haiti (Kino 2010: 1) to numerous scenes from Iraq (Kino 2010: 1; Klish 2011: 18) and Afghanistan (Kino 2010: 1; Klish 2011: 17). Military art is not just about capturing the lives of American military personnel as it also includes images of the far-away landscapes and indigenous populations who live there (Kino 2010: 1).

![Picture 4: “Graffitied” Jersey Barrier Mural in Iraq](image)

2-34. The combat artist is an American warfighter who combines the tactical eye of a warrior with the creative eye of an artist (Klish 2011: 241; Kino 2010: 1, 2). The American men and women depicted via military art is only a small representation of the
millions of individuals who have served their country. Combat artists have captured American warfighters in every facet of their military experience and just like many other cultures, American military art features the elements from warfighters’ everyday life (Taylor 1976: 274). This everyday life includes training for upcoming deployments, performing everyday chores, relaxing, engaging in battle, recuperating from wounds, and sometimes holding a fallen comrade during or after a battle.

Picture 5: Marine Combat Artist Captain C.J. Bauman

Military Music

2-35. Music is an essential part of the culture of war (Van Creveld 2008: 118) and it has played a significant role in military battles, ceremonies and rituals throughout history. Music has a variety of uses (especially in military contexts) and because of its effectiveness in expressing sentiment and value, it has an impact on those who participate and listen to it (Taylor 1976: 269). Many warriors throughout the world enter into battle to the sound of musical instruments of every kind (Van Creveld 2008: 116).
This is evidenced by a seventh-century B.C. Corinthian vase which displays the image of two rival forces approaching one another as a musician plays to pace the advancing warriors as they march into battle (Lynn 2008: 56).

![Picture 6: Seventh-Century BC Corinthian Vase](image)

The earliest pictorial, sculptured, and written records of musical instruments were used in connection with military activity for signaling during encampments, parades, and combat operations (FM 3-21.5 2003: 1-2). Egyptian, Greek, Roman, and American Indian chronicles and pictorial histories show trumpets and drums of many varieties (FM 3-21.5 2003: 1-2). Early and middle twentieth century examples include the British Army leaving their trenches to the sounds of bagpipes (Van Creveld 2008: 117) and German armored columns blaring *Ride of the Valkyries* during a charge over the Oder River in 1945 (Van Creveld 2008:117-118). In contemporary battles in the Global War on Terrorism, American warfighters on the battlefield incorporate music into combat preparation and actual combat engagements.
During the “shock and awe” phase of Operation Iraqi Freedom in 2003, heavy metal, gangster rap music and American military marching tunes could be heard from a myriad of vehicles blitzkrieging across the desert. Heavy metal and gangster rap music is not traditionally military in nature, but it (as well as military music) was incorporated and used as a stimulant for the already highly anticipated engagement of the enemy as “music induces emotion and communicates feelings and information not easily expressed in speech or other nonmusical ways” (Taylor 1976: 270). This is similar to the manner in how a war dance builds up feelings of aggressiveness before and/or during a battle or how solemn tunes can relax and console at a military funeral (Taylor 1976: 270). Music (both military and non-military) has been used to commemorate battles (i.e. Battle of Fallujah) as well as to celebrate the American Armed Forces in general (YouTube—Fallujah 2007; YouTube—Taliban 2006).
In ceremonial contexts, military music establishes a sense of alertness, urgency, attention to detail, discipline, and confidence (U.S. Army 2009: 129). Examples of this include bugle calls and an adjutant’s call—which indicates the adjutant is about to call a formation of the guard, battalion, or regiment. The *Star-Spangled Banner* pays honors to the American flag when it is raised, and *Retreat* is played when the flag is taken down (FM 3-21.5 2003: 1-2). Other examples of military music include the U.S. Army’s official song: *The Army Goes Rolling Along* (FM 3-21.5 2003: 1-2) and the Marine Corps’ *The Marines’ Hymn* (Palm 2009: 29).

![Picture 8: The President's Own United States Marine Corps Band](image)

Among all military music, “none is so easily recognized or more apt to render emotion than *Taps*” (Villanueva 2012: 1). *Taps* is played by a single bugler (AR 600–25 2004: 23) and was composed in 1862 by Union Army Brigadier General Daniel Butterfield. In 1874 *Taps* was officially recognized by the U.S. Army and in 1891 it became standard at all American military funerals (Villanueva: 2012: 1). *Taps* is
reserved for deceased military or former military individuals (Estes 1996: 356) and it is
an eternal tribute to the fallen American warfighter (Öuten 2009: 1).


Military Funerary Rites

2-39. The ceremony of the American military funeral is a tribute of honor to American
warfighters who have passed away and/or made the ultimate sacrifice in service of the
nation (FM 7-21.13 2003: C-13). The United States Armed Forces established
dedicated military cemeteries by an act of Congress in 1862 (Van Creveld 2008:153)
and like any other culture, American military culture has developed a rich tradition in
funerary and burial rites. These include but are not limited to the grave itself (this
includes either cremation, burial in the ground or at sea), body arrangement (fallen
placed in coffin in accordance with religion), grave goods (fallen’s sword or personal
items), adornment of the body (medals, rank, insignia), and cemetery organization
(Pearson 2008: 5-12). There are a myriad of rituals associated with the burial of fallen
warfighters and these traditions have been around for thousands of years (Öuten 2009:
1).
2-40. The first general mourning proclaimed in America was the death of Benjamin Franklin in 1791 and the death of George Washington in 1799 where the purpose was to pay a last tribute of respect with simple but grand ceremonies of religion (FM 3-21.5 2003: 14-1). American military funerals have musical honors during transfer of a fallen warfighter (Estes 1996: 356). This includes transfer of the fallen’s remains to and from the vehicle (such as a hearse or horse drawn buggy); to and from the fallen’s house of worship (church, temple, etc.); and finally, to the grave and resting site (Estes 1996: 356). Several military funerary traditions used today have been brought forward from the past (FM 3-21.5 2003: 14-1). Familiar attributes of American military funerals include rituals such as the American flag-draped coffin procession, the gun salute and presentation of the American flag to the deceased’s family, as well as memorials to deceased and/or fallen warfighters.

2-41. The custom of the flag-draped coffin began during the Napoleonic Wars when the fallen were carried off the battlefield by their comrades on a caisson covered with a flag (Arlington National Cemetery 2012: 1). The American flag draped over a casket originated during the American Civil War (Oüten 2009: 1). During American military funerals the American flag covers the casket and is placed so the union blue field is at the head of the casket and over the fallen’s left shoulder.
The American flag is not placed in the grave nor is it permitted to touch the ground (Arlington National Cemetery 2012: 1). Instead the flag is folded by the pall bearers (also military personnel or former military personnel) into a triangle where only the blue field and stars of the flag are visible. The flag is then presented to the next of kin (the parents or the spouse of the deceased) usually by the military chaplain (Arlington National Cemetery 2012: 1; Oüten 2009:1). Pallbearers and others who perform duties at a military funeral consider it a privilege to participate as it is a distinct means of honoring fellow warfighters who have served before or who have given their lives in defense of America (FM 7-21.13 2004: C-13).

Picture 11: Flag Draped Coffin for deceased American Soldier
The gun salute reflects the American military custom of firing “three volleys of musketry” over the graves of fallen comrades (AR 600–25 2004: 22-23). The practice of firing three volleys originated when Roman legionaries would shout the name of their deceased comrade(s) three times (Oüten 2009:1). During the American Revolution and Civil War, ceasefires would be called so each side could clear their war dead off the battlefield (Oüten 2009: 1). Once both sides had cleared its fallen comrades off the battlefield, each would fire three volleys to indicate that their dead had been cared for and that they were ready to resume the battle (AR 600–25 2004: 22-23).
Memorial ceremonies are patriotic tributes to deceased comrades (FM 7-21.13 2003: C-11). In recent years, one of the most prominent ways in which warfighters honor a fallen comrade is the battle cross. The origins of the battle cross made its first appearance during the American Civil War (Greatest Generation 2013: 1). After a battle, Confederate and Union military personnel would move through the battlefield and mark the bodies in order to recover them. The most convenient manner to do this would have been a fallen Soldier’s rifle with its bayonet stuck into the ground and his hat placed on top (Greatest Generation 2013: 1). During World War II, Soldiers and Marines would often bury their fallen comrades in shallow graves and mark them by placing a rifle with bayonet fixed into the ground with a helmet on top to indicate the location of a fallen American warfighter—this is now known as the battle cross.

The battle cross has now become a visible reminder of the deceased American warfighter and it contains the following items: the helmet and identification tags which represent the fallen; the inverted rifle with bayonet which indicates a time for prayer as
well as an operational pause in order to pay tribute to the fallen; combat boots which represent the warfighter’s final march of the last battle; and finally a photograph of the fallen warfighter is placed in the center of the cross (FM 7-21.13 2003: C-12). Since the Global War on Terrorism began the battle cross has begun to attract popular attention with numerous units erecting crosses at memorials to honor the fallen. Since most warfighters cannot attend the funerals of their fallen comrades, many military organizations have erected battle crosses in order to provide a means for warfighters to pay tribute to their fallen comrades (Greatest Generation 2013: 1). The battle cross is also depicted on tattoos on the comrades of a fallen warfighter as a living memorial to him or her. Monuments across the United States also have statues and memorials depicting the battle cross.

**Agency**

2-44. The human will is the chief incalculable in war (Liddell-Hart 2008: 151). Like any social or cultural institution, the institutions and individuals in the American military are heterogeneous (Harrell 2003: 10). It is important to understand the American warfighter and how he or she functions individually and as part of a group before, during, and after combat operations (Van Doorn 1984: 35). While American warfighters share common values and beliefs, it is a mistake to view them in a monolithic fashion. As is the case in any cultural group, there are as many differences among individuals within the group as there are differences between cultural groups (Fenell 2008: 1). When an individual joins the American Armed Forces he or she voluntarily enters a lifestyle and environment that is vastly different from American civilian society (Goldich 2011: 62). The purpose of recruit training is to immerse the recruit in military discipline and introduce military
history, custom, tradition, and basic technical and tactical skillsets where individualism is eliminated as much as possible and uniformity is enforced (Van Creveld 2008: 49; Van Creveld 2012: Personal Communication). Individualism should not be confused with individuality (Rapport and Overing 2007: 209). Individualism is a conceptualization of the person or self (Rapport and Overing 2007: 209). Individuality refers to the universal nature of human existence, with individuals maintaining agency in that realm of existence (Rapport and Overing 2007: 209). The minimization of individualism resides in the paradox that even as the American Armed Forces are the front-line guardians of our cherished American Republic and democracy, they do not live in and/or practice democracy themselves (Wertsch 2011: 107). This premise can not only be observed in the authoritarian structure of the chain-of-command but also in its core values of selfless service, namely by putting one’s comrades and mission above one’s self. On the other hand, individuality and agency are left relatively untouched as the warfighter retains his or her own character and personhood no matter how they may express it (individualism) in a socio-cultural context—albeit in a cleaned pressed uniform and a closely cropped haircut!

2-45. To expound on this concept of American military culture and agency, George Patton wrote about the warrior soul where he stated it was the “implausible something” that could be readily discerned by the acts and thoughts of warfighters (Coker 2007: 16). “The warrior soul is what makes war an intensely existential experience” (Coker 2007: 16). The warrior soul is the part of a warfighter’s individuality and is the facilitator of the warfighter’s expression of individualism in the form of the warrior ethos and the warrior code. The warrior ethos is the foundation for the warfighter’s dedication on and
off the battlefield and enforces four tenets: mission first; never accept defeat; never quit; and never leave a fallen comrade behind (U.S. Army 2009: 112-113). The warrior code conveys to American warfighters there is no honor in killing an unarmed person, let alone a child (Coker 2007: 61).

2-46. Today’s American warfighters are composed of an all-volunteer force. Perhaps the most pertinent example of individual choice and agency by these volunteers are the American military oaths of enlistment and office. The first oath under the Constitution was approved by an Act of Congress on September 29, 1789 and it applied to all commissioned officers, noncommissioned officers and enlisted members in military service of the United States (CMH 2012: 1).

2-47. The current oath of enlistment for enlisted members of the American Armed Forces

I, _____, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and that I will obey the orders of the President of the United States and the orders of the officers appointed over me, according to regulations and the Uniform Code of Military Justice. So help me God (Title 10, US Code; Act of 5 May 1960 replacing the wording first adopted in 1789, with amendment effective 5 October 1962) (CMH 2012: 1).

2-48. The current oath for commissioned officers for members of the American Armed Forces

I, _____ (SSAN), having been appointed an officer in the Armed Forces of the United States, as indicated above in the grade of _____ do solemnly swear (or
affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office upon which I am about to enter; So help me God (DA Form 71, 1 August 1959, for officers) (CMH 2012: 1).

Picture 15: Captain Tommy Livoti, USMC Taking the Oath of Office, 01 October 2002

2-49. American warfighters take their oath of office seriously and it is the epitome of agency and freedom of choice. The oath is perhaps the ultimate testament to selfless service to the Nation and to one’s comrades where the individual’s word is his or her bond. The oath is something American warfighters live with daily and it reflects the core values and the warrior ethos in how they live and serve each day in war and in peace.
Common Ground

2-50. Anthropologists and American warfighters have much in common which includes spending long periods of time in the field and attempting to establish rapport with local populations (Simons 2003: 113) and despite today’s sophisticated military technology, nothing can replace the element of humanity in achieving success during humanitarian and/or combat operations (Gabriel 1987: 7). Therefore, it makes sense for the American military to have its personnel trained in anthropology. This is because anthropology is the one social science dedicated to the study of humanity in that it attempts to define and describe human ways of life as they occur in cultures throughout time and space (Swartz and Jordan 1976: 33). Even though archaeology and history (including military history) illustrate that cultures change throughout their existence (albeit at different rates) (Swartz and Jordan 1976: 56) we also know that the ancient warrior was psychologically and physiologically identical to the contemporary warfighter as “he was subject to the same fears and sufferings that have always accompanied military life in whatever age” (Gabriel 2007: 33). Therefore, it is imperative that anthropologists not only conduct ethnographic research on American military culture—but ethnologic research within and outside of military institutions and the people they comprise of. This will provide a holistic anthropological and historical background from which anthropologists will be better able to appreciate the individual and common warfighter and how he or she contributes to the American military as a culture.

The Common Everyday Warfighter

2-51. Contemporary archaeological research has now stressed the importance of examining the fate of the common fighting man in past conflicts (Bletzer 2010: 1) when
examing the archaeological and historical records. The emphasis on the common American warfighter would benefit anthropologists who choose to study the American military and its culture (past and present) and all the contexts (war, peace, humanitarian) in which they exist. Today military historians maximize time spent with warfighters on the ground in order to permit detailed observation of their day-to-day events—this observation increases the military historian’s comprehension of the myriad of battlefield events that otherwise would almost certainly remain obscured (Keegan 1976: 32).

Military history today has a much wider scope than previous generations of scholars granted it. More than simply the story of armed conflict of campaigns and battles, it is the story of how societies form their institutions for their collective security and how those institutions operate in peace and war. It is the story of soldiers and the subculture of which they are a part. It includes the entire range of economic, social, legal, political, technological, and cultural issues that arise from the state’s need to organize violence to preserve its existence and accomplish its national goals (Stewart 2005: 5).

2-52. Military historians now present the history of warfare from the perspective of the common warfighter instead of only the perspectives of generals and admirals, who more often than not, rarely experience the hardships and difficulties present in the life of the common warfighter (Gabriel 2007: 12). Anthropologists would be right to do the same, only approaching the common American warfighter from an anthropological in addition to historiographical perspective(s). Just as anthropologists study the history of cultures they prepare to engage, anthropologists can gain a better understanding of the ways in
which warfare influenced the development of complex states, which will in turn provide useful insights to better comprehend the background of contemporary warfare (Sabloff 2008: 62). They can do so by spending time with American warfighters before during and after deployments as well as studying and learning about American military history and military history in general. This includes but is not limited to the individual warfighter’s family history and how it is connected to the warfighter’s ancestors who (may) have served in the military, especially during armed conflicts.

2-53. War is one of humanity’s great social inventions (Gabriel 2007: 21) and institutions (Hoebel 1949: 390) and so long as war exists, the American military will play an important role in one way, shape, or form—this includes but is not limited to the enforcement of American foreign policy objectives when political and diplomatic mechanisms fail. American military culture is a viable, genuine, living and evolving culture and since “anthropology studies the ways in which cultures persist and change” (Segal 1984: 170) “it is essential that the worldview, the mindset, and the historical perspective of life in the military are understood” (Hall 2011: 4).

2-54. The cruel reality of warfare has grown exponentially more complex and the human element of warfare has not changed; nor is it likely to change (Gabriel 1987: 13). If contemporary warfighters are successful in making cultural connections with host nation populations in the Global War on Terrorism, there is a high probability that these populations will view American warfighters “as people, as individuals and not as generic cut outs of the U.S. military war machine” (Philyaw 2011: 76). Anthropologists are the key to facilitating this goal—and appreciating and recognizing the American military as a culture is the first step to this realization. This realization will assist anthropologists in
not only appreciating the culture of the American Armed Forces but provide a culturally unique insight to the concept of military ethics as well as the history of anthropology and the American military.

**Military Anthropology**

2-55. Although the Department of Defense has no official definition of military anthropology, the following examples are intended to describe three types of military anthropology (Lucas 2009:85). The first is anthropology of the military (MA1) or the anthropological study of military culture (Lucas 2009:85). The second is anthropology for the military (MA2) or human terrain systems (HTS)\(^{21}\) (Lucas 2009: 85). The third is anthropology for the military (MA3) via educational programs (language, culture, regional studies) at military service academies (Lucas 2009: 85). These descriptions (MA1, MA2, and MA3) provide a basic understanding in the ways military anthropology has and/or may be employed in the Global War on Terrorism.

2-56. MA1 is the anthropological study or research of the military itself, or its distinct organizations and/or service subcultures (Lucas 2009: 87). The first known anthropological study of an American military organization was the American Expeditionary Unit during World War I (Hawkins 2003: ix). MA1 is the ethnographic study of the members, organizations, and subcultures of the military (Lucas 2009: 87).

---

\(^{21}\) HTS as identified in this section as MA2 should not be confused with the past Human Terrain Systems program of the U.S. Army. “[The Army’s Human Terrain Systems] HTS is not an applied anthropology program. HTS conducts operationally relevant socio-cultural research and analysis, utilizing [sic] multiple social science disciplines and operational skill sets” (Human Terrain Systems Website 2011:1).
The subject of the military can be tremendously diverse as each military department has its own culture, mission, and structure (Harrell 2003: 3). The purpose here is to understand military organizations and subcultures as the focus of scientific study in the same manner an anthropologist would study any other organization, subculture or society (Lucas 2009: 87).

2-57. MA2 (HTS) is organized into five categories according to Lucas (Lucas 2009: 142). HTS1 provides cultural advice and regional knowledge (including language skills) to military personnel deploying to or while serving in combat zones. HTS2 consists of unclassified cultural databases maintained in the United States. HTS3 conducts cultural espionage and gathers clandestine cultural data for classified data bases. HTS4 carries out forensic anthropology and investigates possible war crimes. HTS5 is charged with the preservation of valuable cultural patrimony in war zones (Lucas 2009:142).

2-58. MA3 has become more robust in the last decade. Since the Global War on Terrorism began, the military has made an effort to examine the consequences of not understanding the culture of the enemy and civilian non-combatants (Fujimura 2003:145). This is important during asymmetric warfare as the culture of the enemy and civilian non-combatants are often one in the same. Today, there are a few anthropologists who teach and conduct their research at military service academies, war colleges, and language institutes and advise these institutions how to increase cultural literacy, promote and enhance foreign language proficiency, and increase the cultural awareness and cultural sensitivities of military men and women serving overseas (Lucas 2009: 7). Programs like Project Minerva (a Department of Defense-wide program) assist in the development of regional study programs for military units
deploying in support of the Global War on Terrorism (Lucas 2009: 7). As anthropology and anthropologists have evolved over the last century, the concept of military anthropology will continue to evolve as well—especially as more anthropologists and archaeologists begin to cross the divide and work with military organizations and personnel.

**Military Anthropology History**

2-59. After America declared war\(^{22}\) in 1917, Mayan archaeologist Sylvanus Morley volunteered his services to the Office of Naval Intelligence\(^{23}\) and has been recognized as the greatest American spy during World War I (Harris and Sadler 2003: 46). Other Mesoamerican archaeologists with experience in Latin America joined Morley and volunteered their services to the Office of Naval Intelligence when America declared war (Brunhouse 1971: 112). Their task was to collect information on German activity in Latin America\(^ {24}\) as the Germans wanted to exploit Latin American antipathy toward the United States and attempt to secretly construct submarine facilities on the east coast of Central America and southern Mexico (Harris and Sadler 2004: 1). The use of archaeology as a

\(^{22}\) On April 2, 1917, President Woodrow Wilson addressed Congress asking for a declaration of war against the German Empire. Just over two months earlier, on January 31, the German government had announced its resumption of “unrestricted submarine warfare” (Stewart 2005: 7).

\(^{23}\) The Office of Naval Intelligence was the most active branch of secret service at the time (Brunhouse 1971: 112).

\(^{24}\) “Less than a year before the United States’ entry into the war, German submarines had visited U.S. ports three times in not-so-subtle demonstrations to the U.S. Navy in their reach capability of their U-boats” (Harris and Sadler 2004: 1). “The U-boat was potentially a war-winning weapon and German submarines had not only ravaged Allied shipping but conceivably could prevent the transport of U.S. troops and supplies to France” (Harris and Sadler 2004: 1).
cover in World War I was not unique to Americans working in Latin America. The British recruited archaeologists for espionage as well. During World War I archaeologists Thomas E. Lawrence and C. Leonard Woolley conducted intelligence operations in Syria while their colleague Gertrude L. Bell conducted intelligence operations in Egypt and Mesopotamia; all three used their academic research as covers (Price 2003: 32). Some scholars took issue with archaeologists serving as spies in World War I and there are scholars today who disagree with the concept of military anthropology and its application in the Global War on Terrorism (Fluehr-Lobban 2003: 9; Browman 2005: 3; Harris and Sadler 2003: 46). These anthropologists cite Franz Boas in his opposition to anthropologists using their knowledge and skills in World War I as a cover for espionage.

**Franz Boas**\(^25\) and the Boas Principle

2-60. Today Franz Boas is considered a brilliant and talented scholar who shaped American anthropology and has influenced all four subfields (Marks 2005: 30; Smedley 2001: 57)—and rightfully so. However, during Boas’ time in American anthropology (especially World War I), there was a significant amount of resistance from the anthropological community to Boas’ radical ideology and the application of his ideas into American anthropology (Browman 2011:11). Boas considered himself both a scientist and a citizen (Lesser 1981:11). As a citizen Boas expressed his personal opinion where

\(^{25}\) The following critique of Franz Boas is not a condemnation of him as a person, or as an anthropologist. The analyst believes that Boas greatly contributed to the field of anthropology and did much more good than harm for the discipline, and remains an example for all anthropologists to follow, including the analyst.
he was opposed to war and as a scientist, he was against other scientists using their profession as scientists in order to engage in espionage to support warfare (Lucas 2009:69). On December 20, 1919 Franz Boas wrote a letter in *The Nation* newspaper. His letter was in response to scientists (specifically Morley; generally, Lawrence, Bell) using their positions as archaeologists for the purposes of collecting information and data for military intelligence organizations.

A soldier [sic] whose business is murder is a fine art, a diplomat whose calling is based on deception and secretiveness, a politician whose very life consists in compromises with his conscience, a business man whose aim is personal profit within the limits allowed by a lenient law-such may be excused if they set patriotic devotion above common everyday decency and perform services as spies. They merely accept the code of morality to which modern society still conforms. Not so the scientist. The very essence of his life is the service of truth. We all know scientists who in private life do not come up to the standard of truthfulness, but who nevertheless would not consciously falsify the results of their researches (sic). It is bad enough if we have to put up with these, because they reveal a lack of strength of character that is liable to distort the results of their work. A person, however who uses science as a cover for political spying, who demeans himself to pose before a foreign government as an investigator and asks for assistance in his alleged researches (sic) in order to carry on, under this cloak, his political machinations, prostitutes science in an unpardonable way and forfeits the right to be classed a scientist (Boas 1919).
Boas’ letter led to his censure by the American Anthropological Association ten days later (Tyrrell 2007: 12).

2-61. Boas claimed that he had recently learned about such activities in October of 1919 (Browman 2011:14), but in fact “Boas had known about this spying and had written his feelings about it to various anthropologists for more than two years prior to this fateful letter. So, it may appear disingenuous of him to write in October 1919 implying this had just come to his attention – if we ignore the possible political strategy involved” (Browman 2011:14). Franz Boas is well-known for influencing twentieth century American anthropology but what is less well-known was his commitment to radical political causes (Bullert 2009: 208).

2-62. To understand Boas’ ideological agenda, we must examine his background. Born and educated in Germany, Boas received a doctorate in physics before immigrating to the United States (Erickson and Murphy 2003: 74). In 1891 Boas became an American citizen (Stocking 1974: 308), yet despite his American citizenship, he had always considered himself a German and World War I was a time of great emotional strain for him (Stocking 1974: 308). In his anthropological research, Boas espoused the idea of cultural relativity: the idea that cultures should be understood from their own perspectives and not judged by the values and morals of outsiders (Lassiter 2009: 18). In World War I America, Franz Boas was the ultimate outsider26 in that he was an anti-American intellectual with pro-German cultural affection and loyalty to the German

---

26 Boas considered himself German and he was in America to promote German culture, values, and morals in America (Cole 1999: 280).
nation-state (Cole 1999:280; Browman 2005: 3). Boas’ letter to *The Nation* was influenced more by his pacifism and loyalty to Germany rather than scientific principle. Furthermore, Boas’ scientific judgment was clouded by his anger and outrage with Office of Naval Intelligence archaeologist-spies in their efforts to defeat Germany during World War I (Lucas 2009: 53). It is here that Boas “sounded a lofty tone of righteous indignation, decrying what he considered to have been the prostitution of science” (Harris and Sadler 2003:284).

2-63. To understand the reasoning behind his letter, it is very important to know that Boas believed American Soldiers\(^ {27}\) were nothing more than cold-blooded murderers (Lucas 2009: 90). Therefore, we must not “dignify his elitist, smug, and condescending moral judgments of classes of people including Soldiers” (Lucas 2009: 74) as ethical or scientific principle but instead recognize Boas’ letter was a reflection of his personal and political ideology. Ironically Boas’ condemnation of such a diverse range of activities was not only anti-relativistic but a “grave disservice to science” (Lucas 2009: 53) as well. Boas grouped all American warfighters (and did so without an anthropological study) as cold-blooded murderers in that he assumed there were moral distinctions dividing scientists and warfighters, with the former somehow being morally superior to the latter (Tyrell 2007: 3). Even more ironic was the fact that, during his later years, Boas used his authority to facilitate “radical political-social transformation” in American anthropology (Bullert 2009: 208) which still influences American anthropology departments today (Erickson and Murphy 2003: 74). Boas combined anthropological

\(^{27}\) Soldier, Marine, Airman, Coast Guardsman, and Sailor are capitalized when referring to those who serve in the American Armed Forces.
method and theory with a radical political perspective in order to “professionalize” North American anthropology; this established the foundation for twenty-first century anthropological ethics and this based on Boas’ control of anthropology and his distaste for science being used as a cover for espionage (Tyrrell 2007: 2).

2-64. It is very important to note that in the course of World War I Boas emphasized his political agenda via anthropology and committed treasonous acts while trying to expose American archaeologists serving as spies for the Office of Naval Intelligence to foreign governments and officials (Harris and Sadler 2003: 287). Boas no longer considered Lawrence, Bell, and others like them as scientists (Harris and Sadler 2003: 284). Indeed, using one’s profession as a cover for spying certainly has the potential to cause moral dilemmas and compromises—which are true for all professions in any context, especially war. The context of war and the obligation to serve one’s country required Boas’ colleagues to become Soldiers (Sailors in Morley’s case) as well as scientists. This context and the cultural relativism of the environment and realities present during war was not, unfortunately, considered by Boas when he publicly denounced those colleagues who were attempting to win a war against Boas’ German comrades in Europe. Despite Boas’ bias and prejudice, he emerged as the victor in controlling early 20th century anthropology and “he took advantage of his power base and rewrote the history of anthropology, giving no quarter to his institutional competitors” (Darnell 2001: 11, 33, 35). The rewriting of the intellectual history of our discipline by the victors is known as unreflexive presentism (Browman 2011: 1). Because of the rewriting of

28Boas wrote letters to colleagues in Mexico in order to expose archaeologists John Alden Mason and William Hubbs Mechling who were conducting operations in Mexico (Harris and Sadler 2003: 285, 287).
anthropological history, modern anthropology has continued to be influenced by Boas’ ideology and his version of anthropological ethics. Boas’ contempt for the Soldier and his condemnation of the scientist as spy has resulted in American anthropology’s aversion for and distrust of the military (Tyrrell 2007:12). This aversion and distaste for the military has evolved into the Boas Principle (Lucas 2009: 93).

2-65. The Boas Principle considers the Department of Defense and intelligence agencies moral abominations—thus any anthropologist who works for these organizations in any capacity (even with good intentions) is morally and ethically invalid and may no longer consider himself or herself a scientist (Lucas 2009: 93). Boas’ sentiments are “one-sided, stereotypical, and generally unworthy of so eminent and accomplished social scientist”; moreover “his laudatory moral assessment of science itself is highly idealized and we now know from numerous sociological and historical studies it is deeply flawed” (Lucas 2009: 53). Scientists are human beings who are driven by their sense of patriotism (or lack thereof) like everyone else.

29This aversion and distaste originate from the end of World War I and was reinforced during Vietnam and the Cold War (Tyrrell 2003:12).

30 Includes the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, Coast Guard, service Academies, War Colleges, Reserve Officer Training Corps Units, Defense language institutes (Lucas 2009: 93).


32 As a result of Boas’ letter to The Nation, he was censured by the American Anthropological Association (Price 2008: 1). “The entire AAA Executive Board at the time realized the 1919 letter was not an astonished discovery or sudden concern about intellectual integrity, but part of a series of political agendas by Boas” (Browman 2005: 3).
Scholars (e.g. Lucas 2009; Tyrrell 2007; Browman 2005; 2011; Bullert 2009; Harris and Sadler 2003) have demonstrated that Boas was politically motivated as opposed to being firmly grounded in objective scientific principles. Despite the obvious context of Boas' bias, contemporary anthropologists have used Boas (and his letter) to justify the condemnation of applying military anthropology in the Global War on Terrorism. This has led to a flawed ethical basis that unjustly repudiates military anthropology. A closer reading of Boas’ 1919 letter revealed that he did not come right out and say that science must not be used for harm during times of warfare or that using anthropological skills or knowledge in the context of war was necessarily wrong (Price 2008: 16). Boas also never stated that anthropologists should avoid working for military and intelligence agencies (Price 2008: 16). Rather he paved the way for future critiques (via the Boas Principle), which became ethical impasses related to military anthropology (Price 2008: 16). Boas’ political and ideological bias has been used to bring cases against military anthropology, (Browman 2005:3). One such "case" is Project Camelot.

Project Camelot and Unreflexive Presentism

Project Camelot was conducted in 1967 in Chile in order to measure Chileans’ inclination to communism via questionnaires provided by social scientists. Project Camelot outraged some in the anthropological community because some social scientists had been providing cultural information for the American war effort in Vietnam (Harris and Sadler 2003: 317). The American Anthropological Association’s Commission on the Engagement of Anthropology with the U.S. Security and Intelligence Communities (CEAUSSIC) report used Project Camelot as an historical example in

______________________________
order to oppose the application of military anthropology in the Global War on Terrorism. This example however is not historically accurate (Lucas 2009: 56). Project Camelot was created by the Army’s Chief of Research and Development where research was delegated to the American University in Washington D.C. (Fluehr-Lobban 2003: 8).

“Project Camelot was commissioned to determine the feasibility of developing a general social systems model which would make it possible to predict and influence politically significant aspects of social change in the developing nations of the world” (Horowitz 1967: 5). Project Camelot was never classified or secret and it was never designed to conceal U.S. Army sponsorship (Fluehr-Lobban 2003: 8). “Although Camelot was not a classified project and Chile was not one of its primary research sites, the research design caused an immediate outcry from American and Latin American social scientists, the State Department, and the press” (Wakins 1992: 28). There was no spying or clandestine research in Project Camelot (Lucas 2009:60) and there was in fact, only one anthropologist involved with the project as most of the social scientists involved in the research were sociologists and psychologists, not anthropologists (Fluehr-Lobban 2003: 8). There is no evidence of Camelot conducting malicious acts or its social scientists (including the one anthropologist) having engaged in unethical practice as defined by codes of conduct during that time or since (Lucas 2009: 62).

33 The anthropologist in question was Assistant Professor Hugo Nuttini (Lucas 2009: 59). Nuttini was retained in a limited and decidedly informal capacity as an outside consultant with a modest honorarium of $750, charged to explore the feasibility of cooperating with social scientists in Chile on the project, (Lucas 2009: 59).
2-68. Even though Camelot was never an anthropological endeavor and was not in conflict with Boas’ objection to scientists serving as spies, Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban states that, without the Camelot affair, no statement regarding ethics would have been forthcoming from the American Anthropological Association (Fluehr-Lobban 2003: 10). The American Anthropological Association states that: The international reputation of anthropology has been damaged by the activities of individuals…who have pretended to be engaged in anthropological research while pursuing other ends. There is good reason to believe that some anthropologists have used their professional standing and the names of academic institutions as cloaks for the collection of intelligence information and for intelligence operations (Fluehr-Lobban 2003: 9).

2-69. Fluehr-Lobban goes on to state that because of Project Camelot, Boas was justified and his actions during World War I are vindicated (Fluehr-Lobban 2003: 9; AAA-1 2005: 1). Using unreflective presentism, Fluehr-Lobban attempted to associate Project Camelot with actions that never took place with a large group of anthropologists who did not exist. Fluehr-Lobban’s above analysis is inaccurate in that she cites Project Camelot as vindicating Boas even though, through her own admission, Project Camelot did not violate anything Boas had criticized during World War I. Moreover, Project Camelot never violated the American Anthropological Association’s 1967 statement on ethical behavior in that the project did not ask anyone (anthropologist, sociologist, psychologist) to collect information for the purposes of intelligence or participate in intelligence operations. There is no evidence that anyone involved with Project Camelot was expected or authorized or expected to do so (Lucas 2009: 61). The fear of a “Camelot fiasco” refers to the public scrutiny and subsequent cancellation of Camelot,
but not to its existence as a research project (Wakins 1992: 60). Camelot was an applied social science (not anthropological) endeavor whose goal was to assist the United States government in developing stability and security in third world countries (Wakins 1992: 60-61). “If Boas’ position on such matters even requires ‘vindication’, it would not be forthcoming from the details of this incident” (Lucas 2009: 61).

2-70. Boas’ goal was to professionalize anthropology as a science (Tyrell 2007: 3) within his own ideological agenda. “As such, anthropologists must meet the ‘highest ethical standards’ held for scientists including their expulsion for certain ‘heretical’ acts of which ‘spying’ is amongst the worst” (Tyrrell 2007: 3). “One point that is crucial to note is that certain key words are used in opposition to ‘ethics’ – ‘spying’, ‘deception’, and ‘falsification’ stand out in particular” (Tyrrell 2007: 3). Whether you agree or disagree, arguments within anthropology about the roles and responsibilities of anthropologists conducting applied work are based on the idea that conducting applied anthropological (or archaeological) investigation or work must fall under certain ideological and methodological positions (Green 2006: 119). The dichotomy between academic and applied anthropology has resulted in many academic anthropologists regarding applied anthropologists with contempt (Gow 1993:381). This dichotomy is even more pronounced in the context of applying military anthropology in the Global War on Terrorism. “Accepted critiques within the social sciences, and within anthropology have exposed the fallacy of seeking, and trying to represent objective truth and the false promise of scientism, while explicit alliance with certain political positions equally compromises any claims to, if not truth, an honest presentation of research findings” (Green 2006: 119). This has led to the Boas Principle in that for one to practice
anthropology, one must follow an ethical policy based on anti-war ideology and historical fiction. While there are many anthropological and archaeological professional organizations with ethical codes, some may choose to follow the Boas Principle while others may not. Due to the myriad of anthropological and archaeological professional organizations and their subsequent ethical codes the ethically conscious anthropologist must decide on which code to follow—but which one is best?

Ethics: Professional Organizations and the Military

2-71. The purpose of establishing of a code of ethics was to codify fundamental ethical principles that Western archaeologists should follow in their day-to-day research and field work (Hamilakis 2007: 21). When it comes to ethical codes in anthropology and archaeology, there are “attempts to establish abstract universal applicability” (Hamilakis 2007: 22). This however is not possible as there are many professional organizations that have many ethical codes, and more often than not, they are not always in sync with each other. There are no list of rules or regulations that could ever be detailed enough to cover every possible situation and every possible action (Imiola and Cazier 2010: 15). This is especially true during times of war.

2-72. The American Anthropological Association and the Society for American Archaeology provide ethical guidelines for anthropologists and archaeologists to follow when conducting their research (e.g., how to work with stakeholders and how findings should be distributed to the public) (Riggs 2007: 84). Should archaeologists and anthropologists choose one set of ethics or follow all anthropological codes of ethics? This is the challenge anthropologists and archaeologists face (Riggs 2007: 85). Is adhering to one code better than another? Who decides which code is best and for
whom? On one subject, one ethical code is specific, while on that same subject, another ethical code is less specific. For example, “scientific research is often at odds with respect for other cultures” (Riggs 2007: 85). According to the American Anthropological Association’s Code of Ethics, anthropologists have ethical obligations first and foremost to the people, species, and materials they study and to the “people with whom they work, and these obligations can supersede the goal of seeking new knowledge” (Stone 2005: 208). The American Anthropological Association makes it clear that the people being studied take precedence (Riggs 2007: 85-86). However, the Society for American Archaeology’s Principles on Ethics does not even address the issue of putting these subjects first (Riggs 2007: 85-86). Even if it did, but differed in its intent or perspective, which ethical code would take precedence for the practicing archaeologist?

2-73. While an archaeologist who is anthropologically trained could just as easily turn to the American Anthropological Association’s prioritizing of the people and materials being studied if another ethical code is too vague, this example draws attention to the fact that it is unrealistic to expect a code of ethics based on generalities to provide solutions to the vast range of issues that exist in the real-world (Groarke and Warrick 2006: 164). Instead there should be an ethical platform which provides anthropologists and archaeologists an opportunity to employ their skillsets in accordance with the situation after it is identified, assessed, and therefore can be properly (and ethically) addressed (Groarke and Warrick 2006: 164). “Archaeological ethics are overburdened with statements, guidelines, codes and standards: the relationship of these dreary documents to archaeological praxis is very often a vague and formal one, and almost invariably unreflexive” (Moshenka 2008: 163). “Only after seeking objective knowledge
can the anthropologist even begin an informed assessment of the relative threats of the courses of action recommended by the competing ethical platforms” (Stone 2005: 208). Switching back and forth from one ethical code to another in order to ensure no one code is violated is unrealistic. War is a human driven activity that is fluid and unpredictable. Therefore, flexible and situational-based ethical paradigms are required in order for an anthropologist to operate effectively in a real-world context—especially on the battlefield.

2-74. Thus, anthropological ethical codes composed in theoretical black and white ignore the real-world (applied) gray (Stone 2005: 208). Nothing in life is black or white, especially during times of war. Too frequently during war the best choice for a military member is often still a bad choice (Rhodes 2009: 3). “If the moral authority of anthropology depends, as some claim, on its capacity to grasp social and cultural reality, it is possible that anthropological inquiries overly obedient to moral constraints may, paradoxically, undermine the moral authority of the discipline, since moral agendas run the risk of limiting our capacity to study and to understand certain aspects of this reality” (Stoczkowski 2008: 350). There has to be a commonsense approach to a situation as it arises, and a black or white ethical approach based on a zero-defect mentality does not offer a solution, especially in a real-world context such as warfare. Applied anthropological issues in the real-world are situational and should be approached and considered on a case-by-case basis (Nicholas and Hollowell: 2007: 73).

2-75. Since the Global War on Terrorism began, American military leadership has been reaching out to the anthropological community for help in order to better understand the
[asymmetric] battlefield (Serrato, Laporte, and Dhanju 2009: 24). Yet many American anthropologists have not only neglected the American military—they have also condemned it (Tyrell 2007: 12). Despite the military’s request, the Boas Principle has become the basis for opposition to military anthropology, especially in the Global War on Terrorism. The idea (from individuals within the anthropology community) that there is either the military or ethics is a false dichotomy and is unfair to military organizations and personnel (Toner 2003: 1). This dichotomy falls back to Boas’ 1919 categorization of the so-called pure scientist versus the impure non-scientist and thus creates an “us versus them” dichotomy (Tyrell 2007: 8). This is an artificial dichotomy (Toner 2003: 1) which forces anthropologists into two camps within anthropology.

In a discipline which has minimal presence outside the ivory towers of established universities, the majority of those identified as anthropologists or who identify themselves as such, are part of a tiny group of academics employed within an elite university sector. Such individuals continue to practice what those in the established profession recognize as “anthropology”; occasional, if extended, periods of field-based research and the production of articles and books oriented towards a community of specialists pursuing questions of theoretical interests to anthropologists. However not all anthropologists confine themselves to this kind of anthropology. Individuals also do other kinds of social research work; they do so for different audiences (Green 2006:119).

2-76. Different audiences include civil, military, and intelligence organizations currently operating overseas. “Unless codes of ethics and practice are in a constant state of revision and negotiation, the dangers of solidification, stagnation, and ethical complicity
are always present” (Hamilakis 2007: 22). There needs to be plausible alternatives that will address pressing ethical issues in the real-world (such as war and armed conflict) and avoid the types of codification that result in inaction and stagnation (Hamilakis 2007: 22). “But what is the alternative? Should we subject anthropological investigations only to epistemological constraints? Would it be possible to consider all knowledge about human beings equally worthwhile, provided that it meets some epistemological criteria, independently of the uses it can be turned to” (Stoczkowski 2008: 350)? Does a plausible alternative exist? The answer to these questions requires an ethical framework that addresses the legitimate concerns of anthropological organizations yet recognizes the realities of the asymmetric battlefield in the Global War on Terrorism. One conceivable plausible alternative—at least in wartime contexts—is military ethics. Like applied archaeology, military ethics is an applied science (Rhodes 2009: 19).

Military Ethics and Just War Theory

2-77. Ethical codes are limited because they do not cover every possible ethical situation or dilemma (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2006: 116). It seems that ethical codes are primarily concerned with what not to do instead of focusing on action to promote positive outcomes (Scarre and Scarre 2006: 3). That said there is never a good reason to ignore ethics especially during times of war (Rhodes 2009:3, 4). Military ethics apply to all warfighters in every situation (Rhodes 2009: 4). This is especially true in the Global War on Terrorism and the military’s global counterinsurgency efforts. The

---

34 Counterinsurgency is defined as those military, paramilitary, political, economic, psychological, and civic actions taken by a government to defeat insurgency (Petraeus, Amos, and Nagl 2007: 383). Insurgency is defined as an organized movement aimed at the overthrow of a constituted government through the use of subversion and armed conflict (Petraeus, Amos, and Nagl 2007: 385).
ethical challenges posed in a counterinsurgency environment require all warfighters’
attention and action (Petraeus, Amos, and Nagl 2007: 251). This statement from the
Counterinsurgency Field Manual exemplifies the efforts of the American military in the
enforcement of a robust ethical standard in every context on the battlefield. The
Counterinsurgency Field Manual has implied ethical principles throughout its pages
(Perez 2010: 59). These applied ethical implications in the Field Manual ensure that the
warfighter understands how to assess a situation and how to competently carry out his
or her actions (Rhodes 2009:1). “Wars as awful as they are would be worse in the
absence of military ethics” (Rhodes 2009: 1).

2-78. Just war theory\(^{35}\) forms the foundation for American military ethics. Just war
theory was developed over the centuries in order to clarify when war or military action
was justified for nation-states (Hartle 2004: 94). That said there are principles of just war
theory that are generally agreed upon. The principles are *jus ad bellum* (the initiation of
war); *jus in bello* (the conduct of war) (Hartle 2004: 96); and *jus post bellum* (the
responsibility and accountability of warring parties after the war) (Moseley 2009: 1). *Jus
ad bellum* or the right to fight concerns the morality of going to war (Guthrie and Quinlan
2007:11). *Jus in bello* or how to fight concerns the morality of what is done within war
and how it is to be waged (Guthrie and Quinlan 2007: 11). For the purposes of this
section, *jus ad bellum* and *jus post bellum* will not be discussed as this section is
focused on the ethics of how military anthropologists conduct themselves during
operations, more specifically, in counterinsurgency situations.

\(^{35}\)Just war theory deals with the justification of how and why wars are fought (Moseley 2011: 1).
2-79. *Jus in bello* encompasses two important considerations during the conduct of war. The first consideration is proportionality, which applies at the micro level in the conduct of military operations. All force applied during an operation must be proportional to the goal or objective of the operation (Hartle 2004: 97). Proportionality considers the lives of our own military, non-combatant civilians, enemy prisoners of war, and even the lives of the enemy (Guthrie and Quinlan 2007: 14). The second consideration is discrimination, in that combatants are never to target noncombatants (Hartle 2004: 97) or deliberately attack the innocent (Guthrie and Quinlan 2007: 14).

2-80. Military ethics are by no means infallible and are subject to the same analysis and critique as other ethical codes. Military ethics applies to the real-world environment of war and has developed courses of actions that help guide warfighters for present and future conflicts (Rhodes 2009:2). Within military ethics, deontological ethics, virtue ethics, and utilitarian ethics are often identified as one of the three primary moral options between which individuals can choose (Surprenant 2010: 165). When it comes to military ethics (as well as the analyst’s own ethical dilemmas during actual combat operations), the analyst asserts that it is not a choice of one but a combination of all three. Within this combination, one ethical construct may be applied more robustly than others. It will “depend on the situation” (King 2004:15).

**Virtue Ethics and Military Core Values**

2-81. “Character is merely virtue in action” (Toner 2003: 8). Virtue ethics are based on character and trust and do not place codes or rules as the priority (Scarre and Scarre 2006: 8). That being said, virtue ethics does not discount the idea of deontological or utilitarian ethics. For in order to be virtuous in your profession, you have to be a virtuous
person first (Scarre and Scarre 2006: 4). Virtue ethics follows along the same concept of what the military refers to as core values. Military core values are custom-made versions of virtue ethics for members of the military. Ultimately, core values are about an individual putting the needs of others above the individual’s own needs. In the Air Force its "service before self"; in the Army it’s called "selfless service"; and in the Navy and Marine Corps it’s called commitment" (Toner 2003: 2). Army core values include principles, standards, and qualities considered essential for Soldiers and are fundamental to Soldiers and Army civilians making the “right decision in any situation” (FM 6-22 2006:4-2). Marine Corps core values are the values that form the heart of

36 Since most military anthropology will be conducted with ground troops, I will only include Army and Marine Corps core values. This is in no way a dismissal or disrespect of the U.S. Navy, Air Force, or Coast Guard, who have similar core values and standards.

37Loyalty: Bear true faith and allegiance to the US Constitution, the Army, your unit, and other Soldiers. Duty: Fulfill your obligations. Respect: Treat people as they should be treated. Selfless Service: Put the welfare of the nation, the Army, and your subordinates before your own. Honor: Live up to all the Army values. Integrity: Do what’s right—legally and morally. Personal Courage: Face fear, danger, or adversity both physical and moral (FM 6-22 2006: 4-2).

38Honor: the quality that guides Marines to exemplify the ultimate in ethical and moral behavior; never to lie, cheat, or steal; to abide by an uncompromising code of integrity; to respect human dignity; to have respect and concern for each other. Courage: The mental, moral, and physical strength ingrained in Marines to carry them through the challenges of combat and the mastery of fear; to do what is right; to adhere to a higher standard of personal conduct; to lead by example, and to make tough decisions under stress and pressure. Commitment: The spirit of determination and dedication within members of a force of arms that leads to professionalism and mastery of the art of war. It leads to the highest order of discipline for unit and self; it is the ingredient that enables 24-hour-a-day dedication to Corps and Country; pride; concern for others; and an unrelenting determination to achieve a standard of excellence in every endeavor (MCWP 6-11 2002: 101).
Marine character and provide guidance to meet any challenge (MCWP 6-11 2002: 101). The core values stress the importance of virtue in all aspects of military endeavors and promote living an honorable life on and off the battlefield. These core values can be utilized by an anthropologist or archaeologist working on the battlefield as well.

**Utilitarian Ethics and Consequentialism**

2-82. Utilitarianism (Consequentialism) states that an act is right or wrong based upon the consequences of that action or inaction (Olsthoorn 2011: 81). Utilitarian ethics is an approach to what is universally good and although it is consistent with virtue theory, it adds another important perspective to ethical thinking (Rhodes 2009: 10). This approach does not concentrate so much on the sort of person one ought to be but rather on how one ought to choose how to act. These options may amount to the same thing in some ways, but the emphasis in this approach is in on how to make decisions rather than on how to live well (Rhodes 2009: 10). All military leaders are responsible for everything they do or fail to do as well as their actions and inactions—and the resulting consequences or outcomes. Military Leaders are also responsible for everything those in their charge do or fail to do as well as their actions and inactions—and the resulting consequences or outcomes.

2-83. The main objective in counterinsurgency is to avoid taking the lives of non-combatants (and to persuade the insurgent to denounce violence and return to the political process) and uses the principle of double effect to mitigate if not eliminate the chance of harming innocent life (Olsthoorn 2011: 83). The realities of war, however, make it impossible to always avoid the killing and/or injury of non-combatants. While this reality is sad, the military recognizes that killing, in and of itself, is an evil act. This
principle states that evil acts are permitted if four conditions are met (Olsthoorn 2011: 83). The first condition is the evil act must be morally permissible (Rhodes 2009: 117). The second condition is the positive effect must be proportional to the negative effect (Rhodes 2009: 117). The third condition is that the intention must be good (such as neutralization of the enemy is intended, and civilian deaths are not) (Olsthoorn 2011: 83). The fourth condition is the intended positive effects (the neutralization of the enemy) outweigh the unintended negative effects (civilian deaths), namely, the chosen means should be proportional (Olsthoorn 2011: 83) and that an evil effect must not be intended or desired (Rhodes 2009: 117).

**Deontological Ethics and Military Rules, Regulations and Policy**

2-84. The deontological school of ethics argues that rightness of action is determined by certain rules in place (Chatterjee, Sarker, and Fuller 2009: 143). The military has rules based on deontological standards such as the Uniform Code of Military Justice. “The Uniform Code of Military Justice constitutes a specific body of rules supported by sanctions that apply to the military” (Hartle 2004: 62). Other deontological rules of the military include general orders issued by commanders in specific theaters of combat and garrison. General orders are given by a commander in how his or her organization will implement policy and procedures in accordance with the Uniformed Code of Military Justice and other military rules and regulations. The military is also beholden to international treaties on war including but not limited to The Hague Convention and the Law of Land Warfare. All are deontological in nature and form the rules-based codes that all military members must obey.
Military ethics is an applied science rooted in individual conscience and is in concert with all three ethical schools (virtue, utilitarian, and deontological) (Rhodes 2009:19). Therefore, military ethics as an applied science is an ideal and reasonable alternative for an applied anthropology on the contemporary battlefield and its employment within the Global War on Terrorism.

Military Ethics and Do No Harm

“When did do no harm become do nothing” (Serrato, Laporte, and Dhanju 2009: 24)? Many anthropological ethicists have spent time scrutinizing the consequences of actions by colleagues but not on the consequences of inaction by colleagues, especially when it comes to human life (Fosher 2010: 267). If an anthropologist does nothing about a situation in which he or she can reduce harm or save lives; where does that fall in terms of “do no harm” (Fosher 2010: 267)?

[Do no harm] is, after all, a truism that comes out of medicine, so ‘harm’ is always measured against the current and projected physical state of the individual (Tyrell 2011: Personal Communication).

Anthropological ethics resulted from anthropology borrowing ethical principles from other disciplines in which peer review provides oversight for research methods and practice (Meskell and Pels 2005: 3). “Even in medicine, its utility is in question when it gets applied into a larger social group; say the debate on assisted suicide-it was never meant to be a social code (or, rather, a code applied to a social group)” (Tyrell 2011: Personal Communication). The term harm is itself, when it comes to anthropology is a very relative term. Anthropology’s holistic perspectives (Stone 2005: 198) can be applied in any context, especially asymmetric warfare. Keeping this in mind, there is
little justification in remaining on the sidelines for apprehension in causing harm (Stone 2005: 198). “The principle of beneficence (do no harm) obligates researchers to create procedures and research designs that allow them to accurately predict and assess the risks and benefits of their research and to be both vigilant and effective in avoiding unnecessary harm to their research participants” (Whiteford and Trotter 2008:74). In the art and science of applying anthropology in war, the same applies in accordance with *jus in bello*. This means we must not take action where the harm done is disproportional to the military benefit. Harm is to be applied in relation to all human life, especially the lives and well-being of innocent people (and even the enemy) (Guthrie and Quinlan 2007:14). In all contexts of combat, warfighters must never use more force than necessary (Guthrie and Quinlan 2007: 14).

2-87. One advantage military ethics has in its application on the battlefield are rules of engagement. Rules of engagement are “directives issued by a competent military authority that delineate the circumstances and limitations under which United States forces will initiate and/or continue combat engagement with other forces encountered” (Petraeus, Amos, and Nagl 2007: 387). Actions based on military ethics will “depend” on the situation, location, and operational environment. Rules of engagement tailor how

---

The operational environment is a composite of the conditions, circumstances, and influences which affect the employment of military forces and bear on the decisions of the unit commander. The three major types of operational environments are (1) permissive: the host country military and law enforcement agencies have control as well as the intent and capability to assist operations that a unit intends to conduct (2) uncertain: the host government forces, whether opposed or receptive to operations that a unit intends to conduct, do not have totally effective control of the territory and population in the intended operational area (3) hostile: hostile forces have control and the intent and capability to effectively oppose or react to the operations a unit intends to conduct (FM 6-02 2004: 1-138).
military ethics and actions will be employed in a specific area of operation and recognize that the military ethical code (like other professional and academic ethical codes) is not applicable universally. Rules of engagement assist military personnel in accomplishing their mission within a context of proper application of force, restraint, and civil engagement. Military ethics (unlike professional and academic ethical codes) incorporates rules of engagement in order to provide specifics in respect to different geographical locations and evolving situations when dealing with “gray” issues on the battlefield. As mentioned earlier, the principle of double effect is consumed with mitigating and/or eliminating harm. The idea of the principle of double effect is still in use today, especially when the issue of harm to noncombatants is in play (Rhodes 2009:29). Contemporary counterinsurgency method and theory stresses in its implementation: respect for human rights; uphold security and justice; foster transparency and do no harm (JP 3-24: 2009: VI-17).

Informed Consent, Transparency, and Confidentiality

2-88. “The process of informed consent is one of the most important, powerful, and complex actions embedded in the respect for persons section of research/practice ethics” (Whiteford and Trotter 2008: 65). The Counterinsurgency Field Manual “values freedom of thought, conscience, and activity by espousing the democratic principle of consent” (Perez 2010: 64). In war, gray is more common than black or white. Applying

40Situational understanding is knowledge and understanding of the current situation which promotes timely, relevant, and accurate assessment of friendly (including non-combatants), enemy, and other operations within the battlespace to in order to facilitate decision making and quickly determine the context and relevance of events as they unfold (Petraeus, Amos, and Nagl 2007: 387-388).
anthropology on the battlefield may at times deviate from academic standards of practice due to the reality, circumstances, and uncertainty during military operations. Considering Mead’s support (1942: 13-14) for using anthropology to win the war, there may be times when consent and transparency are not applicable, especially when dealing with the enemy. Toner (2003) provides a poignant example of doing no harm amid the gray and grave circumstances of World War II:

Lying is wrong. But would you lie to a Nazi if you owned a house in Warsaw in 1939 and he knocked on your door, asking if you had seen two fugitive Jews (whom you were hiding in your basement)? Of course, you would lie, for you recognize the importance of the situation, circumstances, or realities. The Nazi knocking on my door in 1939 is not entitled to the truth, and I will lie to him, knowing that a literal-minded devotion to the idea here of the rule ‘do not lie’ will result in the reality of a gross miscarriage of justice— the likely murder of those two Jewish people. I have two duties— one to save the Jews and the other to tell the truth. The rule of truth telling finds exception or exemption in this instantiation (Toner 2003:4-5).

2-89. In situations like the one above, transparency is not always required for any member of the military (including anthropologists and archaeologists who choose to serve with the military). The example above can also be used via analogy to the realities of doing no harm, informed consent, and transparency within the Global War on Terrorism. Take for example a rapid ethnographic assessment conducted by an Army anthropologist working to improve teenage girls’ and young women’s education and health care (literacy, use of birth control, feminine hygiene) in an Afghan village. The
village elders as well as the females themselves consented to the assistance from the anthropologist, however, there are known Taliban roaming the villages who are tasked with stoning any female who receives assistance from the anthropologist. Because of the Taliban threat, the Army anthropologist is justified to work in secret and in a non-transparent manner in order to improve the health and well-being of village girls and women. The Army anthropologist is under no obligation to share her applied work with anyone who does not have the "need to know." She is also under no obligation to tell the Taliban the truth because the Taliban (like the Nazis) are not entitled to nor do they "deserve the truth" (Toner 2003:5). “Secrecy” on the battlefield is called confidentiality in peacetime environments. “Ethical confidentiality procedures are designed to protect the information collected and observed in the course of the research—or in this case, applied anthropological assistance. Ideally, such protection will be supported by law to assure that the data will not be used to harm the person socially, financially, or emotionally” (Whiteford and Trotter 2008) or physically. Under the Afghan village example, the Army anthropologist meets all the criteria for justifying her undisclosed applied work: it is to protect the girls and women of the village from being stoned to death by Taliban gangs; and it was supported by the Law of War, rules of engagement, and mission tasks and requirements, all of which are grounded in military ethics.

Military Ethics vs. Professional Organizations’ Codes of Ethics

2-90. Cultural relativism warns us about the danger in assuming that all our preferences are based on an absolute rational standard—they are not (Rachels 2003: 30). The recent surge of ethical codes has all but eliminated classroom discussions as students assume these codes are absolute and must be followed without question (Colwell-
Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2006: 116). To examine every ethical code in anthropology and archaeology would be a dissertation in and of itself! Instead, the analyst has chosen two popular associations and their ethical codes—the American Anthropological Association and the Society for American Archaeology. As stated earlier, the purpose of this section is not to generate confrontation with the anthropology community (or their professional organization’s positions on ethics) but to foster common ground and create partnerships in applying anthropology and archaeology to solving real world problems in the context of armed conflict.

**American Military Ethics and the American Anthropological Association**

2-91. The ethical concerns regarding harm and human dignity are shared by both military ethics and the ethics of the American Anthropological Association as is recognition of complex and unpredictable environments. The American Anthropological Association code of ethics states that it has a responsibility “to avoid harm or wrong, understanding that the development of knowledge can lead to change which may be positive or negative for the people or animals worked with or studied” (AAA-2 2009). Current military doctrine is clear when it restricts (even when engaging legitimate military targets) the harm it inflicts, thereby sparing civilians from deliberate attack (Rhodes 2009: 103). Counterinsurgency ethics recognizes that in every situation American warfighters must remain faithful to their respective military service and the corresponding standards of proper behavior and respect for the sanctity of life (Petraeus, Amos, and Nagl 238:2007). This would apply to all military members, including anthropologists and archaeologists applying their skillsets during combat or humanitarian operations.
2-92. The American Anthropological Association code of ethics recognizes that “in a field of such complex involvements and obligations, it is inevitable that misunderstandings, conflicts, and the need to make choices among apparently incompatible values will arise. Anthropologists are responsible for grappling with such difficulties and struggling to resolve them in ways compatible with the principles stated here” (AAA-2 2009). The American Anthropological Association recognizes the complexity of anthropological work, and so does the American military. In terms of ethical considerations, counterinsurgency environments are extremely complex. Counterinsurgency doctrine dictates that preserving noncombatant lives and dignity is the priority when conducting and accomplishing missions and recognizes that this imperative exists within a complex ethical environment (Petraeus, Amos, and Nagl 2007: 245-246). The anthropologist or archaeologist working with the military will be subject to adhering to these military ethical standards when applying anthropology on the battlefield.

2-93. Given the American Anthropological Association and American Military ethical standards appear to share a respect for the sanctity of life and avoiding harm, along with the awareness of unpredictable and complex environments, it seems clear the common ground is at least worth discussing and even cooperation between the American Anthropological Association and the American military, with one caveat—that the American Anthropological Association approach and examine military ethics from its “own terms”, and not based on the academic experiences of their members.
American Military Ethics and the Society for American Archaeology

2-94. The American military and the Society for American Archaeology recognize the complex responsibilities regarding archaeological resources, and both take on the same mission in stewardship and preservation. The Society for American Archaeology’s Principle of Stewardship states “it is the responsibility of all archaeologists to work for the long-term conservation and protection of the archaeological record by practicing and promoting stewardship of the archaeological record” (SAA 1996). The military ethical principle of discrimination refers specifically to “sparing religious and cultural sites protected under the laws of war” (Hartle 2004: 97). There are also numerous Department of Defense directives and general orders mandating that warfighters (including anthropologists and archaeologists) preserve and protect archaeological resources on the battlefield. For example, the Multinational Forces in Iraq during Operation Iraqi Freedom enforced General Order Number One which stated the following was prohibited: removing, possessing, selling, defacing, or destroying archaeological artifacts or national treasure (Multinational Force Iraq 2010). Archaeological stewardship and preservation principles of the American military are aligned with the stewardship and preservation principles of the Society for American Archaeology. These similarities can form the basis of partnerships between civilian and military archaeologists in the protection of cultural property in the Global War on Terror.

An Anthropological Military for the Twenty-First Century

2-95. Some cultural heritage professionals may refuse to coordinate with the military on ethical grounds; however, this approach merely provides an excuse for military planners to downplay cultural property concerns and may potentially impede the ability to provide
emergency cultural property conservation assistance (Wegener 2008: 165) to anthropologists and archaeologists serving in the Global War on Terrorism. The American military needs anthropologists and archaeologists to help it understand diversity within and outside of the military institution, and the implications this understanding will have for successful military ventures, especially those that promote peace and understanding across national boundaries (Frese 2003: 149). The resistance to this need has been the accusation by many in the anthropological community that U.S. Armed Forces (and by extension U.S. Intelligence Community) are attempting to militarize anthropology (Forte 2008: 1; Gonzales 2007: 14, 19). However, by reaching out to the anthropological community to better understand cultures in the context of counterinsurgency, military leadership is attempting to “anthropologize” the military (Steir 2007: 1).

2-96. “Anthropoligization” of the military will not only have an impact on military operations but it will also have an impact in civilian society as well. When warfighters leave the Armed Forces, they will apply their anthropological experiences in business, civil service, government, and academia. This will create an educated and more informed group of combat veterans/citizens who understand cultures and the importance of recognizing diversity in an applied real-world environment and will continue to reach across national boundaries beyond a military context in promoting peace and international cooperation. Decision making on the battlefield is often constrained by circumstances that may leave American warfighters (including operational archaeologists) with genuinely no good choices—here the difficult decisions often encountered during war may often be better or worse choices instead of right or
wrong (Rhodes 2009: 20). Considering these realities, who better to guide, assist, and advise military leadership than an anthropologist or archaeologist?

Moving Forward

2-97. The analyst has examined the history and the contemporary state of anthropological ethics not to criticize but to celebrate the choice anthropologists and archaeologists have when applying ethics to their day-to-day work—whether it be in a classroom, a boardroom, a construction site, or a battlefield. In the examination of that history, the analyst wishes to convey:

(1) As human beings, archaeologists possess agency to freely associate and work with whomever they choose. This includes the American Armed Forces in support of humanitarian operations and combat operations. If an archaeologist chooses not to associate with an anthropological or archaeological professional organization—that is also his or her choice. No anthropological or archaeological professional organization, department or professor has legal or canonical authority to dictate how a non-member or student chooses to apply his or her skillsets.

(2) Even if the Project Camelot narrative were true, and numerous anthropologists were on the payroll and secretly conducting operations—that was still the choice of those individuals—and whether or not it “harms” the discipline of anthropology is subject to debate and depends on one’s ideological stance and particular worldview. Furthermore, the analyst maintains that diversity of thought and opinion in anthropology and archaeology is their strength and
anthropologists and archaeologists should not be required to champion only one worldview or ideology (i.e. Boas Principle).

(3) Finally, the analyst self-identifies as a United States Marine who happens to be an archaeologist, not an archaeologist who happens to be a Marine. The analyst chooses to apply his archaeological skillsets in support of the American Military in both combatant and humanitarian contexts with the express intent of protecting the welfare and safety of non-combatants (and even the enemy); the safeguarding and preservation of cultural property; and to stand in unity with and in support of American warfighters serving in the American Armed Forces.

2-98. “Warfare and anthropology have long intersected in fundamental ways when anthropologists contribute their professional knowledge and skills to further military and intelligence endeavors of their nation at war” (Price 2008: xi). If an archaeologist chooses to serve alongside the American Military, then the corresponding ethical standards he or she follows could very well be American military ethics—just as an anthropologist who chooses to work for a corporation, a university, or non-government organization will more than likely follow the prescribed ethical codes as dictated by the aforementioned entities. Does this mean the archaeologist working for or with the military dismisses out-of-hand the ethical concerns of professional organizations? Absolutely not. Applied archaeology goes hand-in-hand with applied ethics. Consideration of other ethical perspectives outside of the military promotes intellectual growth and awareness—and prevents the previously mentioned stagnation. More importantly it can lead to collaborative undertakings with diverse groups and organizations—especially when they share common ethical attributes.
2-99. Archaeology obviously will not stop wars, but it does provide a useful historical context for discussions about the inevitability of war and its role in modern civilization (Sabloff 2008: 60). All ethical concerns regarding applied anthropology during armed conflict should be considered in order to ensure the right actions are taken, on and off the battlefield. Military ethics as described in this essay can be an effective “plausible alternative” for applying archaeology during military operations. Despite any disagreements on ethics and the application of anthropology during war, it is essential for individuals and organizations to recognize similarities and find common ground, no matter how minute, and safely navigate through and beyond the current Global War on Terrorism as well as future military conflicts. Cooperation begins with small steps. Small steps amongst colleagues in and out of uniform who will debate the differences, embrace the similarities, and all work to make anthropology and archaeology relevant in every context—especially armed conflict.
Section 3
Applied Archaeology during Counterinsurgency Operations

Counterinsurgency operations are similar to emergency first aid for the patient. The goal is to protect the population, break the insurgents’ initiative and momentum, and set the conditions for further engagement (Petraeus et. al 2007: 153).

3-1. Wars are often controversial, and the Global War on Terrorism is no different—especially when cultural property and cultural heritage\(^{41}\) are involved. The looting of archaeological sites is one of the most alarming and destructive types of cultural property destruction (Bowman 2008: 1). During periods of armed conflict, the looting of cultural property is not only causing irreparable damage to museums and the archaeological record (Zottin 2008: 236), but it is also generating support in the form of cash and/or weapons to insurgent and terrorist organizations around the world (Charney et al. 2012:1), especially in the Middle East and Mediterranean (North Africa) regions\(^ {42}\). These regions are significant for archaeologists because the Mediterranean and the Middle East have played formative roles in the birth of the discipline and practice of archaeology (Meskell 2001: 17).

3-2. For example, during Operation Iraqi Freedom, looting of Iraq’s archaeological sites proceeded at a rate of destruction estimated at 10% per year (Rothfield 2008: 21). During Operation Enduring Freedom (the war in Afghanistan), archaeological sites were being systematically looted by teams of organized looters and smugglers (this is still happening)

\(^{41}\) Cultural heritage and cultural property include the full range of nonrenewable remains of products of human activity or occupation (GTA 2009: 2). For the purposes of this section, cultural property and cultural heritage will be used interchangeably.

\(^{42}\) These regions have a robust American diplomatic and military presence.
In both cases, looted antiquities and other types of cultural property are funding terrorist and insurgent organizations such as al Qaeda and the Taliban (Russell 2008: 42; Journeyman Pictures 2009: 1).

3-3. As the United States continues to conduct and/or support military operations in regions of its geo-political interests, archaeologists and colleagues dedicated to the preservation of cultural property in areas of armed conflict will be faced with questionable military objectives, complex Department of Defense bureaucracy, and seeming disregard for cultural property protection by military regional commanders and indigenous populations alike (White and Livoti 2013: 199).

3-4. Decades of legislation including current international laws alone are unable to protect cultural property during and after military conflicts (Atwood 2004: 267-268; Ghaidan 2008: 94). Despite this fact, the majority of the international archaeology community has become overly reliant on international laws in the hope that these laws’ mere existence will deter looting and destruction of cultural property on the battlefield. This hope has fallen short as archaeological sites and cultural property in American military areas of operation (as well as other areas of armed conflict) continue to be looted, defaced, and/or destroyed (White and Livoti 2013: 200). This is because the American government and military does not have a clear and inclusive wartime strategy for the preservation of cultural property during armed conflict (White and Livoti 2013: 199).

3-5. This section is written specifically for the archaeologist who wishes to work for the American military during military operations in support of the Global War on Terrorism. This section is not a debate about the validity of war or certain types of war. This section
does however recognize the reality of war and recommends courses of action to mitigate its adverse effects in order to save human life and preserve cultural property. To accomplish this, the section will explore the practice of an applied archaeology in the context of the Global War on Terrorism—more specifically current counterinsurgency efforts in American military areas of operations. This section will examine the following: (1) The contemporary battlefield environments in which the exploitation of cultural property takes place; (2) An examination in how looted cultural property funds and supports terrorist and insurgent organizations; (3) The *Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict* and why and how it needs to be enforced; (4) Three American led military organizational proofs-of-concept and how applied archaeological approaches during periods of armed conflict can save lives and preserve cultural property.

**The Operational Environment**

3-6. Today’s conflicts combine new actors with new technology and transfigured ways of war. The old threats however also remain and have to be dealt with in the same time and space, stressing resources and overloading the systems of American and Western militaries (Kilcullen 2009: 5-6). Archaeologists should always be aware and have knowledge of the environment in which they plan to conduct archaeological investigations. This is important in peacetime environments as well as wartime

---

43 The operational environment is a composite of the conditions, circumstances, and influences that affect the employment of capabilities and bear on the decisions of the commander (JP 3-0 2011: GL-14).
environments; more specifically asymmetric\textsuperscript{44} environments with active terrorist and/or insurgent activity.

3-7. Today’s conflicts are not as clear-cut as they have been in the past. Twenty-first century armed conflict has become increasingly blurred and global stability is no longer determined solely by conventional\textsuperscript{45}, nation(s)-versus-nation(s) (i.e. World War I, World War II) conflict (Mansoor 2012: 12). Since the end of World War II (WWII), insurgency and terrorism have become the dominant forms of armed conflict and will continue to be in the future whereby conventional forms of warfare decrease and the number of terrorist and guerilla organizations continue to grow (Boot 2013: 13). Today the vast majority of conflicts occur inside states rather than between them (Nagl 2005: 222). Irregular warfare\textsuperscript{46} has therefore replaced conventional warfare as the typical form of war in global armed conflict. This includes insurgency and counterinsurgency (Petraeus et al 2007: 2)—which will be the focus of this section.

\textsuperscript{44}Asymmetry is dissimilarities in organization, equipment, doctrine, and values between armed forces (formally organized or not) and U.S. forces. Engagements are asymmetric if forces, technologies, and weapons are different, or if a resort to terrorism and rejection of more conventional rules of engagement are the norm (FM 1-02 2004: 1-15). Insurgents are, by nature, an asymmetric threat and use terrorist and guerilla tactics because they are the best means available to achieve the insurgency's goals (Petraeus et al. 2007: 109).

\textsuperscript{45}Conventional wars are armed conflicts openly waged by one nation-state against another by means of their regular armies (Van Creveld 2004: 1).

\textsuperscript{46} Irregular warfare is violent struggle among state and non-state actors for legitimacy and influence over the relevant population(s) (JP 1 2013: I-6).
3-8. In contemporary terms, an insurgency is an “organized movement aimed at the overthrow of a constituted government through the use of subversion and armed conflict” (FM 1-02 2004: 1-101; Kilcullen 2010: 1). “Stated another way, an insurgency is an organized, protracted, politico-military struggle designed to weaken the control and legitimacy of an established government, occupying power, or other political authority while increasing insurgent control” (Kilcullen 2010: 1; Petraeus et al. 2007: 2). Counterinsurgency, on the other hand, consists of military, paramilitary, political, economic, psychological, and civic actions used to defeat an insurgency (FM 1-02 2004: 1-47). Unlike conventional warfare, counterinsurgency has no front lines or uniformed belligerents. Instead, the insurgent blends in with the local population (White and Livoti 2013: 196). Counterinsurgency is in competition with an insurgency for the ability to win the hearts, minds, and acceptance of the local population (Kilcullen 2010: 29). The two major differences between conventional warfare and counterinsurgency are:

(1) Conventional warfare is an enemy-centric approach with a focus to defeat the enemy (Kilcullen 2010: 9).

(2) Counterinsurgency employs a population-centric approach with a focus to win over the benign and vulnerable segments of the population (Boot 2013: 21; Moyar 2009: 2) whose intent is to identify and eliminate the facilitators of violence (White and Livoti 2013: 196-197).

3-9. Counterinsurgency’s lack of front lines and population-centric focus permits cultural property preservation to play a major role in security, stabilization, and reconstruction

---

47 Members of al Qaeda and affiliated organizations do not wear uniforms, have military rank, conduct drill or render salutes (Cassidy 2008: 152).
efforts during counterinsurgency operations (White and Livoti 2013: 196-197). It will do so by denying the insurgent and/or terrorist a mechanism of funding that has gone relatively unnoticed since the events of September 11, 2001.

**Looted Cultural Property: Funding Source for Terrorist Organizations**

3-10. The best way to understand the struggle between rising third-world insurgencies\(^{48}\) and Western interests is to examine the course of relations in regard to questions of cultural property (Goode 2007: 2). Looting of archaeological sites and the loss of provenance and knowledge is a well-known fact (Brodie et al 2006: xiii)—especially during armed conflict. A less well-known fact is how the illicit trade in cultural property is third in the world after drugs and arms trading and has been connected to terrorism (Bowman 2008: 1). “Funding greatly influences an insurgency's character and vulnerabilities” (Petraeus et al 2007: 19). International law enforcement efforts have frozen the financial assets of terrorist organizations. These efforts have also neutralized the charities that once served as fronts for Islamic supremacist groups thereby cutting off the traditional means of financing for terrorist and or insurgent activities. These actions have forced the insurgent and/or terrorist to adapt and find new mechanisms to support their activities (Bogdanos 2005c:1). As a result, terrorist and insurgent groups rely on looted cultural property as a major funding source for their operations and activities (Charney et al 2012: 1). Unfortunately, the exploitation of cultural property for the purposes of funding warfare is not without precedent.

---

\(^{48}\) Goode uses “nationalist movements” instead of insurgencies. While some insurgencies do have nationalistic origins, many are transnational (i.e. religious) and are having a direct impact on cultural property.
3-11. Before and during WWII, the Nazis stored and/or sold looted cultural property and
treasure in order to finance the Axis war effort and other Nazi activities\(^49\) (Nicholas
officials began contemplating the possibilities for plunder in the occupied territories
(Pringle 2006: 205) as soon Nazi forces launched their attacks in both eastern and
western Europe.

Picture 16: Goring and Hitler examine a looted work of art.

It used to be called plundering, but today things have become more humane. In
spite of that, I intend to plunder, and to do it thoroughly. Reichsmarshall Hermann
Goring, Speaking to a conference of Reich Commissioners for the Occupied
Territories and the Military Commanders, Berlin, August 6, 1942 (Edsel 2009:
VII).

3-12. The Nazis had been preparing years before WWII to loot cultural property whereby
German “scholars” began visiting nations all over Europe and secretly preparing cultural

\(^{49}\) The Nazis also did this for personal gain as well (Nicholas 1994: 34-35; Edsel 2009: 405-406; Eizenstat 1998: 1; Sabian 2011: 1).
property inventories so when the German military conquered each country, Hitler’s agents would know the name and location of every important object of artistic and cultural value (Edsel 2009: 13). As early as 1939 the Nazis were auctioning off looted cultural property under the guise of raising money for German museums. Many of the buyers however, believed proceeds from the sales would actually finance the Nazi party. In the end the museums never saw a penny and the proceeds from the auction were deposited into Nazi accounts in London (Nicholas 1995: 13). Cultural property soon became a major factor in the Nazi economy as everyone with cash—from black marketeers to Hitler himself, sought safe assets (Nicholas 1995: 117).

3-13. In the occupied countries, the Nazis raided museums, confiscated cultural objects and commissioned Nazi archaeologists to loot archaeological treasures (Pringle 2006: 18, 205, 326). Nazi organizations such as the Ahnenerbe SS50 (Pringle 2006: 10; Nicholas 1995: 20) and the Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg (Nicholas 1995: 111; Eizenstat 2003: 187) were created specifically to plunder archaeological sites, museums, artwork, and other cultural objects.

3-14. The Nazis also destroyed cultural property for the purposes of psychological warfare in order to demoralize, terrorize, and subdue the populations of the occupied territories. They fortified numerous cultural and religious sites and burned infrastructure, sometimes for tactical reasons but often did so simply because they could (Edsel 2009: 91). There was an official policy to loot Jewish sites and destroy Jewish monuments,

50 By the late 1930s the Ahnenerbe SS was in complete control of all archaeological research in Germany (Nicholas 1995: 85).
including graves and cemeteries (Edsel 2009: 74, 168). Synagogues were burnt or otherwise destroyed, holy books and scrolls thrown onto bonfires, and the headstones of Jewish cemeteries\(^{51}\) were used as paving stones. Christian shrines were desecrated, and churches were looted and subsequently converted into dance halls, storage rooms, garages, and hay barns (Nicholas 1994: 76). In Axis occupied France, Nazi forces tore down statues of French war heroes (Nicholas 1995: 197) and destroyed national cultural monuments in Poland (Edsel 2009: 74; Nicholas 1995: 74). Some of these cultural monuments were melted down in order to produce bullets and artillery pieces for the Nazi war effort (Edsel 2009: 117; Nicholas 1995: 157).

3-15. As with the Nazis who preceded them, international terrorist organizations such as Al-Qaeda, the Taliban, [and most recently DAESH\(^{52}\)(Islamic State)] are profiting from the illicit trade in antiquities in order to fund terrorist attacks and other activities (White and Livoti 2013: 207). In Iraq\(^{53}\) the illicit trade in cultural property falls just below kidnappings for ransom and mob-style "protection" money extorted from businesses and local citizens (Bogdanos 2008: 124). Insurgents in Iraq are able to do so because there is a virtual limitless supply of cultural property (especially antiquities from museums and archaeological sites) available to them throughout the countryside (Bogdanos 2008: 124).

---

\(^{51}\) In France the graves of American Jewish Soldiers who fought and died in World War I were destroyed by the Nazis as well (Edsel 2009: 168).

\(^{52}\) Daesh is a transliteration of the Arabic acronym formed of the same words that make up ISIS in English: Islamic State in Iraq and Syria, or al-Dowla al-islamiyya fi-il-i'raaq wa-ash-shaam. Daesh is word that most Arab states and many European governments use to refer to the Islamic State or ISIS since the words Islamic and State denote legitimacy to the terrorists who formed the so-called caliphate (Garrity 2015: 1).
Antiquities smuggled out of Iraq every day may be putting tens of millions of dollars into Iraq’s underground economy and providing weapons and funding to terrorists and insurgents (Thurlow 2005: 180-181; Johnston 2005: 1). In 2005, Donny George, then director of Iraq's National Museum, stated that the sale of looted cultural property was helping insurgent groups purchase “weapons and ammunition to use against Iraqi police and American forces” (Becatoros 2008: 1). For example; Iraqi Security Forces and American Marines conducting operations in Al-Anbar Province arrested five terrorists and found them in possession of automatic weapons, ammunition, ski masks, night vision goggles, and more than 30 artifacts looted from the Iraq National Museum (Bogdanos 2007: 730). In the Syrian Civil War, looted artifacts were being traded directly for weapons (Baker and Anjar 2012: 1). The Federal Bureau of Investigation has acknowledged “there is a link between the removal and transport of cultural objects and the funding of terrorism” (Thurulow 2005: 180; Johnston 2005: 1) and INTERPOL has also linked the illicit sales of antiquities to terrorist organizations (McNamee 2010). In 2005, the German newspaper Der Spiegel reported that September 11 al-Qaeda terrorist Mohammad Atta had approached an archaeology professor (Ruiz 2010: 1) at the University of Gottingen in an attempt to sell looted antiquities in order to raise money to buy an airplane (De La Torre 2006: 10). Most recently DAESH has been benefiting from the illicit trade in cultural property and integrated cultural property trafficking into its diverse financial portfolio (Howard 2016: 1). The U.S. House of Representatives Finance Services Committee’s Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing indicated that

54 INTERPOL is the world’s largest international police organization whose role is to enable police around the world to coordinate efforts to make the world a safer place (INTERPOL 2013: 1).
DAESH encourages and profits from the looting of cultural property in the territory it controls (U.S. House of Representatives 2016: 5). Within its territory, DAESH permitted the looting of pre-Islamic sites on an industrial scale and taxed the illicit excavations to raise money for the caliphate it declared in 2014 (Myers and Kulish 2016: 1). It is therefore important to recognize that protecting cultural heritage may not only be an important diplomatic strategy but may also facilitate the fight against global insurgency and terrorism by denying terrorist organizations the ability to profit from the illicit sale of looted cultural heritage (Thurlow 2005: 181).

3-16. Al Qaeda, the Taliban and DAESH (like the Nazis) also conduct psychological operations to demoralize populations they control by exploiting cultural property that does not fit into their narrative of Islamic Supremacy and Sharia law. In 2012 Iraqi intelligence officials discovered a plot by al Qaeda to destroy all pre-Islamic archaeological sites, monuments, and artifacts because they are considered idolatrous and not compatible with al Qaeda’s version of Islam (al-Qaisi 2012: 1). In Afghanistan, the Taliban did this by destroying the Bamiyan Buddhas in 2001 (Atwood 2004: 268; Hegarty 2012: 1) and Ansar Dine (an al Qaeda linked terrorist group) destroyed and or defaced sacred shrines and tombs in the African nation of Mali (Karimi 2012: 1). In 2015 Islamic State militants released a video on showing them destroying priceless antiquities in northern Iraq (Williams 2015: 1). According to DAESH, the Taliban and Al Qaeda these renowned and priceless cultural heritage sites are an affront to their perverted version of Islam.

3-17. Professional looters in many Third World countries make a living in the distribution and sale of looted antiquities (Schiffer 1996: 115). Even in the United States the looting of cultural property (mainly archaeological sites) is common because laws and enforcement policies do not provide adequate mechanisms for protection (Schiffer 1996: 114). In areas of armed conflict this activity is intensified as cultural property is at its most vulnerable state of being looted, damaged, and/or destroyed due to the chaos that takes place during warfare (Bernhardsson 2005: 73; White and Livoti 2013: 197). As a result, the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (the Convention) was established to identify and protect cultural property during times of war (Bernhardsson 2005: 73-74).

3-18. The Convention has roots in the Union Army’s Lieber Code written in 1863 during the American Civil War. The Lieber Code recognized that “cultural, scientific, artistic works and repositories were to be protected during warfare and should not serve as war booty” (Gerstenblith 2008a: 183). The Convention was completed in the wake of large-scale intentional looting and destruction of cultural property perpetuated by Nazi Germany during WWII (Gerstenblith 2008a: 183). Modeled on instructions given by Supreme Allied Commander, General Dwight D. Eisenhower to aid in the preservation of Europe’s cultural legacy, the Convention is the oldest international treaty to address cultural property and heritage preservation exclusively (USCBS 2013: 1). On September

55 Many individuals within the cultural property community support the ratification of the Convention as a tool for protecting and preserving cultural property during armed conflict. The analyst decided to illustrate how the Convention could be employed in contemporary counterinsurgency operations as well as other asymmetric conflicts. The analyst wishes to thank Task Force-South West Judge Advocate Captain Sean Price for providing the idea of including this footnote to the dissertation (Price 2019).
25, 2008, the U.S. Senate voted to ratify the *Convention* (USCBS 2013: 1) and was signed into law by President (POTUS\(^{56}\)) George W. Bush in early 2009. The United States now joins 121 nations in becoming a party to this historic treaty as a signatory (USCBS 2013: 1). These events place the Department of Defense in a decisive position to determine the American military’s future plans-of-action for the preservation of cultural property during periods of armed conflict (White and Livoti 2013: 198).

3-19. Because the *Convention* was ratified by the Senate and signed by POTUS, it has become codified law (similar to a Constitutional Amendment) and therefore obligates the American government and military to meet the *Convention’s* intent. The *Convention’s* intent is “to take all possible steps to protect cultural property” (UNESCO 2013: 1) during armed conflict by way of the articles contained therein. However, ratification has had very little impact to ensure the American military creates and enforces an all-encompassing cultural property protection directive in current (and future) military operations. This is for the following reasons: (1) The *Convention* is a vague document leaving many of its articles subject to broad interpretation on how to enforce it and (2) there has been no attempt to apply the *Convention* from the perspective of a counterinsurgent as the *Convention* resulted from a mid-20th century conventional conflict, not a 21st century asymmetrical global insurgency (White and Livoti 2013: 198).

**Military Necessity**

3-20. While the *Convention* was designed and planned by an international coalition of statesmen and concerned stakeholders, its implementation rests upon military personnel (whose nations are signatories to the *Convention*) who are either planning for and/or are

\(^{56}\) POTUS: President of the United States.
currently engaged in global combat and/or humanitarian operations. Since the
*Convention* was created for military forces it makes sense for the *Convention* to be
applied in a military context. For the American military and the Global War on Terrorism,
the context is irregular warfare, more specifically, counterinsurgency operations.
Therefore, the *Convention*’s intent can be met if it is applied from an asymmetrical
perspective (White and Livoti 2013: 199).

**Article 4, Military Necessity, and Cultural Property Protection**

3-21. Article 4 of the *Convention* states “The obligations of the convention may be waived
only in cases where military necessity imperatively requires such a waiver” (UNESCO
2013: 1). There is no universal agreement on what is meant by military necessity and the
*Convention* is unclear as to what military necessity means (Gerstenblith 2010: 9).
Fortunately, the Department of Defense defines military necessity as the principle
whereby a belligerent has the right to apply any measures which are required to bring
about the successful conclusion of a military operation and which are not forbidden by the
laws of war (JP 1-02 2010: 235). It has been argued that military necessity significantly
undermines the value of the *Convention* (Gerstenblith 2010: 9). This concern has merit
as there have been times in the past where combatant commanders did not make the
distinction between military necessity and military convenience. Simply defined, military
convenience is the conscious effort of military personnel to take advantage of a situation
for the sole purpose of ease and expediency that is not necessary for mission

---

57 See Edsel 2009: One contemporary example of military convenience in the Global War on Terror was
the Marine Corps occupation of Babylon during Operation Iraqi Freedom- an occupation of which the
analyst was present.
accomplishment and or saving human life. Keeping this in mind, it is also important to note that:

The prohibitory effect of the law of war is not minimized by “military necessity” which has been defined as that principle which justifies those measures not forbidden by international law which are indispensable for securing the complete submission of the enemy as soon as possible. Military necessity has been generally rejected as a defense for acts forbidden by the customary and conventional laws of war inasmuch as the latter have been developed and framed with consideration for the concept of military necessity (FM 27-10 1956: Appendix A-1).

3-22. Therefore, in order to ensure the military necessity concept is not taken advantage of by combatant commanders and/or warfighters, the Department of Defense, during times of war issues general orders and rules of engagement to further clarify how military necessity applies in different combatant and other military contexts. This can also apply when it comes to cultural property protection during armed conflict.

Solution: Cultural Property Protection as Military Necessity

3-23. Many of the concerns addressed in the Convention regarding cultural property and military necessity are mainly oriented toward justification in the destruction and/or

---
58 General orders are given by a commander in how his or her organization will implement policy and procedures in accordance with the Uniformed Code of Military Justice and other military rules and regulations.

59 Rules of Engagement are “directives issued by a competent military authority that delineate the circumstances and limitations under which United States forces will initiate and or continue combat engagement with other forces encountered” (Petraeus, Amos, and Nagl 2007: 387).
damage of cultural property during military operations. This is because the *Convention* offers its member states metered guidelines which aim to avoid reckless disregard and destruction of irreplaceable objects that represent national identity and cultural diversity—actions that can be interpreted as antagonistic and increase in occurrences of armed conflict (White and Livoti 2013:198-199). However, Article 4 also states that parties to the *Convention* “undertake to prohibit, prevent and if necessary, put a stop to any form of theft, pillage, or misappropriation of, and any acts of vandalism directed against cultural property” (UNESCO 2013: 1).

When read literally, it seems to impose an obligation on nations to prevent any form of theft or pillage, even if it is being carried out by the local population. However, this provision probably refers only to an obligation to prevent acts of theft, pillage and misappropriation by members of the nation’s own military (Gerstenblith 2010: 9; See Gerstenblith 2006: 308-311).

3-24. While the above statement is one of the “broad interpretations” of the *Convention*, it is not the only one to consider. Article 4 contains two significant statements. To review: The first statement is for the American military “undertake to prohibit, prevent and if necessary, put a stop to any form of theft, pillage, or misappropriation of, and any acts of vandalism directed against cultural property” (UNESCO 2013: 1). The second statement is that the American military recognize “the obligations of the convention may be waived only in cases where military necessity imperatively requires such a waiver” (UNESCO 2013: 1). For the Global War on Terror and subsequent counterinsurgency operations, Article 4 provides a way in which the *Convention* may be applied in an asymmetric
manner. It will do so by providing the American military the ability and flexibility to protect cultural property in two different but integrally related contexts.

Context 1: Protect cultural property for the purpose of preserving it for host-nation populations, concerned stakeholders, and for all humanity.

Context 2: Protect cultural property for the purposes of military necessity. This will deny the terrorist and/or insurgent the ability to profit from the looting of cultural property which is used to fund its operations against civilian populations via intimidation and violence.

3-25. Article 4 is an adaptive article in that it can be applied to a myriad of situations and realities which are present on the asymmetric battlefield. Article 4 also provides the American military an applicable counterinsurgency mechanism for saving cultural property and most importantly saving human life. It appears the Convention’s vagueness is in actuality its greatness.

3-26. The preceding information illustrates two points:

(1) Current international laws *alone* are unable to protect cultural property during and after military conflicts (Ghaidan 2008: 94) and

(2) Laws and treaties are meaningless without actual protection and enforcement by personnel who are trained in archaeological skillsets as well as knowledge of military tactics, techniques, and procedures and how to apply them within the military decision-making process.

The American military, however, cannot accomplish this without assistance. For the most part, archaeologists and cultural property professionals are at best on the periphery in both the planning and execution of cultural property protection on the
battlefield—especially those who champion the intent of the *Convention*. Cooperation between the American military and archaeologists during times of war however is not a new concept. This cooperation can be accomplished by way of study of past partnerships during periods of armed conflict and applying the lessons learned from military historical examples to twenty-first century warfare.

3-27. The section will now examine three vignettes on American military organizations of the past (one modern, two contemporary) that have applied archaeological and/or cultural preservation skillsets during armed conflict. These examples will serve as frames of reference for future cultural property protection organizations in the American military during counterinsurgency operations.

**Proofs of Concept**

**Vignette 1: Monuments, Fine Arts, and Archives Section**

3-28. During WWII the Allies under the direction of General Dwight D. Eisenhower attempted to protect and locate looted cultural property and heritage. At this same time, Nazi leadership had established laws and regulations to legalize and legitimize the plunder which took place during their occupation of the conquered territories. This included compelling conquered nations to provide specific cultural property as a term of their surrender (Edsel 2009: 117). To counter the Nazi war crimes against cultural property, the American and British\(^6\) military forces formed the Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives Section (MFAA), also known informally today as the Monuments Men.

\(^6\) British participation in the Monuments Officers was organized by archaeologist and British Army Colonel Sir Leonard Woolley (Spirydowicz 2010: 16).
The creation of the Monuments Men was a remarkable experiment because it marked the first time the U.S. Army fought a war while comprehensively attempting to mitigate cultural property damage (Edsel 2009: 2). The Monuments Men had one objective: “to save as much of the culture of Europe as they could during combat” (Edsel 2009: 2). The Monuments Men also conducted cultural and archaeological damage assessments before, during and after battles; advised Allied commanders in protecting cultural property and heritage on the battlefield (military necessity); retrieved stolen cultural property and returned it to its original owners; and hunted down the Nazi war criminals and their collaborators (which included classified missions) responsible for the looting and theft of cultural property from the conquered territories (Alford 2000: 105; Edsel 2009: 34-5, 400, 404; Eizenstat 2003: 188-189). To properly employ their scholarly talents, the Monuments Men used both
military methods (including data and information collection for military intelligence and analysis\textsuperscript{61}) and law enforcement methods, such as reconnaissance and investigation to accomplish its tasks (Alford 2000: 57-59, 200, Edsel 2009: 148, 233-234). The extraordinary service of the Monuments Men was instrumental in preserving Europe’s cultural heritage during the final days of WWII (Eizenstat 2003: 188). This approach was repeated on another battlefield sixty years later during Operation Iraqi Freedom (White and Livoti 2013: 202).

\textit{Vignette 2: Joint Inter-Agency Coordination Group}

3-30. In February of 2003, the National Museum of Baghdad (the Museum) was forced to close down due to the build-up of American led military forces in Kuwait. On April 10, 2003, after the American military entered Baghdad, looting and pillaging of the Museum took place. Some of the looting was committed by random mobs out for revenge against the regime of Saddam Hussein. Other incidents included the coordinated and systematic looting of the museum by museum personnel and organized crime syndicates which had detailed knowledge of what cultural property to take while worthless copies were left behind (Deblauwe 2003: 1,3). In the end the looters pilfered 7,000 years of history while helpless museum security officials stood by and watched in horror (Ghaidan and Paolini 2005: 23). Original estimates by the media (and archaeological community) were exaggerated\textsuperscript{62} and based on misinformation

\textsuperscript{61} Like today’s Global War on Terror, children were usually the best sources of information during WWII (Edsel 2009: 263).

\textsuperscript{62} The intensity to which some people held on to these exaggerations of the museum’s losses increased in direct proportion to the individual’s opposition to the Iraq War (Bogdanos 2005b: 494). This included misinformation from the press and academia (Bogdanos 2005a: 208-209).
In response to these events, the American military’s Central Command established the Joint Inter-Agency Coordination Group consisting of Federal Bureau of Investigation, Central Intelligence Agency, Drug Enforcement Administration, U.S. Customs and American military personnel to track down looters and document returned artifacts (Bogdanos 2005a: 17; Deblauwe 2003: 3). The Joint Inter-Agency Coordination Group was commanded by Marine counter-terrorist expert Colonel Mathew Bogdanos—who attempted to locate and document the initial assessments of the museum’s losses (Deblauwe 2003: 3). The Colonel used the following approaches to complete the Joint Inter-Agency Coordination Group’s mission:

1. Identify what was missing;

2. Send photographs of the missing items to the international law-enforcement and art communities to assist in intercepting stolen objects in transit;

3. Reach out to religious and community leaders to promote an amnesty program for anyone returning antiquities; and
(4) Conduct raids based on information developed about stolen artifacts (Bogdanos 2005b: 488).

3-32. In the spirit of the Monuments Men, Colonel Bogdanos and his team were successful in locating and returning thousands of looted artifacts (Bogdanos 2008: 120). The Joint Inter-Agency Coordination Group did so because of a well-coordinated and multi-disciplinary boots-on-the-ground local approach (Bogdanos 2006: 1; White and Livoti 2013: 203). Soon after the Joint Inter-Agency Coordination Group completed its mission, another American archaeological military organization operating in Iraq was preparing for another important undertaking.

**Vignette 3: Iraq Mass Graves Investigation Team**

3-33. In June 2004, the Department of Justice requested forensic and archaeological assistance from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in the excavation and analysis of evidence from mass graves associated with the former regime of Saddam Hussein in Iraq (Trimble 2005). In response to this request, the St. Louis, Missouri district of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers assembled a team of archaeological and forensic experts (Trimble 2005). In August 2004, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ Mass Graves Investigation Team was attached to the Department of Justice under the Regime Crimes Liaison Office to conduct the arduous task of excavating and accumulating facts surrounding the war crimes of the former Iraqi regime (Trimble 2005).
3-34. While the focus of the mission was forensic research, the principles and employment of archaeological skillsets in a military setting were in step with archaeological methods applied to counterinsurgency operations (White and Livoti 2013: 203). During the course of the archaeology and forensic mission in Iraq, military leadership from several of the Armed Services and law enforcement agencies sought archaeological/cultural property guidance and assistance from the Mass Graves Investigation Team (Trimble 2005). These requests involved:

1. Direct forensic assistance in law enforcement endeavors,
2. Assistance and advice to various military units’ inadvertent archaeological “discoveries” by American ground and support troops, and
3. Troop educational outreach and awareness classes on cultural property, such as artifacts, sites, and monuments (Trimble 2005).
The Mass Graves Investigation Team was not always able—or permitted—to answer all these requests due to the nature of their mission while in Iraq. However, the Mass Graves Investigation Team was designed within a military hierarchy where the analyst served as a forensic archaeologist and security liaison (Trimble 2009) whose duties involved: walking the defensive perimeter; communications checks with higher military headquarters; coordination of air support assets; forensic archaeological survey and excavation; troop advising, education, and outreach; and laboratory assistance (Trimble 2009; White and Livoti 2013: 204). The Mass Graves Investigation Team combined sound archaeological and forensic investigation while maintaining:

(1) Vigilant situational combat awareness;

(2) Public education and outreach; and

(3) Continuous liaison with the media, indigenous population, and authorities in a counterinsurgency environment—all the attributes necessary for success in
conducting archaeological operations in a counterinsurgency (White and Livoti 2013: 204).

The Mass Graves Investigation Team leadership embraced counterinsurgency principles, including the civil-military cooperation concept, by seeking key personnel from both the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and from outside the Department of Defense, as well as medical institutions, law enforcement organizations, and academia (USACE 2006: 8). Due to Mass Graves Investigation Team’s efforts, Saddam Hussein and his regime were brought to justice, tried, and sentenced (White and Livoti 2013: 204).
While the above vignettes represent successful proofs of concepts, they were designed to be temporary in nature and only for specific missions. So far, this section has demonstrated how the destruction of cultural property and illicit sales thereof are having devastating effects on multiple levels (archaeological record, destruction of museums, funding of terrorist and insurgent organizations) which ultimately provides the terrorist and/or insurgent the means to destroy cultural property and human life. In response to this, many cultural organizations and academics are content to issue call for papers rather than a call for action (Bogdanos 2008: 121)—it’s time for the American archaeological community and military to take action.

**Call to Action**

Similar to warfare, archaeology is both an art and a science, and the line between art and science is often blurred. During war, campaigns and battles are never the same, just as archaeological surveys and excavations can differ dramatically, based on
research goals, environmental factors, and recovered artifacts (White and Livoti 2013: 199). Another important similarity is that war (Clausewitz 2010: 39) and archaeology (Goode 2007: 164) are both political and are deeply connected with the realities of political discourse (Meskell 2001: 18, 19). “No longer is archaeology regarded as a neutral or a purely scientific discipline, but as a process influenced by the aims of its practitioners, who are, in turn, deeply affected by contemporary intellectual, social and political agendas” (Gillot 2010: 1). Therefore, the tools and personnel employed for success in both archaeology and war will often “depend on the situation” (King 2004: 15). At any time during war, rogue military personnel, criminals, and terrorists may take advantage of the chaos in order to destroy and/or loot cultural property, permit such actions, or remain indifferent. During this time, open-minded, ethically conscious American military combatant commanders truly need archaeologists the most (White and Livoti 2013: 200).

3-37. Despite this reality, some archaeologists refuse to coordinate with the military on ethical grounds (Wegener 2008: 165). As stated earlier, refusal to work with the military merely provides an excuse for military leaders and planners to downplay cultural property concerns (Wegener 2008: 165). It also makes it difficult for archaeologists to deal with military officers who may be totally oblivious and/or not care about the importance of cultural property preservation before, during and after battle (Nicholas 1995: 281). In addition, refusal to work with the military is a disservice because it neglects the role of stakeholders—both military and private—and the preservation and protection of cultural property (White and Livoti 2013: 201). Furthermore, most critics of the military’s efforts on cultural property protection in time of conflict wish only to
arbitrate a no-strike-list or deploy to a military area of operation and protect cultural property only if it is safe and/or when the fighting is over (White and Livoti 2013: 201).

This approach is flawed for the following three reasons:

1. A no-strike-list has its place throughout military operations, but it fails to consider and incorporate other types of cultural property (archaeological sites, traditional cultural properties) as the fight on the battlefield will inevitably evolve (White and Livoti 2013: 201).

2. Going to battlefields to preserve and mitigate the effects of warfare on cultural property after the fight is often pointless, as the damage and/or destruction has already taken place (White and Livoti 2013: 201).

3. In time of conflict, host nation governments and American military organizations must tend to the social by-products of war (combating terrorists and or insurgents, restoring infrastructure), and they have few resources and trained personnel to track and properly identify looted cultural property (Bogdanos 2008: 121).

3-38. Action requires organization and organization requires a new concept for proactive and robust cultural property protection on the battlefield. This concept is operational archaeology and the operational archaeologist.
Section 4
Applied Archaeology in Action: Operational Archaeology

We should be very clear on one thing, there is no doubt that antiquities trafficking is funding terrorism and has since 2005... In terms of what percentage, you should not confuse what is publicly released with what exists. Like it or not, because of the connection to terrorist activities, the vast majority of this information is classified (Bogdanos 2015: 1).

4-1. “Operational archaeology employs the art and science of archaeology to support military operations, including, but is not limited to combat and humanitarian operations” (White and Livoti 2013: 204). The goal of operational archaeology is simple: to save lives (including those of the enemy) and to save cultural property from destruction—in that order. In the case of looted cultural property and the funding of terrorist and insurgent activities—saving cultural property itself will translate into saving lives as well.

4-2. The concept of operational archaeology asserts however that tracking down looted cultural property and tending to the social by-products of war are one in the same—as both have the same end state63—saving lives.

4-3. Operational archaeology works within the parameters of a third-party determinant in the same manner as public archaeology, applied anthropology, and cultural resource management (White and Livoti 2013: 204-205). During military operations, an

---

63 End State is a set of required conditions which defines the achievement of the combatant commander’s objective(s) (JP 3-0 2011: GL-9).
operational archaeologist\textsuperscript{64} will liaison on behalf of the military commander with military and civil authorities via a unity of effort\textsuperscript{65}. The operational archaeologist must fully integrate all efforts into the combatant commander’s plan of action. This includes providing support to the combatant commander’s intent and scheme of maneuver\textsuperscript{66}, as well as mutually supporting higher and adjacent military organizations working within the context of achieving stability and security (White and Livoti 2013: 200, 202).

4-4. Operational archaeologists must take an applied approach and execute a “boots-and-trowel-on-the-ground” plan of action in concert with and in support of the combatant commanders’ efforts. This includes working at the local level as well as working in close concert with military intelligence personnel. Archaeologists can no longer be bystanders to what transpires in the Global War on Terrorism nor can the American military disregard the importance in preserving cultural property in their areas of operation. There needs to be a unified effort by the American military and archaeological community to incorporate, train, and employ operational archaeologists in a proactive manner which will become a permanent fixture in the American military. This will not

\textsuperscript{64} The operational archaeologist should not be confused with the Cultural Heritage and Preservation Officer specialty- which is based in the Civil Affairs military occupational specialty. The operational archaeologist is based in the field of military intelligence.

\textsuperscript{65} Unity of effort is the coordination and cooperation among all forces toward a commonly recognized objective, even if the forces are not necessarily part of the same command structure (FM 1-02 2004: 1-194).

\textsuperscript{66} Scheme of Maneuver is the description of how a military unit will accomplish the commander’s intent (JP 1-02 2011: 321).
only preserve cultural property, but more importantly, save human life in the Global War on Terrorism and future military conflicts.

4-5. The operational archaeologist will demonstrate to combatant commanders that implementing the simplest methods of cultural resource management and awareness into the military decision-making process can protect cultural property and do so without compromising mission success, intelligence, and most importantly, protecting and saving human life and cultural property on the battlefield. The challenges an operational archaeologist will face in preserving cultural property in a counterinsurgency environment is the same challenge a military engineer will encounter in restoring essential service infrastructure (electricity, schools, roads etc.). Both must operate within the insurgency as a counterinsurgent, and like military engineers, operational archaeologists working for the military in a time of armed conflict will not succeed by working in a vacuum (White and Livoti 2013: 201-202). Here the operational archaeologist will be part of a coordinated effort of military professionals working toward the same goal of saving lives on the asymmetric battlefield.

4-6. If operational archaeologists are to effectively manage and protect cultural property on the battlefield, they must not only be technically proficient in archaeological skillsets and site management planning, but also proficient in military culture, language, tactics, techniques, procedures, and planning (Edsel 2009: 60; White and Livoti 2013: 205). This is because once the operational archaeologist is assigned to a combatant command he or she becomes a warfighter and a counterinsurgent and needs to ensure the combatant commander has both tactical courses of action regarding cultural property protection (White and Livoti 2013: 200). At its most basic, the operational
archaeologist’s preparation for preserving cultural property during counterinsurgency operations requires three things: physical fitness, study of the host nation’s history and archaeology, and endless training to build muscle memory and install confidence while conducting cultural property preservation on the battlefield (Bogdanos 2005a: 116).

The following is a billet description in how an operational archaeologist could function as a member of a combatant command. The following section is based on the five-paragraph operations order format currently in use by the American military.

**Operational Archaeologist**\(^6^7\) Billet Description and Responsibilities

4-7. I. **Situation**

Since the events of September 11, 2001 there has been insufficient cooperation between archaeologists and the American military regarding the identification, protection, and preservation of cultural property in American military areas of operation in the Global War on Terror.

4-8. II. **Mission**

Assign operational archaeologists to combatant commands in order to advise the commander, train warfighters, investigate and survey cultural landscapes, sites, and monuments; and conduct liaison with civil and military authorities on cultural property preservation, management, and methods before, during, and after

---

\(^6^7\) Operational orders are used for combat operations, humanitarian operations, military social and sporting events, and billet descriptions and responsibilities.

\(^6^8\) The operational archaeologist should not be confused with the Cultural Heritage and Preservation Officer specialty - which is based in the Civil Affairs military occupational specialty. The operational archaeologist is based in the field of military intelligence.
combat and/or humanitarian operations.

4-9. III. Execution:

4-10. a. Concept of Operation:

4-11. 1. Selection to serve as an operational archaeologist will be open to U.S. citizens who possess a bachelor’s degree or higher in anthropology, archaeology or related field and the ability to receive a TOP SECRET security clearance.

4-12. 2. Once selected the operational archaeologist will attend a Uniformed Service’s (Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, Coast Guard) military intelligence school (in accordance with rank\(^{69}\)) in order understand the intelligence preparation of the battlefield process and the military decision-making process. Upon graduation from said course, the operational archaeologist can serve in as a military intelligence\(^{70}\) officer or warfighter while assigned to the combatant command.

4-13. 3. Operational archaeologists will conduct all manner of training relating to combat preparedness which will permit them to operate in a myriad of environments (such as counterinsurgency).

---

\(^{69}\) During counterinsurgency, “Rank is nothing: talent is everything (Kilcullen 208: 31). The operational archaeologist can be officer or enlisted.

\(^{70}\) Historically archaeologists and anthropologists have served in military intelligence when volunteering to serve in their nation’s armed forces (See: Allen 2013; Bamberger 1970; Bernhardsson 2005; Coon 1980; Harris and Sadler 2003; McIntyre 1989; Morell 1995; Pringle 2006).
4-14. b. **Tasks**

4-15. 1. Assist and advise the combatant commander in all manner of planning for and execution of missions regarding military necessity and cultural property awareness.

4-16. 2. Conduct reconnaissance, survey, and assessment of cultural property before, during, and after combat and or humanitarian operations.

3. Identify hazards and assess risks associated with natural, accidental, or intentional events as they pertain to cultural property, and provide guidance to civil and military institutions on mitigation steps before, during, and after military operations.

4-17. 4. Promote mitigation and preparedness training with warfighters and the host nation cultural property community via liaison and joint training.

4-18. 5. Assist higher, adjacent, and subordinate military organizations responsible for the care and preservation of culturally and historically significant resources and properties.

4-19. 6. Educate warfighters of potential risks for specific missions and how they will affect cultural property before, during and after operations.

4-20. 7. Provide guidance to the combatant commander in the prioritization of available resources (i.e. funds, equipment, personnel) for specific cultural/historic sites that may need assistance.

---

71 Majority of tasks modified from the Scope (Section II) in the *Cultural Property Appendix 1 Appendix to the Emergency Support Function 11 Annex of the Utah Emergency Operations Plan* (Utah 2012: 4).
4-21. 8. Provide guidance, coordination, and assistance in long-term cultural property resource management strategies for both follow-on military forces and host nation cultural property officials.

4-22. 9. Conduct site exploitation of looted archaeological sites to assist warfighters in supporting military intelligence organizations and/or counter-threat finance organizations via the collection of information and data in order to produce actionable military intelligence for the purpose of saving lives and saving cultural property.

4-23. IV. Administrative/Logistical Requirements:

4-24. a. Logistical Requirements:

4-25. 1. The operational archaeologist will have a standard issue military kit\(^{72}\) including M9 pistol and M4 carbine rifle. Any archaeological/field equipment needed for conducting archaeological operations can be made via a request from the operational archaeologist’s supply and/or logistics officer.

4-26. b. Administrative Requirements:

The operational archaeologist will be subject to all laws and regulations involving deployment during domestic/overseas operations and training exercises.

4-27. V. Command and Signal

4-28. a. Command:

4-29. The chain of command for the operational archaeologist is the unit intelligence officer (or designated officer), followed by the combatant commander (or designated

\(^{72}\) Basic standard military issue includes but is not limited to a uniform, boots, rucksack, day pack, body armor, kevlar helmet, and other gear required for specific missions.
officer). For evaluation purposes\textsuperscript{73}, the unit intelligence officer (or designated officer) will serve as the operational archaeologist’s reporting supervisor followed by the combatant commander (or designated officer), who will serve as the reviewing supervisor on the evaluation.

4-30. During day-to-day operations, the operational archaeologist will work out of the unit intelligence section (or designated section) and reports daily to the intelligence officer (or designated officer) in order to provide updates and progress. During military training exercises and operations, the operational archaeologist will also coordinate with the unit operations officer and/or other personnel as directed.

4-31. b. \textbf{Signal:}

4-32. The operational archaeologist will use standard radio communication equipment and will initiate communication checks and situation reports as per order and/or standard operating procedure by direction of the combatant commander and/or communications officer.

4-33. The operational archaeologist’s duties will straddle many different facets of a military organization. It is therefore imperative that the operational archaeologist not only understand military organizational dynamics, but more importantly, the complex nature of the environment he or she will operate.

\textsuperscript{73} Each military service has different terminology for the chain of command when it comes for evaluation of its personnel.
Cultural Heritage Assessment and Advisory Detachment (CHAAD)\textsuperscript{74}

4-34. As stated earlier in reference to the *Convention*, the Cultural Heritage and Preservation officer specialty exists but there is not dedicated military unit established to organize and deploy 38G’s (or operational archaeologists) overseas in American military areas of responsibility.

4-35. In response to this, the analyst created the Cultural Heritage Assessment and Advisory Detachment (CHAAD). As of this writing, the CHAAD is in the initial stages of development. The analyst has been working closely with an active duty officer who holds a doctorate in Fine Art/Classical Reception and is along with the analyst one of the first officers to be designated with the cultural heritage and preservation specialty. The capabilities\textsuperscript{75} of the CHAAD are the following:

4-36. 1. Assist and advise the combatant commander in all manner of planning for and execution of missions regarding military necessity.

4-37. 2. Conduct reconnaissance, survey, and assessment of cultural property before, during, and after combat and or humanitarian operations.

4-38. 3. Identify hazards and assess risks associated with natural, accidental, or intentional events as they pertain to cultural property and provide guidance to civil and military institutions on mitigation steps before, during, and after military

\textsuperscript{74} The CHAAD concept should not be confused with the Army’s new Monuments Men unit. The CHAAD, like the operational archaeologist, is designed to function under military intelligence, not Civil Affairs.

\textsuperscript{75} The capabilities development is based upon the State of Utah: Cultural Property Appendix to the Emergency Support Function 11 Annex of the Utah Emergency Operations Plan from the time the analyst served as the Cultural Property Liaison officer for the Utah National Guard (State of Utah 2012: 1).
operations.

**4-39.** 4. Promote mitigation and preparedness training with warfighters and the host nation cultural property community via liaison and joint training.

**4-40.** 5. Assist higher, adjacent, and subordinate military organizations responsible for the care and preservation of culturally and historically significant resources and properties.

**4-41.** 6. Educate warfighters of potential risks for specific missions and how they will affect cultural property before, during and after operations.

**4-42.** 7. Provide guidance to the combatant commander in the prioritization of available resources (i.e. funds, equipment, personnel) for specific cultural/historic sites that may need assistance.

**4-43.** 8. Provide guidance, coordination, and assistance in long-term cultural property resource management strategies for both follow-on military forces and host nation cultural property officials.

**4-44.** 9. Conduct site exploitation of looted archaeological sites to assist warfighters in supporting military intelligence organizations and or counter-threat finance organizations.

**4-45.** The CHAAD, and the operational archaeology concept is the latest effort of the analyst to promote a proactive and intelligence based military cultural heritage protection organization in the Armed Forces of the United States. More progress to come.
Section 5

Applied Theories

We all use theory whether we like it or not (Johnson 2011: 26).

The Complexity of Insurgency and Counterinsurgency

5-1. Insurgency and counterinsurgency are forms of warfare that are both challenging and complex in nature (Petraeus et al. 2007: 1; MCDP-1 1997: 12; Rouzer 2009: 179). The complexity of an insurgency stems from its ability to operate on different levels of time and space and across international boundaries. Insurgencies also operate with post-modern capabilities as well as pre-modern structures and ideologies (Kilcullen 2009: 6; Miller and Page 2007: 234). This combined with differences in populations, unfamiliar terrain, and the counterinsurgents and insurgents themselves (Moyar 2009: 5) makes for an extremely complex environment. The purpose of today’s military operations during the Global War on Terror is to counter a global insurgency led by terrorist organizations (Kilcullen 2010: 166). To better understand the challenges of global insurgency, many counterinsurgents employ complexity theory (Kilcullen 2004: 22).

Complexity Theory

5-2. Complexity theory is a multi-discipline field of study (Beech 2004: 3) of self-reinforcing interdependent interactions and how such interactions create evolution, fitness, and surprise (Marion and Uhl-Bien 2003: 56). Operational archeologists should be interested in complexity theory because it is used specifically for the study of complex systems of interacting agents—which is what all human societies are past and present (Bentley and Maschner 2003: 5). Complex systems are self-organizing and adaptive in that they actively attempt to turn any circumstance they are presented into
an advantage (Waldrop 1992: 11). This is the same for insurgencies and their subsequent actions and organizational efforts (i.e. looting) on the battlefield.

5-3. Many counterinsurgents recognize insurgencies as not only complex, but organic systems as well—in that organic systems adapt, evolve and change their behavior frequently —often in response to the actions of counterinsurgents (Kilcullen 2010: 29; Moyar 2009: 5). It is therefore imperative for the counterinsurgent to achieve maximum awareness of the complex environment and gain the advantage before the insurgent does by applying a holistic world-view in which the complex environment is recognized as an integrated whole of interdependent organic systems and organisms (Capra 1996: 6). This awareness offers innovative mechanisms for improving the local population’s quality of life; including health care, education, business, and other day-to-day activities (Capra 1996: 3).

5-4. Interdependence of organisms within the complex environment of American military areas of responsibility provides the driving force that maintains an insurgency via feedback loops (Kilcullen 2004: 23, 24). “A feedback loop is an arrangement of circular causality within a system, such that a self-reinforcing ‘vicious circle’ develops: A causes B, which exacerbates A, which in turn intensifies B, and so on” (Kilcullen 2004: Appendix C, 3). These principles can be used specifically to understand and recognize the looting of cultural property as a phenomenon on the asymmetric battlefield (White and Livoti 2013: 208), its interdependence within the insurgency, and its existence as a microorganism operating within the organism of insurgency itself. Just as complexity theory can be used to examine an insurgency, it can also be used to examine and understand the looting phenomenon taking place on contemporary asymmetric
Complexity Theory and Archaeology

5-5 As stated earlier, looted cultural property is a substantial economic commodity in the funding of insurgents' training, indoctrination, propaganda, weapons, and explosives (White and Livoti 2013: 208). Insurgent violence (including terrorism) causes a lack of legitimate commerce (White and Livoti 2013: 208). The lack of commerce causes poverty and compels some of the population to loot cultural property in order to make a living (White and Livoti 2013: 208, 210). The looting is facilitated by smugglers in league with the insurgency (White and Livoti 2013: 210). Via the sale of illicit antiquities, the looters provide funding to the insurgency (White and Livoti 2013: 210). The insurgency then conducts more violence and intimidation of the population (White and Livoti 2013: 210). This violence suppresses legitimate commerce, which, in turn, causes widespread poverty and compels some of the population to loot cultural property (White and Livoti 2013: 210), hence, a repeatable feedback loop (Figure 1) that provides the power to fuel the insurgency (Kilcullen 2004: Appendix C, 6).
5-6. Deny the commodity of looted cultural property within the cycle of the looting feedback loop, and the insurgency loses power and significantly loses influence within the insurgency organism (complex system) (Kilcullen 2004: 23) which in turn will degrade the life force of the insurgency. It is therefore imperative to employ cultural property protection to deny insurgents and terrorists a funding mechanism that not only destroys cultural property but facilitates the violent loss of human life (White and Livoti 2013: 210).

5-7. In keeping with the counterinsurgency doctrine and theory, all efforts to preserve cultural property will be at the local level via rapid ethnographic and archaeological

---

76 Based on Kilcullen’s Socio-Economic Dislocation Model (Kilcullen 2004: Appendix C, 6; See White and Livoti 2013: 210).
assessments with local stakeholders (White and Livoti 2013: 210). As with any other effective counterinsurgency endeavor, a bottom-up (Kilcullen 2010: 155-159) solution is necessary to mitigate if not eliminate looting (White and Livoti 2013: 210). A bottom-up approach is analogous to the same methods U.S. forces employ in eliminating roadside bomb factories—aggressive reconnaissance, intelligence gathering and direct engagement with tribal and local leaders—not via bureaucrats at the national level (White and Livoti 2013: 210). Counterinsurgency begins at the local level and so does cultural property protection (White and Livoti 2013: 210).

**Combined Arms Concept**

5-8. The art and science of combined arms has existed for centuries (House 1984:1) and was practiced by ancient armies such as the Greeks and the Egyptians (Gabriel and Boose Jr. 1994: 50, 152). Combined arms is a military term for the coordinated application of several arms such as infantry, armor, field artillery, combat engineers, air defense, and aviation in order to achieve an effect on the battlefield that is greater than if each arm were used in sequence or separately (FM 1-02 2004: 1-37; FM 3-0 2008: 4-7). Here different arms and weapons systems can be used in concert to maximize the survival and combat effectiveness of each other (House 1984: 2). This will maximize combat power by using all available resources to achieve the best advantage on the battlefield (MCDP-1 1997: 94).

5-9. Combined arms is a military term for the coordinated application of several arms—such as infantry, armor, field artillery, combat engineers, air defense, and aviation in order to achieve an effect on the battlefield that is greater than if each arm were used in sequence or separately (FM 1-02 2004: 1-37; FM 3-0 2008: 4-7). The military combined
arms concept can be applied to the employment of archaeological theory—especially in areas of armed conflict and counterinsurgency. As mentioned earlier archaeologists wishing to work for the American military must understand that looting on the battlefield does not exist in a vacuum (White and Livoti 2013: 208) but in a complex environment, including “complex physical terrain, complex human terrain, and complex informational terrain” (Indiana National Guard 2007: 4). This environment exists because insurgencies are complex forms of engagements that straddle the boundaries between armed conflict, government, social stability, and moral acceptability (Kilcullen 2004: 21). As a complex system, [insurgencies] also possess multiple interactions, nonlinearity, contingency, and dynamics (Agar 2004: 413). Therefore, archaeological theory and complexity theory have much to offer to one another “from epistemology down to methodological detail” (Agar 2004: 413)—but which archaeological theoretical paradigm(s) is the most appropriate for applying in a counterinsurgency environment? The answer is simple: it depends (King 2004: 15). [Operational archaeologists] can find common ground in complexity theory (Bentley 2003: 9)— especially in counterinsurgency environments. This is because it allows for the envelopment of archaeological theory which can be applied in different manners as well as different times and places (Bentley 2003: 9). This also includes combining different theoretical paradigms to meet the complex challenges present in myriad of circumstances that exist in a counterinsurgency. This is also true for military action when using the various types of arms and weapon systems in the American military’s arsenal.
Combined Archaeological Theoretical Approach

5-10. In war as in archaeology, there is no “one size fits all” theoretical paradigm during armed conflict—especially when it comes to cultural property protection and preservation operations. “Semper Gumby” is Marine Corps slang to always be flexible when approaching any challenge on or off the battlefield. Flexibility reminds the archaeologist that there is no rote way to do archaeology (King 2005: 52) and the same goes for archaeological theory.

5-11. The combined archaeological theoretical approach—based on the military combined arms concept recognizes that multiple theoretical approaches (within the foundational framework of complexity theory) can be applied in concert to maximize the effectiveness to safeguard cultural property and save human life when engaging the complex situations (three block war example) which arise during counterinsurgency operations. For example, the operational archaeologist may choose to apply processual theory when investigating a looted site but may draw from post-processual theory while engaging the local population in order to determine why the site was looted. The possibilities of the combined theoretical approach are endless and again will depend on the situation (King 2004: 15).

5-12. The combined archaeological theoretical approach, based on the military concept of combined arms, recognizes that more than one theoretical research design may be appropriate when engaging the complex issues that arise on an asymmetric battlefield in both spatial and temporal contexts. For example, the operational archaeologist may choose to use a processual approach when investigating a looted site but may take a more post-processual approach when engaging the local population in order to
determine why an archaeological site was looted. The possibilities of the combined theoretical approach are endless and again will depend on the situation. Such situations may include the following:

In one moment in time, our service members will be feeding and clothing displaced refugees, providing humanitarian assistance. In the next moment, they will be holding two warring tribes apart—conducting peacekeeping operations—and finally, they will be fighting a highly lethal mid-intensity battle—all on the same day ... all within three city blocks. It will be what we call the ‘three block war’.\textsuperscript{77}

5-13. The narrative above has been played out many times since September 11, 2001 and is the reason why complexity theory assists as a framework for employing the various archaeological theories that will be needed in the myriad of situations that may arise. This means all counterinsurgents must be prepared to employ both soft power tactics\textsuperscript{78} and hard power tactics\textsuperscript{79} (White and Livoti 2013: 197) at all times. All warfighters must be prepared for any contingency, and this includes the operational archaeologist. Like laws and regulations however, “theory alone is never enough” (Kohler and van der Leew 2007: 6).

\textsuperscript{77} Former Marine Commandant General Charles Krulak in an address to the National Press Club, Washington D.C. 10 October 1997.

\textsuperscript{78} Soft power is the method of co-opting people rather than coercing them. Rests on the ability to shape the preferences of others on the attractiveness of one’s culture and values (Nye 2004: 18, 19).

\textsuperscript{79} Hard power rests on coercion based on inducements (carrots) and or threats (sticks) (Nye 2004: 18, 19).
Section 6

Applied Archaeological Methodologies

The work of applied anthropologists is often undertaken in new contexts. It involves researching new topics, asking different questions and requires innovative methodologies80 (Pink 2006: 910).

6-1. Applied anthropology is the employment of anthropological knowledge and methods to solve real-world problems, often for a specific client (Haviland et al 2005: 737). This definition of applied anthropology is in keeping with UMDA program’s commitment to apply anthropological theory and research and engage contemporary, real-world and relevant issues (UMDA 2016: 1). In the context of this dissertation defense, the specific client is the American Armed Forces. Keeping this in mind, its also important to recognize that when practicing applied archaeology, a hypothesis gives structure and efficiency to a piece of archaeological research. Its also important to approach archaeology as not a science or discipline in its own right but as a box of tools that we use to investigate hypotheses derived from other disciplines or simply from life—the box of tools notion is very useful because it illustrates archaeology’s alliance with other disciplines (King 2005: 50). This is especially useful during counterinsurgency operations where cultural property protection and preservation is only one piece of the puzzle in counterinsurgents’ goal to save human life.

80 Methodology is the techniques and methods used to collect and interpret archaeological data (Johnson 2011: 264).
6-2. Therefore, it is important to remember the operational archaeologist is a counterinsurgent working for a combatant commander via a unity of effort. It is also important to understand there are no universal answers on how to conduct counterinsurgency operations (Kilcullen 2006: 1). The same goes for conducting cultural property protection during counterinsurgency operations. As a complex phenomenon, an insurgency will continuously evolve and the counterinsurgent must evolve as well. If a tactic works this week, it might not work again next week; if it works in this province, it might not work in the next (Petraeus et al 2007: 50).

6-3. The evolving developments during counterinsurgency operations demand the operational archaeologist maintain continuous analysis of battlefield conditions and maintain situational awareness at all times. As mentioned in the preface, this dissertation is a product of analysis. As the operational archaeologist works in the field, he or she will need to conduct analysis in the same manner an intelligence officer conducts analysis whereby collected information is evaluated and integrated with existing information to produce intelligence products that describe the battlefield situation (FM 1-02 2004: 1-10).

6-4. How the operational archaeologist applies his or her archaeological skillsets and methodology (or methodologies) will once again “depend” (King 2004:15) on the situation. This will include but is not limited to the mission, enemy, terrain, weather, personnel available to assist, time on site, consideration for local civilians/stakeholders and the situational awareness of local conditions. In the military, warfighters are instructed in tactics, techniques, and procedures (TTPs). Methods on how to apply these TTPs are developed at the small unit (local) level and are based on military
training, education, and most importantly, experience.

6-5. Based on this information the operational archaeologist, like other counterinsurgents, must remain flexible and adaptive (Kilcullen 2006: 10). Therefore, the analyst will not constrain or limit the operational archaeologist to a prescribed method (or methods) when tasked with cultural property protection and preservation during a counterinsurgency operation. Instead, the analyst wishes to enable the operational archaeologist into applying known archaeological methodologies (techniques and methods) and develop them into sound and effective cultural property protection and preservation mechanisms in synchronization with and in support of the combatant commander’s mission and tasks.

Military Intelligence and Counterinsurgency

6-6. Counterinsurgency is an intelligence driven undertaking whose focus is on the understanding of the operational environment with particular emphasis on the population, the host nation, and finally, the insurgents themselves (Petraeus et al 2007: 79). Military intelligence\(^{81}\) has been a cornerstone of counterinsurgency operations.

\(^{81}\) Military Intelligence can be defined as the following: (1) The product resulting from the collection, processing, integration, evaluation, analysis, and interpretation of available information concerning foreign nations, hostile or potentially hostile forces or elements, or areas of actual or potential operations (JP 1-02 2011: 179) (2) Information and knowledge about an adversary obtained through observation, investigation, analysis, or understanding (JP 1-02 2011: 179; MCWP 2-1 2003: A-4) (3) Knowledge of the enemy and the surrounding environment that is needed to support decision-making. (MCDP 2 1997: 28).
since the days of Alexander the Great and Julius Caesar (Boot 2013: 13). Due to the complex characteristics of a counterinsurgency environment, it is important to recognize that military operations and military intelligence complement one another (Petraeus et al 2007: 58; Kilcullen 2010: 31). During these complex undertakings, military operations will be driven by military intelligence—therefore military commands must “organize for their own intelligence” (bottom-up intelligence) and not depend solely on military intelligence products prepared and disseminated by higher headquarters (Kilcullen: 2010: 31; MCWP 2-1 2003: 1-6).

6-7. In counterinsurgency operations, combatant commands must “organize for their own intelligence”, as operations will be intelligence driven and not as a product prepared and disseminated by higher headquarters (Kilcullen: 2010: 31) (i.e. bottom-up intelligence). All military intelligence is anthropological intelligence, no matter what forms it may take (Lewis 2011: 67) and this includes operational archaeology. This is why the operational archaeologist can serve in the role of an intelligence officer within a combatant command. One manner in which the operational archaeologist can drive intelligence to facilitate military operations and contribute to saving lives and cultural property is conducting site exploitation operations of looted archaeological sites.

6-8. All archaeological sites have valuable information, and this includes looted archaeological sites. Here valuable information can be exploited and can have a direct

82 Military intelligence is a product resulting from the collection, processing, integration, analysis, evaluation, and interpretation of available information concerning foreign countries or areas. It is also information and knowledge about an adversary obtained through observation, investigation, analysis, or understanding (JP 1-02: 114).
impact on stopping the looting of cultural property and the subsequent funding of insurgent and terrorist organizations. For a looted archaeological site, site exploitation can “recognize, collect, process, preserve, and analyze information, personnel, and/or materiel found during the conduct of operations in order to protect the force and produce an advantage within the operational variables to support tactical, operational, and strategic objectives” (JP 3-31 2010: IV-24). Site exploitation will also serve as an enforcement mechanism of the Convention. This unique archaeological application of site exploitation can assist warfighters in protecting human life as well as produce an advantage for defeating violence and achieving stability and security (JP 3-31 2010: IV-24).

**Applied Approaches: Site Exploitation of Looted Archaeological Sites**

6-9. Site exploitation is the systematic search for and collection of information, material, and persons from a designated location and analyzing them to answer information requirements, facilitate subsequent operations, or support criminal prosecution (FM 3-90.15 2010: 1-1). In military doctrine, a site is defined as a location that potentially contains valuable information (FM 3-90.15 2010: 1-1). This includes looted archaeological sites. Artifacts exist in two forms; the historical record\(^{83}\) and archaeological record\(^{84}\) (Schiffer 1996: 3). Very often at looted archaeological sites, looters will leave behind a collection of sherds near the looted site and instead take unbroken artifacts and vessels (Schiffer 1996: 116). The sherds and artifacts left behind are still a part of the archaeological context (Schiffer 1996: 4) and hence have a

\(^{83}\) Artifacts that exist within living societies in museums and antique shops (Schiffer 1996: 3).

\(^{84}\) Artifacts that exist as culturally deposited objects that are no part of society (Schiffer 1996: 3).
multitude of information that can be examined to assist the operational archaeologist in discovering who is looting the sites and why.

6-10. Historically, site exploitation operations have been associated with eliminating weapons of mass destruction. However, site exploitation operations can contribute to defeating a wide range of current and evolving threats on today's asymmetric battlefield (FM 3-90.15 2010: 1-2) including protecting archaeological sites. Site exploitation of looted archaeological sites as a data collection mechanism can also examine the asymmetric battlefield from both an intelligence driven and archaeological driven perspective whereby it provides the warfighter valuable collection of forensics\textsuperscript{85}, biometrics\textsuperscript{86}, and evidentiary material to assist in mitigating and/or neutralizing the enemy's ability to fund insurgent and terrorist activities including the identification of key individuals who facilitate insurgent and terrorist funding operations. These individuals are usually connected to insurgent/terrorist organizations and/or organized crime smuggling syndicates. Smugglers only care about making money—whether the cargo is drugs, weapons, human beings or cultural property. When pursuing terrorists, American forces are now finding them in possession of antiquities (Bogdanos 2005c: 1). This is critical as some exploitable sites may contain evidence of war crimes (FM 3-90.15 2010: 1-1) such as mass graves and malevolent destruction of cultural property.

\textsuperscript{85} Forensics refers to using "multidisciplinary scientific processes to establish facts. Multidisciplinary scientific processes include, but are not limited to, the following disciplines": Latent prints, DNA and trace material, and forensic anthropology (FM 3-90.15 2010: A7).

\textsuperscript{86} Biometrics refers to the "measurable physical characteristic or personal behavior trait used to recognize the identity or verify the claimed identity of an individual" (JP 2-0 2007: GL-5).
Looters who come into contact with material culture at archaeological sites will leave behind unintentional traces on the looted site and/or the objects they discard. These traces will more than likely come in the form of fingerprints and/or DNA (Moran 2007: 16). Fingerprints (BFF 2012: 75; See Moran 2007) and/or DNA (EP 2012: 6)—usually in the form of blood and or saliva can provide valuable data to the operational archaeologist by contributing to the knowledge and understanding of the material culture (Moran 2007: 16) left behind at looted sites. Identifying, assessing and collecting of fingerprints and DNA will assist in the identification of looters and or smugglers (EP 2012: 6).

By recognizing all intelligence as anthropological, the operational archaeology concept goes a step further in the employment of a holistic approach by examining the cultural, material, geographical, historical, biometric, and forensic properties of a looted site. In doing so, the actions and skillsets of the operational archaeologist becomes a force multiplying asset for the combatant commander on multiple levels on the asymmetric battlefield. These actions combined with a proactive archaeological

87 Other trace material includes but is not limited to hair, skin cells, nail clippings, fibers (EP 2012: 6).

88 There are two types of fingerprints left behind on material culture. Latent fingerprints are invisible, left behind in sweat. Plastic prints that are left behind in another medium (i.e. clay, wax, grease, or paint) (Moran 2007: 16, 17).

89 Deoxyribonucleic Acid.

90 Can also be present in feces, urine, and semen left at the site.

91 A force multiplier is a capability which significantly increases a military organization’s effectiveness during combat/humanitarian operations and thus enhances the probability of successful mission accomplishment (Kila 2011: 323).
awareness will not only preserve and protect cultural property but more importantly save human life.

Conclusion

6-13. The looting of cultural property on the battlefield does more than destroy the archaeological record, cultural monuments, and museums—it finances terrorist and insurgent organizations via the capital generated from its illicit sale on the international black market. Consequentially this endangers the lives of people everywhere.

6-14. As the American military continues to conduct military operations in countries with significant cultural property resources, warfighters will continue to be confronted with battlefield cultural property issues and have little expertise to draw upon (Wegener 2008: 171). While there are a solid group of dedicated archaeologists who provide outstanding training and education to warfighters before they deploy overseas, this alone is not sufficient as their subject matter expertise in cultural property protection are needed during and after military operations as well.

6-15. The American military and archaeological community need to take this a step further in creating a cadre of military trained archaeologists. This effort needs to be in the same manner military engineers, military lawyers, and military physicians have been incorporated into the military for their subject matter areas of expertise while they provide an integral piece to saving lives and winning battles.

6-16. As this section has demonstrated, laws and treaties alone will not suffice in protecting cultural property in the event of armed conflict. While the Convention is well intentioned; its ratification by the American Senate has not stopped the rampant looting of cultural property in American military areas of operation in the Global War on Terrorism. This is because of a
failure of policy within the archaeological community as well as the American military and government (Rothfield 2008: 5). As a result, there is no enforcement, no specific directives and most importantly no presence of American military archaeological personnel on the battlefield working for the specific purpose of protecting cultural property. Proponents of the Convention (including the analyst) believe that Convention can accomplish the following goals:

6-17. 1. Clarify the obligations of the U.S. Military.

6-18. 2. Encourage the marking\(^92\) of cultural sites.

6-19. 3. Give added impetus to the training of U.S. Military personnel in their obligations to protect cultural heritage.

6-20. 4. Require the U.S. Military to ensure an adequate number of properly trained cultural heritage professionals are part of the military.

6-21. 5. Encourage better preparation during war planning and gathering of information as to the locations of cultural sites in a potential war zone.

6-22. 6. Bring greater awareness of the provisions of the convention to war planners.

6-23. 7. Allow for concerns to be incorporated at an earlier stage of war planning.

6-24. 8. Prevent resorting to last-minute efforts to obtain the necessary information and minimize the risk that cultural sites might accidentally be targeted (Gerstenblith 2008b: 84).

6-25. This section has demonstrated the above goals would be much better served with operational archaeologists proactively applying Article 4 of the Convention and doing so

\(^{92}\) Marking includes but is not limited to: adding site coordinates via a GPS or on a map. Could also be marked with engineer stakes at a site in a secure area.
by serving as permanent members of the American military. This new cadre of subject matter experts would not only champion the accomplishment of these goals, but more importantly, serve as a continuous reminder to combatant commanders and warfighters alike on the importance of protecting and preserving cultural property before, during, and after military operations.

6-26. Archaeologists must take an applied approach and execute a boots-on-the-ground plan of action in cooperation with the American military. Archaeologists can no longer be bystanders to what transpires in the Global War on Terror. Nor can the American military disregard the importance in preserving cultural property in their areas of operation. There needs to be a unified effort by the American military and archaeological community to incorporate, train, and employ operational archaeologists and pick up where the Monuments Officers, the Joint Interagency Coordination Group and the Mass Graves Investigation Team left off, and build upon it in a proactive, unified effort rooted in military intelligence that will become a permanent fixture in the American Military: The Operational Archaeologist.
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