(Next to final version. Feel free to circulate this article).

Full Spectrum: The Military Invasion of Anthropology

R. Brian Ferguson
Rutgers University-Newark
bfergusn@rutgers.edu

Abstract

Anthropologists are widely aware of "the issue of security engagement." The *cause celebre,* with reason, is the Human Terrain System, with its goal of embedding anthropologists in combat units. Also widely known is Field Manual 24, *Counterinsurgency,* republished by no less than the University of Chicago Press. The HTS has been discussed by many authors (e.g. Kelly et al. 2010; Lucas 2009), and FM-24 recently got its own *Counter-Counterinsurgency Manual* (Network of Concerned Anthropologists 2009). But HTS and FM-24 are parts of a much larger story, and will receive only passing mention here. Instead, this chapter draws on a flotilla of other manuals, reports, and proposals, to demonstrate just how deeply entrenched and programmatically wide-ranging are the military's cultural demands. Anthropologists need to understand that the Department of Defense and other security agencies are already taking what they want from anthropology, and their appropriation of people and knowledge could transform the discipline in the years to come.

The DoD's Cultural Revolution

Counterinsurgency Reborn. Military thinking was manifestly inadequate for the conquest of Iraq (Melillo 2006; West 2009). By mid 2004, that was obvious. According to one Major General, "I had perfect situational awareness. What I lacked was cultural awareness. Great technical intelligence... wrong enemy" (Scales 2004:1). Major General Scales (2004:3) called for a new form of "culture centric warfare," although his concept of culture was itself very limited, and his idea about implementation correspondingly undeveloped (2004:9; and see McFarland 2005:66).

Into this vacuum of military need stepped an anthropological entrepreneur, Montgomery McFate, who wrote of anthropologists' past participation in colonial, war-fighting projects as an advertisement for their potential utility today. She along with others proposed a wide ranging engagement of anthropology and military needs (McFate 2005a; 2005b; McFate and Jackson 2005). The proposals found enthusiastic backing from a circle of military intellectuals-- "warrior-scholars"-- who came out of the West Point's Department of Social Sciences, or "Sosh" (Axe 2010:62-63). Number one was David Petraeus. In his vision, the military had to retool for a future of long wars–for population-centric counterinsurgency (COIN). Another major visionary from Sosh was John Nagl (Center for a New American Security n.d.), author of a history of counterinsurgencies (Nagl 2002).

Petraeus, Nagl, and those around them reanimated COIN theory, directed at "winning the hearts and minds" of the population in the counterinsurgency area of operations (Kilcullen 2006). To do that, cultural awareness and detailed ethnographic information are needed. As the debacle of Iraq became more glaringly apparent, higher powers in the Bush administration threw their weight behind this vision (Becevich 2008). The new doctrine went public with FM 3-24, *Counterinsurgency* (DoA 2006; and see Gonzalez 2009:8-12; Nagl n.d.).

Within two years of Major General Scales's call for culture-centric warfare, culture-oriented programs were widespread. In September 2006, Mitre Corporation, which manages federally funded research and development centers, conducted a one day conference on "Socio-Cultural Perspectives: A New Intelligence Paradigm" at the Center for National Security Programs in McLean, VA. Its premise was "that cultural intelligence is important for a wide range of national security endeavors and that this fact is increasingly recognized in many government quarters." Representatives of "more than 50 different government organizations attended the conference" (Friedland et al. 2007:iii, 9). (I recently met an engineer from Mitre Corporation, who works with StratCom, the current incarnation of the Strategic Air Command. He told me that anthropological input was essential for their intelligence work. Anthropologists-- he told me twice--fill the same function today as Indian Scouts did in the days of the old west).

The field has grown rapidly since that time. The Defense Science Board Task Force on Understanding Human Dynamics (DSB 2009) was tasked to compile information about every DoD "effort or group" dealing with "human dynamics/human terrain/culture" (2009:98-99). Their final table contains 111 entries, which does not include "the extensive network of expert

cultural consultants" maintained by the Army, Air Force and combat commands (2009:xiv). Even with this proliferation, the Task Force calls for "direct increases in the 'cultural bench' by factors of three to five" (2009:xiv-xv). That includes expanding curriculums in military education, improving career paths for human dynamics advisers, providing advanced degree education, and developing innovative processes for recruiting and rewarding outside expertise.

What is "culture" for the DoD? Military authors recognize, with distress, that there is no one definition of culture within anthropology, or within culture-oriented sectors of the military. It is ruefully amusing to read that on the question of "what culture is and why it is important... at symposia and other technical workshops, once the subject of definitions is broached, whatever the purpose for the meeting, participants often become mired in a turf war" (Alrich 2008:37). Anthropologists are long accustomed to cacophony about culture, but for the DoD, this is a real problem. "Without a shared definition and ontology, the ability to link formal and computational models of culture to the wealth of cultural data collected in the field can be haphazard and some models will not be interoperable." Nevertheless, "It is unlikely that a single definition of culture will emerge, given that there is no common view as to why a single definition is needed." Different elements of the military see different applications of "culture" in their own tasks, so "the DoD may be better served by asking 'what it is about culture that the soldier needs to know to improve performance at the tactical, operational, and/or strategic level?' At each level, different aspects of culture are mission critical" (DSB 2009:70).

This diversity of needs within the DoD stems from the breadth of cultural applications. The military is fond of the term "full spectrum." In its application of culture, there are at least three spectrums. One is the spectrum from the raw recruit up through all the higher echelons, and all the organizational divisions relating to field operations. All must be culturized. Another is the spectrum of deployments, from stability missions during "Phase 0", before armed conflict begins, through foreign security force assistance, to COIN and full scale war. A third spectrum is the range of operations, from "kinetic" lethal attacks, to non-lethal cooperation aimed at winning hearts and minds. Through all these spectrums, the unwavering objective is to fight smarter to win. The following is a typical statement.

> The Army's operations concept is *full spectrum operations:* Army forces combine offensive, defensive, and stability or civil support operations simultaneously as part of an independent joint force to seize, retain, and exploit the initiative, accepting prudent risk to create opportunities to achieve decisive results. They employ synchronized action–lethal and nonlethal–proportional to the mission and informed by a thorough understanding of all variables of the operational environment (DoA 2008:3-1).

Applying Culture in *Areas of Operations.* Most discussion of anthropological engagement focuses on actual war zones, as with Human Terrain Teams. As discussed elsewhere (Ferguson 2011) claims by HTS advocates that their actions support only non-lethal actions are belied by consistent statements by military writers, that cultural awareness and ethnographic information is to be fully integrated into *all* of a commander's options. Information gathered by social scientists may be combined with other information and used in lethal targeting. That usage for killing is one reasons why anthropologists should not

participate.

It is important to study the Human Terrain issue, in part because the topic is sufficiently discrete to throw stark light on broader ethical issues. But Human Terrain Teams are just a small piece of culture-oriented efforts in the field. Sociocultural approaches permeate the battle space. One critique of HTS from within military circles is that troops on multiple rotations long ago learned fundamentals of local cultural organization and interactions (Connable 2009:62; Ephron and Spring 2008:2; Sepp 2007:218). A journalist recently in Afghanistan found soldiers who had hardly heard of the Human Terrain System, were diligently "mapping the human terrain" themselves, and trying to assimilate culturally appropriate ways of interacting with the locals. Within military field operations, Civil Affairs and Provincial Reconstruction Teams are already known for their special "linguistic and cultural skills," and the DoD is seeking ways to integrate them with Human Terrain Teams (QDR 2010:24-25).

To achieve decisive success in future missions, military writers call for two things: "cultural competence and situational awareness" (DoA 2009a:18). This requires turning members of the armed forces into conscious agents capable of intercultural actions. They must internalize the concept of culture and its role in shaping human life, and then use that competence to immerse themselves into and assimilate the particulars of local situations. "Such skills make a better warfighter AND a more dynamic civilian as the soldier moves back into a very competitive and global workforce" (Masellis 2009:14).

A few years ago this was just an idea being put in motion (McFate and Jackson 2005). The Army created a new Training and Doctrine (TRADOC) Culture Center, seeking ways "to leverage cultural knowledge to enhance military operation... from instruction for baseline Soldiers at the lowest level to key military decisionmakers at the highest" (Hajjar, 2006:89). Soon, the need for cultural competence ascended to doctrine (DoA 2009a:1-24).

Culture-specific knowledge comes from compiling thorough knowledge of local society, which is imagined as a table of discrete variables, all of which can be operationally specified (DoA 2009a:1-7). A chart of "typical civil considerations" contains 115 cells, including such entries as: ethnicity, social gathering places, security, gangs, parks, power grids, jails, religion, illicit organizations, visual (graffiti, signs), and religious gatherings (DoA 2009a:1-9). All are to be distilled into easy-to-understand map overlays (DoA 2009a:10), and of course, Power Point slides (see Bumiller 2010).

These over-all characteristics are to be made concrete and personal by being combined with network and event analysis of specific individuals, identified by name with notes, as emphasized in *Counterinsurgency* (DoA 2006, appendix B). The *Human Terrain Team Handbook* also details information to be collected for other kinds of mapping, including social networks, association matrixes, and event coordination registers (Finney 2008:36-37).

Being culturally attuned is expected to give U.S. forces almost a sixth sense in dealing with local populations, giving U.S. forces the power to "anticipate the population actions, and detect subtle changes within the population. Actions inconsistent with the population's

behavioral norms could be indicators of guerrilla activity, internal conflict, or the confirmation or denial of intelligence" (DoA 2009a:1-23)   Put it all together, and what do you get?

>A leader or Soldier has begun to achieve culturally influenced situational awareness when he/she can ask and answer such questions accurately: What is my adversary thinking and why? What are my Host Nation security forces thinking and why?   What are groups of people thinking and why?   What will my adversaries, groups of people, adjacent units, and coalition partners, and Host Nation security forces do if I take action W, and why? How are cultural factors influencing my operations?   How can I make groups of people and Host Nation security forces do what I want them to do?   (DoA 2009a:1-26)

As the Defense Science Board (DSB 2009:5) puts it, "knowledge of the value system of an actual or potential competitor helps in deterring undesirable behaviors and compelling desirable behaviors."

Above and Beyond

Discussion so far has been confined to a fairly delimitated use of culture in military operations.   But the DoD sees culture as just one aspect of much wider knowledge integration, involving other sorts of data, other social science perspectives, higher levels of aggregation, and broader purposes of utilization.   This larger vision is unknown to most anthropologists, even though it may transform the discipline.   The following discussions tour through these broader applications of culture.

Synthesizing, Sharing, Storing, Centralizing.   To start, cultural competency and ethnographic intelligence are required in organizational layers above soldiers in the field, beginning with commanders of larger units.   They are enjoined to "Know the people, the topography, economy, history, religion, and culture.   Know every village, road, field, population group, tribal leader, and ancient grievance.   Your task is to become the world expert on your district" (DoA 2009a: C-2; Kilcullen 2006).

For strategic assessment and planning, this detailed knowledge must be made available in usable form at levels above individual Areas of Operations.   Major General Michael Flynn, the head of military intelligence in Afghanistan, is behind a big push for theater-level comprehensive knowledge.   Flynn et al. (2010) are scathing about the failure of traditional intelligence operations, which focus on covert information leading to killing enemies and the problem of IEDs.   They note that established intelligence operations provide little information useful for leveraging the population against the insurgents, and this opacity gets worse the higher up you go.   "The tendency to overemphasize detailed information about the enemy at the expense of the political, economic, and cultural environment that support it becomes even more pronounced at the brigade and regional command levels" (2010:7-8) "We need to build a process from the sensor all the way to the political decision makers" (2010:4).

Flynn et al. (2010:4-15) are not calling for intelligence analysts to become anthropologists.   "Open source" publications by anthropologists or field observations by Human Terrain Team members are just information sources in the bigger mix.   Their model for intelligence gatherers and analysts is an aggressive reporter, extroverted, hungry, who will roam

everywhere to extract all relevant information, and bring it back to "teams of 'information brokers' at the regional command level who will organize and disseminate proactively and on request–all the reports and data gathered at the grassroots level." It is these go-getter who would debrief the social scientists.

Stability Operations Information Centers are envisioned as functioning much as the current Intelligence and Security Command's Information Dominance Center, which currently integrates multi-disciplinary information for U.S. major commands (Altendorg n.d.; Anon. n.d.), but the new units would make such knowledge much more accessible. Virtually anyone with a reason the military deems legitimate, including local security forces, "should be able to walk in and obtain mission-related information with ease"–comprehensive, succinct, and current (Flynn et al. 2010:19-20).

This accumulating mass of data will not remain in overseas areas of combat. The broader goal is to archive all cultural information from the DoD, the Department of State, and U.S. AID, in permanent, searchable, interoperational data bases. Currently, the Defense Intelligence Agency's Socio-Cultural Dynamics Working Group is the key node for managing work by the "federation of defense intelligence organizations performing socio-cultural dynamics analysis" (2009:73). In the future, the Distributed Common Ground Station may be given charge to "organize, store, and distribute 'human terrain information,' provide tools to keep that data current, and continuously provide cultural insights from competent social scientists to analysts and operators alike"–right along with its current task of integrating satellite, aircraft, CIA, signal intelligence, and everything else (2009:xix, 44). On top of that, there is a call for a new Center for Global Engagement, "as a collaborative hub for U.S. government innovation in cultural understanding, communication technology, resource identification, and creative program development," directed to "engage experts, thought leaders and creative talent from the private sector and civil society" (2009:30). Supporters of the Human Terrain System often claim that they do not produce information that can be used in lethal targeting. When local cultural information is processed at these higher levels, it all goes into unified systems, available for any military or intelligence purpose.

Transforming Societies. This operational omniscience will be employed toward goals beyond combat or stability operations. Its application goes far beyond old-style counterinsurgency. DoD doctrine aims to get to the roots of the problem, to eliminate those discontents that fuel insurgencies. The avowed goal is to find out what the local population wants and needs, and then make that happen. This is clear in General McChrystal's preliminary report on Afghanistan (2009:2/12-18). His COIN orientation involves basics such as providing clean water or electricity, collecting garbage and building roads, but that is only the beginning. New businesses are to be conceived and started-up, jobs created, schools built, and crop substitutions guided. Local and transparent systems of civil administration, finance, and justice systems are to be developed in place and/or purged of corruption. Local communities will be empowered. In Afghanistan, all of this is to be done in the face of a government which, where it exists at all, is seen as incompetent and venal. In this vision, U.S. boots on the ground would help build new societies from the ground up. John Nagl sees the U.S. military as tasked "not just

to dominate land operations, but to change entire societies" (quoted in Bacevich 2008:2).

Tactics in Counterinsurgency (DoA 2009a:7-5-7-28) details the required stability tasks to be implemented by U.S. armed forces, many requiring local cultural understanding (presented here as listed *headings* and subheads): *establish civil control* (establish public order and safety, establish interim criminal justice system, support law enforcement and police reform, support judicial reform, support property dispute resolution, support corrections reform, support public outreach and community rebuilding programs); *support governance* (support transitional administrations, support anti corruption initiatives, support elections); *restore essential services* (provide essential civil services, tasks related to civilian dislocation, support famine prevention and emergency food relief programs, support public health programs, support education programs); and *support economic and infrastructure development* (support economic generation and enterprise creation, support public sector investment programs, support private sector development, protect natural resources and the environment, support agricultural development programs, restore transportation infrastructure, restore telecommunications infrastructure, support general infrastructural reconstruction programs, use money as a weapon). One important goal, in Afghanistan (Batson 2008) and elsewhere around the world (for instance Mexico--Herlihy et al. 2008; Mychalejko and Ryan 2009; Sedillo 2009)), is to effect the transfer of communal landholdings to clear, transferable individual titles–showing, if there was any doubt, that Pentagon world restructuring is neoliberal world restructuring.

This is a controversial vision. One friendly critic applauded McChrystal, but believes that the close circle of advisors around him had turned this doctrine into a "theology," for "armed social engineering" (Corn 2009:11)–though it is fully in line with the doctrine of the warrior-scholars around Petreaus. A more blistering assessment came from Defense Department Analyst Kalev Sepp (2007:222):

> Call it militant Wilsonianism, call it expeditionary democracy, call it counterinsurgency, but this is... decidedly not stabilizing. It is an overturning of nations. It is, at its core, a revolution. American soldiers are the instruments of this revolution... The army would have to lead revolutions on a scale so vast as to completely eclipse what the USA experienced in breaking from Great Britain's imperial rule, or in reconstructing the defeated slave states of the South following the American Civil War.

Or in the restructuring of colonial societies in earlier ages of imperialism.

Besides the overweening ambition and imperial hubris of this vision, one has to consider that this social transformation is to be implemented by the U.S. Army. The only local evaluation I know of U.S. development effort comes from a Human Terrain Team observation in Iraq. A sheik who seemed very friendly to U.S. forces, was quite different when addressing other tribal leaders. He loudly complained "things are never done right, never completed, and how things are never improved." The Human Terrain experts explained that this was due to inter-cultural confusion, because local culture could not entertain the idea that invaders actually wanted to help rebuild their society (Schaner 2008:59). A more straightforward interpretation is that U.S. development efforts are seen as incompetent failures, that the U.S. is still seen as an occupying army, and that local power brokers manipulate the conquerors by telling them what they want to

hear (Ferguson 2011:110-112).

However self-deluding may be this imagined ability to penetrate "the locals" hearts and minds, and then make their wishes come true, it is the essence of COIN doctrine. We bring them over to "our side," thus isolating the really "bad guys" and setting them up for targeting and defeat. It is a fantasy, but as U.S. armed forces and its fellow travelers carry out actions around the world, its consequences will be very real.

Employing Culture to Build Local Security Forces. Another major category of cultural application in current or prospective battle zones has largely escaped notice by anthropologists: using cultural understanding to enhance communication and cooperation between U.S. and local security forces. Raising the performance of these agencies is seen as key to all counterinsurgency and stability operations, as detailed in *FM 3-07.1 Security Force Assistance,* invoking the 2008 National Defense Strategy: "Our strategy emphasizes building the capacities of a broad spectrum of partners as the basis for long-term security... By helping others to police themselves and their regions, we will collectively address threats to the broader international system" (DoA 2009b:1-2).

FM 3-07.1 has a chapter on society, culture and cross-cultural communication, and a separate one on "cross-cultural influencing and negotiating." This knowledge and ability is seen as essential for building up forces "including but not limited to military, paramilitary, police and intelligence forces; border police, coast guard, and customs officials; and prison guards and correctional personnel" (DoA 2009b:1-1). Anthropologists might see a problem with that, since it is that array of forces that has so often brutalized the people we study.

Culturally attuned security force assistant is cost-effective, and has the benefit of bringing our partners' local knowledge into joint operations. Currently, culturally attuned security force assistance is helping "seek out and dismantle terrorist and insurgent networks while providing security to populations" in the Philippines, the Horn of Africa, the Sahel, Colombia and elsewhere. "As U.S. forces draw down in Iraq and make progress toward building stability in Afghanistan, more capacity will be available for training, advising, and assisting foreign security forces in other parts of the globe" (QDR 2010:27-28).

An example offered of successful security force assistance is the training and supervision El Salvadoran armed forces in the 1980s. For instance, there is Gabe Acosta, a US military intelligence officer in El Salvador.

> During his first tour in 1983-1984 he established a set of friendships and relationships that were very helpful... [but] the real pay off came on his second tour in 1990-91. Between tours in El Salvador, as part of his stateside professional military education, Acosta attended the School of the Americas, where he made the acquaintance of thirteen more Salvadoran officers. As a result, those officers were completely comfortable in sharing information with him during his second tour in country (Renzi 2006a:18).

Gill (2004) should be consulted on the horrible human rights record of the School of the Americas.

Global Reach. Throughout all the discussions on the future of cultural awareness and "human terrain" intelligence in war, the premise is that this is a *global* necessity. Andy Marshall, the secretive Director of the super-secretive Office of Net Assessment—they call him Yoda (McGray 2003)--has called for "anthropology-level knowledge of a wide range of cultures" (quoted in McFate 2005:46). (A proposal by anthropologist Anna Simons and David Tucker, "Improving Human Intelligence in the War on Terrorism: The Need for an Ethnographic Capability" was submitted to the Office of the Secretary of Defense for Net Assessment in 2004. It has not been made public [Renzi 2006b:22]). Today the focus is on Iraq and Afghanistan, but plans are in process for Africa, the Pacific, and Latin America (Axe 2010:68; Hodge 2009).

DoD savants see a need to develop deep cultural knowledge and connections all over the world *now*, to begin gathering cultural information for possible future deployments. This was recognized from the first statements of the DoD's new cultural needs.

> At the heart of a cultural-centric approach to future war would be a cadre of global scouts, well educated, with a penchant for languages and a comfort with strange and distant places. These soldiers should be given time to immerse themselves in a single culture and to establish trust with those willing to trust them... Global scouts must be supported and reinforced with a body of intellectual fellow travelers within the intelligence community who are formally educated in the deductive and inductive skills necessary to understand and interpret intelligently the information and insights provided by scouts in the field. They should attend graduate schools in the disciplines necessary to understand human behavior and cultural anthropology (Scales 2004:4-5).

This concept was fleshed out in an article in *Military Review*, "Networks: Terra Incognita and the Case for Ethnographic Intelligence" (Renzi 2006b; and see 2006a).

> The proliferation of empowered networks makes "ethnographic intelligence" (EI) more important to the United States than ever before... Today, we have little insight into which cultures or networks may soon become threats to our national interests. For this reason, America must seek to understand and develop EI on a global scale, *before* it is surprised by another unknown or dimly understood society or network...(Renzi 2006b: 16-17).
> The United States could develop a corps of personnel dedicated to the task and base them out of a more robust military annex to our embassies. ... a low-key, constant interest in overt ethnographic matters would show that the United States cares and is indeed watching. Perhaps this constant attention would serve to subtly constrict the amount of safe-haven space available for dark networks. The overt information gathered by military ethnographers could complement the covert work done by the CIA (and vice versa)... Ethnographic intelligence can empower the daily fight against dark networks, and it can help formulate contingency plans that are based on a truly accurate portrayal of the most essential terrain—the human mind... The Nation must invest in specialized people who can pay "constant attention" to "indigenous forms of association and mobilization," so that we can see and map the human terrain (Renzi 2006b:20-22).

(Renzi references the proposal to Net Assessment by Simons and Tucker, and studied under

Simons, so it is not unreasonable to expect this position reflects ideas in that   proposal).

Integrating, Modeling and Predicting.   In the DoD vision of omniscience, ethnographic information and theory will be joined with higher tech knowledge to enable behavior prediction.   The Defense Science Board (2009:54-57) describes efforts to integrate a cultural focus with neuroscience and sensors.   Among them, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, (DARPA, the people who gave us the M-16, drone aircraft, and the internet [Lal 2006:7]), is

> exploring the potential of neuroscience research and development and its applications to understanding human dynamics.   Advances in using neuroscience to understand the basis for human cognition, including non-invasive sensor technologies, may be applicable for understanding perception, the neurological origins of trust and compliance, and the neuroscience of persuasion–all relevant to the topic addressed in this report.   The broad concept is to develop quantitative neuroscience tools and techniques to predict the effects of "ideas" within diverse populations.

Since DARPA is also implanting sensors into drivable insect cyborgs (DARPA 2006), the possibilities seem endless.

Cultural knowledge will be brought into high tech targeting systems.   In 2007, Assistant Deputy Under Secretary of Defense John Wilcox (2007) gave a PowerPoint presentation to a meeting of the Precision Strike Winter Roundtable, where the focus was on futuristic weapons systems to eliminate any target anywhere in the world within 60 minutes (called Prompt Global Strike).   His first bullet point was "Need to 'Map the Human Terrain cross the Kill Chain–*Enables* the entire Kill Chain for GWOT" (Global War on Terrorism).   (The Kill Chain is a linked sequence of operations: Plan, Find, Fix, Track, Target, Engage, Assess).   When engagement critic Roberto Gonzalez called attention to this, McFate retorted that Undersecretary Wilcox "is in no way connected with HTS" (Gonzalez 2008:22, 25; McFate 2008:27).   That is precisely the point.   Cultural information collected by HTS, and by other DoD cultural programs, will be totally integrated within the full spectrum of DoD operations.

In the DoD vision, cultural perspectives will stream into a new, security social science (Jaschik 2008a).   Working together over time, diverse disciplinary perspectives are imagined as developing trans-disciplinary, *predictive* theory for application to security issues.   Hypotheses and data will be run through sophisticated computer models (see Gonzalez, this volume).   For instance, the Journal of Defense Modeling and Simulation recently called for papers for a special issue: "Modeling, simulating and prognosticating the Human Terrain of deployed force's area(s) of operation is recognized as being increasingly important for U.S. and Coalition Forces during counter-insurgency and stability operations...   This special issue is therefore interested in contributions that forecast population response to different messaging (e.g. kinetic operations, cordon and search, reconstruction...)" (Society for Modeling and Simulation International 2009).

The Deputy Director of the Information Exploitation Office of DARPA saw this coming years ago (which is typical).

We believe the way forward is clear... What is needed is a strategy that leads to a greater

cultural awareness and thorough social understanding of the threats comprising the new strategic triad [failed states, WMD, terrorism].   ...the path to understand people, their cultures, motivations, intentions, opinions and perceptions lies in applying interdisciplinary quantitative and computational social science methods from mathematics, statistics, economics, political science, cultural anthropology, sociology, neuroscience, and modeling simulation...   These analytical techniques apply to cognition and decision-making.   They make forecasts about conflict and cooperation and do so at all levels of data aggregation from the individual to groups, tribes, societies, nation states, and the globe... Victory in the 21st century strategic threat environment no longer belongs to the side that owns the best and most sophisticated ISR or weapon systems.   It belongs to the side that can combine these cutting-edge technological marvels, which emerged from the physical sciences, with methods from the quantitative and computational social sciences (Popp 2005).

The fighting arm of the U.S. will know all, everywhere that matters—what makes locals tick, how to make them move.   Their projects will integrate everything from social science hypotheses to neuroscience findings to HTS data to signals intelligence into a seamless, constantly updated, computer modeled, and continually evaluated system of intelligence, prediction, and prescription.   The DoD (and associates) will have its thumb on the local pulse wherever U.S. power centers see "U.S. security interests" at stake--monitoring, predicting, channeling, even transforming societies from the ground up to neutralize even potential threats.

Intermezzo: Virtual War and Magical Death.

What I have described thus far is how Cultural Awareness and Ethnographic Intelligence are being built into the virtual war simulacrum.   The overarching goal of this full tilt press is to create a computer copy of the real world, the ultimate divination machine.   Actual or *potential* Areas of Operations include much of the planet, but it is mostly directed at peoples of color, in areas where modernism has not extirpated "traditional" identities and loyalties.   In theory, where ever imagined Threats to American Security are seen, security practitioners at any echelon would just have to ask the right question.   What if X happens, or if we do Y?   The answers will roll out: who is involved, what do they want, how do they think, what can they do?   What will happen?   How can we control events to serve our interests?   The all-knowing system of systems will be able to predict the future, and might be dubbed "crystal ball"–if that name was not already in use by DARPA (2007), (for a battle system that will virtually read commanders minds from statements and sketches, then produce battle options and probable outcomes).

Some time ago I compared national intelligence agencies to sorcerers, divining the hidden and disrupting our adversaries (Ferguson 1999: 428).   Current DoD plans take this magical aspiration to whole new levels, beyond the imagination of any warlock.   This is not merely a fantasy of omniscience, but of omnipotence.   Through tightening up the Kill Chain, Prompt Global Strike should be capable of destroying any target anywhere in the world in under an hour. Impressive, but not compared to transforming whole societies, to make them like us, and *be* like us.   That ambition is positively alchemical.   The universal solvent of modernity would gradually dissolve the traditional ties that impede neoliberal integration, be a panacea for the

10

disruptive infections that ail our global ambitions, and metamorphose the enemy into friend, ally, or client.

For all the talk of "war without blood", blood will gush in abundance, and the intensifying grip of the American empire will lead to incalculable violence spread through the lives of those people anthropologists traditionally study, an expectable consequence of building up local security forces of all stripes. Will the dead be killed by magic? Usually, bullets, rockets, and jails will do the job. But the thinking behind this vision is magical. Many parallels can be drawn. Picking among the classicists, others in this volume discuss Evans-Pritchard's idea. But consider Malinowski (1979). Humans often confront situations that "put them in harm's way"--drought, storms at sea, war–where practical knowledge is no help. Humans want to believe they have control over these existential threats, or they find it difficult to go forward. In giving the illusion of control, magic is practical. It prescribes concrete measures to alleviate the anxiety of plunging into the unknowable and uncontrollable. If it fails, there are always reasons to explain the failure, without questioning the premises.

This bears comparison to current security ambitions. The cultural turn of the DoD creates the *illusion* of control. The Human Terrain System, as a critical test of concept, does provide useful information to combat commanders, but there is no available evidence that it is making any headway toward its announced goal of transforming Areas of Operations into secure, friendly spaces (see Ferguson 2011). The simulacrum is a glamour, a false construction that deceives those under its spell. The savants of security, the magicians of DARPA, who envision a world of secure predictability, are captured by a naive faith, that is justified neither by advances in social sciences, or in hard sciences such as molecular biology, where greater knowledge means recognition of expanding dimensions of ignorance.

I research and teach on issues of "human nature." The advent of the genomic era was once foreseen as unlocking the secrets of what we are, and why. There was heady talk of genetic interventions, and finding specific genes for specific predispositions. What the great research progress of recent years has actually produced is realization of just how rudimentary our understanding is. The developmental, systemic interactions of functional genes, non-coding regulatory DNA, epigenetics, multiplying classes of RNA, and proteomics–all of which are open and influenced by non-predictable environmental factors--are far, far beyond our ability to comprehend. "It's all in the genes," it was once thought, and genomics would show us how. Now we have to recognize that cellular systems may be irreducibly complex and in important ways nondeterministic. We should expect nothing less from whole human beings.

The prophets of intelligence seem incapable of drawing the conclusion that the ability to know and predict the world is inherently limited, despite such glaring "intelligence failures" as the fall of the Soviet Union, and now the democratic uprisings across the Middle East. The lesson always drawn is that more and better intelligence is needed. The first half of this chapter has described how the DoD is pushing relentlessly to develop an all-encompassing virtual world of threat detection and neutralization. There is no call here for an "anthropological perspective" –that could be critical of U.S. military expansion around the world. But an essential ingredient is anthropological *product*, what anthropologists know about culture that can be absorbed and

11

uses for more effective military control. And the DoD is doing everything it can to get it.

It is impossible to imagine how this boundless program will penetrate and affect the lives and cultures of peoples around the world. Certainly there are many precedents in previous efforts of "insurgency prophylaxis"—as Project Camelot was called—yet never before has such money, technology, and intense focus of the U.S. military been directed at monitoring and controlling "indigenous networks." It brings empire up to a whole new level, and without question the impact will be great. But the permanent war has and will transform not only life in foreign lands, but right here at home. The second part of this chapter takes on one small part of the ongoing militarization of U.S. society, what the Pentagon's quest for culture means for anthropology, social science, and U.S. universities.

Militarizing Anthropology

How will the security demand for culture be manifested for the discipline of anthropology? To borrow a phrase, the impact will be *full spectrum*, changing conditions in education, employment, and research.

Military Education. A very large impact is expectable in education—in teaching possibilities within the DoD, in a militarization of campuses in general, and strains on anthropology programs specifically. Inside the military, a vast archipelago of educational programs demand cultural perspectives. That means a lot of anthropology teachers and instructional products.

The Institute for Defense Analysis was charged with surveying in-house military cultural education programs. It was surprised by how much already existed. "In addition to the vastness of the landscape with respect to the programs and initiatives, the variety of emphases and missions cannot be overstated" (Alrich 2008:2). Instruction comes in many forms. There are one-off lectures for predeployment forces, and short courses on military bases, such as Intro to Anthro or Islam (Capuzzo 2007). A major growth area is online training and education resources, beginning with a Warfighter Cultural Awareness curriculum, and including specialized instructions about particular areas for soldiers in the field (Masellis 2009:14).

There are higher level collegiate and post-graduate venues for anthropological instruction within the military, beginning with the service academies of West Point, Annapolis and the Air Force Academy, and extending through Command and Staff Colleges, most of which have military think-tanks or research groups (Roxborough 2008:2-3). Across levels, however staffed or structured, a great surge in military education in foreign languages and cultures is assuredly on the way. The 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review sees this expansion as one of the Defense Department's most important investments (QDR 2010:25-26)

Militarizing Campuses. Moving outside the Camo Tower to consider our universities, Secretary Gates, former President of Texas A&M, called ringingly for greatly increased cooperation between the DoD and research universities. Campuses as a whole are targeted for a major increase in military/security engagement: opening them for more ROTC programs,

12

"actively promoting the military as a career option, or giving full support to military recruiters on campus... [and] wide-ranging initiatives to recognize veterans for the knowledge they have..." Online courses should be offered for military personnel that are "immediately relevant–the history of the Middle East, anthropology classes on tribal culture, and so on." To encourage participation, universities could offer degree credit for these courses–"the Department could offer logistical advice" (Gates 2008:3). Beyond individual universities, Secretary Gates envisions "a consortia of universities that will promote research in specific areas," (2008:2) encouraged by Minerva funding (below). After a closed-door meeting with Secretary Gates, presidents of major universities were reportedly enthusiastic, even "extraordinarily excited" by the proposal of greater collaboration between the Pentagon and US universities (Jaschik 2008a:2).

The Intelligence Community (IC) is already farther along than that. Two current programs bring intelligence agencies on to campuses. The Pat Roberts Intelligence Scholars Program was the first manifestation of security engagement to attract attention within anthropology (see Price 2005a). PRISP is a scholarship program for individual students, who receive substantial funding to study languages and topics, cultural and otherwise, which are of direct interest to the CIA and other intelligence agencies. Applicants go through a security investigation, polygraph test, and drug screening. Recipients must have an internship with an approved agency. After graduation, they are required to spend one and one-half the duration of their funded studies in the employ of an intelligence agency, or pay back the scholarship at punitive rates of interest (DIA n.d.; Price 2005b). Faculty have no way of knowing if one of these intelligence trainees is in their class.

Only recently coming to broad attention (Price 2010a) is the Intelligence Community Centers of Academic Excellence (CAE) Program. Presently offered are renewable $600,000 grants for adjusting universities to long-term intelligence needs. CAE will "create a new diverse talent pool from which the intelligence community can recruit" (CAE n.d.: Home Page). All participating universities are required to enhance curricula needed by the IC, hold colloquia with other consortia universities on IC issues and careers, send IC scholars abroad for education and immersion, and reach out to local high schools about intelligence careers. By 2010, 22 universities had signed up, including the University of Maryland, College Park, the Universities of New Mexico and Nebraska, Pennsylvania State, and Virginia Polytechnic (CAE n.d.: Institutions). Of course, a major intelligence presence on U.S. campuses is hardly something new (Price 2004; 2008a)

Anthropology Programs. My guess is that most who teach in colleges and universities already have service men and women in their class rooms. At Rutgers-Newark, I get many, and they and their interests are welcome. I also get the standard office-hours question, "What can you do with an anthropology degree, even a BA"? I include the military/intelligence possibilities, and we talk about it. At graduate levels, be prepared for a surge of enrollments in anthropology MA and Certificate programs. For anyone charting a military career today, or someone from another social science wanting to re-tool in an ethnographic direction, an MA or Certificate would be a solid investment, especially if somehow subsidized by DoD. University administrations love MA and Certificate programs.

Then there are PhDs, military persons who obtain the highest degree from research universities.   It is frequently emphasized that the training of senior officers "should extend to the world's best graduate schools" (Joint Forces Command 2009:49).   This is a challenge facing diverse disciplines, but especially pointed for anthropology programs.   If they enroll a military person for a PhD in anthropology, will they do fieldwork under departmental auspices, like any other fledgling anthropologist?   How would IRB's handle this dual orientation?   How would a department even categorize someone as a military person?   Many would come in after leaving active duty, intending to utilize their anthropological training in future security contexts.   If graduate anthropology departments have not met to consider this, they should.

> As more *military anthropologists* achieve higher degrees, they will expand the possibility of the "grow our own" alternative, in which higher-level anthropology training takes place within military post-graduate institutes, thus bypassing AAA professional concerns (Connable 2009:64).
>
> Regrettably, the anthropological community in academia has tremendous reservations about working with the military... a specialized group of ethnographers is urgently needed.   The solution is for the Department of Defense to grow its own cultural experts–hybrids between soldier and anthropologists, who may not have to be uniformed,
>
> but do have to look at cultural matters from a security standpoint (Renzi 2006a:12-13)

According to John Allison, a cultural anthropologist who joined then resigned in protest from the Human Terrain program, this is happening already.   "[T]he military is beginning to do an end run by producing its own anthropologists/social scientist PhDs at West Point, the Air Force Academy, the Naval Academy and other cooperating institutions; thus marginalizing the criticism" (quoted in Price 2010b:4).

Funded and Promoted Research.   Another broad front of the military invasion will be in anthropological research.   In April 2008, Secretary Gates announced the Minerva Research Initiative   (Asher 2008; Gates 2008; Jaschick 2008a, b).   Building on a series of private meetings with leaders of the Association of American Universities, Minerva aims to engage disciplines such as history, anthropology, sociology, and evolutionary psychology, on topics of "strategic importance to U.S. National Policy."   Between the directly administered Minerva grants, and a parallel program outsourced to the NSF, upwards of $74 million dollars over five years is dedicated to new research.

In the first 24 grants announced for both programs, the largest number (6) concern terrorism or insurgency, with additional clusters on group behavioral psychology and dynamics (4), environmental security (2), conflict in weak or authoritarian states (3), post-conflict recovery (2), plus several that cannot be lumped with others (Minerva n.d.a).   One cannot tell the value of a proposal from its title, but by the titles, most of these seem like worthwhile projects. Notably absent is any title that hints at a critical perspective on U.S. military or other security projects.   The Social Science Research Council posts a panel of thoughtful commentaries on Minerva, and its prospective effect on social sciences.   Gusterson (2008) and Lutz (2008) notably, worry that expanded engagement through Minerva/NSF funding will bend the priorities and practices of anthropology into the military orbit.   Researchers may gravitate toward studying what the DoD wants studied. No doubt additional sources of security-related funding will come.

Both research funding programs are explicitly intended to cross disciplines, to build a new community of security science researchers, "to foster a new generation of engaged scholarship in the social sciences" (Minerva n.d.b). Besides creating a network of civilian security researchers, the DoD also intends to connect multi-disciplinary scholars directly to the military establishment. The Human Terrain System calls for development of a network of area specialists to call on as needed (Kipp et al. 2006:14) The Defense Science Board Task Force (DSB 2009: xiv) notes that "both the Army and Air Force reported that each maintained an extensive network of expert cultural consultants. The combatant commands also have their own 'rolodex files'... [but the DoD as a whole lacks] procedures, funding lines, and automated expert finder/locator for effectively engaging and leveraging expertise in industry and academia"–and needs to develop them. "Recognizing the importance of such cross-disciplinary interactions, Secretary Gates is actively working to reassure those who may be reluctant to collaborate with the Department of Defense..." As anthropologists and other social scientists are drawn into security studies, regular interaction with security professionals will become normal.

Security Appropriation of Normal Anthropological Research. Perhaps the broadest connection of the military and anthropology is already at hand, not through funding new work, but through the diligent mining and absorption of normal, published research and dissertations. The most important fount of anthropological data will not be from HTS social scientists, but from what security people call "open sources." The head of military intelligence in Afghanistan concludes open source information makes up 90% of the intelligence future, clandestine work merely being more dramatic (Flynn et al. 2010:23). The standard operating procedure now for Human Terrain Teams is to pose a problem for the Reachback Cells stateside to investigate through open source materials. As anthropologist John Allison wrote to David Price (2010:3), before he quit the HTS:

> One interesting fact that was revealed today is that *the time that an anthropologist or social scientist has to finish an interview before the probability of a sniper attack becomes drastically high, is about 7 minutes.* How deep an understanding, rapport or trust develops in 7 minutes? It seems that the "data" sought is very limited to operationally tactically useful stuff. For anything deeper, they "reach back" to the research centers for work from anthropologists that they will use without permission and without attribution (emphasis in original).

A similar evaluation was made by another HTS team member in the field: "Without the ability to truly immerse yourself in the population, existing knowledge of the culture... is critical. Lacking that, we were basically an open-source research cell" (Ephron and Spring 2008:2).

HTS Reachback specialists, and "deskbound analysts" in other programs and institutions, constitute another major source of employment for anyone with any anthropology degree (see Kipp et al 2007). These analysts will be part of the process of streaming together anthropological data with other sources of intelligence. For instance, BAE Systems, the former contractor of the Human Terrain System, advertised for a "Senior Human Terrain Analyst" to use new toolkits to "address specific, often time sensitive topics that normally include the fusion of SIGINT data, tribal/cultural patterns, message traffic, imagery, open source and advanced geospatial technologies" (BAE 2009).

15

Given the overarching, insistence emphasis on standardizing information and integrating it within interoperational data sets, it can safely be assumed that these textual sources are being analyzed and coded for recovery and modeling. High aspirations are plain in a Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA 2008) call for proposals for a Universal Reading Machine, capable of reading everything, categorizing information, processing it through programs for analyzing behavior, and passing it along to whom or whatever that can use it. This proposed system would apply to academic publications, print media, and web postings, going beyond what may be accomplished by human reader/processors. "Manually encoding such knowledge can become prohibitively expensive... the goal of the MRP [Machine Reading Program] is to create an automated Reading System that serves as a bridge between knowledge contained in natural texts and the formal reasoning systems that need such knowledge" (6).

All anthropologists working in any area of potential interest to U.S. security agencies–and that is much of the world–should understand that any ethnographic information they publish, any sort of explanation of why those people do what they do, may be assimilated into the great network of security data bases and modeling systems, and through them made available to military, intelligence, and other security practitioners.

Price (2008a) describes how U.S. military needs around World War II contributed to the development of basic anthropological research projects and tools, such as area handbooks and the Human Relations Area Files. Thus he notes the irony in that the leaked Human Terrain Handbook calls for contributing Human Terrain data to the HRAF data base. "'This practice will also allow us to tie into the HRAF database and compare the existence of one social practice, symbolic system, or historical process in our area of operations with others elsewhere in the world. Such cross-cultural analysis enables us to get closer to explaining causation and make weak assertions of what will likely happen in the population in the near future'" (Finney 2008, quoted in Price 2008b:3). But given the plans for data integration and modeling described in this chapter, the new DoD efforts will make HRAF correlational studies seem like the horse and buggy. Given high level pledges of research openness (Gates 2008), anthropologists probably will be invited to use these tools–or some of them anyway–although these tools may have a built-in bias toward topics of security interest. The scholarly possibilities will be bedazzling.

Conclusion

The DoD Cultural Revolution will have a profound impact on anthropology and its intellectual environment. People with degrees from BA to PhD will find work with the military as teachers and analysts. (What may be distasteful for a tenured professor may seem quite different for a young person trying to set up a job, life and family). Campuses and social sciences will reorient to security needs. Militarily-oriented culture-seekers will filter into anthropology teaching programs. Militarily useful anthropology will be trained into soldier-anthropologist hybrids, who then can reproduce their own. Academic research will be funded and otherwise channeled into security relevant topics. All "open source" work with possible security relevance will be assimilated into the great security networks and nodes of synthesis, analysis, and prediction.

Of course, that assumes that the DoD emphasis on culture will continue in the years to come. Although details and outcomes are debated, can anyone claim that the DoD's turn to culture has turned the tide in Afghanistan? Some in power have questioned the new counterinsurgency, Vice President Biden for one. Yet it is very unlikely that a lack of success will lead to a turn away from culture-centric counterinsurgency. As with the CORDS/Phoenix counterinsurgency program in Vietnam, blame can go elsewhere–the program got started too late, it was misunderstood, the American public had lost the will to fight, etc. (Andrade and Willbanks 2006; White n.d.). The emphasis on Global COIN and counterterrorism (CT)–often put in harness with Stability Operations (SO)--will not go away. The DoD Cultural Revolution has gone too far to turn back, permeating its power centers, while a new generation of COIN combat officers is rising within the Pentagon.

COIN/CT will not go away because too much is riding on it. These spotlighted global challenges give the Pentagon something it desperately needs–an unending rationale for massive military spending. As the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR 2010:20) puts it:

> Stability operations, large-scale counterinsurgency, and counterterrorism operations are not niche challenges or the responsibility of a single Military Department, but rather require a portfolio of capabilities as well as sufficient capacity from across America's Armed Forces and other departments and agencies. Nor are these types of operations a transitory or anomalous phenomenon in the security landscape. On the contrary, we must expect that for the indefinite future, violent extremist groups, with or without state sponsorship, will continue to foment instability and challenge U.S. and allied interests.

Even if many of the DoD's high-budget items are of little relevance to COIN/CT/SO, terrorist-linked insurgents provide the critical fear factor that supports massive security spending, that bleeds the federal government dry for domestic spending. 'It's a dangerous world out there'–the militarist mantra goes–'We are locked in a life and death struggle with deadly fanatics who thrive on disorder. We must spend whatever it takes to give our brave soldiers whatever it takes to prevail, and to protect America.'

This volume raises the question "when is war?" For the DoD, war is always, everywhere. Even when there is no realistic threat to "U.S. security interests," the potential exists. The envisioned global surveillance system will be vigilant against a threat's emergence, peering into the shadows, sweeping out the corners, turning over rocks. That is how to get ahead of the curve. Actually fighting and winning a war is just one aspect of this project, a clean-up when prior forms of surveillance and control have not done their jobs.

This premise of existential threat underlies political discourse in the United States. Take away terrorism and insurgency, and where is the visceral danger for U.S. voters? (OK, North Korea and Iran work too, but China?) Why should the federal government channel about *half* of its entire discretionary spending into the military? Why should the U.S. maintain some 600-700 overseas military bases? (It is a telling fact that no one has been able to ascertain the number of bases more precisely than that–Turse 2011). Say the magic words: To Preserve American Security. Yet look at the man pulling the levers behind the curtain. What is really thriving on perceptions of global "instability and challenge [to] U.S. and allied interests" is the U.S.

military-corporate-political complex.

Anthropologists working in war zones (Lubkemann 2008; Richard 1996) have come to understand that war may not be a defined period, separate from ongoing projects of everyday life, but a chronic state of existence, the context for ongoing life projects. So it is for the United States. Lutz (2002), other anthropologists (Gusterson and Besteman 2009), and earlier pioneers such as Seymour Melman (1974; 1984) document the myriad ways in which U.S. society and culture have been thoroughly reoriented to a permanent war footing. This is always the way of militaristic societies and empires (Ferguson 1999). Questioning military projection is ruled out of bounds within "legitimate" political discourse. Language is bent to the cause. U.S. forces are "put in harm's way," rather than sent to do harm—which is what any army is about. (I recall Johnny Carson commenting on the Reagan administration's renaming a new nuclear missile "the Peacekeeper– which sounds a lot better than World Ender"). Anthropology now is being pulled into this total war complex, just like video gaming.

The DoD is only the biggest dog in the room. The State Department, think tanks, and private corporations will all be looking to put culture to use. Civilian surges (Binnendijk and Cronin 2008; DeYoung 2009; Jelinkek 2009), stability operations (Center for Technology and National Security Policy 2008), and the rapidly expanding State Department Civilian Response Corps (Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization web site), all will offer increasing opportunities for social scientists to work not for, but with the military, complicating choices about individual engagement. But they too will bring anthropology closer to the security world.

To be clear, *I am not against all manner of security engagement.* Opportunities should be considered situation by situation. But all those situations are being created by powerful agencies with lots of money, that are manipulating incentives to increase cooperation. The sum total of individual situations and choices may result in a profound shift for anthropology as a whole.

Any anthropologist considering closer work with the DoD and other security agencies really should make themselves aware of the record of past engagements (see Price 2004; 2008a). But they should also be thinking about our future. The military invasion of anthropology must be recognized in its scope and ambition. What will it mean for anthropology if our research, expertise, and practitioners are assimilated into the imperial apparatus? One response to this global challenge would be to reorient scholarly efforts in a countervailing directions–studying, publishing, and teaching more on US militarism and its consequences, at home and abroad, as this book does.

Resistance is not futile.

References Cited

Alrich, Amy
   2008 Framing the Cultural Training Landscape: Phase 1 Findings.   Alexandria, VA: Institute
        for Defense Analysis.

Andrade, Dale, and James H. Willbanks
   2006 CORDS/Phoenix: Counterinsurgency Lessons from Vietnam for the Future.   Military
        Review, March/April, 9-23.

Asher, Thomas
   2008 Making Sense of Minerva Controversy and the NSCC.
        http://www.ssrc.org/minerva/wp-content/upload/2008/10/asher.pdf, accessed February
        19, 2009.

Axe, David
   2010 Social Scientists under Fire.   Miller-McCune, March-April, 58-69.

Bacevich, Andrew
   2008 The Petraeus Doctrine.   The Atlantic Online, October 2008,
        http://www/theatlantic.com/doc/print/200810/petraeus-doctrine , accessed March 4, 2009.

BAE
   2009 (Job Posting) Senior Human Terrain Analyst, BAE Systems Information Technology,
        http://www.applyhr.com/12560533 , accessed February 10, 2009.

Batson, Douglas
   2008 Registering the Human Terrain: A Valuation of Cadastre.   Washington, DC: National
        Defense Intelligence College.

Binnendijk, Hans, and Patrick Cronin
   2008 Civilian Surge: Key to Complex Operations: A Preliminary Report.   Washington, DC:
        National Defense University, Center for Technology and National Security Policy.

Bumiller, Elisabeth
   2010 We Have Met the Enemy and He is PowerPoint.   The New York Times, April 27, A 1.

CAE (Centers of Academic Excellence)
   n.d.   Intelligence Community Centers of Academic Excellence (CAE) Program.
        http://www.dni.gov/cae/ , accessed April 25, 2010.

Capuzzo, Jill
   2007 When Troops Need More Than Knowledge of War.   The New York Times, October 17,
        B4.

Center for a New American Security
   n.d.   Dr. John A. Nagl.   Center for a New American Security.   http://www.cnas.org/node/57 ,
        accessed April 11, 2010.

Connable, Ben
   2009 All Our Eggs in a Broken Basket: How the Human Terrain System Is Undermining
        Sustainable Military Cultural Competence.   Military Review March-April:57-64.

Corn, Tony
   2009 Toward a Kilcullen-Biden Plan?   Bounding Counterinsurgency in Afghanistan.   Small
        Wars Journal.   http://smallwarsjournal.com/blog/journal/docs-temp/312-corn.pdf,
        accessed October 13, 2009.

DARPA (Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency)

2006 Hybrid Insect MEMS (Hi-MEMS): Presolicitation Notice.
http://www.darpa.mil/MTO/solicitations/baa06-22/index.html , accessed April 29, 2010.

2007 DARPA-BAA07-56. Deep Green.
https://www.fbo.gov/index?print_previews=1&s=opportunity&mode=form&id=4276c25
fd2ed23a00a6e7, accessed April 4, 2011.

2008 DARPA-BAA-09-03 Machine Reading Broad Agency Announcement.
https://www.fbo.gov/download/edb/edbaaf9dad2cb7d11d47ee265a71f94b/Machine-Read
ing-BA-14Nov08_final-.pdf, accessed April 20, 2010.

DIA (Defense Intelligence Agency)
n.d. Pat Roberts Intelligence Scholars Program.
http://www.dia.mil/employment/student/2008_PatRoberts_Intelligence_Scholar_Program
_Final.pff, accessed April 20, 2010.

DoA (Department of the Army)
2006 FM 3-24 Counterinsurgency. Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army.

2009a FM 3-24.2 Tactics in Insurgency. Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the
Army

2009b FM 3-07.1 Security Force Assistance. Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of
the Army

DSB (Defense Science Board)
2009 Report of the Defense Science Board Task force on Understanding Human Dynamics.
Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.
Washington Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and
Logistics.

Ephron, Dan, and Silvia Spring
2008 A Gun in One Hand, A Pen in the Other." Newsweek,
http://www.newsweek.com/id/131752/output/print , accessed April 28, 2008.

Ferguson, R. Brian
1999 A Paradigm for the Study of War and Society. *In* War and Society in the Ancient and
Medieval Worlds, Kurt Raaflaub and Nathan Rosenstein, eds., 409-458. Cambridge,
MA: Harvard University Press and the Center for Hellenic Studies,
(http://www.newark.rutger.edu/socant/brian.htm).

2011 Plowing the Human Terrain: Toward Global Ethnographic Surveillance. *In* Dangerous
Intersections: Anthropology of the National Security State. L. McNamera and R.
Rubenstein, eds., 101-126. Santa Fe: School of Advanced Research Press, in press.

Finney, Nathan
2008 Human Terrain Team Handbook. Human Terrain System, Fort Leavenworth, KS.

Flynn, Michael T., Matt Pottinger, and Paul Batchelor
2010 Fixing Intel: A Blueprint for Making Intelligence Relevant for Afghanistan. Center for a
New American Security.

Friedland, LeeEllen, Gary Shaeff, Jessica Glicken Turnley
2007 Socio-Cultural Perspectives: A New Intelligence Paradigm. Mitre Center for National
Security Programs, Mitre Technical Report MTR070244.
http://www.mitre.org/work/tech_papers/tech-paper_08/07_1220/07_1220.pdf , accessed
April 25, 2010.

Gates, Robert

2008   Speech, Association of American Universities (Washington, D.C.), April 14, 2008,
        http://www.defenselink.mil/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1228 , accessed March 4,
        2009. http://www.worldaffairs

Gill, Lesley
  2004 The School of the Americas: Military Training and Political Violence in the Americas.
        Duke University Press.

Gonzalez, Roberto
  2008 "Human Terrain:" Past, Present, and Future Applications."   Anthropology Today 24(1)
        February, 21-26.
  2009 American Counterinsurgency: Human Science and the Human Terrain.   Chicago: Prickly
        Paradigm Press.

Gusterson, Hugh
  2008 The Minerva Controversy.   Social Science Research Council,
        http://www.ssrc.org/essays/minerva/2008/10/09/gusterson/ , accessed February 19, 2009.

Gusterson, Hugh, and Catherine Besteman, eds.
  2009 The Insecure American: How We Got Here and What Should We Do About It.
        Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hajjar, Remi
  2006 The Army's New TRADOC Culture Center.   Military Review, November-December:
        89-92.

Herlihy, Peter, Jerome Dobson, Miguel Aguilar Robledo, Derek Smith, John Kelly, and Aida
Ramos Viera
  2008 A Digital Geography of Indigenous Mexico: Prototype for the American Geographical
        Society's Bowman Expeditions.   Geographical Review 98:395-415.

Hodge, Nathan
  2009 Help Wanted: 'Human Terrain' Teams for Africa.   Wired.com, Danger Room,
        http://blog.wired.com/defense/2009/01/help-wanted-hum.html , accessed February 10,
        2009.

Jaschick, Scott
  2008a A Pentagon Olive Branch to Academe.   Inside Higher Ed,
        http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2008/04/16/minerva , accessed May 12, 2008.
  2008b Pentagon Provides Details on 'Minerva.'   Inside Higher Ed,
        http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2008/05/12/minerva , accessed May 12, 2008.

Joint Forces Command
  2008   The JOE 2008: Joint Operating Environment.   United States Joint Forces Command,
        https:us.jfcom.mil/sites/J5/j59/default.aspx , accessed June 29, 2009.

Kelly, John D., Beatrice Jauregui, Sean T. Mitchell, and Jeremy Walton, eds.
  2010 Anthropology and Global Counterinsurgency.   Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kilcullen, David
  2006 Twenty-Eight Articles: Fundamentals of Company-Level Counterinsurgency.   Military
        Review, May-June, 103-108.

Kipp, Jacob, Lester Grau, Karl Prinslow, and Don Smith.
  2007 The Human Terrain System: A CORDS for the 21st Century."   Military Review,
        September-October, 8-15.

Lucas, George R.

2009 Anthropologists in Arms: The Ethics of Military Anthropology. AltaMira: Lanham, MD.
Lal, Amit
    2006 Hybrid Insect MEMS Proposer's Day.
        http://www.darpa.mil/MTO/solicitations/baa06-22/pdf/lol_proposerday.pdf , accessed
        April 30, 2010.
Lubkemann, Stephen
    2007 Culture in Chaos: An Anthropology of the Social Condition in War. University of
        Chicago Press: Chicago.
Lutz, Catherine
    2002 Making War at Home in the United States: Militarization and the Current Crisis.
        American Anthropologist 104:723-735.
    2008 The Perils of Pentagon Funding for Anthropology and the Other Social Sciences.
        http://essays.ssrc.org.minerva/2008/11/08'/lutz/, accessed February 19, 2009.
Malenowski, Bronislaw
    1979 The Role of Magic and Religion. In Reader in Comparative Religion, fourth edition. W.
        Lessa and E. Vogt, eds., pp. 37-46. New York: Harper Collins.
Masellis, Nick
    2009 Human Terrain: A Strategic Imperative on the 21st Century Battlefield. Small Wars
        Journal, http://smallwarsjournal.com/blog/journal/docs-temp/250-marsellis.pdf, accessed
        October 12, 2009.
McChrystal, Stanley
    2009 Commander's Initial Assessment. Headquarters, International Security Assistance Force:
        Kabul, Afghanistan.
McFarland, Maxie
    2005 Military Cultural Education. Military Review, March-April 2005:62-69.
McGray, Douglas
    2003 The Marshall Plan. Wired, November 2.
        http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/11.02/marshall_pr.html , accessed May 10, 2010.
McFate, Montgomery
    2005 Anthropology and Counterinsurgency: The Strange Story of their Curious Relationship.
        Military Review, March-April 2005, 24-38.
    2005b The Military Utility of Understanding Adversary Culture. Joint Force Quarterly, July,
        42-48.
    2008 Cultural Knowledge and Common Sense. Anthropology Today 24(1):27.
McFate, Montgomery, and Andrea Jackson.
    2005. An Organizational Solution for DOD's Cultural Knowledge Needs. Military Review,
        July-August, 18-21.
Melillo, Michael
    2006 Outfitting a Big-War Military with Small-War Capabilities. Parameters, Autumn:22-35.
Melman, Seymour
    1974 The Permanent War Economy. New York: Simon and Schuster.
    1984 The End of War. In Warfare, Culture, and Environment, R. B. Ferguson ed. 387-396.
        Orlando: Academic Press.
The Minerva Initiative
    n.d.a Funded Research. http://minerva.dtic.mil/funded.html , accessed March 16, 2010.

n.d.b Frequently Asked Questions.   http://minerva.dtic.mil/faqs.html , accessed April 25, 2010.
Mychalejko, Cyril, and Ramor Ryan
   2009 U.S. Military Funded Mapping Project in Oaxaca.   Z Magazine, April 1.
      http://www.zmag.org/zmag/viewArticle/21044 , accessed September 9, 2009.
Nagl, John
   2002 Counterinsurgency Lessons from Malaya and Vietnam: Learning to Eat Soup with a
      Knife.   Westport, CT: Praeger.
   n.d.   The Evolution and Importance of Army/Marine Corp Field Manual 3-24,
      Counterinsurgency.   http://www.press.uchicago.edu/Misc/Chicago/841519foreword.html
      accessed August 28, 2009
Network of Concerned Anthropologists
   2009 The Counter-Counterinsurgency Manual: or, Notes on Demilitarizing American Society.
      Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press.
Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization, U.S. Department of State Web site
      http://www.state.gov/s/crs
Popp, Robert
   2005 Utilizing Social Science Technology to Understand and Counter the 21st Century Strategic
      Threat.   DARPA Information Exploitation Office.
      http://webext2.darpa.mil/darpatech2005/presentations/ixo/popp.pdf , accessed April 4,
      2010.
Price, David
   2004 Threatening Anthropology: McCarthyism and the FBI's Surveillance of Activist
      Anthropologists.   Durham: Duke University Press.
   2005a The CIA's Campus Spies.   Exposing the Pat Roberts Intelligence Scholars Program.
      CounterPunch, March 12/13.   http://www.counterpunch.org/price03122005.html ,
      accessed April 19, 2010.
   2005b Carry on Spying (or Pay Us Back at the Rate of 2,400 Per Cent): CIA Skullduggery in
      Academia.   Counterpunch, May 21/22.
      http://www.counterpunch.org/price05212005.html , accessed April 20, 2010.
   2008a   Anthropological Intelligence: The Deployment and Neglect of Anthropology in the
      Second World War.   Durham: Duke University Press.
   2008b   The Leaky Ship of Human Terrain Systems: First Read of a Leaked Handbook.
      Counterpunch, December 12/14, pg. 3.
      http://www.counterpunch.org/price/12122008.html , accessed April 25, 2010.
   2010a Silent Coup: How the CIA is Welcoming Itself Back onto American University
      Campuses. CounterPunch.   17(2) January 16-31, 1-5.
   2010b   Human Terrain Systems Dissenter Resigns, Tell Inside Story of Training's Heart of
      Darkness.   CounterPunch, February 15,
      http://www.counterpunch.org/price02152010.html , accessed March 16, 2010.
Renzi, Fred
   2006a   The Military Cooperation Group.   Master's Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School,
      December.
   2006b Networks: Terra Incognita and the Case for Ethnographic Intelligence.   Military
      Review, September-October, 16-23.
Richards, Paul

1996 Fighting for the Rain Forest: War, Youth and Resources in Sierra Leone.   Oxford: James Curry.

Roxborough, Ian
   2008 The Minerva Controversy: The Military-Social Science Interface.   Social Science Research Council, http://www.ssrc.org/essays/minerva/2008/10/29/roxborough , accessed February 19, 2009.

Scales, Robert
   2004 Statement of Major General Robert Scales, USA (ret.): Testifying before the House Armed Services Committee on July 15, 2004. http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/congress/04-07-15scales.pdf , accessed April 10, 2010.

Schaner, Eric
   2008   The Human Terrain System: Achieving a Competitive Advantage through Enhanced "Population-Centric" Knowledge Flows.   Master's Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA.

Sedillo, Simon.
   2009 The Demarest Factor: The Ethics of U.S. Department of Defense Funding for Academic Research in Mexico.   www.elenemigocomun.net/2255 , accessed September 9, 2009.

Sepp, Kalev
   2007 From "Schock and Awe" to "Hearts and Minds:" The Fall and Rise of US Counterinsurgency Capability in Iraq."   Third World Quarterly 28:217-230.

Society for Modeling and Simulation International
   2009 Modeling and Simulation in Human Terrain Systems: Call for Papers. http://www.scs.org/specialissues?q=node/101 , accessed April 4, 2010.

West, Bing
   2009 Counterinsurgency Lessons from Iraq.   Military Review, March/April, 2-12.

Wilcox, John
   2007 Precision Engagement–Strategic Context for the Long War. (Powerpoint presentation to the Precision Strike Winter Roundtable). Http://www.dtic.mil/ndia/2007psa_winter/wilcox.pdf