

A Framework for Effective Relations:

Social Scientists and the Military in operations other than war

Krystal Buckle
The University of Adelaide



THE UNIVERSITY
of ADELAIDE

SAGE



**International
AUSTRALIA**

Scholarship | Statecraft | Strategy

SAGE International Australia (SIA) is an independent, not-for-profit think tank dedicated to deepening the understanding of global strategic and political issues.

This report was written under the supervision of SIA Associate, David Olney for the University of Adelaide course, *International Relations Internship*.

Cover page image credit: ABIS Tom Gibson

Krystal Buckle

The University of Adelaide

July 2018

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Executive Summary | 4 |
| Introduction | 6 |
| Current Operations | 8 |
| Background | 11 |
| Why Culture Matters | 11 |
| Ethics | 13 |
| A History of Military-Social Science Relations | 16 |
| Failure of the Human Terrain System & Bowman Expeditions | 17 |
| Key Concerns | 20 |
| Recommendations | 27 |
| Conclusion | 33 |
| References | 35 |

Executive Summary

This report is an initial exploration into creating a culture of ethical and effective behaviour that allows for social scientists to develop meaningful and mutually beneficial relations with the military. It aims to develop a pragmatic way ahead by addressing the current ethical debate within the social sciences regarding cooperation with the military. Despite a sizeable body of literature addressing the need for socio-cultural awareness and training in the military, there remains a visible lack of strategic framework outlining how best to approach this historically fraught relationship.

Due to a current lack of public security debate in Australia, this report deals with limited resources and draws largely on U.S. efforts to involve the social sciences in military operations. The public demise of their Human Terrain System program acts as a particularly instructive window for understanding the complex layers involved. Furthermore, this report wishes to add to the quality of public debate immaterial of what is unfolding behind the security veil and encourage further discussion on this topic. The key to a well functioning, cooperative relationship is sustained dialogue and debate.

Initially, this research was undertaken to develop a clear framework for cooperation between the social sciences and military. However, it later became clear that this issue is one that requires more than just a set of guidelines. As is the nature of ethics, this is a continually evolving and dynamic area, one that merits ongoing

debate. Yet, it is acknowledged that without an appropriate normative framework that addresses current issues and guides cooperation, future relations between the military and social sciences may follow in the shaky footsteps of the United States.

When I hear the word 'culture', I reach for my gun.

-Hanns Johst, 1933

When I hear the word 'gun', I reach for my culture.

- Alexander Gerschenkron, 1969

Introduction

The relationship between the military and the social sciences is at a critical juncture. Vast changes in global geopolitical landscapes continue to strengthen the significance of understanding culture and society. Growing environmental concerns and ongoing political instabilities require humanitarian aid and response operations, during which, understandings of cultural norms and narratives will be essential. The management of the military-social sciences relationship thus deserves careful consideration and necessitates an overarching framework that encourages mutual understanding. This report aims to address the relationship- both past and present, and take the initial steps in developing a framework that acknowledges current issues and guides future cooperation. Beginning with an overview of current Australian Defence Force operations and the shifting strategic environment in which it finds itself, this report seeks to address developments within the Australian military and the subsequent need for a framework that facilitates cooperation with the social sciences. The following section establishes the significance of cultural knowledge in addition to the defining role of ethics in the social sciences. Leading into the history of military-social science relations, its troubled past is considered

alongside more recent programs such as the U.S. Army's Human Terrain System and Bowman Expeditions. Drawing on the specific concerns expressed by social scientists toward these contentious programs, the report examines a number of key concerns in-depth. By addressing the concerns that arose from failures such as the HTS, potential recurrences may be alleviated. While it is important to note that this list of concerns is far from being complete, an understanding of the initial concerns that arose from past programs may assist in establishing more stable foundations for a mutually beneficial relationship. With these concerns in mind, the report proposes seven recommendations to facilitate the relations between the social sciences and the military. While this report began with the broader aim of developing a fixed set of guidelines, it soon became clear that this relationship deserves further discussion. Thus, the recommendations strive to consider both sides of the military-social sciences debate in order to construct a sustainable way ahead. However, they are merely a starting point. This complex relationship requires continued discussion and further efforts must be made to bridge the cultural and organisational divide. While a consensus might be difficult to reach, it is vital that this conversation continues and involves all relevant and interested parties.

Current ADF operations and the regional environment

Australia's geographical location is one of increasing strategic tension. The Indo-Pacific region includes three of the world's largest economies, fourteen of the smallest, and is home to seven of the world's largest militaries including five declared nuclear nations (Campbell 2017). International engagement is becoming increasingly significant to the stability of the region and a vital military requirement, with bilateral and multilateral agreements continuing to guide development in the Indo-Pacific. At present, the Australian Defence Force is involved in:

- Maritime security operations in the Middle East
- Maritime surveillance patrols in the North Indian Ocean, South China Sea and Pacific Region
- Operations to safely dispose of explosives in South Pacific island nations;
- Operations in Iraq, Syria & Afghanistan
- UN Truce Supervision Missions in Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic
- Multinational Force and Observers (MFO) Missions in Egypt
- Monitoring human rights and the delivery of humanitarian aid for the UN Peacekeeping Mission in South Sudan
- Humanitarian Disaster Response
- Alliance Management

- Bilateral and Multilateral Training Exercises (Australian Government Department of Defence 2018)

In this highly complex region, Australia will continue to be challenged by the spread of transnational crime, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, the environmental and security effects of climate change and uncontrolled migration due to both environmental and political factors. During the 2016 Annual Security Summit in Canberra, Chief of Defence Lieutenant General Angus Campbell suggested that while we might ‘pine for the days when Ulysses S. Grant could state, “*the art of war is simple enough. Find out where your enemy is. Get at him as soon as you can. Strike him as hard as you can, and keep moving on.*” It seems unlikely that such advice will suffice in an era of empowered individuals, assertive states and an unstable planet.’ (2016, p. 7) He argues that the ‘policy answers to these issues will not lie in any single service, organisation or even nation. They will require engagement, collaboration and sharing of rigorous and confronting ideas with the widest possible policy community’ (Campbell 2016, p. 7). This will likely mean the role of the ADF will continue to take on work pertaining to civil disaster recovery and nation building assistance, contribution to border security, counter-terrorism operations, delivering humanitarian aid and critical infrastructure support to disaster stricken areas, and enforcing immigration policies.

2016 Defence White Paper

Australia’s standing and role as a ‘middle power’ is reaffirmed in 2016 Australian Defence White paper, as is the significance of the Indo-Pacific region to Australia’s

strategic interests. The white paper identifies six key drivers that will profile Australia's security engagement and requirements until 2035; ongoing military modernisation, the US-China Relationship, terror attack threats with roots in the Iraq and Syrian conflicts, state rivalry in the Indo-Pacific and cyber attacks (Australian Government Department of Defence 2016). The Government has pledged to increase the defence budget to 2% of GDP by 2020-21 to support investment in new defence capabilities.

As ongoing areas of strategic interest, South East Asia and the South Pacific Islands will continue to be a focus for Australia. The continuing *Defence Cooperation Program (DCP)* currently providing assistance to 28 countries, allows ADF personnel to become more active in defence engagement activities and supports capacity building in the region. Engagement activities include:

- Providing replacement patrol boats to 12 Pacific Island countries as part of the Pacific Maritime Security Program
- Working with the Timor-Leste Defence Force Land Component to strengthen its ability to operate effectively and professionally (English language training program, cooperative exercises)
- Building defence capability in PNG in the lead-up to the 2018 APEC Summit
- Comprehensive Strategic Partnerships with Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam, Philippines, Indonesia, and more
- Contribution to the Indian Ocean Rim Association and Indian Ocean Naval Symposium (Australian Government Department of Defence 2018)

To support the general outline above, Defence will increase investment in training ADF and Australian public service personnel responsible for undertaking international engagement in order to build interoperability and improve responses to international challenges. This also includes the expansion of cultural and language capabilities through developing higher levels of cultural and linguistic understanding in the Indo-Pacific. The number of overseas military attaches will be gradually increased to support enhanced international engagement.

Background

Why Does Culture Matter?

Moving away from the conventional East-West conflict that dominated warfare in the 20th century, there is a growing recognition in the security sphere of the importance of culture at the policy and strategic levels. The advance of globalisation has contributed to a world where territorial boundaries and centrality of power is no longer clearly defined. Identity-based movements and threats challenge the tendencies of states such as the U.S. to sustain a monopoly on warfare. Protracted, asymmetric conflicts requiring small-scale stability and capacity-building support operations will determine the balance of war and peace in the 21st century and beyond. This emerging narrative includes a more assertive China and Russia, ongoing unrest in the Middle East, nuclear proliferation, religious tensions and the growing influence of non-state actors. Among these concerns, alliance management, multinational and peacekeeping operations, political instabilities and humanitarian aid all require concentrated situational and socio-cultural knowledge.

Moreover, trends of globalisation and changing environmental conditions will necessitate increased cooperation and connectivity between states. In a shrinking world, misunderstanding, ignorance and isolationism will threaten the ability of states to deal with and respond effectively to situations.

With this changing security narrative in mind, understanding a partner or adversary requires more than just a reliance on intelligence and weapons. Situational awareness does not translate to cultural awareness. The ability to consider the influence of cultural dimensions by communicating with locals, analysing cultural nuances and gauging body language can have a profound effect on the conduct and success of military operations. It is important to note here that the difficulties of understanding culture stem from the fact that culture itself is difficult to define and by no means absolute. For the purposes of this report, culture is recognised as,

‘aset of basic assumptions and values, orientations to life, beliefs, policies, procedures and behavioural conventions that are shared by a group of people, and that influence (but do not determine) each member’s behaviour and his/her interpretations of the ‘meaning’ of other people’s behaviour’ (Spencer-Oatey 2008, p. 3).

The manifestation of culture can be seen through symbols that represent values, and norms such as language, ideology, customs, traditions, religion, rituals, art, music and fashion. Culture, suggests Martinsen, is not a form of entity ‘that can be readily identified as [a] catalyst for behaviour but should rather be seen as preconditions under which preference and behaviour occur’ (Greathouse 2010, p. 61). An awareness of the ideas, customs and beliefs of a particular group of people

opens the door to understanding the strategic culture that guides their behaviour. Each state 'enters the international arena with its historical baggage of accumulated experiences, beliefs, cultural influences and geographic and material limitations' (Al-Rodhan 2015, p. 1) all of which influence its strategic decision-making. Working alongside diverse cultures requires highly perceptive communication skills, diplomacy and finesse. Understanding the points of friction and cultural divisions within a society is crucial to leveraging them. It is thus vital that those developing and enforcing policy have the cultural knowledge to make effective and informed decisions. However, military leaders, strategists and policy makers often view situations through a cultural lens. Cultural determinations made by the individual eye guide our interactions with others and affect how behaviour is interpreted. Consideration of the meaning systems that underlie certain actions help to inform and shape culturally constructed perspectives. It is evident that access to reliable, accurate and balanced multi-disciplinary material from the social sciences is vital for the assessment and understanding of other cultures. Our current dynamic and complex security environment demands an approach that utilises cultural knowledge to deliver effective and adaptable solutions.

Ethics

Despite their importance, questions of ethics are undeniably intricate and multifaceted in their situational complexity. Guided by religious, historical, cultural and philosophical influences, ethics can be understood as a system of moral principle and judgement that provides a moral map or way of thinking about and approaching moral issues. After three thousand years of relative literature from a

multitude of cultures, the meaning of ethics includes standards of right and wrong that guide behaviour. Institutions, associations and companies generally have standards or a code of ethical conduct designed to ensure certain values and principles are upheld.

Since its emergence, the field of social sciences has been oriented towards ethical behaviour and procedure. Built on a history of egregious human rights breaches, it is unsurprising that ethics have come to form an integral role in the study of social sciences. This is particularly evident in the field of anthropology, in which issues of informed consent and harm take priority. A great diversity of research methods are applied within the social sciences, however there are some overlapping core ethical principles recognised by all. These include doing good, avoiding harm and protecting the wellbeing and safety of all research participants (Iphofen 2013, p. 11).

To ensure clarity, social sciences as defined by Gurzawska & Benčin, is

“...a group of academic disciplines that take human society as the object of their study, attempting to understand human behaviour, relationships and institutions within society. Traditionally, the group includes sociology, psychology, anthropology, economics, law and political science, although there is no outright consensus on which disciplines should be included. A large number of subfields have and keep emerging, including human geography, cultural studies, business studies, communication studies, development studies, criminology, etc.” (2015, p. 3).

Qualitative research in the social sciences requires direct contact with human subjects and this often raises a number of key ethical concerns. While quantitative research deals with the ethical treatment of data, qualitative research raises issues with the ethical treatment of research participants. In order to build trust among research subjects and gain credibility, it is imperative social scientists develop, maintain and abide by systems of ethical assurance. 'The trust of the public, professional colleagues, those who commission and fund research and those being studied requires an effective system of ethical review, clear lines of responsibility and a manageable degree of independent overview' (Iphofen 2011, p. 5).

Professional associations for each discipline in the social sciences outline their own ethics guidelines that prioritise certain principles over others. A wide range of ethical concerns are considered and include; research integrity, harm, confidentiality, transparency in intent, relations with peers and informed consent (Gurzawska & Benčin 2015, p. 3). Potential for harm is less concerned with health and injury and more with 'psychological distress and the danger of stigmatisation if sensitive private information is disclosed' (Gurzawska & Benčin 2015, p. 3). It is important to recognise that ethics, in this sense, 'goes to the heart of the discipline: the premises on which its practitioners operate, its epistemology, theory and praxis' (Caplan 2003, p. 1). Consequently, a consideration of ethics needs to play a central role in any cooperative framework with social scientists.

A History of Military-Social Science Relations

Social scientists have had a long, troubled history of cooperation with the military. Despite agreement on the significance of sociocultural knowledge, legacies of colonialism continue to hinder such collaboration. This 'litany of shame' as it is referred to in the literature, shadows the consciousness of each discipline amassed under the social sciences umbrella. Currently, 'there are few anthropologists either available or willing to play in the same sandbox with the military' (McFate 2005, p. 27). Will it ever be possible for social scientists to ethically cooperate with military and security forces in operations without sacrificing their core disciplinary values and beliefs? This report's purpose in examining the history of the relationship and past failures by the United States is to encourage an appreciation of the sensitivities and unease with which social scientists approach collaboration.

Cooperation between the military and social sciences remains a complex and highly sensitive topic. Social scientists have historically lent their expertise to colonial and military campaigns and anthropologists in particular, have been accused of 'having consorted with colonialists and aided in the oppression, victimisation, and forced migration or resettlement of indigenous peoples and cultures by powerful foreign elites' (Lucas 2009, p. 11). During World War I and II, social scientists both enlisted and were conscripted in a variety of capacities including clandestine research with intelligence organisations. According to Price, 'one OSS [U.S. anthropological] study sought to identify specific biological differences among the Japanese that could be exploited with biological weapons' (Price 2011, p. 11). These projects developed methods to manipulate local populations and undermine governments.

In March 1970, documents surfaced that implicated social scientists in U.S. counterinsurgency programs in Thailand. It is alleged that anthropologists gathered data for the U.S. Defense Department that would later use development aid to assist in encouraging tribal villages to remain loyal to the Thai Government. For the past three decades, anthropology has fought to distance itself from its historical role as 'colonialism's handmaiden' (Price 2008, p. xii).

Failure of the Human Terrain System & Bowman Expeditions

The Human Terrain System (HTS) was a post-9/11 proof-of-concept program developed by the United States' Department of Defense. Implemented in 2007, HTS 'was designed to meet the military's requirements for socio-cultural knowledge across a spectrum of operations that the U.S. may encounter in today's world' and the program 'seek[ed] to integrate and apply socio-cultural knowledge of the indigenous civilian population to military operations in support of the commander's objectives' in Afghanistan and Iraq (HTS website quoted in CEAUSSIC 2009, p. 4). Despite being the largest investment in a single social science project in U.S. Government history, HTS was highly controversial among both military and academic professionals and consequently, ceased operations in 2014. The purpose, according to a past HTS social scientist, was to 'provide cultural insight to brigade command staff by interviewing local populations and utilising social science methodologies to better enable culturally astute decision-making' (King in CEAUSSIC 2009, p. 4). However, it played directly into old stereotypes of hidden agendas and as a result, caused many anthropologists to be ostracised by their academic peers for their involvement in 'sustaining neo-colonial relations' (Rouse,

Lederman & Borneman 2015, p. 2). The use and management failure of HTS in the United States sparked a fierce debate surrounding the ethics of anthropology and led to a comprehensive review of the current AAA Code of Ethics. HTS continues to represent a desperate desire not to lose on behalf of the U.S. military and undermined the potential success of a sustained cultural awareness program.

Similarly, the American Geographical Society's Bowman Expeditions beginning in 2007 sparked controversy surrounding professional ethics. Funded by the U.S. Army, the expeditions that begun in Mexico, the Antilles and Colombia were designed to improve policymakers' understanding of foreign lands and people. Its aim was to commence the building of a comprehensive multi-scale geographic information system (GIS) for each region and conduct geographic research on issues of national interest to the U.S. The initial project in 2007, labelled *Mexico Indigena*, sent AGS teams to research the geography of indigenous populations in Mexico. Joe Bryan, author of *Weaponising Maps*, suggests the project took advantage of 'indigenous peoples' desires for land rights to gather intelligence that... let policymakers more effectively intervene in indigenous affairs' (Bryan 2010, p. 2). Mexico Indigena created an English-only website that left locals uninformed and unaware that the project reports would be handed over to the U.S. Army. Critics allege that the military were not forthcoming about their financial role in the project. In 2013, the DoD and AGS expanded its Bowman Expeditions program to include a new Central American Indigena project. The implications of the Mexico Indigena expeditions raised concerns about participatory mapping and its political application. They highlight the role 'that militaries themselves have played in

shaping participatory mapping techniques through their efforts to gain knowledge of the human terrain' (Perreault, Bridge & McCarthy, p. 256). This controversy gives context to the concerns of geographers when asked to cooperate with the military. Once again, we return to the clash between military and social science professional ethics.

Despite a growing interest in the potential uses of social science within the military, there remains a remarkable naivety surrounding the discipline's history. Additionally, it could also be suggested that social science views toward military culture can be improved. As anthropologist R. Rubinstein argues in his commentary on ethical considerations and national security, condemnation of sweeping statements such as 'the Arabs' is much the same as those concerning 'the military'. He argues that 'militaries are as varied and complex as other human communities' (Rubinstein 2016, p. 193) and emphasises anthropology's important contribution to 'the idea that all peoples are fundamentally deserving of the same respect and engagement' (Rubinstein 2016, p. 194). With this in mind, deeper understandings of both the social sciences and military cultures are required. As the smoke surrounding controversies such as HTS clears, it is time to revisit the key concerns and string of failures that triggered their demise. An understanding of past scandals such as the Human Terrain System and Bowman Expeditions are particularly instructive as they bring attention to the larger debate surrounding professional ethics. Historical knowledge is crucial in informing future guidelines and policy.

Key Concerns

In order to develop a framework to guide future cooperation, the key concerns of social scientists must first be understood and addressed. Given the increasing significance of soft power and cultural awareness in the security sphere, political, ethical and methodological concerns will grow in importance. Calls for more input from the social sciences overlook the fundamental importance of first establishing rapport with the discipline.

It is important to note that these are just a select few of the concerns highlighted by social scientists. The very nature of this work brings a host of continually emerging considerations that will test the professional ethics of both the military and the social sciences. However, awareness of current concerns allows for the development of strategies and policy to mitigate their future role in damaging these relations. The AAA's CEAUSSIC Final Report on the HTS in 2009 is a useful tool for interpreting concerns that emerged from the implementation of the Human Terrain System. Addressing concerns with an awareness of the ethics involved behind them is the first step toward establishing understanding.

Lack of Ethics Protocol

An extensive code of ethics informs the behaviour of each discipline within the social sciences. Concern for the ethics of researchers and their subjects form the focus of a lengthy debate regarding cooperation between the military and the social sciences. During the design and implementation of the HTS program, concern for

ethics and their evaluation with eminent bodies such as the American Anthropological Association were largely ignored. This contributed to debate surrounding the program, as researchers were ill informed regarding HTS intentions from the beginning. It underlines greater concerns of anthropologists surrounding ethics and their potential marginalisation once the military become involved.

Professional codes of conduct in the social sciences for undertaking open-source research include a full Institutional Review Board process, also known as an Independent Ethics Committee (IEC). The AAA CEAUSSIC found that the research 'conducted by HTTs [did not] pass through any standard and approved ethics review process' and 'safeguards to ensure informed consent of subjects and data protections [were] not in place' (AAA CEAUSSIC 2009, p. 33). Rather than addressing the complexity of ethical conduct, the HTS simply overlooked them. Their 'unusual avoidance of Institutional Review Board oversight and the silence of HTS leadership in publicly addressing how core anthropological research ethics concerns are negotiated by HTS ethnographers in field settings' (AAA CEAUSSIC 2009, p. 42) demonstrate no well-defined ethical framework of conduct or concern for one. This example is further supported by a European Commission report on research ethics, which addresses the burgeoning complexity of ethical review issues due to the growth of 'multi-site, interdisciplinary and cross-national studies' (Iphofen 2013, p. 4). It is argued that 'knowledge transfer requires partnership arrangements that may lead to aspects of joint research programmes being beyond the control of any single partner' (Iphofen 2013, p. 4).

Ethical Obligations to Research Subjects

The phrase 'do no harm' is deeply entrenched in anthropological research and conduct. However, responsibilities imposed by the military may obstruct obligations to research subjects and expose them to unwanted cultural abuse and targeting. These fears are not unjustified; in 2003, U.S. forces drew on anthropological scholarship (particularly, the sexual practices of Arabs and causes of humiliation) to assist in the torture of Iraqi prisoners in Abu Ghraib prison. The use of this knowledge for psychological and physical torture deeply affected those who contributed to this research and their subjects. Moreover, numerous examples of unintentional harm to research subjects in both Iraq and Afghanistan can be drawn on. According to a HTS analysis in Iraq,

“We spoke to this one sheik and we figured out that he was an actual power broker. But then he was kidnapped and held for 0-14 days. He was tortured, beaten, and told, “Hey, you are not going to the Americans anymore.” After that, basically everyone stopped talking to us’ (Joseph 2014, p. 56).

This incident, and broader program in which respondents are placed in a highly vulnerable position, raises serious ethical concerns for the researcher to consider.

The collection of sensitive socio-cultural data by social scientists and whether the use of this data may cause harm on subjects in the field is among the most significant of these concerns. Findings from the AAA’s CEAUSSIC Report on HTS suggest ‘human subject protections [had not] been systematically incorporated into the program in a formal and unambiguous way’ (2009, p. 53). Therefore, ‘we are not confident that all HTT research teams can ensure ‘no harm’ to those with whom

they work, particularly since HTTs are not able to maintain reliable control over data once collected' (AAA CEAUSSIC 2009, p. 53).

Data Collection

It is no secret that data collection differs greatly between the social sciences and the military. However when combined, issues surrounding the dissemination of social science data among military departments arise. Understanding concerns surrounding the later use of this raw data returns to the research ethics of social scientists and in this case, anthropologists. Generally, the data collected would be protected by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) protocol developed by the researcher. During the course of the Human Terrain System, researchers collected sensitive socio-cultural data that had the potential to be used to the detriment of the subject. Social scientists were unsure if HTS data was being fed back into the intelligence community through databases, where researchers have limited control over how it is used. As the AAA's CEAUSSIC Report outlines, 'conflicts could arise despite the best intentions of a given researcher, given the ways that data could potentially circulate through existing databases and pass through the hands of strategic coalition partners' (2009, p. 33). This compromises the social sciences' commitment to confidentiality and protection of sources.

The Relationship between Research & Intelligence

Differences between ideas of field research in the social sciences and intelligence collection within the military are causes of concern for social scientists. Confusion between open-source, intelligence data collection and ethnographic research

conducted by social scientists is highlighted as a potential area of conflict that threatens the activities and ethics of social scientists cooperating with the military.

The AAA's CEAUSSIC report states,

'the relative lack of familiarity with social science field research... alongside an extremely broad definition of the term 'intelligence' linked to cultural analysis, and the ways that information flows through military and civilian efforts on the ground- there exists ample room for confusion regarding appropriate roles and activities of social scientists, as well as uses of the knowledge they produce' (2009, p. 40).

Professional Implications for Social Scientists

Since the publication of the AAA's opposition to HTS and military cooperation generally, social scientists have viewed these 'thinly veiled threats' as a warning. While 'disingenuously claiming it is happy to support the DoD under certain restricted circumstances', in reality the AAA suggests those who cooperate with programs such as the HTS will be ostracised by their profession and face 'the barely disguised threat of being unable to pursue a career in academia' (Garfield 2010, p. 2). Social scientists in the U.S. have been deterred from potential relations with the military due to rigid ethical demands from associations such as the AAA that make it difficult for relations to exist.

Secrecy & Lack of Transparency

Productive academic environments require honesty and reflexivity. As academic Dave Price notes, the environments in which social scientists function, 'are

nourished by the self-corrective features of open disagreement, dissent and synthetic reformulation' (Giroux 2015, p. 69). Military operations that require secret and clandestine academic research harm the very foundations of these academic processes. In the absence of the transparency that allows social scientists to debate and reflect, efforts to maintain ethical research standards are hindered. It also compromises the ethical commitment to enhancing the welfare of the individuals and the communities they study.

One academic recommendation for the future of social science-military relations suggests withholding the identity of the sponsor and purpose of research from the social scientist for 'the greater good' of the local population and military forces. This recommendation and thinking is profoundly flawed. It would only work to weaken relations between both parties by confirming distorted agenda-setting and secretive tactics, further fragmenting a troubling divide.

The Weaponization of Knowledge

The phrase 'weaponization of knowledge' appears regularly in literature condemning military-social science relations. Drawing on a troubled and controversial history of social science research use by the military to control populations, there is a fear that the knowledge collected by researchers will be used as a weapon for future operations. This relates to the concern above regarding data collection and storage.

A great concern that arose from the Bowman Expeditions was the potential for 'military funding and furtherance of military research agendas' as a tool to 'militarise

understandings of geography in the classroom and beyond' (Bryan 2010, p. 2). Additionally, while proponents of the HTS were adamant that the program was not an intelligence asset, it was housed under an intelligence asset and briefed as 'an intelligence-operations hybrid' (CEAUSSIC 2009, p. 54).

Moral Risk

Cooperation with the military exposes social scientists to greater moral risk. The history that informs many of the disciplines under the social sciences umbrella is tarred by their involvement with the military. Researchers are aware that any future cooperation or relations with the security sphere exposes them to an increased likelihood of moral risk.

Contamination of the Field

Errors and blunders often accompany military operations and affect the way local populations view the country. Social science research embedded in military operations harms the discipline by making it more dangerous by association. The concern here is: what implications does this have for dissociated social scientists working in the same region? Will these local perceptions compromise their fieldwork?

There is an enduring awareness in the social sciences of the lasting consequences of 'wrong' decisions in the field for other researchers. 'Contamination of the field diminishes public trust in the act of research and in the actions of other researchers

thereby effectively hindering future access to respondents and undermining the value of any knowledge produced' (Iphofen 2013, p. 17).

The Way Ahead

Recommendations to guide future cooperation

This report proposes seven recommendations to guide future cooperation between the social sciences and the military. These recommendations are designed to ensure that the military can appreciate and respond to the historical sensitivities that have the potential to affect relations with the social sciences and consider possible mitigation strategies. Currently, Australia has the advantage of being able to learn from both historical and recent U.S. experiences and to develop the nuanced ethical approach that is required. Although the concerns that these recommendations address are not static, a thorough consideration of both sides of the debate allows military personnel, social scientists and policymakers to better identify and develop options for cooperation. A stable, constructive and mutually beneficial relationship between very different professions is the key aim of this framework.

This report recommends:

1. Cooperation be limited to operations other than war
2. Opportunities for guided discussion be established between the military and the social sciences
3. A code of conduct be established

4. Mutual understanding be enhanced through historical knowledge and awareness of current processes
5. Social scientists wear civilian clothes during involvement in operations
6. The military refrain from using the term 'human terrain'
7. Australia develop an effective model for social science-military cooperation

Recommendation 1: In Operations Other Than War

To address ethical concerns, this report recommends that all cooperation between the social sciences and the military be for operations other than war. By focusing on developing capability in overt operations such as humanitarian & disaster relief, aid delivery, alliance management, peacekeeping and activities under the Defence Cooperation Program, concerns surrounding secrecy and lack of transparency may be alleviated. Expectations and intentions can be clearly outlined from the beginning, preventing possible scope creep from occurring. The focus then, shifts towards a strategic rather than tactical level.

This recommendation allows for all relevant associations and academic bodies to be informed and consulted regarding social science participation in military activities, lowering concern regarding hidden agendas and the potentially destructive use of research findings. It will contribute to, rather than undermine, an organic, sustained cultural awareness program.

Recommendation 2: Opportunities for guided discussion be established between the Military and Social Sciences

As previously stated, productive academic environments require honesty and reflexivity. This report suggests that both the social science and the military academic communities are provided with opportunities to engage in guided discussion and dialogue in order to encourage the 'self corrective features of open disagreement and dissent' (Price in Giroux 2015, p. 69). Encouragement of open discourse surrounding this sensitive issue may contribute to greater understanding of military objectives and ethical research standards; lowering instances of social scientists being ostracised from their profession.

Moreover in operations other than war, the military could consider greater transparency in regard to information relevant to the collection and use of cultural knowledge, while respecting the necessity for operational security and secrecy related to tactics. The development and long-term maintenance of trust may create a shared space for the idea of cultural awareness and sustained social science-military relations to generate legitimacy.

Recommendation 3: Establish a code of conduct

It is recommended that a code of conduct for relations between the social sciences and military be established. This will guide cooperation and ensure key professional and ethical concerns are addressed. Research conducted by social scientists needs to pass through professional safeguards, standards and an approved ethics review

process. Thus, institutional review board oversight addressing the protection of data collection and storage is additionally suggested as a part of the code of conduct. This includes addressing ethical issues such as obligations to research participants at every stage of the research process, and ensuring informed consent and data protection guidelines are in place. This report additionally suggests that any code of conduct is revisited on a scheduled basis. It is important to note that the field of ethics is rarely fixed and acceptance of this may justify reasons for protocol variability. Ultimately, this recommendation supports the development of a flexible, situational protocol that reflects the difficulties of fieldwork and data collection.

Recommendation 4: Mutual understanding be enhanced through historical knowledge and awareness of current processes

In tackling the divide between the organisational cultures of both the military and social scientists, this report recommends efforts be made to increase awareness of these differences. As was quoted earlier in the report, Rubinstein's argument against sweeping statements about 'the military' and its complex human community highlight a need to uphold anthropology's contribution to the idea that all individuals deserve the same level of engagement and respect. Richer knowledge of military processes, doctrine and hierarchical structure may overcome the generalisations often made about 'the military' by the social sciences.

Likewise, an understanding of social science ethics, research methodology and historically evolved perspectives may assist in making individuals more perceptive to past, present and potential concerns in the future. The expertise of social scientists lies in their unique way of looking at, studying and investigating different cultures and social worlds. It is a field with potentially transformative ideas and roles, with rich understandings of human processes at the individual, collective and state levels. Appreciation of this may grant further understanding of the processes involved in its ethical conduct. Lastly, greater understanding of both organisational cultures makes room for a more comprehensive and ongoing professional conversation.

Recommendation 5: Social scientists wear civilian clothes during involvement in any military operations

The distinction between a soldier and social scientist must be clearly evident. Many anthropologists in the U.S. Army's Human Terrain System wore military uniform when conducting fieldwork, a contentious decision. This report recommends any social scientist acting in a cooperative capacity with the military wear civilian clothes. This symbolises the independence of social scientists from military personnel and instead, allows them to act in an advisory manner. This recommendation may reduce potential risks associated with social scientists in military uniform, including contamination of the field, personal risks that come with being associated with a state's military, and the damaging of individual professional careers.

Recommendation 6: The military refrain from using the term ‘human terrain’

This report recommends the military refrain from using the term ‘human terrain’ when discussing the use of cultural awareness knowledge in an operational setting. Its connections to the Human Terrain System in Iraq and Afghanistan have discredited it as a phrase. One of the key issues with ‘human terrain’ is its similarity to physical terrain; it works to confirm the fears of those critical of military activities. In the U.S. Human Terrain program, social scientists embedded in Afghanistan and Iraq were painted as ‘armed social workers’ by the Pentagon, White House and military contractors. For those unaccustomed and unresponsive to working with the military, this language appears impersonal and insensitive. While this calls for discussion on what umbrella the concepts covered by human terrain should fall under, it acknowledges sensitivities toward certain language and highlights a conscious effort being made to establish a mutually agreeable cooperative relationship.

Recommendation 7: Australia develop an effective model for social science-military cooperation

This report is an attempt to contribute to the ongoing development of effective cooperation between the social sciences and the military and suggests Australia develop a model that can later be exported to other middle powers. By determining a functional framework for approaching military-social science relations, Australia’s

middle power status can serve as a role model for designing and implementing strategies for civil-military relations.

Conclusion

Adapting to the complexities of the current security environment requires an approach that utilises cultural knowledge to interpret and deliver effective response. Lessons learned from the United States, such as the Human Terrain System and Bowman Expeditions point to a lack of comprehensive guidelines or overarching system of cooperation. In the case of HTS, this led to its eventual public demise. There is a growing awareness in the security sector of the need for socio-cultural capacity among the military, particularly due to the changing nature of warfare. The ability to work in cooperation with other cultures through knowledge of their cultural values and norms is a highly useful skill in the current security climate. Access to reliable social sciences information is thus vital to the effectiveness and sustainability of any cultural awareness program. However, this necessitates cooperation with the social sciences. By addressing the key concerns and past experiences of social scientists, particularly in the United States, this report has strived to deepen current debate and give context to the sensitivities of social scientists that arise from cooperation with the military. The recommendations aim to encourage deeper mutual understanding and build trust, factors vital to the success of these relations.

The questions of how and if will not vanish overnight. Yet suspicions concerning the relationship between the social sciences and the military in Australia may be

alleviated through guided discussion, mutual respect and a deeper understanding of each side. Lastly, this report encourages a continued public dialogue surrounding the concerns and arguments for and against cooperation. Given the emotions that have sometimes surrounded this topic, approaching it with respect and consideration will generate far more fruitful results.

References

AAA CEAUSSIC 2009, *Final Report on The Army's Human Terrain System Proof of Concept Program*, American Anthropological Association, viewed 23 April 2018, <http://s3.amazonaws.com/rdcms-aaa/files/production/public/FileDownloads/pdfs/cmtes/commissions/CEAUSSIC/upload/CEAUSSIC_HTS_Final_Report.pdf>.

Al-Rodhan, N 2015, *Strategic Culture and Pragmatic National Interest*, Global Policy, viewed 12 May 2018, <<https://www.globalpolicyjournal.com/blog/22/07/2015/strategic-culture-and-pragmatic-national-interest>>.

Australian Government Department of Defence 2016, *Defence White Paper*, Commonwealth of Australia.

Australian Government Department of Defence 2018, *Global Operations*, viewed 25 April 2018, <<http://www.defence.gov.au/Operations/>>.

Bryan, J 2010, 'Force Multipliers: Geography, Militarism, and the Bowman Expeditions', *Political Geography*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 1-3, viewed 18 May 2018, <<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.405.597&rep=rep1&type=pdf>>.

Burr, R 2015, *Deputy Chief of Army address to ASPI conference 25 June 2015*, Australian Defence Force, viewed 25 April 2018, <<https://www.army.gov.au/our-work/speeches-and-transcripts/deputy-chief-of-army-address-to-aspi-conference-25-june-2015>>.

Campbell, A 2016, *Chief of Army address to the 14th Annual Security Summit*, The Australian Army, viewed 21 April 2018, <https://www.army.gov.au/sites/g/files/net1846/f/speeches/20160830_ca_address_to_nss_30_aug_16_2300_monday_formatted.pdf>.

Campbell, A 2017, *Preparing for the Indo-Pacific Century: Challenges for the Australian Army- Chief of Army address to RUSI, 8 December, 2017*, Australian Defence Force, viewed 25 April 2018, < <https://www.army.gov.au/our-work/speeches-and-transcripts/preparing-for-the-indo-pacific-century-challenges-for-the>>.

Caplan, P 2003, *The Ethics of Anthropology: Debates and Dilemmas*, Routledge, U.K.

CEAUSSIC 2009, *Final Report on the Army's Human Terrain System Proof of Concept Program*, American Anthropological Association, viewed 10 May 2018, <http://s3.amazonaws.com/rdcms-aaa/files/production/public/FileDownloads/pdfs/cmtes/commissions/CEAUSSIC/upload/CEAUSSIC_HTS_Final_Report.pdf>.

[oad/CEAUSSIC HTS Final Report.pdf](#)>.

Garfield, A 2010, *The Value of Social Science Research in Military Operations*, [Speech] Brigham Young University Lecture, David M. Kennedy Centre for International Studies, <http://glevumassociates.com/doc/speech_Ethics_of_Research-Andrew.pdf>.

Giroux, H.A. 2009, *University in Chains: Confronting the Military-Industrial-Academic Complex*, Routledge.

Greathouse, C.B. 2010, 'Examining the Role and Methodology of Strategic Culture' in *Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 57-85, viewed 6 May 2018, <<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.2202/1944-4079.1020>>.

Gurzawska, A, Benčin, R 2015, *Ethics Assessment in Different Fields of Social Sciences*, SATORI, <<http://satoriproject.eu/media/2.d-Social-Sciences.pdf>>.

Iphofen, R. 2011, *Ethical Decision Making in Social Research: A Practical Guide*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Iphofen, R 2013, *Research Ethics in Ethnography/Anthropology*, European Commission, DG Research and Innovation, viewed 24 April 2018, <http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/other/hi/ethics-guide-ethnog-anthrop_en.pdf>.

Joseph, P 2014, *"Soft" Counterinsurgency: Human Terrain Teams and US Military Strategy in Iraq and Afghanistan*, Palgrave Macmillan, U.S.

King, C 2009, 'Managing Ethical Conflict on a Human Terrain Team' in *Anthropology News*, vol. 50, no. 6, p. 16, viewed 24 April 2018, <<https://anthrosource.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1556-3502.2009.50616.x>>.

Lucas, GR 2009, *Anthropologists in Arms: The Ethics of Military Anthropology*, Rowman & Littlefield, U.K.

McFate, M 2005, 'Anthropology and Counterinsurgency: The Strange Story of their Curious Relationship' in *Military Review*, vol. 85, no. 2, pp. 24-38, viewed 23 April 2018, <<http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/milreview/mcfate.pdf>>.

Perreault, T, Bridge, G, McCarthy, J 2015, *The Routledge Handbook of Political Economy*, Routledge, U.K.

Price, DH 2008, *Anthropological Intelligence: The Deployment and Neglect of American Anthropology in the Second World War*, Duke University Press, U.S.

Price, DH 2011, *Weaponizing Anthropology: Social Science in Service of the Militarised State*, AK Press, U.S.

Rouse, C, Lederman, R, Borneman, J 2015, *Engaged Anthropology: The Ethics and Politics of Collaborations in the Field*, Princeton, U.S.,
<https://www.princeton.edu/international/doc/Rouse_GCN-Engaged-Anthropology-PR.pdf>.

Rubinstein, R 2016, 'Ethical Considerations from the Study of Peacekeeping' in Albro, R, Marcus, G, McNamara, L, Schoch-Spana, M 2016, *Anthropologists in the SecurityScape: Ethics Practice and Professional Identity*, Routledge, U.S.

Spencer-Oatey, H 2012, *What is Culture? A Compilation of Quotations*, GlobalPAD Core Concepts, viewed 26 April 2018
<<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.401.3386&rep=rep1&type=pdf>>.

Wong, L 2004, *Developing Adaptive Leaders: The Crucible Experience of Operation Iraqi Freedom*, Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College, U.S.