

Chapter 1 : Anthropologists in Arms: The Ethics of Military Anthropology by George R. Lucas Jr.

Anthropologists in Arms looks at the moral and ethical debates surrounding the recent development of 'military anthropology'—particularly the practice of embedding anthropologists with combat troops in Iraq and Afghanistan.

This is a rush transcript. Copy may not be in its final form. We turn now to the issue of anthropologists and war. Well, the Pentagon has a new strategy in Iraq and Afghanistan. They have graduate degrees in anthropology and serve as cultural advisers to the US military. But the move has anthropologists up in arms. In September, a group of scholars formed the Network of Concerned Anthropologists. Security and Intelligence Communities released its final report in November. David Price is associate professor of anthropology at St. He has written extensively on the history and ethics of anthropologists interacting with members of the military and intelligence agencies. David Price joins us now from Seattle. Welcome to Democracy Now! Well, this debate very much cuts to the core of what the appropriate uses of anthropology are, regarding warfare and regarding large ethical issues about what does it mean to have anthropologists embedded with military forces during a time of war. You know, there are large ethical issues about embedding ethnographers with troops. The executive board of the American Anthropological Association weighed these and others issues and made a very strong statement against the Human Terrain program, because it saw it clearly wandering into these very ethical problematic areas and not really showing due concern for the people who are studied. What specifically is the Human Terrain program? How did it start, and how does it typically operate now in places like Afghanistan and Iraq? Now, the claim by Human Terrain is that they can reduce casualties by giving more nuanced information to people in battle situations. CORDS program in Vietnam was used to map human terrain, to identify suspected individuals and groups that the military believed were sympathizers for the Viet Cong, who were, in the Vietnam era, targeted for assassination. But the problem is, is that there are armed ethnographers. Not all the ethnographers working for Human Terrain carry weapons, but we do know there are instances where they do. So they travel with troops and independently in the countryside, gathering culture information that they bring back and give to the command. So these are not necessarily people who are already in the military? Now, my understanding is that this is also potentially very lucrative. And again, these are people with sort of marginal regional expertise who are being used. David Glenn wrote a piece about her — also this story was broken in Wired magazine — talking about how she was released from the Human Terrain System program amidst an investigation of her national loyalty shortly before she was to deploy to Iraq. The investigation stemmed from a quip she made over beers late one night in June. With the help of at least one senior administrator in the Human Terrain program, she is fighting to expunge her security record and to clear her name. Can you talk a little more about what you know of Ms. I know basically the facts that you stated there. I was on a panel with her in a session organized by the Network of Concerned Anthropologists at the anthropology meetings, and her critique was very interesting. Her critique of Human Terrain is not my own. Part of it is. She had serious complaints, from the inside, about basically the intellectual incompetence of the people who are involved in the program. But this is where I differ with her. She believed that if, you know, better anthropologists or people with higher degrees of competence were involved, then the program would be a good one. I disagree with that entirely, because that would not resolve the ethical issues, you know, as well as the moral issues of being involved in a very corrupt war being fought in Iraq today. Talk about how this debate is being played out in the Anthropological Association and what this oath is all about. Well, the oath is very simple. Hugh Gusterson, an anthropologist who studies nuclear weapons production, came up with the idea of modeling a very similar pledge. Yeah, Human Terrain certainly casts a large shadow of suspicion on the entire discipline of anthropology. American Anthropology in the Second World War. Can you talk about the historical use of anthropologists? You know, in fact, you can look at it going back to the Indian wars and, you know, early anthropology in the nineteenth century, where anthropological knowledge was used or, in many cases, anthropologists protected the knowledge in ways that the military could not access it. My book on the Second World War uses the Freedom of Information Act, a lot of archival research, oral history and such, to try and piece together how broad was the anthropological

contribution to the war. You know, well over half of American anthropologists were involved in some sort of contribution to the war, working for agencies like the Office of War Information. Many worked for the OSS, the intellectual or the institutional predecessor to the CIA — you know, and many other uses. Some of this, in my view, was not really ethically problematic. It involved sort of library work and such. But even during World War II, there were ethically troubling things that happened. Probably the most egregious example those involves anthropologists at the OSS who were consulted and agreed to work on efforts to try and identify biological weapons that would — to be used against the Japanese, under the belief that the Japanese were somehow a different race and they might be able to find and exploit a biological difference, you know, in Japanese physiology. You know, there are many other cases. There were also anthropologists at the Office of War Information who spent the last year of the war basically beating their head against the wall, trying to convince the White House and Pentagon that the Japanese were ready to surrender and were culturally capable of surrendering. And they did very good work. And in Vietnam, what was the role of some anthropologists there? Vietnam, you know, the American Anthropological Association really blew up in a large uproar, when it was disclosed that there were ethnographers that were providing information for use in counterinsurgency, basically modeling what was known about village life in Thailand and also the highlands of Vietnam, that was used by Special Forces. So that really created rifts in the association that are still there today. And, you know, Human Terrain is really resurrecting some of these issues today. But there are still many of the same dynamics. I see the leadership of the American Anthropological Association as acting much more conscientiously, if not progressively, in dealing with these issues. But many of the same dynamics are there in play, and there are real battles going on with people, you know, on both sides being very passionate, worrying about the soul of their discipline. I want to thank you very much for being with us, David Price, associate professor of anthropology at St. His forthcoming book is called *Weaponizing Anthropology: American Anthropology and the Second World War*. Please attribute legal copies of this work to [democracynow](#). Some of the work s that this program incorporates, however, may be separately licensed. For further information or additional permissions, contact us.

Chapter 2 : Anthropologists At War - In These Times

Anthropologists in Arms looks at the moral and ethical debates surrounding the recent development of "military anthropology"--particularly the practice of embedding anthropologists with combat troops in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Anthropology of, and for, the Military Chapter 6 Chapter Four: Even more so, it shines an informative light on the complex ethical and policy issues that surround military anthropology with both balance and good sense. A fascinating and accessible book, it is a signal achievement that is sure to raise the level of discussion within the discipline and become essential reading for anyone concerned with the future of anthropology. Rubinstein, professor of anthropology and international relations, Maxwell School of Syracuse University *Anthropologists in Arms* is a tremendous contribution to the emerging professional debate concerning the morality as well as the academic propriety of scientists and scholars working closely with the military in modern warfare. Set against the background of discord over the American invasion of Iraq, Guantanamo, and continuing war in Afghanistan, this is a must read not only for anthropologists, but also for other scientists, academics, and professional military officers. In this exquisitely careful and thoughtful book, philosopher Lucas examines the controversial connections between anthropologists and the military. His account of the moral problems is as insightful as his conclusions are balanced. His groundbreaking work on establishing the criteria for a just peace set the terms of the debate. With *Anthropologists in Arms*, Lucas applies his ethical expertise in a new arena, plunging into the relatively little-known world of military anthropology. He exposes the growing use of anthropologists by the U. This raises a host of fascinating issues, relating not only to potential violations of professional values, but also more universal concerns about the appropriate roles and responsibilities of scholars and citizens. What is your obligation if you believe a particular military effort is unjustified, but you have specialized knowledge and skills that could prevent the situation on the ground from deteriorating even further or help limit the scope of the damage including the suffering of innocents? Controversy has swirled around the ethical, professional, and political issues involved in the employment and deployment of anthropologists in the global war on terror, especially in regard to programs that embed social scientists with combat units as cultural intelligence advisors. However, the range of types of engagement, and thus the ethical and professional issues they raise, is not well-understood or evaluated. Lucas reviews critically the relevant history and debates in anthropology, and his collegial recommendations from a colleague in philosophy to anthropological professionals are of the utmost, urgent relevance. Engaging and pitch-perfect, *Anthropologists in Arms* is a thoughtful, sincere, and balanced treatment of past and present debates and a very important addition to the current literature. With *Anthropologists in Arms*, Lucas applies his ethical expertise in a new arena, plunging into the relatively little-known world of military anthropology. What is your obligation if you believe a particular military effort is unjustified, but you have specialized knowledge and skills that could prevent the situation on the ground from deteriorating even further or help limit the scope of the damage including the suffering of innocents? Not shying away from controversy, Lucas addresses vital questions of conflicting moral duties, backing his conclusions with sound philosophical reasoning and careful research. He then offers practical solutions to guide future policy. This is an important book that should be read and discussed not only by anthropologists and other academics but widely within government, the military, and NGO communities. For this work, Lucas should be commended. Stockdale Center for Ethical Leadership.

Chapter 3 : Anthropologists in arms : the ethics of military anthropology in SearchWorks catalog

Anthropologists in Arms looks at the moral and ethical debates surrounding the recent development of 'military anthropology'--particularly the practice of embedding anthropologists with combat troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. Lucas traces the troubled history of social scientists collaborating with.

In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: Robert Albro bio George R. The Ethics of Military Anthropology. The controversy still lingers. Naval Academyâ€™ uses the methods of applied philosophy and the tools of a professional ethicist self-effacingly and often sensibly to engage the discipline about how it conducts its own internal dialogues and construes its ethics. Not an anthropologist himself, Lucas provides a timely and often helpful extra-disciplinary account. He is well informed and treats anthropological preoccupations with respect. But given his critical distance, he does not accept these at face value. While anthropologists are unlikely to agree with everything Lucas has to say, he does the discipline a service, as an informed observer [End Page] conversant with disciplinary concerns while subjecting its sometimes parochial internal debates to broader assessment. In this process he helps to widen the universe of discussion by encouraging us collectively to scrutinize the basic assumptions underlying our sense of our moral responsibilities: For this work, Lucas should be commended. Lucas is most provocative when examining the ways in which the discipline chooses to tell its own story. He describes this as a "collective self-consciousness" 69 that includes a "litany of shame" 25 about supposed complicities with the military that in his view have an "outsized mythological significance" In point of fact, he gently suggests, our history is not what we have made of it. Despite regular invocation of the infamous Vietnam-era Project Camelot as a key historical precedent, for example, no anthropologists were in fact integral to it. Lucas is at his most helpful when discussing the disciplinary prohibition against "secret and clandestine" research. He points out that a long-standing concern among anthropologists about secrecy appears in fact to be a concern about the possibility of espionage, which is not the same. He also suggests that in principle, secrecy cannot simply be dismissed as unprofessional. Lucas differentiates between secrecy per se and the often morally objectionable intentions behind it. He discusses the appropriateness and inappropriateness of clandestinity, deception, not being public, espionage, classified work, an intention to victimize, an intention to protect anonymity, the complete withholding of research including results , and uses of "double blind" experiments in other social sciences, among other nuances. By unpacking the prohibition against secrecy while considering different varieties of secrecy, Lucas encourages a productive redirection of our discussion of this bugbear, from its status as a self-evident ethical dictum toward greater attention to what people actually do, and how varieties of secrecy might play a part though often not in ways we might assume. This book helpfully reminds us that our debates are often insular ones, with too much time spent talking to ourselves about ourselves. These nuances lead Lucas to question the apparent elision by anthropologists [End Page] of the rejection of all forms of secrecy with a rejection of government work. Nonetheless, the conversation is worth having You are not currently authenticated. View freely available titles:

Chapter 4 : Anthropologists in Arms : George R. Lucas :

Anthropologists advise their academic employers in these institutions on how to increase cultural literacy, promote and enhance foreign language acquisition and competence among their students, and increase the "cultural awareness" and cultural sensitivities of those students.

Chapter 5 : George R. Lucas, Anthropologists in Arms: The Ethics of Military Anthropology - PhilPapers

Anthropologists in Arms looks at the moral and ethical debates surrounding the recent development of 'military anthropology'--particularly the practice of embedding anthropologists with combat troops in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Chapter 6 : Anthropological criminology - Wikipedia

Anthropologists in Arms looks at the moral and ethical debates surrounding the recent development of 'military anthropology'—particularly the practice of embedding anthropologists with combat troops in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Chapter 7 : Anthropologists in arms : the ethics of military anthropology - University of Manitoba Libraries

Anthropologists in Arms Edition by George R. Lucas Jr. and Publisher AltaMira Press. Save up to 80% by choosing the eTextbook option for ISBN: ,