

## **The Anthropology of National Security: TOWARDS THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW EPISTEMOLOGY**

Chester B. Cabalza \*

---

*The Anthropology of National Security dissects the evolving ties between anthropology and the military. The development of this new epistemology originated at a time when anthropology, as a developing science, was used as a “handmaiden of colonialism” since the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Although, military power in pursuit of security interests is much older. The construction of this new discourse is relevant in the study of people, culture, and society in today’s deterritorialized world. In particular, Filipinos must acquire a culture of respected national character and national morale that are fundamental to metaphysically build an infrastructure to nationhood propounded by our great ancestors. This vision which was adequately foreseen by revolutionary generals and past leaders in our history is slowly laying a golden map to fortify Filipinos psycho-social and socio-cultural imaginings away from persistent colonial mentality. This vision of greatness must be executed in a grand manner based on the vintage designs of our great ancestors to generally inculcate a sense of pride in Filipinos of today and tomorrow.*

### **Introduction**

One of the grave contraventions of anthropology, academically translated as the study of humans, especially when it was concocted as a distinct discipline and perceptibly a product of western scholarship, is how it played with the subjugation process by western powers on their colonies. Henceforth, ties between anthropology and the military are old ones. The science originated as a “handmaiden of colonialism” since 19<sup>th</sup> century.

American model of anthropology is holistic in scope; embracing Franz Boas’s four-fields of disciplinal approach in its discourse, namely: [1] physical or biological anthropology; [2] socio-cultural anthropology; [3] archaeology, and [4] linguistic anthropology. Nevertheless, each respective field of anthropology has numerous and evolving sub-fields underneath its successful domains. With

---

\* Chester B Cabalza is Associate Professor and Course Director of the Socio-Cultural Dimension of National Security at the National Defense College of the Philippines. He is also a Senior Lecturer at the Department of Anthropology in the University of the Philippines Diliman.

much interest, notable examples of anthropology's sub-branches are forensic anthropology, medical anthropology, paleontology, primatology, sociobiology, economic anthropology, environmental anthropology, legal and political anthropology, maritime anthropology, classical and historical archaeology, garbology, underwater archaeology, historical linguistics, and ethnology to name a few. But there is a wide gamut of anthropological ontology and epistemologies that are coupling with centuries old medieval disciplines and birthing with a new scientific body of knowledge hence.

Contrary to comprehensive subjects under the academic realm of anthropology, common people and misinformed individuals would only explicitly associate the discipline of anthropology to culture; albeit, anthropology may seemingly be deemed as the science of culture. To support the logic, a classical definition of culture was provided by Edward Tylor in 1871 as, "that complex whole which includes knowledge, beliefs, law, morals, customs, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by a person as a member of a society."<sup>1</sup>

That 19<sup>th</sup> century definition of culture explicitly highlights holism of the emerging academic discipline of anthropology; impliedly expanding its theoretical and methodological scopes in succeeding centuries as the scientific study of human culture. Henceforth, as anthropology now poses itself globally as a stand-alone scholastic and mature scientific body of knowledge on modern human's biological and cultural aspects, at par with other social sciences and humanities, and oftentimes with hard sciences because of physical anthropology and archaeology; it has also branched out to be identified with the arching systemic study of national security.

In light of the development of socio-cultural dimension of national security in the Philippines, the curriculum that was developed by the Ad Hoc Committee of the National Defense College of the Philippines (NDCP) in 1963 which envisioned the product of the College to be "general" material in the Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP), was primarily based on the curricula of the National War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces of the United States. Presidential Decree 190 bestowed the NDCP with power to confer the Master in National Security Administration (MNSA) upon its graduates. But originally, instead of the socio-cultural dimension of national security, a three-unit psycho-social foundations course was offered to virtually expose students to Philippine cultural values and the Filipino psyche.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Tylor (1871, reprint 1958) p.2.

<sup>2</sup> Syjuco (1997, reprint 2001), pp.73-75.

In retrospect, under the branch of social anthropology, culture and personality is one of its sub-fields that may cover the mantle of psycho-social foundations, heavily propounded by female anthropologists like Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict during the 20<sup>th</sup> century at the height of the propagation of American school of thought in anthropology.

Ironically, in the narrative of a famous Filipino anthropologist, anthropology has been persistently defined as the study of man and the behavior of man. However, when the female liberation movement was organized, the women protested on the scope of the discipline focusing only on the study of man or simply male hegemony. To accommodate the complaint, anthropology was defined as “the study of man embracing woman” in the context of providing significance to Filipino values in terms of national security (Jocano, 1980).

In the discourse of national security, it is not surprising to learn that security in Chinese character is referred to as 安 (ān xián) from the etymology of a woman 女 (nǚ) in the house 宀 (mián). This calligraphic representation of woman in the Chinese culture hypothetically places Chinese women with high-esteem supported by Mao Zedong’s political decree, referring to them as those “holding up half the sky” in the Chinese society.

Psychology has also links to sociology and anthropology. Psychology studies the mind, mental processes, and individual behavior, including the phenomena such as perception, attitudes and values, personality and mental aberration or illness; however, socio-cultural dimension studies the broader aspect of personality development.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, sociology started as the study of the problems besetting western societies after the Industrial and French revolutions and of advanced and contemporary societies. While anthropology looks at the whole of humanity and studies various societies in different historical and geographical setting.

The common denominators of the disciplines of anthropology, psychology, and sociology when translated into the domain of national security are security interests. Interests are constructed through a process of social interaction. Security interests are defined by actors who respond to cultural factors. This does not mean that power, conventionally understood as material capabilities, is unimportant for an analysis of national security (Katzenstein, 1996).

Needless to say that from late 20<sup>th</sup> century to the second decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, anthropological and sociological studies are side by side, symbiotic, and

<sup>3</sup> Panopio and Rolda, (2006, reprint 2007) p.13.

interdependent, dominating the discourses of culture, society, and national security; hence, socio-cultural dimension may be considered as one of national security's most important and primordial core courses, the heart and soul of national security today.

### **Militarization of Anthropology**

The iota of militarization of anthropology alarms people, misjudging the history of the discipline as a *sine qua non* of colonialism and imperialism. During World War I (WWI), respected American anthropologist Franz Boas became very critical when a number of anthropologists were enlisted to assist military and intelligence community through his powerful missive, "Anthropologists as Spies," charging that four American anthropologists abused their professional research positions by conducting espionage in Central America.

At the height of World War II (WWII), British and American colonizers sent anthropologists to their colonies to study culture, kinship, and networks of various colorful societies and 'uncivilized' tribes unwittingly described by often 'racist' and ethnocentric anthropologists (however, notice how derogatory and politically-incorrect terms were used to describe peoples and their societies in the past, as interpreted in present-day discourse). Unknown to the locals, their military tall order would be an assignment for deployment in isolated hinterlands to act as spies. Nevertheless in today's anthropological convention, espionage entered the academic circles' debate on whether it is ethical or not to allow scholars and scientists like anthropologists in military and intelligence operations.

For instance in the Philippines, Dean Worcester, a zoologist and an accidental anthropologist through his early scientific expeditions in the country wrote an influential book supported by texts and photographs about the Philippine Islands and the Filipinos in 1898 which paved way for his appointment as a Commissioner consecutively to the Schurman and Taft Commissions by President William McKinley, the last US President to have served the American Civil War. His controversial writings and lectures, particularly his photographs of naked tribal peoples are adamantly questioned today by scholars. On the other hand, his contentious black and white photographs were later on used to illustrate census of the Philippines. It was also preserved for scientific records but framed through the divisive racial classification and evolutionary paradigms.

Worcester was recognized as an expert in early Philippine Studies from the *etic* or outsider's/colonizer's point of view during his time and shaped much

the regime's internal administration. His appointment as a high ranking public administrator during the American Insular Government in the Philippines was of great help especially in 1899 to 1902 when the Philippine-American War broke out which took more lives of American soldiers than during the American-Spanish War in early 1898. His stint as Secretary of Interior from 1901 until his resignation in 1913, oversaw a number of government bureaus on agriculture, forestry, government laboratories, health, mining, weather, and the Non-Christian Tribes which was later renamed as the Ethnological Survey of the Philippines Office. He remained a controversial American administrator during his tenure and expressed his strong stances to perpetuate the US responsibility to 'civilize' its brown colonial subjects.

As a classical practice, anthropologists sent on mission would by chance, marry local/s as part of their rapport and immersion in the community during their fieldwork. To cite an example, H. Otley Beyer, the father of Philippine anthropology and archaeology, did marry an Ifugao ethnic had for his fieldwork. Beyer was interested strictly in typological and distributional studies based on culture-historical contexts; he had also strongly shaped or influenced the academia, especially in the track of peopling of the Philippines through his pioneering yet controversial migration theory, later on debunked by local and foreign anthropologists (Bellwood and Chang, 1995; Jocano, 1998; Solheim, 2006) working on the same area of research interest and study.

Two prominent female anthropologists, Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead, shared sphere of influence and expertise after their influential, popular, and best-selling writings to reverberate the role of anthropologists in high-level policymaking as their grit for cross-cultural policy recommendations were observed at war time. Ruth Benedict, then Head of the Basic Analysis Section of the Bureau of Overseas Intelligence of the United States' Office of War Information (OWI), advised President Theodore Roosevelt by the time Japan lost the war to the US in WWII, not to dethrone the emperor of Japan to allow the continuity of the divine monarchy of the Rising Sun.

Margaret Mead for her part, headed the National Research Council's Committee on Food Habits. This committee applied anthropological methods to problems of food distribution and preparation in war-affected countries. During WWII, anthropologists used the techniques they had developed in small-scale societies. By gathering information from immigrants to the US, as well as from published sources and films, they studied culture "at a distance." Such research was used to guide government and military policy, to further cooperation among wartime allies, and to plan for a postwar world. Similar studies continued after the

war with the Research in Contemporary Cultures project, which was led by Mead after Ruth Benedict's death in 1948.<sup>4</sup>

Instances of archaeological shenanigans in pursuit of fascist principles of German-Austrian supreme ideals were also perpetuated during the Second World War when Adolf Hitler stringently commanded his team of archaeologists to fabricate artifacts and excavation sites to uphold and underscore the make-believe "Aryan" race. At that time, a breed of highly-trained and specialized anthropologists called Nazi archaeologists prevailed in Germany, as they were espoused to rapid scientific and technological advances aimed at attaining hegemonic power in Europe and across the Pacific. On the other hand, the same strategic maneuvering was outdid by Saddam Hussein during the Gulf War, as he tried to annex Kuwait to his former country's glory using archeological and anthropological foundations inspired by the Mesopotamian civilization, with present-day Iraq as cradle of the early recorded civilization in west Asia, in which tiny oil-rich Kuwait is only a part of it.

Furthermore, strategic value of vernacular language was also used during wars like when the US Marines had to protect Navajo code talkers in Saipan during World War II. As a practice, top diplomats, United Nations translators, commissioned scholars, and military strategists learned languages of war-torn countries for diplomatic and strategic purposes; or trendsetting in the evolving dominance of major languages for defense, diplomacy, and trade in the global arena. Since the rise of the west, French, Dutch, German, Spanish, and English are used for major transactions in all facets of negotiations in the world; but because civilization-state China is fast resurging, evidenced by its unprecedented and tremendous economic success, emerging political sphere of influence, and increasing soft power or cultural global clout, now Chinese Mandarin is arguably posed to challenge English as the world's lingua franca in the future.

The epistemologies on linear or cyclical social evolution and ethnological research like the rise of bands, tribes, early cities, civilizations, nations, states, and from primitive to complex structure of societies appealed much to more classical anthropologists, sociologists, and other thinkers of 19<sup>th</sup> century as they postulated their own tried and tested theoretical frameworks and concepts, inspired by 18<sup>th</sup> century Enlightenment period in Europe (Marx and Engels, 1845; Spencer, 1860; Tylor, 1871; Morgan, 1877; Durkheim, 1895; Boas, 1911; Freud, 1913; Mauss, 1922).

---

<sup>4</sup> Cited from <http://www.loc.gov/exhibit/mead/oneworeld-char.html>.

American, British, and French schools of thought observing the changing structural functionalism of modern societies founded their own concepts and fields of expertise with the influx of their own academic followers and distinct methodologies that certainly shaped early and mid-20<sup>th</sup> century prisms of thinking (Kroeber, 1919; Boas, 1920; Weber, 1922; Radcliff-Brown, 1922; Radin, 1927; Mead, 1928; Sapir, 1929; Benedict, 1930; Evans-Pritchard, White, 1943; Murdoch, 1950; Conklin, 1955; Steward, 1955; Mills, 1959; Fried, 1960; Malinowski, 1961; Leach, 1962; Douglas, 1963; Levi-Strauss, 1962; Rappaport, 1967; Tyler, 1969; Geertz, 1973; Chagnon, 1968; Harris, 1975).

Seemingly, that generation of scholars and scientists triggered eruption of substantial debate and controversy on questions pertaining to culture, society, and science under the framework of “nature versus nurture,” but now there are discourses of twining “nature and nurture,” encompassing various issues relating to family, adolescence, gender, social norms and attitudes that certainly sparked the fluidity of academic freedom by the brilliant minds of above-mentioned intellectuals as they are continuously and prominently cited today by young scholars and social scientists through their ground-breaking ethnographic and revolutionary research works.

Important anthropological methods proposed by Franz Boas adapted for keen strategic academic analysis to present and future studies on culture and society include historical particularism that requires the anthropologist to describe the particular characteristics of a given culture with a view toward reconstructing the historical events that led to its present structure. On the other hand, cultural relativism is an attitude that society’s customs and ideas should be viewed within the context of the society’s problems and opportunities. Each culture possesses its own particular traditions, values, and ideals. Albeit, these cultural methods have had critiques to further accept the propinquity of its usage to current research on society and culture. Therefore, if historians seek to establish the chronology of events, on the other hand, anthropologists seek to show the interrelationship between events and document cultural and social patterns in them.

Meanwhile, clash of civilizations of the east versus the west, *ad infinitum*, drew syntheses from great thinkers in post-world wars and post-Cold war to the deterritorializing nature of the 21<sup>st</sup> century currently pre-dominating socio-cultural dimension of national security (Said, 1978; Hartman, 1983; Fukuyama, 1992; Macridis, 1992; Huntington, 1992; Baldwin 1993; Wendt, 1999) and today more mushrooming topics on deconstruction, gender, globalization, human security, post-9/11, post-modernism and other potent and extensive narratives on the importance of culture and society in magnanimous ways beyond (Derida, 1967; Toffler, 1970;

Foucault, 1976; Anderson, 1982; Crapanzano, 1986; Fernandez, 1986; Llewelyn-Davies, 1989; McLuhan, 1989; Appadurai, 1990; Bourgois, 1995; Ong, 1999; Buzan and Ole, 2003; Hough, 2004; Friedman, 2005; Mahbubani, 2009; Jacques, 2012).

There are four strengths of anthropology that can be related to the object of study of national security. These are universality, integration, adaptation, and holism. Anthropological discourses are very comprehensive yet the study is similarly universal because all of us belong to one dominant single human species today called *Homo sapiens* based from human paleontology and biological evolution. Whatever kinds of tribe, ethnic group, citizenship, and nationality one belongs, anthropology will certainly study issues and threats on peoples in the purview of national security. Integration plays a vital role into the study of anthropology of national security because all aspects of life in all societies are interwoven to form a social whole. Foreign powers and relations are also interrelated to global-local (glocal) *vis a vis* local-global cultures or cultural hybridity of regimes and norms. More so, adaptation needs to be studied in the anthropology of national security for the reason of massive influx of migration and diaspora around the world and how adaptation to various environments affects culture and society. For instance, in the great Indus civilization, climate change and patterns of monsoon season certainly affected its rise and fall. For this reason, empires and kingdoms may also rise and fall due to the strengths and weaknesses of its military power. Lastly, holism which is the thrust of anthropology has influenced the study of national security because of its multi-disciplinary approach whereby one studies panoramic phenomena using different bodies of knowledge.

All in all, the lexicon of social evolutionary process in anthropology's militarization has a tinge of 'Otherness' that substantially affect the wide ranging discourses of national security issues. Temptation to ascribe to exoticism of knowledge in the ambit of identity, ethnicity, historicity, locality, and universality in the ongoing narratives of hegemonic power of culture should in certain ways face ethical accountability by global actors and major producers of knowledge that may destabilize cultural and social norms or world order. Dependency on who provides critical narratives and body of knowledge based from solid theoretical frameworks and concepts must be scrutinized contentiously to lessen ethnocentrism or intended biases towards 'other' cultures and societies especially now when truth has become subjective and descriptive in post-processual ways.



### **The Anthropology of National Security**

In the current academic program of the MNSA, the socio-cultural dimension of national security, is the first module taught from the six core subjects of the program, following the acronym of PESTEM (political domestic and international, economic, socio-cultural, techno-scientific, environment, and military but more focused on defense and security sector) of national security.

Socio-cultural dimension of national security covers the basic concepts of culture, values, change, perception, attitudes, motivation, and personality. These concepts provide NDCP students/scholars with operational and high-level definitions and understanding as these relate to national security. The module also emphasizes the importance of the interrelationships between and among disciplines and modules.<sup>5</sup>

To calibrate the strategic value of socio-cultural dimension of national security, I redesigned the module with an aim at providing NDCP students/scholars an in-depth knowledge and rethinking of Philippine society and culture and to become critical in their analysis using various perspectives in its implications to national security. The course gives a general and holistic survey of the major cultural, social, historical, political, and economic processes in the country through an examination of rapid changes in Filipino values and character.<sup>6</sup>

Contents and contexts of the course contain approaches mainly from anthropology and sociology, but also complemented by the disciplinal scope of history, humanities, psychology, gender studies, public policy, Asian, international, and security studies - again in the purview of national security. Thematic and topical discussions ranging from pre-historical, chronological events, and future discourses on society and culture from various levels of analysis in local, regional, and global developments are inclusively compacted in the module.<sup>7</sup>

Furthermore, there are four units/approaches in the course content of the socio-cultural dimension of national security. The first unit of the module introduces students/scholars to digested theories and concepts of anthropology and sociology in relation to national security. The second unit delves on pre-historical and archaeological findings that will critically help students/scholars understand our country's infrastructure to nationhood and civilization. The third unit focuses on various regional groupings in Asia-Pacific to closely understand different peoples

<sup>5</sup> NDCP Student Handbook (2012-2013), p.10.

<sup>6</sup> NSA 204 Syllabus (2012-2013), p.1.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

and our neighbors' culture and society from ancient to contemporary periods and major socio-cultural security issues in their respective regions. And the fourth unit presents special topics that have impact on culture and society not only in the Philippines but also in other parts of the world, as well as issues on global scale. These eye-opener thematic issues selected timely for social and cultural discussions and debates may be relevant in the study of the socio-cultural dimension of national security.<sup>8</sup>

As to the methodology, anthropology's most important contribution in the academe and the scientific community is the use of ethnography. Ethnographic method is a descriptive narrative of culture and society. Anthropologists are highly encouraged to do fieldwork using participation-observation (PO) and key informant (KI) methods, but those who are not fit to doing these methods are labeled as "armchair anthropologists". In the realm of national security, soldiers and military officers who get deployed on the ground get to see the realities of various peoples' culture and society. Their first-hand experiences and information could be more useful in their analyses of the actual happenings on the ground in contrast to simply relying on perceptions from secondary reading materials.

In the discourse of national security management, field visits are imbedded in the module, namely: Sub-national Security Development Studies (SSDS) and the Regional Security Development Studies (RSDS). These activities, although it may be too short in time, might be equated with fieldwork and participation-observation through rapid assessment, key informant interviews, and secondary data gathering and analyses. Hence, national security depends on the accurate perception of realities within the country itself and the various countries in its region, and the ability to develop and effectively pursue a strategy that meets the demands of these realities.<sup>9</sup>

The SSDS is a field visit to selected regions in the Philippines where the students/scholars interact with important and influential individuals and groups in the subject areas to identify strategic issues, challenges, and opportunities for development and security areas. The annual activity is also aimed at strengthening the academic learning process by translating theoretical concepts of national security into the practical aspects by relevant exposure to the field and actual events. This is to discuss, agree on, and propose possible solutions or courses of action in responding to the perceived security and development issues and opportunities using appropriate tools and approaches learned in class.

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid, pp.2-3.

On the other hand, the RSDS is one of the activities that will round off the students/scholars' experiences by providing them with a chance to witness first-hand and at close march the actual interplay of national security dimensions in an international context. This will allow students/scholars to gather information which may serve as basis for the formulation of recommended policies and strategies relative to the Philippine national security issues *vis a vis* the target country. It is an avenue to interact with national security managers of the target country and to see how their national interests and objectives are determined and protected. This is to broaden national security perspective and development capacity in addressing national security problems objectively with facility and competence. This also serves to provide first-hand knowledge of the situation on the ground, identify problems in the actual operational setting, and validate our own existing interests and objectives by recommending measures to further enhance the same.<sup>10</sup>

But today, there is still a sharp divide between academia and the military in the broader application and conceptualization of national power. A case in point is the 2007 American Anthropological Association (AAA) board resolution expressing "disapproval" of anthropologists working in Afghanistan and Iraq, through Pentagon's pilot project in 2005 named Cultural Operations Research, popularly known Human Terrain System (HTS), arguing it as an "unacceptable application of anthropological expertise."<sup>11</sup>

Anthropologist Montgomery McFate, however, believes that what social scientists bring to the military is in some cases a deep expertise on the specific area of interest. Anthropologists working for defense and security sectors bring a fresh perspective and a methodology for research and analysis that benefits both the military and the local civilian population in the area of operations. Therefore, anthropologists should be involved in developing "military applications of cultural knowledge."<sup>12</sup>

Harsh criticisms by anthropologists were formulated to negate the controversial program. The Network of Concerned Anthropologist wrote to the US House of Representatives in 2010 asking Congress to stop government support for the HTS and cancel plans for its expansion. That year, Professor Hugh Gusterson vividly renounced the HTS stating that, "the Pentagon seems to have decided that anthropology is to the war on terror what physics was to the cold war...asking an anthropologist to gather intelligence." Same sentiment was shared by Marshall

---

<sup>10</sup> SSDS and RSDS booklets, p.1-2.

<sup>11</sup> Vergano and Weise. Cited from [usatoday30.usatoday.com/tech/science/ethics/2008-12-08-anthropologist-soldiers\\_N.htm](http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/tech/science/ethics/2008-12-08-anthropologist-soldiers_N.htm). Originally published in Military Review (2005).

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

Sahlins in 2011 about the HTS as “manipulating local culture, imposing on them, transforming anthropologists into spies, and putting people you work with at risk.”<sup>13</sup>

### **The Heart and Soul of National Security**

Redefinition of national security outside of plainly defense or military security must transcend to include the security of ideas – this is the security of the abstract forms that sometimes play as powerful forces that elevate our cohesive national interests (Jocano, 1980).

I deem that to achieve a robust national security, Filipinos must acquire a culture of respected national character and national morale that are fundamental to metaphysically build an infrastructure to nationhood propounded by our great ancestors. This vision which was adequately foreseen by revolutionary generals and past leaders in our history is slowly laying a golden map to fortify Filipinos’ psycho-social and socio-cultural imaginings away from persistent colonial mentality. This vision of greatness must be executed in a grand manner based on the vintage designs of our great ancestors to generally inculcate sense of pride in Filipinos of today and tomorrow.

One of the great insights in boosting our infrastructure to nationhood is the deep awareness of our unstained ancestry and past glory prior to foreign colonization of our country. Archaeologists are making waves right now in excavating beneath our lands to unveil mysteries of our past. Physical and cultural heritage are unearthed to unleash our national identity and national character. Discovery of the Callao man approximately dated 67,000 years ago, or presumably even older, strengthens our strong Darwinian national identity that will masquerade our inferiority complex since colonization period.

The discovery of the earliest hominid in the country showcases that we have much older beginnings and culture compared to some of our neighbors in the region. It also elucidates our concept of our national identity as a Filipino people. Our ancestors etched the path of our earliest beliefs, philosophies, and way of life. As recourse, our history should be re-written in pursuit of stronger national character and morale.

Paleoanthropology conscientiously played, and will continuously be helpful, in the construction of racial nationalism. A case in point is the Peking

---

<sup>13</sup> From Nestor Castro’s PowerPoint Presentation. “Embedded Social Scientists: Warriors for Peace?” IFSSO April 2013.

man, scientifically named, *Sinantropus pekinensis*. Albeit today, there are debates on the peopling and origins of the Chinese people. Some experts conceive of the “yellow race” as the initial distinction while probing on the concept to skin color of the Chinese people compared to other Asians. Strategically, Chinese thinkers would debunk the monogenic (single origin) hypothesis of African-originated early hominids and modern humans.

Instead, a tough sinocentric view of the genesis of the world through the paleontological discovery of the Peking man warrants a powerful Chinese brand of patriotism that had been handed down from generation to generation. This kind of cultural ideology and harmonious spirit in pursuit for a unified political objective had led many Chinese people to believe that their mytho-historical imaginings and continuous nationalism had preserved the world’s oldest continuous civilization-state.

The political role of archeological and paleoanthropological finds prove that these scientific discourses can be made as tools for grandiose architectural construction of racial nationalism that had been alive since pre-semi-colonial times in China. Even in today’s theatrical stage of international political hegemony, given the resurging power of China in the world today, great scientific discovery, even when missing fossils like the Peking man’s skullcaps, can be used for soft power strategies. Indeed, to cement China’s greatness as a civilization-state, it requires unifying myths, symbols, and memories from relics of prehistory and origins in search of the human past.

This propaganda based from scientific discoveries is a potent example of building a stronger national identity and national character of which our country may opt to set as an example while learning from older civilizations like China. Thus, the Philippines has equitable fossils to mount a stronger national identity and national character, abruptly, mixed with stronger narratives of colonialism – of three hundred years in the convent, fifty years in Hollywood, and four years in the arsenal. Consequently, descriptive accounts of the discovery of the Callao man by anthropologists and archaeologists are objective and reliable. What becomes questionable is the interpretation made by historians of these data.

By way of making the socio-cultural dimension the heart and soul of national security, it affirms the proverbial tone of “an army without culture will not win a battle.” Capitalizing on education is one of the great ways to leapfrog and become a developed country. Educated citizens and peoples of societies become smart and respected as they respond to challenges of their countries and resolve problems through their innovative and powerful ideas courtesy of great education.

### List of References

- Cabalza, C. (2012). Syllabus on Socio-Cultural Dimension of National Security, National Defense College of the Philippines, Quezon City: Philippines, pages 1-3.
- Jocano, F. (1980). National Security and Filipino Values, National Defense College of the Philippines, Quezon City: Philippines, pages 36- 40.
- Katzenstein, P. (1996). The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Syjuco, J. (2001). Military Education in the Philippines, National Defense College of the Philippines, Quezon City: Philippines, pages 73-75.
- Panopio, I. & Rolda, R. (2007). Society and Culture: Introduction to Sociology and Anthropology, Katha Publishing Co., Inc., page 13.
- NDCP Student Handbook for MNSA Regular Class 48 (2012-2013), pages 10-12.
- Vergano, D. and Weise, E., Should Anthropologists Work Alongside Soldiers? retrieved from [usatoday30.usatoday.com/tech/science/ethics/2008-12-08anthropologist-soldiers\\_N.htm](http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/tech/science/ethics/2008-12-08anthropologist-soldiers_N.htm)

#### *Suggested Readings:*

Marx, K. & Engels, F. Opposition of the Materialist and Idealist Outlook, (1845); Spencer, H. The Social Organization, (1860); Tylor, E. The Science of Culture (1871); Morgan, L. Ethical Periods (1877); Durkheim, E. What is Social Fact? (1895); Worcester, D. The Philippine Islands and their People (1898); Freud, S. The Return of Totemism in Childhood (1913); Kroeber, A.L. On the Principle of Order in Civilization as Exemplified by Changes of Fashion; Boas, F. The Methods of Ethnology (1920); Malinowski, B. The Essentials of the Kula (1922); Radcliffe-Brown A.R. The Andaman Islanders: A Study in Social Anthropology (1922); Weber, M. The Nature of Social Action (1922); Mead, M. Growing Up in Samoa (1928); Benedict, R. Psychological Types in the Cultures of the Southwest (1930); Evans-Pritchard, E. Witchcraft, Oracles, and Magic Among the Azande (1937); White, L. Energy and the Evolution of Culture (1943); Murdock, G.P. Family Stability in Non-European Cultures (1950); Conklin, H. Hanunoo Color Categories (1955); Steward, J. The Patrilineal Band (1955); Mills, C.W. Sociological Imagination (1959); Malinowski, B. The Argonauts of the Western Pacific (1961); Levi-Strauss, C. The Savage Mind (1962); Derida, J. Of Grammatology (1967); Rappaport, R. Ritual Regulation of Environmental Relations among a New Guinea People (1967); Chagnon, N. Yanomamo: The Fierce People (1968); Tyler, S. Cognitive Anthropology (1969); Geertz, C. The Interpretation of Culture (1973); Harris, M. Cows, Pigs, Wars, and Witches: The Riddles of Culture

---

(1975); Foucault, M. The History of Sexuality Volume 1: An Introduction (1976); Said, E. Orientalism (1978); Llewelyn-Davies, M. Women, Warriors, and Patriarchs (1981); Benedict, A. Imagined Communities (1982); Hartmann, F. The Relations of Nations (1983); Crapanzano, V. Hermes' Dilemma: The Making of Subversion in Ethnographic Description (1986); Fernandez, J. Persuasions and Performances: the Play of tropes in Culture; McLuhan, M. The Global Village: Transformations in World Life and Media in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (1989); Appadurai, A. Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Difference (1990); Huntington, S. The Clash of Civilizations (1992); Fukuyama, F. The End of History and The Last Man (1992); Macridis, R. Foreign Policy in World Politics (1992); Baldwin, D. Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate (1993); Bellwood, P. The Austronesians: Historical and Comparative Perspectives (1995); Bourgois, P. From Jibaro to Crack Dealer: Confronting the Restructuring of Capitalism in El Barrion (1995); Moore, J. Visions of Culture (1997); Jocano, F.L. Filipino Prehistory: Rediscovering Precolonial Heritage (1998); Ong, A. The Family Romance of Mandarin Family (1999); Wendt, A. Social Theory in International Politics (1999); Buzan B. & Ole, W. Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security (2003); Hough, P. Security and Securitization (2004); Wilhelm, S. Archaeology and Culture in Southeast Asia: Unraveling the Nusanto (2006); Friedman, T. The World is Flat (2005); Mahubani, K. The New Asian Hemisphere (2009); Jacques, M. When China Rules the World: The End of Western World and the Birth of a New Global Order (2012).