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At the 1954 meeting of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), 123 nations signed the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property during Armed Conflict. The US ratified the 1954 Convention in 2008 following public outcry after incidents such as the looting of the Iraq National Museum in Baghdad. The US Department of Defense (DOD) has placed an increased importance on cultural property protection and general cultural awareness. The intent of this thesis project was to create realistic training scenarios that could be used by the military to educate soldiers about the importance of cultural property protection and how it affects the military mission. It became clear that cultural property specialists of various academic backgrounds are often unaware of how to appropriately engage the military and implement training plans. This research identifies precursors required before presenting line troops with training scenarios designed to develop greater awareness of cultural properties on the battlefield.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

At the 1954 meeting of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), 123 nations signed the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property during Armed Conflict (Rush 2010). UNESCO signatory nations began to ratify into law this Convention by 1956. However, the United States (U.S.) failed to ratify the Convention for fifty years. After the raids of the Iraqi National Museum in Baghdad in 2003, as well as other culturally sensitive incidents, the U.S. was politically obligated to ratify the 1954 Convention in 2008. Since the U.S. ratification, the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) has placed an increased importance on cultural property protection and general cultural awareness.

In 2005, even before the Convention was ratified by the U.S., Dr. Laurie Rush, the Cultural Resource Manager at Fort Drum, New York identified the need for better educational materials to teach soldiers about the rich cultural heritage of Iraq and Afghanistan. By 2006 she and her team of experts created a deck of playing cards with culture heritage messages and cultural properties emblazoned on them. By 2006-2007, Rush had created mock cultural sites within Modern Operations Urban Training (MOUT) sites to provide soldiers with exposure to the types of cultural property that would be encountered while on deployment to either the Iraq or Afghanistan theaters (DOD Legacy 2011).

Dr. Rush created training scenarios that addressed the concerns of cultural property specialists regarding military operations near cultural resources. These training scenarios were focused on the archaeological resources and did not put these landscape features into the context of a larger military operation. For military leaders and junior soldiers alike the exposure to cultural sites was seen as a positive outcome of Dr. Rush’s efforts. One soldier stated that some of the mock cultural sites “looked exactly like Iraq” (Dr. Rush, personal communication, 2011).
Despite the positive feedback, a lack of realistic training scenarios attuned to the military mission and operating procedures inhibited dynamic use of these training facilities (Dr. Rush, personal communication, 2011).

The initial intent of this thesis project was to create realistic training scenarios that could be used by the military to educate soldiers about cultural property protection and develop standard procedures recognizing the importance of cultural property as it affects the military mission. Military interaction with cultural property, for the purposes of this project, refers to the procedures that service members should use when encountering cultural properties in the battle space. Adjusting military procedures to alert the proper individuals would significantly alter the interaction of U.S. military with cultural properties. In order for cultural property protection training to be accepted as a viable training task, it is important to develop appropriate reporting structures, a cultural property hierarchical structure that would allow continued operations and a symbol for cultural property to act as a visual aid on operational graphic systems.

As the project progressed, it became clear that cultural property specialists of various academic backgrounds are often unaware of how to appropriately engage the military and implement training plans. Academic professionals and civilian specialists are often asked to provide their expertise as consultants to the military. These consultants are used in situations from Human Intelligence gathering to vehicle mechanics to equal opportunity counseling. These consultants are not always asked for input by the military, but rather to identify a deficiency and engage the military. Recently Dr. Rush, acting as the archaeological consultant at Fort Drum, New York and for Central Command (CENTCOM), has developed training scenarios, but these have not been standardized for the entire force. For this reason, the project has morphed into an educational treatise for two separate groups; first, the academic community and second, the
military. Innovative, realistic and meaningful training scenarios that present the importance of cultural property protection to the military are essential for assisting cultural property specialists in their efforts to change the way the U.S. military interacts with cultural sites in theaters of war. Consultation with senior military officials, experienced ground commanders, soldier feedback on proposed training and personal military experience have helped to inform this project on best practices for implementing and training the U.S. military on cultural property protection.
CHAPTER II: BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND RESEARCH DESIGN

Historic Background

During World War II (WWII) there was a growing concern for the effects of war on cultural property. Between the intensive air raids across Europe which destroyed significant architecture and the Army of Nazi Germany seizing important works of art from displaced Jewish families and museums of invaded countries, large amounts of cultural property were destroyed or stolen (Rush 2010). Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts organized the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in Europe (American Commission 1946). This Commission was christened the Roberts Commission and led to the creation of the Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives Section (MFA&A) which was attached to the G-5/G-9 (Civil Affairs) Division of the Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force (SHAEF). The U.S. military found in its ranks qualified personnel to serve in the MFA&A. While not all monuments and artwork were recovered or protected by the MFA&A, these service members had a significant impact and prevented many cultural resources from being destroyed. Noted successes of the MFA&A include the recovery of looted material housed in Nazi underground repositories (Nicholas 1994).

In 1954, UNESCO met in the Hague and passed the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict. Article 1 of the Convention defines cultural property as any movable or immovable property important to the culture heritage of all peoples, to include archaeological sites, historic sites, art, monuments, and any building or structure containing such property (UNESCO 1954). The convention then details the appropriate actions taken by host and occupational forces of a conflict. The host nation is required to prepare for the
protection of cultural resources within its territory in the event of conflict and the occupying nation is to respect and, to the best of its ability, prevent the damage to the host nation’s cultural property. All signatory nations of the convention are to instill a culture of respect for all cultural property within its armed forces. A military force should not engage in and should seek to stop the destruction of cultural property (UNESCO 1954).

The 1954 Hague Convention was signed by 123 nations including the United States though it was not immediately ratified into U.S. law. The convention was not ratified by the U.S. because it was believed that the protection of cultural property was not feasible in the event of nuclear war. Because the convention was not ratified, the U.S. military did not undertake cultural property awareness training (Rush 2010).

The recent conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq damaged many cultural resources in these countries (Stone and Bajjaly 2008). Due to the increase in media technology and increased coverage by the media many of these incidents resulted in bad publicity for the U.S. military. In Afghanistan there was inadvertent damage done to a karez, an ancient water supply system, at Forward Operating Base (FOB) Wolverine (Phillips 2009). In Iraq, locals looted the Iraq National Museum and this incident was seen as a failure of the U.S. military to provide for this resources protection (Vitelli and Chanthaphonh 2006). The Marine Corps, in Iraq, constructed a FOB on the ruins of ancient Babylon damaging many artifacts and their archaeological context. As a result of these incidents, increasing pressure from the academic and international communities led to the ratification of the convention in 2008, eight years into the war in Afghanistan and five years into the war in Iraq (Rush 2010).
It is worth noting that cultural property protection and the role of archaeologists and anthropologists in this endeavor differs from that of their role in Human Terrain Systems (HTS). In HTS social scientists are asked to help construct cultural maps that will allow the military’s operations to be conducted more efficiently given the knowledge of cultural context of the host nation in a conflict (Lucas 2009). While this is a form of cultural awareness, archaeologists and anthropologists may have ethical concerns about performing such actions (Vitelli 2006). The chief ethical concern is the stipulation that archaeologists and anthropologists are to do no harm to the subjects of their study. Conversely, educating and creating meaningful training for the military, in order to instill a culture of cultural property awareness is a professional and ethical responsibility of all social scientists (Lucas 2009). The International Committee of the Blue Shield (ICBS) has taken this responsibility to heart and is working to implement cultural property training to the military. ICBS has consistently sought the advice of representatives from the military and have been an integral part of furthering research on cultural property protection and the military since 2006. ICBS has also allied its efforts with other academic groups such as the Military Archaeological Resources Stewardship (MARS) interest group of the Society for American Archaeology (SAA), the Combatant Command Cultural Heritage Action Group (C-CHAG) and the Cultural Heritage by AIA-Military Panel (CHAMP) of the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA). These groups have worked with Dr. Rush, the military and other cultural property professionals to create educational materials and to identify appropriate military counterparts to promote cultural property protection (ICOM 2012).

Military Policies

As a signatory nation who has ratified the 1954 Hague Convention into national law, the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) is obligated to plan its operations around cultural resources
that may be present in any country that it operates in. The U.S. military has clearly written policies that enumerate the responsibilities of the services towards cultural property. In the United States the DOD reports to the Department of the Interior (DOI) regarding environmental concerns. Every military base has an environmental department with a minimum of one cultural resource manager. The environmental command of each service is required to present an annual environmental report to the DOI (USAEC 2012).

The DOD has developed specific guidance concerning the cultural property in foreign countries as well. The Overseas Environmental Baseline Guidance Document (OEBGD) reflects the 1954 Hague Convention’s articles and establishes them as military policy (USAEC 2012). OEBGD requires that plans be in place to lessen the effects of war on property listed on or eligible for listing on the equivalent of the U.S. National Register of Historic Places. Section 13.2.3 of the OEBGD list four ways to accomplish this: to limit the magnitude of the action, to relocate the operation entirely, to repair or restore the resource, or to record all data of the resource before destruction. Key articles of the OEBGD have to do with the identification and inventory of cultural property in order to plan appropriately for their mitigation. This document sets the tone for the service specific regulations and field manuals. The regulations are largely reiterations of the DOD OEBGD with some variation. All regulations list the post commander as the U.S. ambassador to the host nation during foreign conflicts as well as for inter-governmental relations with tribal organizations within the Continental U.S. The U.S. Navy and U.S. Marine Corps instructional documents differ from other services in that they also detail appropriate actions concerning submerged cultural resources within their areas of operation (AO). Service specific cultural resource regulations are found in the Operations of the Navy Instruction (OPNAVINST) 5090.1C Environmental Readiness Program Manual, the Marine Corps Order
Within the Army, Civil Affairs Officers are responsible in part for the identification and inventory of cultural property within host nations. These soldiers are not necessarily professionals in social sciences and receive minimal training on the subject (MAJ. Reyes, Jorge, Civil Affairs Officer, personal communication, 2012). The majority of the responsibilities of the Civil Affairs Corps are to identify the needs of civilians within a host nation and provide the best solutions possible to their problems. These actions include acquisition of water and other resources. U.S. Army Civil Affairs soldiers are not as well trained, yet remain our equivalent of the Italian Carabinieri. GTA 41-01-002, the Civil Affairs Arts, Monuments and Archives Guide, is the manual for Civil Affairs soldiers who are tasked to monitor cultural resources and illegal trade of antiquities.

The DOD divides the globe into six unified combatant commands. These commands are in charge of a specific area of responsibility (AOR) within which any military action is under its command. Iraq and Afghanistan fall within Central Command’s (CENTCOM) AOR (Delessandro 2009). Because of this CENTCOM has produced AOR specific guidelines concerning appropriate actions of service members. Among this guidance are the provisions for the protection of cultural resources, the prohibition of trade of antiquities, and an obligation to stop any actions conducted by military or civilians that may have adverse effects on cultural property. These instructions can be found in CENTCOM’s General Order 1A and General Order 200-2.
Previous Research

In response to the damage to Babylonian ruins in Iraq, Dr. Laurie Rush, Cultural Resource Manager at Fort Drum, New York, began working with other government agencies to bring greater cultural awareness to the DOD (Rush 2010). The DOD Legacy Resource Management Program provided funding for her research and the Center for Environmental Management of Military Lands (CEMML) of Colorado State University created working groups to aid Dr. Rush in the creation of a deck of playing cards that provided cultural training to troops (Rush 2010). CEMML also worked to establish websites that provided cultural awareness training for Iraq, Afghanistan, and Egypt (Fort Drum Cultural Resource Program and CEMML 2012). The Defense Environmental Safety and Occupational Health Network and Information Exchange (DENIX) is another DOD website that provides a database of cultural resource management activities on military bases both within the Continental U.S. (CONUS) and outside the Continental U.S. (OCONUS) (DENIX 2012).

Dr. Rush also spearheaded the construction of mock archaeological sites within Military Operations Urban Training (MOUT) sites. She then created scenarios for military personnel to train and interact with these mock cultural resources (Rush 2010). According to military personnel experienced with the training scenarios, these did not reflect the size and scope of standard military operations and they did not address all possible scenarios of the effects of a military encounter on cultural resources. As a result these training scenarios have largely been ignored by military leaders and the mock archaeological sites have not been used as intended. Instead of training on and utilizing the mock cultural property in order to educate soldiers on how to appropriately handle the advent of cultural property on the battle space, these sites have
become little more than an aesthetic back drop to the MOUT sites (Laurie Rush, personal communication, 2011).

Theoretical Background

The purpose of this thesis project is to create meaningful training scenarios for the U.S. military based around mock cultural resources. The objective is to foster cultural awareness and to affect protection of cultural resources in areas of military conflict. The result will be greater compliance with the 1954 Hague Convention. The International Committee of the Blue Shield (ICBS) and the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA) suggest that this approach to cultural training for line units will foster increased awareness of cultural resources (AIA Annual Meeting 2012). This vision is supported by the success of the Italian and Austrian military’s in similar programs (Rush 2010).

Theories of public archaeology have been employed to develop training and questionnaires that have informed the construction of these scenarios (Davis 2005). Public archaeology seeks to include affected communities or the public at large to foster an atmosphere of community stewardship of cultural resources and heritage. Public archaeology is able to do this by sharing archaeological information with the public and by finding relevant ways of addressing cultural property issues within that community (Davis 2005). Relevant topics for the military include how cultural property protection can affect operations, how it can be responsibly integrated into military operations and how it can influence public opinion.

For this project, professional archaeologists and military members were consulted to produce reporting structures and a curricula appropriate for educating service members about the importance of cultural property. Including service members in the discussion should lead to a better understanding of military operations and the complexities of cultural property protection.
within a battle space have been identified. There has been an attempt to bring about cultural awareness and concern for cultural property protection within the U.S. military, in a way that the military can comprehend (Davis 2005). Because of the recent ratification of the 1954 Hague Convention, compliance responsibilities and concerns for cultural property protection are not going to go away. Successes of the U.S. military regarding the protection of cultural property in WWII prove that cultural property protection is feasible in a force on force environment. Therefore cultural property protection and security missions are not anomalies of the Counterinsurgency and Contingency operating environment of the current wars against terrorism, this type of cultural consideration is applicable to conventional war environments as well (Rush 2010).

This project focused on training combat arms units of the U.S. Army and the U.S. Marine Corps. The reason for this focus is because the discharge of ordinance and fixed wing and rotary wing close air support are not conducted without explicit direction from ground troops. For instance a landing zone for a rotary wing aircraft is requested and marked by the soldiers on the ground and it is they who should be most aware of the location of cultural resources. Further, the identification of submerged resources or resource identification from the air is beyond the abilities of most junior enlisted personnel (DOA 2006c). As this project seeks to train the military force from the bottom up, the advanced training required for these identification processes is beyond the scope of this project.

Objectives

The goal of this project is to create realistic training scenarios that will foster greater cultural awareness and will promote cultural property protection during armed conflict. This project will attempt to give soldiers an understanding of what an archaeological resource looks
like and to establish a structured report for soldiers to give their superiors when they identify a site. The projects objectives are:

1. Create training scenarios focused on the protection of cultural property.
2. Train soldiers how to identify a potential cultural property.
3. Create a structured cultural resource report.
4. Create hierarchical framework within which to place archaeological sites and determine whether that framework is ethical or feasible.
5. Evaluate whether the theory and practice of public archaeology are applicable to educating soldiers in combat training.

A discussion of each of the objectives follows.

Objective 1: Create meaningful training centered on mock cultural sites in order to train service members on proper procedures when cultural property is encountered. The faux archaeological sites at Fort Drum, New York were specifically built to engage soldiers and marines in issues of cultural sensitivity. Initial training scenarios have not been utilized to the extent archaeologists had envisioned and the sites are merely accent pieces for Military Operations Urban Training (MOUT) sites. Because service members are not fully aware of their responsibilities towards cultural property, they do not know how to interact with and learn from these mock cultural sites.

Objective 2: Create training that teaches what cultural property is and how to identify archaeological sites. Service members are not archaeologists. Some military personnel may have a background in archaeology or other social sciences but these individuals are the exception. Creating training scenarios will do little good, if service members are not taught how
to identify cultural resources. While it is not the purpose of this project, nor is it possible, to
make service members experts in site identification, a basic understanding will have a
tremendous effect on cultural property protection during armed conflict in the future.

Objective 3: Create a structured cultural property reporting system. Once a site has been identified, there needs to be a way to report it to the command structure. Cultural resources should be part of the intelligence gathering and situation reports because that would give the combatant commanders greater situational awareness and may allow for more cultural-property-sensitive operations orders to be constructed. In addition, there needs to be a clear, codified symbol that represents cultural property. This symbol will aid in operations planning and briefing. These suggestions would all be part of the Intelligence Preparation of the Battlefield (IPB) process (DOA 2009).

Objective 4: Develop a hierarchical system to categorize cultural resources in various areas of operation. A qualitative categorization system is needed in order to give combatant commanders the ability to assess options for avenues of approach to the military objective. Simply requiring all cultural resources to be protected is not reasonable, nor is it feasible, given the military operating environment.

Objective 5: Assess the receptiveness and comprehension of the service members to the proposed training. While individuals learn differently, military units learn as a team. Presenting ideas of cultural property protection and the training scenarios in a way the team can understand may prove more effective and efficient, given time constraints within which military personnel operate.
Methods

The initial phase of this project consisted of literary research to arrive at a basic understanding of what an archaeological site is, so that it might be presented in a way that military professionals might understand. Several questionnaires were distributed to soldiers in order to gauge their comprehension on all presented materials. These questionnaires received approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) on October 18, 2012; the results of the questionnaires are open to the public and soldier’s participation was strictly voluntary. The questionnaires were administered to soldiers by Michael Sprowles on November 13 and 15, 2012, after the October IRB approval date. Michael Sprowles is a graduate of Indiana University and is a cultural resource specialist at Fort Drum. Participating soldiers were given an oral voluntary consent briefing after which they were given an opportunity to withdraw themselves or their responses from the study. The questionnaires covered the ethics and feasibility of establishing a hierarchical framework within which to place identified sites, for example from most important sites to least important sites. Military leaders have been asked to provide examples of how cultural property may have effected their operations in the past. Personal experience from my own military career has been included as well. Both archeologists and military personnel have aided in formulating a draft, structured report for identified cultural resources.

The training scenarios have been structured around the examples identified by military leaders. The scenarios follow the Master Scenario Event List (MSEL) format used by the U.S. Army. A MSEL is an abbreviated operations order that specifies the intent of the instructor or creator of the training scenario. It is up to the training non-commissioned officer (NCO) and the commander (CDR) to identify the intent of the MSEL training and supplement all additional
information for the draft of a complete operations order. A five paragraph operations order has been included in Appendix B to give the professional civilian community an idea of what is involved in planning a military operation. The five paragraphs cover situation, mission, execution, service and support, and command and signal (DOA 2009). These training scenarios have to be focused on the military mission while cultural resource identification and protection remain implied or secondary tasks. Focusing on standard military operations will give these training scenarios more plausibility and are therefore more realistic to the service member.

Combining the examples given in the questionnaires and the MSEL format, with an understanding of the terrain and layout of the MOUT sites proved to be essential in the creation of the training program. Several trips were made to the MOUT sites at Ft. Drum, New York in order to evaluate the landscape and how they would be integrated into the concept of and used during the execution of the training scenarios. Maps and other visual products were put together as well for soldiers and marines to use while navigating the sites.

Before training troops in the field, a class was given on the basics of site identification, reporting sites, and the hierarchical framework. After all of the data was compiled and training scenarios were screened by combatant commanders for plausibility, they were incorporated into the plans for future field training exercises (FTX) of infantry companies and cavalry troops. The troops will be given a mission brief and they will come up with plans and execute them. After careful consideration, terrain considerations were deemed to be irrelevant because of the universal nature of military training scenarios. Military training scenarios are to be written in a way such that they are applicable in any situation or environment. Training scenarios and their specifics are to be used at the discretion of the commander (CDR), allowing the CDR to add or detract from scenarios based upon the training needs identified by the CDR.
Instead of complete mock operations, soldiers were guided through an actual archaeological site and asked to identify appropriate actions and personnel and equipment placement given the terrain and nearby cultural property. After completing the walkthrough an after action review (AAR) was conducted to further gauge their knowledge and to get feedback on the training itself. The researcher evaluated how well the soldiers performed their tasks, whether they properly reported the sites according to the drafted reporting system and whether there were any instances of disrespect towards cultural sites within the training area. An anonymous survey was distributed to the troops before and after classroom instruction. These surveys also received approval from the IRB on October 19, 2012. This survey helped to evaluate receptiveness and comprehension. This was also an opportunity for the soldiers to make any additional comments they deemed necessary. Finally, the training scenarios have been amended to fit the needs of the military and to ensure the best cultural training possible for future field training exercises (FTX).
CHAPTER III: MILITARY ORGANIZATION

One of the challenges facing civilian cultural heritage specialists involved in educating the armed forces in cultural property protection is identifying the appropriate channels to go through to gain military approval for such training. The military is a complex organization that requires strict adherence to the chain of command.

Though platoon leaders (PL) and company commanders (CDR) have the authority to introduce training or make changes to training at their discretion, this is not a common practice. Discretionary training is often presented as “filler” material during free time between scheduled training events. This type of training is conducted when there is nothing else on schedule for that day and the commander or platoon leader needs to keep his troops occupied. Discretionary training may also occur because the subject of the training is of particular interest to the leadership or out of respect for the specialist who is introducing the training. Civilian specialists and academic professionals are often asked to educate service members on specialized topics as consultants to the military.

Discretionary training is not standardized and only reaches the soldiers under the particular leadership who has authorized it. Approaching company commanders with new training to field test the scenarios and the blocks of instruction, may be beneficial to the researcher who is trying to validate the training however this is not the route to take if the objective of the researcher is to train an entire force.

There are two approaches to ensure the entire force receives appropriate training. One would be to involve the command structure of the particular post on which training is to occur. The second, would be to submit the training scenarios and associated products for publication in service field manuals (FM) and tables of organization and equipment (TO&E).
The first solution requires knowledge of the post command structure. Cultural specialist should approach the highest ranking official that deals specifically with the training of soldiers. For the U.S. Army the Post Operations Officer (G-3) is in charge of all training that occurs on that post. If the training is accepted and authorized, the Division G-3, will give the training plan to an associate G-3 officer who is in charge of injecting all training plans into the training rotation of the entire Division. The training plans will be passed down to subordinate levels of the chain of command, along with orders to conduct the training, until they reach each individual company commander (CDR) and the company training non-commissioned officer (NCO). Once at the company level the training will be organized and taught to the individual platoons of soldiers.

While this can be an effective approach it still does not provide the training service wide. The training will only occur at the select individual post where it was approved by the local command structure accepted it. Approaching the G-3 of a post does not guarantee the training will be accepted. The G-3 still has to use his/her discretion in accepting or not accepting the training and the G-3 has to clear the training through the post or Division CDR. The following is a list and bubble map (Figure 1) of stopping points for the developed training plan as it makes its way down to the line troops.

**Training Scenario Inject Routing via Post Command Structure**

1. Formulate Training Scenarios
2. Contact G-3 Actual (out of courtesy)
3. G-3 Exercises Office and G-3 MSE Office (Division)
4. S-3 (Brigade) receives inject from G-3
5. S-3 (Battalion) receives inject from S-3 (Brigade)
6. Training NCOs (Company) receives inject from S-3 (Battalion)
7. Line Troops (Platoons) receive training scenario and Operations Order from Company Commander (CDR)
The second implementation solution enforces the training, service wide. In the U.S. Army, the way to accomplish this is through the Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC). TRADOC produces field manuals (FM), training manuals (TM) and Army Training and Evaluation Programs (ARTEP) that delineate the responsibilities of the entire chain of command for any given military task. The tasks can either be overarching concepts or subtasks. It is my belief that tasks involving cultural property protection should be subtasks to those tasks already being trained. In this way we are not asking the military to conduct any training that is foreign to them, rather we are merely adding an additional aspect to standard training.
Once a training plan has been created, it could be submitted to TRADOC for editing. Editing would include the division of labor for the specific task being added to the FM. Once the training is accepted and added to the various products mentioned above it will become mandatory training that will occur on a cyclic basis for each individual unit Army wide. The following is a list of stopping points and a bubble map showing the route new training is added to unit cyclic training going through TRADOC.

Training Scenarios Routing via Army Training and Doctrine Command

1. Formulate Standardized Training Tasks and Objectives
2. Contact Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) and Field Manual (FM) authors and convince them to revise the selected field manual. Note: The author and TRADOC contact information can be found in the publishing information section of the manual.
3. TRADOC publishes training, Tasks, Conditions and Standards in updated Army Field Manuals (FMs)
4. The training becomes a mandatory cyclic occurrence based upon TRADOC FMs, unit’s Army Force Generation (ARFORGEN) cycle and unit’s Modified Table of Organization and Equipment (MTOE)
5. Training in field manuals will be implemented into the Training cycle based upon a unit’s ARFORGEN cycle and MTOE

Figure 2. TRADOC flow chart
It is important to note that in either implementation route the training has to make sense for a unit’s place on the Army Force Generation (ARFORGEN) cycle and with the unit’s Modified Table of Organization and Equipment (MTOE). For example, it does not make sense for a Finance Officer or a Finance unit to learn certain military tasks as they rarely leave the Forward Operating Base (FOB) in theater. It does, however, make sense to teach cultural property protection training to combat arms and line units who interact with the local populous and local terrain on a regular basis.

The ARFORGEN cycle was created for the current conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan as a way of insuring that units had the appropriate time for recuperation from a deployment as well as their preparation for their next deployment. The ARFORGEN cycle is supposed to be a five phase and a four to five year plan. The first year and first phase of the cycle, back from a deployment is focused on equipment and personnel maintenance. Soldiers are often given three to six months during this year to mentally recover and spend time with families. The next phase is largely dedicated to sustaining knowledge of vehicle and individual weapon systems. This means there is a large amount of time dedicated to the firing ranges. The third phase focuses on squad and platoon level proficiency. This means that all tasks associated with these levels will be trained on to ensure that squad and platoon sized elements can operate effectively at this level. This is the first time duty specific tasks are trained on. The fourth phase is focused on Troop/Company level proficiency and the sustainment of Platoon level training. This phase is to evaluate whether the Platoons can work together effectively, forming a trained and ready Troop. The fifth phase is what is known as the ready phase. This phase is a sustainment phase for Troop level proficiency and it is understood that the Troop can be called upon at any time for deployment during this time. It is important to note that active duty units will go through each of
these steps within a single year, though a five year deployment break is the standard. Therefore for the Active duty unit they may repeat this process four to five times while Reserves and National Guard units may spread this cycle out over the entire five year period.

The MTOE simply defines the unit’s capabilities. It defines what type of vehicles or weapon systems are inherent in a given unit. It also defines the number of personnel and support personnel associated with a given unit. Understanding the unit’s mission, capabilities per MTOE and which phase the unit is currently operating in according to the ARFORGEN cycle is key in understanding when a unit is most likely to be able to train on a specific task.

Layers of the Military Organization

It is important to remember that the military organization operates at three distinct levels. These levels are the Tactical, Operational, and Strategic levels of the military command structure. The tactical level of command includes line troops and officers, Captains (O-3s) and below. The tactical level of command constitutes the warfighters, the platoons and companies who carry out the missions given to them by members of the operational command. The operational command, generally Major (O-4) through Colonel (O-6) support the strategic objectives by managing and organizing line troops in a way that achieves the military objective. The strategic level of command, general staff officers (O-7) and above, will work with political leaders to identify specific objectives that will win the war both politically and militarily. Understanding the levels of the military command structure will inform decisions on how best to structure educational and reporting materials for cultural property below.
CHAPTER IV: A NOTE ON TRAINING SOLDIERS

Training soldiers cannot be equated to an academic environment. Soldiers train to increase their knowledge and ability to engage the enemy, accomplish the military mission and return home alive. This single minded pursuit is at the heart of every soldier on the front lines. Therefore any information that is deemed extraneous to this effort will not be trained on or remembered by the soldiers. For this reason it is imperative to relate cultural property protection training to how it can become a force multiplier on the battlefield. Civilian instructors can accomplish this by explaining the fact that not protecting cultural property can lead to animosity from local groups, who may ally themselves with the enemy and thereby fuel an insurgency.

Simply bringing good ideas and well prepared talking points to soldiers is not enough. While soldiers are respectful to any presenter who is endorsed by the chain of command, if that individual is not a service member, soldiers are less likely to be actively engaged in the training. The reason for this is often a conscious or subconscious disdain for civilian instructors who are not sharing or have not shared in the same risks and pressures inherent in the military lifestyle. Therefore it is recommended that instructors of cultural property protection training be either service members or prior service members who have expertise in archaeology or another applicable social science.

Additionally, soldiers, while again respectful, will be either consciously or subconsciously less attentive to a service member instructor who has not been deployed. Soldiers are able to identify those who have deployed by looking at various identifiers on the individual’s uniform. Again the instructor who has not been deployed will be looked on as though he has not completely shared in the risks of military life. Further because of the individuals lack of experience in a combat theater the soldiers may perceive the individual as
having no real experience and therefore has no right to instruct them on proper procedures when overseas. Therefore if at all possible the instructor should have deployment experience.

In this way, I believe that the theories of public archaeology can be applied to educating the military about cultural property protection. While soldiers as individuals may be stakeholders in cultural property at a local, state, national or, in the case of the current armed conflicts, international level, they are not permitted to engage in political or lobbying enterprises as is often the case when considering cultural property. Rather, soldiers are stakeholders of cultural property in another sense. The protection or destruction of cultural property could lead to consequences that either enhance or detract from the military mission or the ability of the soldiers to return home, and soldiers are certainly stakeholders regarding these. So it is imperative that the instructors are able to relate to the soldiers and convey the importance of cultural property protection.

It is important to remember that soldiers are NOT mindless followers. Soldiers are trained and mentored to be able to operate at the level of two ranks above their own. Therefore a Private First Class (PFC) is already thinking like a section leader or a Sergeant (SGT), a SGT is already thinking like a Platoon Sergeant (PSG) or Sergeant First Class (SFC) and a First Lieutenant (1LT) is already thinking like a Commander (CDR) or Captain (CPT). Because of this soldiers do not follow just because they are ordered to do so, though they will, they follow orders also because the leaders have instilled in them a just cause for accomplishing a specific task. For this reason a mission statement will always include an In Order To (IOT) clause which intimates the importance of mission success. For instance: 1st Platoon (PLT) conducts a route reconnaissance IOT facilitate the movement of follow on units to Baghdad. In this same spirit cultural property protection instructors must address its importance. While soldiers will do what
they are told, they may not do it with the same fervor as if they believed in the mission or task being ordered. Belief breeds attentiveness and attentiveness saves lives on the battlefield.

The receptiveness of soldiers to the idea of cultural property protection training and its importance on the battlefield is astonishing. Michael Sprowles, archaeologist at Fort Drum, instructed a pilot class to several groups of soldiers at Fort Drum, New York, after which the soldiers were asked to complete several surveys about the training. This instruction and subsequent questionnaires took place after the Institutional Review Board approved this research in October 2012. These soldiers were enrolled in either a foreign language course learning Pashto or Dari or were enrolled in the Environmental Officers course. Ten percent of the students enrolled in these courses were chosen as a random sample to receive instruction on cultural property protection. These soldiers were from various Military Occupational Specialties (MOS). Out of 17 soldiers, only three, or 18%, contended that cultural property protection should not be a focus of the military during war and viewed it as a distraction from the mission. 65% understood cultural property protection as a force multiplier and could see the value in the training. All of these soldiers had been deployed and have experienced first hand how important it can be to make the local populations allies by protecting cultural property, thereby gaining human intelligence on the enemy. 40% of the soldiers demonstrated an understanding of cultural property and its value before the instruction was even presented. In the pre-instruction questionnaire, several soldiers named monuments and battlefields and one soldier astonishingly named an intangible cultural property such as the visual beauty of the nature preserve, Balboa Park, in his home town.

Soldiers are clearly capable of learning about cultural property protection. Elements of the public archaeology theoretical approach can be applied to a military educational setting.
After the instruction, the soldiers were asked to provide feedback on the hierarchical structure, report structures and symbols for cultural property. The data from those questionnaires will be discussed in the following sections.
CHAPTER V: HIERARCHICAL STRUCTURE

Cultural Property Hierarchy

Because cultural property is subject to the values that the stakeholders place on it, cultural property that one cultural group deems insignificant could be extremely significant to another culture. Cultural properties may have different values to different stakeholders. Because a property is not significant at a national or international level does not mean it is not valuable to the culture that identifies with that property (King, 2008).

Why is it important to develop a hierarchical structure for cultural property on the battle space? Simply, cultural resource professionals cannot expect the military to agree to cultural property regulations that do not maintain the military’s ability to maneuver on the battlefield. An example I often use when describing how the military might respond to cultural property regulations is one in which a military unit is forced to proceed to its objective through a constricted valley. In this case, the valley floor is lined left to right with cultural property. On the left is a standing mosque still in use, in the middle are the ruins of an ancient building and on the right is an artifact scatter consisting of ceramics. If we place the same weight on the various types of cultural property found here and expect the military commander to abort his mission, the military commander will likely ignore the directive and proceed to the military objective. It is important to remember that the military mission is always placed first, before other concerns. Rather than directing that the mission be aborted to avoid the cultural properties, a better approach is to develop general guidelines on how to consider their avenues of approach given the presence of cultural property. In this example, the framework must consider the size and dimensions of the properties as well as their durability. Durability in this instance means the effect that the weight of vehicles or fire power may have on that location. Additionally, soldiers
when on ground have to be aware of recent offerings at specific sites and of sites that are held in high esteem by the local population with whom the military interacts. But soldiers cannot be expected to be aware of or understand this at all times and must rely on deductive reasoning to determine which sites can withstand military movement or action. It is obvious that a standing structure, which is still in use, should not be driven over by a tank, whereas the pottery scatter is by its very nature, broken, very little additional harm would be imparted to this type of site. Many archaeologists would question the possibility of cultural properties underneath the artifact scatter and the possibility of terrestrial compression from the vehicles, but soldiers cannot be expected to identify cultural property they cannot see nor have any knowledge of. So it is incumbent upon this research to consider how best to categorize cultural property in a hierarchical framework in order to give the combatant commanders the ability to make informed decisions about what type of vehicles or munitions to use within a given landscape.

Military operations incorporate many types of vehicles that have different types of effects on cultural resources. Ground vehicles naturally affect cultural sites more frequently, while airborne vehicles affect cultural sites based on mission planning and at the request of ground forces. The varying weights and the vehicle type have a direct correlation to the type of damage a vehicle can have on a site. For example a track vehicle will likely affect a site differently from a wheeled vehicle because track vehicles tend to be heavier causing greater terrestrial compression. Track vehicles scrape and drag surface debris, surface scatters and visible foundations. Rotor wash from a rotary wing aircraft will have different effects on surface finds as it will push artifacts outward in a cyclonic fashion. Marine vessels will have a similar effect on submerged cultural sites via the screw’s wake and slipstream. Fixed wing aircraft will have yet another effect because of the force generated by their jet engines. In addition any ordinance
discharged from these vehicles will be devastating to cultural resources. It is a general rule of U.S. Army and the Marine Corps that once a cultural resource is identified that vehicles and all operations be kept at a distance of 50 meters away. However, this guideline is dependent upon military necessity.

If the enemy is occupying a cultural resource and using it as a firing position, soldiers have the right to fire back. However, soldiers could consider the size of the enemy element and determine what type of munitions would eliminate the threat without causing catastrophic damage to the cultural property. For example, if the enemy element is Platoon size (28 personnel) or larger, a 120mm high-explosive tank round may be necessary to eliminate the threat. Unfortunately, the cultural property will likely be eliminated also. If there is a lone rifleman within the cultural property it may be more efficient and less damaging to put a 7.62mm sniper round on the target. There still might be damage to the property but not catastrophic damage. Conversely if the cultural property is an artifact scatter, it may not matter if 120mm tank round is fired given the nature of the artifacts.

In this way it is important to develop a hierarchical structure for the evaluation of cultural properties on the battlefield. It maintains the combatant commander’s ability to manage and maneuver his force within the battle space in order to accomplish the military objective. It also allows for more concise reporting. In a classroom environment or at an actual cultural property such as LeRay Mansion at Fort Drum, soldiers received training in the identification of cultural properties, through an introduction to this hierarchical structure. An introduction is all that is needed given the role of line troops in reporting cultural property, which will be discussed in the following section. The following is the proposed hierarchy for cultural property. This hierarchy is meant to be applicable in any theater of war not only in the current conflict areas.
Proposed Cultural Property Hierarchy of Importance

Level 1: Known cultural property with names or sites of local importance: Places with evidence of recent offerings, burials, evidence of current avoidance for cultural purposes, such as recent burials, and religious structures (Mosques, Churches, Synagogues, Temples, etc.).

Level 2: Features present: fire places, any type of foundation, out of place hills (tells) without names or documentation, or any built feature such as a shrine.

Level 3: Artifact scatters: stone tool or ceramic debris.

Soldiers’ Response to the proposed Hierarchy

Out of the 17 soldiers this hierarchy was presented to, 13 (76%) agreed that it was simplistic easily understood and easily applied to the report structure. Three soldiers (18%) thought that the hierarchy was good but may not be applicable in all situations. Only one (6%) soldier disagreed entirely, but that soldier was also adamant that cultural property protection should not be the concern of the military. Still an overwhelming majority was convinced that if cultural property protection was going to be attempted on the battle field some sort of hierarchy of importance is needed to facilitate military movement and the accomplishment of the mission. For a more in depth discussion and soldier’s specific responses see Appendix D.
CHAPTER VI: REPORT STRUCTURE

Reporting Cultural Property

When reporting anything on a military radio, the traffic needs to be concise and to the point. Another situation may also require assistance from higher echelons and those soldiers require and deserve the same amount of air time. A radio transmission on the battlefield should not exceed more that 3-5 minutes. Line unit soldiers do not have the time or the expertise to discuss cultural affiliation or a site's level of significance. The best information line troops will be able to provide would be a grid location, what level on the hierarchical structure the property may fall under and what the dimensions of the site are.

Additionally, this type of report would not be utilized during an engagement. It would be better suited for reconnaissance elements which could identify key terrain features on the battlefield and can give accurate descriptions to the combatant commanders. With foreknowledge the commander can plan his course of action. It is unrealistic to suppose that cultural property reports would be given during an enemy engagement.

The following report structure for the line troops would be ideal, because the report focuses more on the effect cultural property might have on military operations it should not be a hindrance to the operation.
Proposed Reporting Structure for Line Troops

Blue 12 / Green 7

Cultural Property Encountered

Line 1: Time. Use DTG

Line 2: Location. Use 8 digit grid coordinates

Line 3: Site type. Use hierarchical structure. Report Level 1, Level 2 or Level 3

Line 4: Dimensions. What is the area that it encompasses in meters?

Line 5: Photographs. Yes or No. Were you able to take photographs of the cultural property?

Line 6: Bypass. Yes or No.

Line 7: Vehicle type. If this cultural area cannot be bypassed what types of vehicles can be driven on or around the site that will cause the least amount of damage.

Vehicle class 1: All vehicle types can pass

Vehicle class 2: No Track or CFVs

Vehicle class 3: Only light wheel vehicles (HMMWVs)

Vehicle class 4: No vehicles

Line 8: Weapon type. What type of weapon will accomplish the mission while limiting damage to the site?

Weapon class 1: All weapon types are acceptable

Weapon class 2: .50 CAL or less

Weapon class 3: Only individual weapon systems

Weapon class 4: No weapon systems permitted
After an engagement, all military units are expected to report a battle damage assessment (BDA). The BDA is 20 line report and the time it takes to report is substantially longer than standard reports. What then would be the harm in adding one additional line to the report that assesses the damage done to the previously reported cultural property? The following is a proposed 21st line of the BDA report.
Line 21: Property grid coordinate (8 digit)

Damage assessment

1. Low damage (small arms fire/single shots)
2. Moderate damage (crew served weapons)
3. High Damage (high explosive/larger than .50 CAL)
4. Total Destruction

Dr. James Zeidler of CEMML and Colorado State University proposed a report structure intended for the line troops but upon reflection and personal consultation found it to be better suited for the Civil Affairs or Intelligence Officers. The Civil Affairs and Intelligence Officers as follow on units may have the time to address more specific questions. By answering questions such as cultural affiliation these officers will be able to pay for or rebuild the structure for the correct affiliated group as well as inform the cultural resource professional community on the existence of the property (Dr. Zeidler, personal communication, 2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPP REPORT INSTRUCTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Date-Time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Reporting Activity and Location</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Property type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Name of site/property</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposed line troop report, the 21st line of the BDA report and the Civil Affairs report will work together to bring about greater awareness of the cultural property in the battle space. In some instances, information about cultural properties will funnel its way to line troops from the Defense Intelligence Agency. In other cases the communication chain will be reversed. However it is imperative that communication flow is not hindered if cultural property is to be
protected. Once the Civil Affairs or Intelligence officers have processed this report it needs to be sent in two directions, first up the chain of command to the theater commander and secondly via text or electronic mail directly to the DIA. In this way, the information will reach the DIA who can place cultural properties on no strike lists. The following flow chart (Figure 3) describes the process through which information is shared and passed up and down the chain of command concerning cultural property.

Figure 3. Communications Flow Chart
Soldiers’ Response to proposed Reporting Structure

80% of the soldiers who participated in the instruction begrudged the fact that they may have to learn a new set of reports, but 76% of them remarked that the report structures as briefed to them made sense. It is worth noting that feedback received from soldiers on my original nine line report have been adapted to the report which has amended it to an eight line report. For a more in depth discussion and soldier’s specific responses see Appendix D.
CHAPTER VII: SYMBOLS

One of the first requirements during preparation for a military mission is for the leadership to provide the soldiers with an idea of the terrain and landscape that they can expect to encounter. In order to accomplish this task, the military leaders produce Modified Combined Obstacle Overlays (MCOO) and Intelligence Preparation of the Battlefield (IPB) mapping overlays or geo-spatial layers. These overlays may be digital or be in the form of physical transparencies that can be placed on top of topographic maps. Symbols are used to signify a myriad of different military features, concerns and objectives and can be confusing. However, there is a system with distinct colors and designs for specific objects on the battlefield. Each symbol can only be used to signify the specific object it represents. As a result, there is a challenge for civilian and military professionals who are working together to develop a system for signifying the existence of cultural property on a military map.

The following is a list of symbols proposed by various archaeologists, interest groups and international organizations (Figure 4).
As an experienced foot soldier and young officer, it is my opinion that this list of symbols and meanings for the symbols is too complicated for the soldier on the front line to understand. Young soldiers do not have the expertise required to decide which symbols to use. Also the proposed symbols represent overlapping categories, for example, a world heritage site may also be an archaeological site. Additionally, the paragraph attached to the proposed symbolism suggests that the soldiers are to be familiar with a myriad of additional symbols not listed here. This expectation is unrealistic. This symbolism may work for follow on support units such as Civil Affairs who may have the knowledge and expertise to differentiate between the types of...
cultural sites. However, the line troops, whose only concern is the accomplishment of the mission and who are not as enlightened to the complexities of what cultural property can be, need a single, simplified, clearly recognizable symbol to associate with all cultural property. Civil Affairs may need this single symbol as well as they are only given one or two classes on cultural property during their entire career. (MAJ. Reyes Jorge, personal communication, 2012)

We will now focus on the symbols themselves. Can any of the above symbols be utilized for the single symbol identification of cultural property that the military requires? I will now go line by line to determine the viability of the symbol.

UNESCO World Heritage Site

Point of Origin site (POO)

Figure 5. (Right) Point of Origin

The UNESCO World Heritage Site symbol is a problem for multiple reasons. First if soldiers label everything using the world heritage site symbol and it reaches the academic and the UNESCO without being changed, academia and UNESCO might be upset because the site labeled as such may not qualify for or be listed on the World Heritage List. Second, and more importantly for the soldiers on the front lines, it looks similar to the symbol for a Point of Origin (POO)/Potential Mortar Firing Point. At quick glance, on the soldier’s Force Battle Command Brigade and Below (FBCB2) computer system during the chaos that is combat, the soldier may mistake this symbol for the POO site symbol and may result in hostile actions toward the site.
Figures 6 and 7. (Top Right) Archaeological Site compared with Nuclear Blast Radius symbol; (Bottom Right) Historic Building compared with Mine Field symbol

Black circles on a map, as proposed for archaeological sites (Figure 6), look like range fans for nuclear weapons. Black circles within black circle alert soldiers to the supposed safe distance away from a nuclear blast. Black circles within a black square, as proposed for historic buildings (Figure 7), look like the symbol for a mine field. Further the black color for the military signifies that the area may be either friendly or enemy and that information is unknown at this time.

Figure 8. Archeological or Cultural Areas compared to (Bottom) Named Area of Interest

All three of the symbols for archaeological and cultural areas (Figure 8) look like the Named Area of Interest symbol. The Named Area of Interest alerts soldiers, especially cavalry men that they have to reconnoiter, neutralize, or otherwise control the area. This is a problem if you do not want soldiers damaging the site as they move through or around it.
The monument symbols (Figure 9) also suggest a named area of interest because of their placement within a back square. Within the named area of interest is an unknown symbol. This symbol still suggests that the soldiers have to reconnoiter, neutralize or otherwise control the area. The proposed monument symbol also looks like the finance officer symbol, to which the soldier might look if they are experiencing pay issues. Soldiers should not be sent to monuments that may contain archaeological treasures to resolve their financial burdens.

As mentioned above, the color scheme of the symbol is very important in military mapping. The color for cultural property should not be black because black signifies unknown enemy/friendly affiliation, named areas of interest, targets and target reference points. The color should not be red as red signifies the enemy. The color should not be blue because blue designates distinctly friendly positions or territory. The color should not be orange or yellow because these colors signify phase lines, suggesting transitions from one phase of an operation to the next. The color should not be green or brown because these colors represent restricted terrain and severely restricted terrain respectively.
Finally, the UNESCO World Heritage site sign symbol (Figure 10) is not a solution for military mapping because it is blue and because it looks like a rally point, check point, or a casualty collection point (Figure 11).

I believe that cultural property should be briefed to line units as if they were key terrain. In fact, cultural property is a form of key terrain on the battlefield because protecting it may garner human intelligence and serve as a force multiplier for U.S. and allied forces. Cultural property can also be key terrain because the enemy may use it as battle positions. Therefore, like key terrain, cultural property could be color coded purple.

Key Terrain

Figure 12. Key Terrain

My recommendation is to use a variation of the recognized key terrain symbol (Figure 12) to be able to differentiate between a random hill top and actual cultural property. Cultural property cannot be labeled with the letters CP as this would signify a Command Post. Cultural property cannot be signified with the letter H as it might appear to be a hospital or a helicopter landing pad. I suggest one of the following three options. The first would be a purple rectangle with the numbers 402 suggesting that the Section 402 process needs to be conducted at the site thereby suggesting that it is a cultural property. Second, and still better in my opinion, would be adaptation of the Roerich pact symbol for cultural property (Figure 13).
The Roerich pact symbol was adopted internationally as the symbol for cultural property and was agreed upon by the U.S. under President Roosevelt in the 1930s. The symbol was supposed to represent the possibility of peace through a greater understanding of culture. It would need to be an adaptation because you cannot use the original color red, red is for enemy, and you cannot have a purple circle around it because it would be mistake for ordinary key terrain. So the Roerich Pact symbol adaptation would be that it was purple and either have no border around it or a purple rectangle. Suggested symbols are found in Figure 14 below.

During the classroom instruction, Michael Sprowles was able to collect feedback on the various symbols enumerated above. Michael Sprowles administered this symbol questionnaire on November 13 and 15, 2012. The feedback obtained came from a random sampling of soldiers from various Military Occupational Specialties (MOS). This means that both line soldiers and support soldiers were able to weigh in on the symbol debate.
Out of 17 soldiers surveyed, the twelve symbol system proposed by various archaeologists and interest groups was unanimously rejected. Reasons for the rejection included issues with its complexity and that the symbols were too close to symbols already in use for operational overlays. The symbols recommended by the researcher had varying approval ratings. Eleven percent of those surveyed liked the Roerich Pact symbol with the border, none approved the Roerich Pact symbol without a border and 41% liked the 402 symbol with a border. The soldiers generally thought that the 402 symbol was the most unique and believed that it would be easily identified on operational overlays. For a more in depth discussion and soldier’s specific responses see Appendix D.

As this information was compiled and analyzed additional information came to light in the form of Marine Corps road maps of the current theaters of operation. On this map a purple Roerich Pact symbol without the border is currently in use to identify historical property. While this map is not an operational overlay and while cemeteries and Mosques are symbolized separately, it does show the military’s familiarity with the Roerich Pact symbol. Road maps could have different symbols for different property; however operational graphics on battle tracking systems and planning overlays should only utilize one symbol in order to decrease confusion.

Finally, while the applications of the proposed twelve symbol system are evident in civilian settings and for strategic planning in higher echelons of the military, it is unrealistic for the tactical military levels. The line units need a quick and easily distinguishable way to reference cultural property on the battlefield. Therefore a single symbol is needed so that line units are aware of the cultural properties existence on the battle space.
CHAPTER VIII: TRAINING SCENARIOS

When writing training scenarios, initially it seemed wise to go out to the MOUT and mock cultural property sites to ensure that the scenarios made sense for the associated terrain. The conclusion was, however, that training scenarios like the report structures should be as universal as possible, thereby being applicable to sundry conflict environments and allowing for minor adjustment as necessary. Therefore the terrain at Fort Drum or any other fort is suitable for any training scenario incorporated.

Training scenarios should follow the U.S. Army Master Scenario Event List (MSEL) format. They should consist of a concise description of the scenario and what is expected of the soldiers. In this way the CDRs can build an operations order from this information and feed the scenario to the line units. Examples of the MSELs can be found in the following chapter and in Appendix A. An example of a completed operations order can be found in Appendix B. This operations order should prove useful to civilian professionals who would like a better understanding of the planning involved in a standard military operation.

Finally, when building training scenarios for the military, awareness of all the procedures that are involved in the actual operation is imperative. Therefore the inclusion of hierarchal structures, report structures and symbols is crucial. It is also important to identify primary and secondary tasks. If you brief cultural property protection as the primary task of an operation you are likely to be met with criticism and annoyance, but if you brief cultural property protection as an element of key terrain and explain that such protection becomes a force multiplier, soldiers and marines will be more receptive.

Cultural property protection, therefore, does not warrant its own field manual. It can be integrated into military tasks that are already standard. Examples of this can be found in the
Training Phases section and in Appendices A and B. Cultural property protection should never be the main focus of an operation with the possible exception of security operations. Cultural property protection will not end wars however protecting cultural property can be a force multiplier on the battle field. As such cultural property protection should be the by-product of good soldiering.
CHAPTER IX: TRAINING PHASES

The Army often uses a progression of difficulty to train soldiers. The first phase is a slow and methodical approach to ensure that the basic concept of the military task is understood by each individual soldier. The second phase consists of training soldiers as a squad or platoon level element. This phase allows for greater autonomy and individual thought on the part of the soldiers and command structure. The final phase is a test of the unit’s proficiency in completing the task. These three phases are generally referred to as the “crawl”, “walk” and “run” phases of training.

Teaching cultural property protection and awareness to a unit should not be different at all. The first task is to establish accepted curricula for a classroom environment. The classroom, associated presentations and a site walkthrough would constitute the walking phase of this type of training. Next would be a field exercise at the squad or platoon level. This field exercise must contain specific guidance for the appropriate actions to be taken in regard to the terrain, vehicle placement, dismounted security team emplacement, and what is and what is not considered appropriate actions towards cultural property. The final phase would constitute the issuing of an operations order and allowing the unit to execute the mission completely autonomously. The commander or an appropriate supervisor would evaluate the missions execution and rate the soldiers on how proficiently they performed the task.

Fort Drum has several excellent sites to conduct all phases of training. If you were to categorize cultural sites in a hierarchical structure, artifact scatters would represent Level 3. Level 3 is characterized by a low level of importance and less likely to be severely damaged. Linear features, foundations, etc. would constitute a Level 2 site, moderate importance. Mosques, standing structures and places of local importance would be considered a Level 1 site,
very important and at great risk of damage. The LeRay Mansion Historic District incorporates all three levels of the hierarchy and is therefore a significant asset for cultural property training. The mock cultural sites at Fort Drum also provide an excellent opportunity for hands on training without risking damage to actual archaeological sites.

If a site like the LeRay Mansion Historic District is available, it allows the soldier to experience cultural property on all three levels mentioned in the hierarchical structure. The “crawl” phase of the training would take place in a controlled classroom environment and then transition to an actual cultural area. The “crawl” phase could be guided with specific tasks and concepts covered by the instructor. Conversely, if cultural property protection is taught in conjunction with or added as a subtask to military tasks the soldiers are already familiar with, the instructor could give a brief scenario and break the unit up into small groups of five personnel or less. These groups can then walk the grounds of the cultural property to get a feel of the terrain and then back brief the instructor on what their courses of action would be. The back brief provide an opportunity for the instructor to evaluate the retention of the classroom material and to have an in depth conversation about appropriate courses of action with an engaged audience.

During the “walk” phase the instructor would designate groups of ten to twenty soldiers. These groups would be given operations orders individually and would be cycled through the training area. This phase would allow for individual thought and autonomy on the part of the soldiers, however the group size is easily managed by one or two supervisors. The “walk” phase also allows for tactical pauses in training for on the spot corrections to the soldiers’ actions. The best location for the walk phase would be a hardened cultural property such as Sterlingville or on mock cultural sites (Wagner 2007). A hardened cultural property is property that has been covered in geo-textiles, mulch, gravel or other substances that protect the site while allowing
water to permeate the areas soil and soldiers to walk or drive on, while performing their training tasks, without damaging the cultural property. While the “walk” phase could occur at sites like the LeRay Mansion, restrictions would need to be made on the types of vehicles and equipment that could be brought to the site. Appropriate vehicle and equipment restrictions would prevent unnecessary damage to the cultural property. The soldiers are training on these tasks and do not need to risk bad press or judicial action for sites within the continental United States.

The “run” phase of training provides the instructor the opportunity to evaluate the soldiers at the unit or company level and rate their proficiency in the trained task. This phase allows the soldiers total autonomy and the training should not be halted except for real world emergencies or extreme safety violations. The appropriate location for the “run” phase of training is mock cultural sites. Utilizing mock cultural sites allows the unit to execute a mission at combat speed without the risk of damaging cultural property in the process. If damage to mock sites occur, the damage can be brought up in an after action review and the guilty parties can be retrained as necessary.

Cultural property training for soldiers has to be correlated to their MOS or their unit’s role on the battlefield and Military Tables of Organization and Equipment (MTOE). This is to say that the line units do not have the time or the expertise to be concerned about identifying the specifics of cultural property. However, the support units such as Civil Affairs and Intelligence Officers might. Therefore, cultural property training has to make sense according to the standard operations of the individual unit. Additionally, cultural property training, for the line units, does not need its own field manual. If cultural property is briefed in a way that soldiers already understand, then cultural property protection becomes a subtask to a military task the soldiers are already familiar with.
An example of this type of training would be a Cavalry Scout Platoon. The Cavalry Scout is trained to reconnoiter an area to identify the intelligence requirements specified by the Commander in an operations order. If the operations order states that the platoon will identify enemy positions and key terrain and that phrase key terrain includes potential cultural resources within the Area of Operations (AO), the soldiers will understand exactly what that means. Cultural property can indeed be key terrain because the enemy may utilize it as a battle position with the assumption that U.S. forces will be hesitant to assault the cultural property. Briefing cultural property in a format that the soldiers already recognize is more effective than filling training time with potentially useless information that does not correlate to the unit’s mission, task and purpose.

Another example of this type of training is Assembly Area (AA) operations. Most soldiers, in most units understand what it means to select a bed down site, an AA site or a site for a FOB. They understand that there is going to be an identified quartering party. The quartering party will then identify the primary, alternate, and supplementary locations for the AA as well as vehicle placement and the location of the Command Post (CP). Once the AA is occupied the soldiers understand that security will need to be emplaced. If you were to brief cultural property for an AA operation, you would put the appropriate guidance in the coordinating instructions. The appropriate guidance being that if the site selected for the AA has cultural property on it, how to mark it off or restrict vehicle and foot traffic. The following is an example of a training scenario for AA operations.
Event: 003

Inject Day: Inject Time: 

Theme: Assembly Area Operations

Training Objective/Task: Conduct Assembly Area Activities

Task Number: 171-121-4058  Conduct Quartering Party Activities

171-123-4000  Plan the Occupation of an Assembly Area
171-123-4005  Conduct the Occupation of an Assembly Area
17-5-0011. 17-DCRW Establish and Maintain Communications

Reference: ARTEP17-97F10 Recce PLT; FM 3-20.98; MOS O 12A; 1FKSM 17-19D24-RECCE; ST 17-19D14; STP 17-19D4-SM; STP 17-19D4-SM-REV

Situation: The areas of Eleanor and Charleston, West Virginia have been secured by Coalition Forces. There are several key terrain areas that provide vantage points from which to observe ENY activity at a distance and these areas are easily defensible. The Museum of Charleston and associated hilltop had been used by the ENY as a base of operations because it was believed that the U.S. and Coalition forces would be reluctant to assault such an area. The hilltop associated with the Museum represents the highest ground in the area and ENY access to the site must be restricted. The protection of local cultural resources is likely to secure popular support for Coalition efforts.

Mission: _____ TRP ______ conducts quartering party activities in the vic of Charleston, WV NLT _(date/time group)_ IOT establish an AA and restrict ENY movement; O/O conducts the occupation of the Assembly Area.

Execution: TRP will plan the Occupation of the Assembly Area. A quartering party will be sent to establish communication and facilitate other AA operations. Report whether cultural resources are present at the AA location.

FFIR: Location of the AA (grid coordinates)?
   What are the effects of AA on cultural resources?
   Where are cultural resources and how will they be marked?
   Where will the vehicles be located?
At the LeRay Mansion Historic District, during my internship at Fort Drum in the summer of 2012, soldiers were given this training scenario as part of their “walk” phase. Classroom instruction on cultural property protection had been given the previous day so the information on appropriate actions was fresh in their memories. The above training scenario was simple and the task very familiar to all involved. The author divided the soldiers into groups of three personnel. Each group had at a minimum one non-commissioned officer or commissioned officer in order to give leadership and planning experience to each group. They were then asked to walk the grounds, identify the cultural property in the area, the property level of importance on the hierarchy, and how they would organize the assembly area given the terrain. Terrain in this instance included cultural property.

Once every group had a chance to get the lay out of the terrain a representative from each group was asked to present the results and plan of action. One soldier identified several different cultural properties and their appropriate levels. Another provided information on the location of his vehicles and personnel if this were his AA.

One soldier provided an in depth overview of the terrain situation and the reasons for placing his unit’s assets where he did. The soldier explained that the terrain to include cultural property restricted most vehicle traffic and that he would leave most of his vehicles staged near LeRay Drive in hide position, the other vehicle would be near the CP, which would be the LeRay mansion. When asked how he would set up communication in the CP, the soldier replied that he would set up communications antenna outside the mansion with the electrical wire being fed through open windows of the mansion. The soldier then said that he would restrict foot traffic to the mansion to command personnel only ensuring that the mansion would not be damaged due to heavy foot traffic and the carrying of equipment. This displayed a keen use of cultural property
of the mansion as an asset while minimizing damage to the property. Next the soldier explained that he would emplace his Observation Posts (OP) and security positions around the area approximately fifteen meters away from any known cultural property. The soldier explained that the known cultural property such as ruined foundations would be fortified with sand bags or hardened appropriately if given appropriate time and resources. The soldier explained that due to terrain and location of cultural property that the cultural property may have to be used as a fighting position should the AA become overrun by the enemy. The soldier then explained that the sand bags or site hardening would provide additional protection to the cultural property as well as cover and concealment for his men.

The above plan by the soldier displayed not only his capacity to organize and execute the AA operations proficiently but also his retention and knowledge of the cultural property protection instruction. The plan utilized the terrain as an asset while maintaining the integrity of the property. In conclusion cultural property protection can be taught to line troopers. The subject should be presented in a way that correlates to the tasks the soldiers are already familiar with. Finally cultural property protection is very important to the mission. Cultural property protection in theater can generate critical human intelligence from local informants and win the hearts and minds of the local populous. Cultural property training however should not be a tome of information, confusing the soldiers being trained. It needs to be a simple subtask to the tasks the soldiers are already trained on. Cultural property training needs to follow the U.S. Army mantra of Keep It Simple Stupid (KISS).
CHAPTER X: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Cultural property protection in the U.S. Military has a long history. In WWII the U.S. was able to successfully recover many priceless works of art and repatriate them to their country of origin. A long hiatus occurred regarding cultural property protection due to the advent of nuclear weapons. Due to international and internal pressure after the 2003 Baghdad Museum incident and other like incidents, the U.S. ratified the 1954 Hague Convention for the protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict into U.S. law in 2008. Since that time, cultural resource professionals and service members alike have been working feverishly to bring the U.S. military into greater compliance with that Convention.

Various ways of implementing cultural property protection into the standard cyclic training calendar has been discussed. A formatted hierarchical structure that feeds a cultural property report structure has been suggested. Various symbols have been proposed and critiqued for integration into the operational graphics for battle tracking. Finally, training scenarios and the best ways of presenting those scenarios within the three phases of training has been discussed.

In conclusion, cultural property protection training can be taught to the U.S. military using elements of the theories surrounding public archaeology. A reporting structure has been drafted and applied to a theorized hierarchical structure. Soldiers will be able to use the proposed hierarchical structure to identify cultural property at a basic level. Finally, example training scenarios have been drafted and can be found in Appendix A of this report. Cultural property protection training does not warrant its own field manual, rather it can be integrated as subtask to already established training. Remember to always Keep It Simple Stupid (KISS).
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Appendix A:

Additional Training Scenarios
Event: 002  
Inject Day:  
Inject Time:  

Theme: Area Security  
Training Objective/Task: Area Security  
Task Number: 17-3-0410. 17-RECP Area Security  
17-3-0406. 17-RECP Respond to Civil Disturbance  
17-3-3809. 17-RECP Battle Handover  
Reference: ARTEP17-97F10 Recce PLT, FM 3-20.98  

Situation: The Republic of Kentucky Army recently conducted an offensive in the vicinity of Eleanor, West Virginia. The result of this offensive has been the abandonment of the West Virginian National Museum at Charleston by the National Guard of West Virginia. The abandonment has led to the local populous massing on the Museum under the direction of the West Virginia Patriotic Front. As a result of this civil unrest the Museum has been virtually unguarded and large numbers of cultural material has been looted. The looting of these materials decreases popular support for the US, which may result in total national instability within West Virginia.  

Mission: _____ TRP ________ provides area security vic West Virginia National Museum in Charleston NLT _(date/time group)_ IOT maintain regional stability, O/O conduct battle handover with ________.

Execution: Engagement Criteria: PLT may engage only when engaged and only squad sized elements. PLT can manage 50 unarmed civilians. The PLT will displace to alternate positions or to a previously identified ORP if engaged by larger forces. The TRP will engage PLT sized elements. TRP can manage 150 unarmed civilians. TRP will displace to alternate positions or to a previously identified ORP if engaged by larger forces. Report cultural resource information.
Event: 001

Theme: Zone Reconnaissance

Training Objective/Task: Zone Reconnaissance

Task Number: 17-2-4010, 17-RECP Zone Recon

17-3-1023, 17-RECP Screen Recon

17-3-1039, 17-RECP Observation Post

Reference: ARTEP17-97F10 Recce PLT, FM 3-20.98

Situation: The Republic of Kentucky Army has infiltrated the border of West Virginia and has employed guerilla tactics to terrorize the local populous. These tactics are aimed at decreasing popular support for US and coalition forces. Key terrain including cultural resources are often used by the ROK Army in an effort to reduce the likelihood of reprisal from the US and Coalition forces. The ROK Army threatens the destruction of West Virginia cultural property if the local populous cooperates with US and Coalition forces.

Mission: _Troop _______ conducts zone reconnaissance from PL Hatfields to PL McCoys NLT (date/time group) IOT determine the ENY size and activity and key terrain along the border; O/O conducts screen reconnaissance along the border.

Execution: Focus: ENY and Key Terrain

Tempo: Stealthy and Deliberate

Engagement Criteria: PLT may engage only when engaged and only squad sized elements. The PLT will displace to alternate positions or to a previously identified ORP if engaged by larger forces. The TRP will engage PLT sized elements. TRP will displace to alternate positions or to a previously identified ORP if engaged by larger forces. Report cultural resource information.
Event: 004

Theme: Action on Contact

Training Objective/Task: Action on Contact

Task Number: 171-121-4009 Action on Contact

` 17-3-0404.17-RECP Conduct a Presence Patrol

Reference: ARTEP17-97F10 Recce PLT; FM 3-20.9B; MOS O 12A; 1FKSM 17-19D24-RECCE; ST 17-19D14; STP 17-19D4-SM; STP 17-19D4-SM-REV

Situation: A ROK Army squad has taken up defensive positions in a church in Huntington, WV. This squad continues to harass Coalition forces, causing as many casualties as they can. This squad has employed small arms, crew served and antitank weapons. It is the belief of these insurgents that the US and Coalition forces will not assault a religious structure. Supporting ENY elements occupy adjacent structures. The ENY is also using this religious structure to dissuade popular support for the US and Coalition forces.

Mission: _____TRP_______ conducts a presence patrol vic Huntington community Church NLT _(date/time group)_ IOT identify ENY positions; O/O conducts actions on contact and assaults ENY positions.

Execution: TRP conducts presence patrol and identifies possible ENY positions. If engaged TRP conducts actions on contact and reacts to an ambush in an urban area. Once the area and the Church have been secured, TRP sends a BDA and reports to higher on the condition of the Church.
Appendix B:
Example Operations Order
1. Situation
   a. Enemy Forces
      (1) The Republic of Kentucky (ROK) Army vic the border of Kentucky and West Virginia.
         (a) Two companies of the 56th mechanized infantry battalion (MIB).
         (b) National Guard of the ROK
      (2) Criminal elements (75 to 125 members) intent on disrupting local cooperation with U.S. forces by destroying cultural sites important to the local populous.
      (3) The ROK Army has operated as a terrorist network for 35 years. They participated in the defense of Kentucky during the 1980s invasion by Ohio and West Virginia. While they share ethnic backgrounds and similar religious beliefs to the Ohioans and the West Virginians, the Kentuckians adhere to a more strict form. The ROK is a religious autocracy under the control of the clergy and believe that a brotherhood of nations under such an autocracy is the only way to combat the incursion of more secularist movements which they believe threaten their traditions and way of life. The current border between the three countries was set by international arbitration after the 1980s conflict. The Ohioans have remained during the recent conflict between the Kentuckians and the West Virginians. Recent terrorist attacks on US soil has inspired international involvement in the area.
      (4) Intelligence has confirmed the following:
         (a) One platoon of the 56th MIB has crossed the NE border of Kentucky into West Virginia.
         (b) The National Guard of the ROK is in the vic of the border near Eleanor West Virginia.
         (c) Both elements have used guerilla tactics to coerce support of civil unrest in West Virginia.
         (d) Unknown forces operate along the NE border of the two nations skirting the Potomac River.
      (5) The ROK forces we are facing is at 70% strength and operate without a clearly defined order of battle. Generally these forces operate in dismounted teams of 10-20 personnel and may drive technical trucks with crew serve weapons mounted to the bed. The 56th IN BN does have access to T-80 tanks and BMP that were left over from the 1980s conflict. These assets are held in reserve in order to provide security to the Kentucky border, but can be used as a quick reaction force when needed within 40 minutes.
      (6) Capabilities of the ROK include the employment of improvised explosive devices, guerilla style attacks on villages, and the deployment of a QR. Limitations include their limited access to ammunition for both small arms and track vehicles.
      (7) The most probable course of action for the ROK Army
(a) Disjointed, guerilla operations designed to coerce and intimidate the local populous into cooperation and to dissuade them from cooperating with US and international forces. The enemy will not be able to stop US or international forces but will attempt to inflict the maximum amount of casualties while maintaining the ability to disengage and hide in restrictive terrain. The ROK reserves are poised at the border between West Virginia and Kentucky and is likely to attempt to ambush or delay U.S. forces movement.

- Observation: No night vision capabilities
- Indirect: 60 mm mortars
- Obstacles: IEDs (Pressure plate and remote detonated)
- Direct: 7.62 small arms and crew serve weapons; rocket propelled grenades
- Air: None
- Chemical: None
- Reserves: Two mechanized Platoons equipped with BMPs and T-80 tanks

(8) If the enemy perceives the threat of US retaliation they will engage and cause the maximum amount of casualties possible before retrograding into restrictive terrain.

If the enemy is fixed in position the QRF will be called and will arrive within 40 minutes to aid the retrograde of the dismounted units.

(9) Threat high value targets (HVT) include US command and control facilities; cultural resources; civilian community leaders in sympathy with US forces; platoon sized elements.

(10) Threat high payoff targets (HPT) include US troop transport vehicles; combat vehicles; isolated US troops out of range of mutual support.

(11) Threat most dangerous course of action (COA) involves the integration of the forward dismounted units and the reserve mechanized units in an organized offensive against local villages and US troops.

b. Civilian Considerations

(1) The US has a treaty agreement with West Virginia. This treaty declares the US intent to support the newly elected democratic government and to aid in the protection of cultural resources. The protection of these resources will result in economic stability for the region through tourism. In a recent election West Virginia elected a new prime minister and democratic parliament committed to the renewal of international relations. The winner of the elections only managed 53% of the popular vote securing the new democracy. The ROK worked in vain to prevent the emergence of this democracy and the losers of the West Virginian election are unified under the West Virginian Patriotic Front (WVPF). The WVPF have taken to the streets with their disgruntled supporters, they have allied with the ROK Army and have threatened violence if a new election is not held within one month. The WVPF and the ROK view the new democratic government to be more aligned
with western democracies and far less favorable to their country’s interests. The natural resource, available only in the east of WV is a vital interest of the US and the international community. The cultural resources of the community are of major importance as their protection may foster greater economic growth in the region from tourism. This economic growth may be key in building greater ties between the US and WV and in turn create a favorable atmosphere for the extraction of the natural resources that are critical to the international communities health and prosperity.

c.  Friendly Forces
(1) Squadron Mission: C TRP 2-104 CAV conducts Zone Reconnaissance IOT clarify the location of enemy troops and cultural resources along the WV and KY border. O/O establish a screen line to provide early warning and target acquisition. Be prepared to defend against attack by the ROK QRF and to assist the RWV Army and U.S. follow on forces stabilize the border.
(2) SCO’s intent: The squadron will conduct zone reconnaissance to the international border identifying ENY activity and key terrain including cultural resources. The squadron will then screen the international border and assist the brigade in missions as necessary. End state is the identification of ENY positions and a reconnaissance screen along the international border.

2. Mission:
C Troop 2-104 CAV conducts Zone reconnaissance from PL Hatfields to PL McCoys NLT (date/time group) IOT determine the ENY size and activity, O/O conducts screen reconnaissance along PL McCoys.

3. Execution:
a. Commander’s intent. The focus of this mission is to determine ENY location and activity within the zone. Tempo will be stealthy and deliberate to identify ENY activity without compromising our position. Platoon may engage up squad size threat elements IAW ROE. The Troop will engage up to platoon sized threat elements. Crowds of less than 50 personnel will be dealt with at a Platoon level while crowds of 150 personnel will be handled by the Troop. Determine where ENY positions are located and whether cultural resources are being uses as ENY battle positions.

Key tasks:
- Conduct passage of lines through A TRP 2-104th
- Determine location and composition of threat forces operating near the international border
- Determine location of Key Terrain and cultural resources
- Establish screen line on the WV border with KY

b. End state: Thorough assessment of ENY disposition and Key Terrain along the international border.

c. Concept of the Operation: The purpose of this operation is to determine the ENY battle positions and assist in securing the international border. This will be a 3 phase operation. Phase I is the passage of lines through A TRP. Phase II is the
zone reconnaissance of our AO to the international border. Phase III is the establishment of a reconnaissance screen along the international border.

(1) Scheme of Maneuver: (brief according to SOPs and terrain)

(a) Phase I: Passage of lines through A TRP

(b) Phase II: Zone reconnaissance from PL Hatfields to PL McCoys.

(c) Phase III: Reconnaissance Screen PL McCoys (international) border

(2) Fires.

(a) Commanders guidance (illumination/smoke/mortars)

(b) priority of fires

(c) High Payoff Targets (HPT)

(d) Restrictions

(e) Locations of firing units

(3) Reconnaissance and surveillance. State task and purpose of each NAI, who is responsible, triggers/time, and how it is linked to squadron CCIR and the brigade CCIR. Refer to the R&S overlay and identify NAIs using the R&S matrix. The event template drives the R&S plan and is the basis of the fiveparagraph squadron OPORD. R&S overlay contains: NAIs, assets, R&S LOA, positions of sensors, routes to and from locations, and purpose. Not in the standard brief, only if the commander wants an update or to inform subordinate commanders. This would be the time to lay out the collection (ISR) plan so all can see the synchronization of the collection effort.

d. Tasks to Maneuver Units. State be-prepared tasks here. These tasks can be specified or implied. Ensure all elements are listed. Always state task and purpose as best as possible. Units must be listed in the same sequence as in task organization.

(1) 1 PLT

(2) 2 PLT

(3) 3 PLT

f. Coordinating Instructions. Applies to two or more units. Many determined during war-gaming. Think by phase if it applies. Highlight key things during the brief. The first five are mandatory.

(1) Time or condition when a plan or order becomes effective.

(2) CCIR. All CCIR is linked to a decision or answer higher CCIR. Identify by phase and assign a number to link with the DST.
May have a separate CCIR chart listing higher CCIR. Identified on the DSM as P1, E1, F1, etc., under criteria. Types of CCIR are the following:

- **PIR:** Linked to targeting or a maneuver branch plan or sequel. (P1, P2, etc.)
- **EEFI:** Linked to force protection, security (counter recon), or deception. If any of your measures fail, you need a branch plan. (E1, E2, etc.)
- **FFIR:** Linked to culmination that generates the commitment of the reserve, add assets, or a branch plan. (F1, etc.)

3. Risk reduction control measures. Identify hazards, preventative measures for those hazards, acceptable risk. MOPP level, OEG, vehicle recognition signals, fratricide prevention measures. Tactical risks are threat related and accident risks are friendly, terrain, and weather related.


5. Environmental considerations. Digging next to water sources, fuel spills. Cultural Resources

6. Movement. By phase if not addressed in the maneuver paragraph. AA to EOM, OOM, movement technique, movement formation, routes, SP and RP times and locations, rate of march, catch-up speed. Add compass directions when describing routes.

7. Engagement priority. By weapon system.

8. Engagement criteria/triggers. Direct fire weapons only, when and where, if not in the maneuver paragraph.


11. Timeline. LD, screen NLT, earliest time of move, (maneuver, CSS, and fires rehearsals), LOGPAC, backbriefs, boresight complete, PCCs complete, PCIs complete, wake up and standto, occupy staging area, intelligence updates, BUBs, plan OPORDs and rehearsals one level down, target list, commander’s huddle, control measures, reconnaissance LD, quartering party, occupy, TOC rehearsal, task organize effective, reconnaissance set, SP TAA, commander’s rest, XO’s rest, movement to TAA, receive engineers, etc..

12. Priorities of work.

13. Actions on contact. During the TRM, etc.


16. Passage of lines. Lane name and location, PP number and location, recognition signals, and vehicle markings.
(17) As required.

4. Service and Support.
   Brief by phase: Asset location, POS, and highlights.
   a. Support Concept (SAFFMM). Brief the concept of support in general terms before, during and after important events in each phase.
   b. Service Support Scheme of Maneuver.
   c. Material and Services.
   d. Medical Evacuation and Hospitalization.
   e. Personnel Support.
   f. Civil/Military.

5. Command and Signal.
   a. Command.
      • Chain of command for unit and higher headquarters.
      • Other.
   b. Signal.
      • SOI ____ in effect.
      • GPS time in effect.
      • COMSEC guidelines and radio communications restrictions.
      • Code words.
      • Visual and pyrotechnic signals: For example, red smoke marks the friendly line of own troops for CAS.
      • Methods of communication by priority.
      • Frequency time changes.
      • Retrans in effect:
         − Day 1 Challenge _____, Day 1 Password _____.
         − Day 2 Challenge _____, Day 2 Password _____.
         − Day 3 Challenge _____, Day 3 Password _____.
      • Hopset series ______.
      • Radio frequencies as needed.
      • Required reports, formats, and time to submit.
      • Review issues/notes:
Appendix C:

Questionnaire Results
Before Instruction Questionnaire

Soldiers were asked a series of questions to gauge their understanding of what cultural property is and how it could be important on the battlefield. In an effort to gauge what soldiers and marines understand to be their responsibilities toward cultural property on the battlefield two of the questions refer to the soldier’s familiarity with regulations that apply to them and cultural property. Several of the responses were intriguing and suggest that soldiers are aware of the importance of cultural property to the war effort while being generally unfamiliar with cultural property regulations within the DOD or at the international level. The following will address each question presented to soldiers and will record their responses in general thematic categories. A few specific responses will be highlighted.

Question 1: What do you think of when someone talks about cultural property protection?

It is Important
- 4 soldiers mentioned stewardship of the past and the potential to educate future generations through the past and that it was important to protect that past
- 2 soldiers: talked about the importance of cultural property to local communities
- 1 soldier: Avoid destroying physical and intellectual property felt strongly that cultural property protection aids in winning hearts and minds and in intelligence gathering

Unsure
- 8 soldiers: completely unsure
- 1 soldier: tried to define cultural property
- 1 soldier: equated cultural property with infrastructure but defined infrastructure as historic places

The responses to this question show that soldiers have an idea of the importance of cultural property to military operations especially in a counter insurgency (COIN) environment.


YES
- 6 soldiers

NO
- 11 soldiers
Question 3: Are you aware of Army Regulation 200-1 Environmental Protection and Enhancement, which support the 1954 Hague Convention and Federal laws on cultural Property?

YES
- 5 soldiers

NO
- 12 soldiers

Question 4: What do you think the consequences could be during military operations for

a. protecting cultural property?

Good
- 5 soldiers: mentioned gaining the trust of locals and intelligence
- 2 soldiers: positive press/public relations for the military
- 2 soldiers: preservation of history that may help educate future generation
- 1 soldier: no adverse action under Uniformed Code of Military Justice (UCMJ)

Bad
- 6 soldiers: cultural property protection might detract from the military mission; enemy would be more likely to use cultural property as they will see our reluctance to fire on those positions

Unsure
- 1 soldier: unsure
- 1 soldier: property would be preserved?

b. not protecting cultural property?

Bad
- 5 soldiers: loss of resource for educational purposes
- 5 soldiers: bad public relations for the military
- 3 soldiers: loss of local support, giving the insurgency greater will to fight
- 2 soldiers: disciplinary action under UCMJ

Unsure
- 1 soldiers: if we are not trained to protect cultural property it is not our fault
- 1 soldiers: unsure

The responses to this question show that some soldiers are already familiar with the consequences of protecting or not protecting cultural property, beyond disciplinary actions and the loss of cultural resources. Most recognized that cultural property protection could be a force multiplier in especially in COIN operations. Some were still skeptical of cultural property protections applications in conventional warfare.
Question 5: Name three cultural properties from your hometown.

- 7 soldiers: named properties and what they were associated with e.g. Underground Railroad
- 6 soldiers: unsure
- 3 soldiers: named types of properties but not specific places
- 1 soldier: named intangible cultural properties such as a specific landscape like a nature preserve or forest

The responses to this question show that even before the instruction service members have an idea of what cultural property is and what it could be. Some of the more surprising responses were those that included intangible resources and landscapes such as tall pine tree forests. Other surprising responses included iconic, modern, sites such as Disney World.
After Instruction Questionnaire

The questions presented here were meant as an after instruction gauge of how receptive the soldiers were to the instruction. The questions ask whether they found the presentation interesting, whether they learned anything and how they felt about some of the proposed products. In general some of my most fundamental beliefs and hypotheses were supported by many of the opinions of the soldiers, those being as simple reporting structure and a single symbol that would represent all cultural property on the battle space.

**Question 1: What did you find to be the most interesting part of the brief?**

- 3 soldiers: the entire instruction or unsure
- 2 soldiers: symbols portion of instruction
- 2 soldiers: learning that the army was interested in cultural property protection
- 2 soldiers: historic precedent and case studies
- 2 soldiers: appreciated the reporting structure portion of instruction
- 2 soldiers: cultural property protection is a force multiplier
- 1 soldier: hierarchical structure
- 1 soldier: WWII examples
- 1 soldier: history of Fort Drum
- 1 soldier: interested that trees and other intangibles may be cultural property

**Question 2: What did you learn from the case studies?**

- 8 soldiers: Everything presented was new or unsure
- 3 soldiers: mentioned how they needed better training and greater situational awareness
- 2 soldiers: cultural property protection is a force multiplier and aids in the military mission
- 2 soldiers: learned about mitigation through proper planning
- 1 soldier: learned about symbols
- 1 soldier: cultural property at Fort Drum falls under Section 102 of the National Historic Preservation Act
- 1 soldier: learned about Army Regulation 200-1

**Question 3: Do you think the hierarchical system allows the military to continue its operations while trying to prevent unnecessary damage to cultural property?**

YES
- 13 soldiers

Unsure/ It Depends
- 3 soldiers

NO
- 1 soldiers
One Soldier felt that older sites of international importance should also receive Level 1 status on the hierarchical structure. However when considering what sites are important to the local populous for the purposes of winning hearts and minds it is clear that international importance should not be a defining criteria when considering a war time hierarchical structure.

**Question 4: What is your feedback for the two tiered reporting structure?**

- 8 soldiers: unsure
- 6 soldiers: the report structure as proposed makes sense and adds to the planning ability of the commander
- 3 soldiers: No. The entire topic is distracting from the mission

**Question 5: Was the reporting structure for the line troops realistic and why?**

- 11 soldiers: yes simple, easy, it is in a format we are used to and because it does not expect line troops to be experts
- 3 soldiers: unsure – too much to remember
- 3 soldier: no – still requires a higher qualification/education than troops have
Symbol Questionnaire

This questionnaire was simply meant to gauge the effectiveness of proposed symbols.

Look closely at each of the symbols below. Write whether they conflict with or look similar to any symbols you are aware of currently in use by the U.S. Army. Then describe the symbol either in words or with a drawing.

UNESCO World Heritage Site

Reaction: Looks like enemy Position/Mortar Firing Point

Liked
• 3 soldiers

Disliked
• 4 soldiers

Unsure
• 10 soldiers

Archaeological Site
(Includes ruins and cemeteries)

Reaction: Looks like Target/Unsure

Liked
• 0 soldiers

Disliked
• 7 soldiers

Unsure
• 10 soldiers
Reaction: Looks like Named Area of Interest

Liked
- 0 soldiers

Disliked
- 7 soldiers

Unsure
- 10 soldiers

Reaction: Looks like land mine/unsure

Liked
- 1 soldier

Disliked
- 6 soldiers

Unsure
- 10 soldiers
**Monument**

*Reaction: UNSURE*

*Liked*
- 1 soldier

*Disliked*
- 6 soldiers

*Unsure*
- 10 soldiers

*Cultural or Historic District or Area (polygon)*

*Reaction: Looks like Named Area of Interest*

*Liked*
- 0 soldier

*Disliked*
- 6 soldiers

*Unsure*
- 11 soldiers

*Is this symbol system easily understood and do you think you would be able to effectively utilize this on the battlefield? Why or why not?*

*YES*
- 2 soldiers

*NO*
- 5 soldiers – because it is too convoluted and confusing

*Unsure*
- 10 soldiers
Do you think cultural property should be symbolized using only one symbol, if so which of the symbols below would be most appropriate? Why?

402 Symbol: Yes, Most original and easily distinguished on maps
Liked
- 7 soldiers
Disliked
- 3 soldiers
Unsure
- 7 soldiers

Roerich Pact (purple) w/o Border: No, easily lost on maps
Liked
- 0 soldiers
Disliked
- 9 soldiers
Unsure
- 8 soldiers

Roerich Pact (purple) w/ Border: No, it is better, but not as original as the 402 symbol.
Liked
- 2 soldiers
Disliked
- 8 soldiers
Unsure
- 7 soldiers
Appendix D:

Military Acronyms
ILT – First Lieutenant
FOB – Forward Operating Base
FTX – Field Training Exercise
GTA – Graphic Training Aid
HMMWV – High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle (HUMVEE)
HUMINT – Human Intelligence
INTEL - Intelligence
IOT – In Order To
IPB – Intelligence Preparation of the Battlefield
KISS – Keep IT Simple Stupid
MAJ - Major
MCOO – Modified Combined Obstacles Overlay
MFA&A – Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives
MOS – Military Occupational Specialty
MOUT – Modern Operations Urban Training
MSEL – Master Scenario Event List
MTOE – Modified Tables of Organization and Equipment
NCO – Non-Commissioned Officer
OEBGD – Overseas Environmental Baseline Guidance Document
O/O – On Order
OP – Observation Post
OPNAVINST – Operations of the Navy Instruction
PFC – Private First Class
PL – Platoon Leader
POO – Point of Origin
PSG – Platoon Sergeant
RECCE or RECON - Reconnaissance
ROE – Rules of Engagement
SFC – Sergeant First Class
SGT – Sergeant
SHAЕF – Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force
TM – Training Manual
TO&E Tables of Organization and Equipment
TRADOC – US Army Training and Doctrine Command
TRP – Troop or Target Reference Point
UCMJ – Uniformed Code of Military Justice
US – United States
2 Shop; S-2; G-2; J-2 – Intelligence
3 Shop; S-3; G-3 – Operations
9 Shop; S-9; G-9; J-9 – Civil Affairs
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