

UNCLASSIFIED

Running head: History Essay

History Essay

SGM Timothy A. Bushee

United States Army Sergeants Major Academy

1 September 2009

Class # 35

## UNCLASSIFIED

### Abstract

Military leaders need to have accurate and useable battlefield intelligence to be able to fight and win in any war. Over the course of history the methods used to collect this information have take on many forms; from the simple field interview to the more controversial forms of torture to obtain information, this is an ever evolving field. How do we as leaders obtain workable battlefield intelligence so we can win in today's contemporary wartime environment? In this essay I will discuss different methods used to obtain battlefield intelligence. Some may be considered unethical while others may seem more suited for peacetime. I will give examples of both to outline the pros and cons' of each and then you can draw your own conclusions.

What is battlefield intelligence? Battlefield intelligence is the ability to use information to predict where and what your enemy is going to do in the future; with information such as this military leaders can construct a plan to counter their enemies' action thereby defeating that said enemy. The ability to collect information pertaining to your enemy can take on many forms but it can be broken down in to two broad areas; these areas are human intelligence (HUMINT) and signal intelligence (SIGINT). There are many smaller sub-specialties from the previously mentioned two broad areas and more continue to emerge every year.

From the beginning of time the ability to accurately predict what your enemy was going to do next has been a much sought after prize. Just as the ever wishful horse bettor wishes he knew the outcome of the horse race before it started, so has the military leader that knows what his adversaries next move would be providing him the opportunity to always be assured to make the right move to counter it. How can someone predict the future? Simply stated, we can't, but what we can do is collect information from a variety of different sources and analyze this material to come up with a probable battle plan our enemies possess.

During World War II it was not uncommon for the both the Nazi SS and the Japanese interrogators to use less than humane techniques to draw information from their captors. The techniques ranged from electric shock to utilizing power tools on the captives extremities to draw this intelligence from Prisoners of War. These types of techniques continued in subsequent conflicts both in the Korean War and the Vietnam War; torture and barbarous methods were employed to gain valuable intelligence. Even in our current conflict methods used by both sides have been considered less than humane which leave great debates raging within the world community about the United States use of water boarding as a means of gaining intelligence from captured terrorists.

Today's approach to intelligence gathering has evolved into a more technology concentric system. Over the last decade the United States has become almost completely dependent on programs like satellite imagery and unmanned aerial drones to capture images of the enemy in the act of performing both acts of terrorism. and in the midst of offensive operations against U.S. and allied forces. Even today throughout the Forward Operating Bases (FOB) of Iraq and Afghanistan the use of unmanned aerial drones called aerostats outfitted with high tech cameras and monitoring devices are used to gather and monitor the areas around the FOB's for hostile actions directed towards Allied Forces. All of the previously mentioned technological advances are geared towards protecting the individual Soldier; by utilizing cameras and drones it avoids the dangers associated with putting an actual person out in the field observing enemy movements and actions. Though we may consider these to be new methods, they have actually been utilized since as far back as the civil war. The Union Army consistently used manned aerial drones to

scope out Confederate fortifications and to direct artillery fire on enemy positions. (Intelligence's New Tools, 2007) The question that begs to be asked is if technology can really replace time tested methods of interrogation and coercion in the gathering of actionable intelligence. Is it inhumane to use the so called archaic methods of sleep deprivation, water boarding and other physically and mentally punishing forms to break a person's spirit to gain valuable information and does it really work? According to many of our high level intelligence operatives, both in the military and on the civilian side, they would say "No". According to Army COL Stuart Herrington, who is a military intelligence specialist who conducted interrogations in Vietnam, Panama and Iraq during Desert Storm. "torture simply isn't a good way to gain information." He says that nine out of ten people can be persuaded to talk with what he calls "no stress methods" at all let alone cruel and unusual ones. He goes on to say that if you use physical force methods to torture someone in to giving you information they will tell you whatever you want to hear just to get you to stop. (Applebaum, 2005). Obviously the aforementioned isn't very good intelligence.

However, the question still presents itself; can we replace age old and tried practices of intelligence with newer more modern forms? In a modern technological world one would think that instead of putting lives at risk trying to observe enemy movements and actions using real live people. Why not send up a drone or aerostat with high tech cameras and video equipment to do the same job? Aren't the unmanned drones gathering the same type of intelligence? Can we use this intelligence in the same way that we would have used it if gathered from a human source? I would say yes; if we are saving American lives then by all means we should use

alternate forms of intelligence gathering. Many people say that a harsher method of interrogation are necessary to save American lives, but is the converse more accurate? If we set the example for the world in using humane methods, then wouldn't the world look more favorably on America as a whole? This, in turn, might sway the world's public opinion on America which would lead to a reciprocation of less torturous practices being used on our own captives. This may be an overly optimistic approach, but how do we know for sure unless we attempt it? Are there times when more drastic, archaic, and sometimes brutal methods need to be utilized? The answer is that it probably is but this most definitely needs to be the exception and not the rule. Even then, how can we be sure that the intelligence gathered by using these methods is any better than if had been collected by less invasive means?

As technology develops and evolves new methods of intelligence become available to us that are less physically invasive, but these methods may be considered emotionally or even legally immoral. These questions need to be addressed now before we start using these methods.

Picture this scenario: an American Special Forces A-Team operating in the disputed border region between Afghanistan and Pakistan performs a raid on a cave complex in search of an identified Al Qaeda high level member. After capturing this individual the team transports the detainee to a Central Intelligence compound near Kabul and turns him over to CIA counter-intelligence (CI) experts. The CI experts take the detainee to a room where a huge machine is located. They strap the detainee to a back board put head phones over his ears and slide him in to the mouth of the machine then leave the room. The machine comes to life and starts making loud noises and then the detainee is questioned about upcoming military offensives planned by Al

Qaeda as well as current locations of weapons, munitions and other pertinent military secrets. The detainee feels no pain and other than the loud noise made by the machine that fully encircles his head, is relatively comfortable. After 45 minutes to an hour the machine stops making noise and the counter intelligence agents come back in to the room and remove him from the machine and take him to a holding cell. Unbeknownst to the detainee the CI agents have just read his mind and gained all of the information they need to conduct counter-offensive operations against Al Qaeda, all the while never harming the detainee. Though the latter may sound like something out of a science fiction novel, this technology is right around the corner; in fact scientists are now able to read someone's mind by looking at the electrical activity of the person's brain. Dr. Demis Hassabis of University College London says that one day using this technology it could be possible. Dr. Hassabis thinks that we are still ten years from having this ability but he also said that it is within the realm of possibility that we could literally read someone's thoughts for a short period of time even if they didn't want you to. (Connor, 2009).

What would the ethical concerns in using electrical activity resonated by someone's brain actually be in gathering usable and valid military intelligence? In a factual sense, does a terrorist have the moral right to try to stop this? These and other questions will need to be addressed by a world court to determine the ethics of this type of procedure.

In conclusion I have discussed many varying types of intelligence gathering methods. There are some methods that have been in place for hundreds if not thousands of years and some are still in use today, and there are also many new and high tech methods emerging every year. These and their predecessors still have some of the same issues with ethics. What is right and

what is wrong? This may all be in the individual or even society's evaluation or belief in what is right or wrong. As a career military person, my belief is that we as soldiers are the executors of the laws and norms of the society and it is very difficult to perform lawful military orders if the those laws or hazy or unclear.

### Bibliography

Applebaum, A. (2005, January 12). *The Torture Myth*. Retrieved June 11, 2009, from washingtonpost.com: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A2302-2005jan11>

Connor, S. (2009, March 13). *Scientists able to read people's minds*. Retrieved June 30, 2009, from The Independent: <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/science/scientists-able-to-read-peoples-minds-164396>

Allen, T. (2007, March 21). *Intelligence's New Tools*. Retrieved June 11, 2009, from CIA.gov:  
<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/additional-publications/civil-war/p25.htm>