Dear RC01 membership,

We have almost come to the end of the year, one eternalised in history. I hope that the effect of the pandemic on your lives, livelihoods and loved ones have not been severe or met with tragedy. This is certainly an unsettling and insecure time for us all, as the pandemic brings forth new human and national security challenges across the world. This health crisis has resulted in militaries deploying in roles and responsibilities beyond their mandate. These have varied from law enforcement operations to enforce lockdown measures, to offering logistical and medical support in support of civilian authorities, stretching both the personnel and organisational capacity of armed forces to their limits. Being on the frontline, has meant that this in itself has posed a threat to the well-being of military personnel, who besides facing the prospect of infection have needed to deal with the tensions that arise when deploying in roles for which they are neither trained, prepared or equipped. While an overlap exists with tasks performed by the armed forces, there is no automatic ‘plug in’ to civilian emergency services and competencies. What is particularly interesting is how the framing of the pandemic within a war narrative. Accordingly, RC01 has initiated a book project to capture the experiences of various countries in combatting Covid-19, and the role of the military in dealing with the challenges this pandemic has posed. This links with a broader debate about the increasing domestic deployment of the military and future roles

As for RC01, Covid-19 had a direct impact on our research committee and its’ functioning, effectively halting the hosting of the RC01 Conference in Stellenbosch. Consequently, we have decided to join forces with Ergomas and host a joint conference in 2021. We hope to present this conference in hybrid format, although the possibility exists that it may be fully online. This has both advantages and disadvantages. The advantages being that the costs associated with conference attendance is minimized, that the virtual space creates the opportunity to attract a much wider audience, as well as increase our visibility. The disadvantage is the social aspect of such
events, which provide opportunities to debate, link up with old, meet new friends and broaden our networks.

At this point, I appeal to all of you to renew your membership and to make an active attempt to help us recruit new members to broaden our international footprint. RC01 is the most internationally diverse military/academic research committee and an ideal opportunity to link up with scholars around the world and present our work to a broader audience. Membership also affects our ability to participate in the ISA World Congress in Melbourne, Australia 24-30 July 2022 [https://www.isa-sociology.org/en/conferences/world-congress]. RC01 is particularly interested in having a more diverse membership from Latin America, Asia and Africa, currently under-represented in terms of our membership. Membership is for a four-year period and joining RC01 now, will ensure that you can participate in the upcoming Ergomas/RC01 Conference as well as the ISA World Congress. To become a member, proceed to the following link: [https://www.isa-sociology.org/en/membership/individual-membership/guidelines]. Note, that there is currently a discount on RC01 membership fees.

Lindy Heinecken  
President RC01

UPCOMING ERGOMAS/RC01 CONFERENCE

Call for Submissions  
16th ERGOMAS Conference in Tartu, Estonia – 19-23 July 2021  
*In collaboration with the ISA Armed Forces and Conflict Resolution Research Committee (RC01)

Hosted at the Institute of Social Studies, University of Tartu, Estonia  
Submission deadline: February 2021  
Submission platform will be open soon!

The European Research Group on Military and Society (ERGOMAS) is an interdisciplinary, international scientific association devoted to collaborative research on military and society. It is a public, non-profit, and politically and ideologically independent professional organization of scientists. Its purposes are pursued through the activities of its Working Groups and a biennial conference. The objectives of the Armed Forces and Conflict Resolution Research Committee (RC01) are to develop professional contacts between sociologists of armed forces and conflict resolution throughout the world; encourage the international exchange of research findings, theoretical developments, and methodologies in the sociology of armed forces and conflict resolution; promote the teaching of course materials dealing with armed forces and conflict resolution at undergraduate, graduate, and post-graduate levels; and promote international meetings and research collaboration in the field of armed forces and conflict resolution.

We are pleased to announce the 16th biennial ERGOMAS conference, in collaboration with the RC01 Interim Meeting! The conference will take place in Tartu Estonia, 19-23 July 2021. The theme for this conference will be Dynamic armed forces in changing societies: Challenges for research in and on the military (see below for additional details).
Conference Theme: Dynamic armed forces in changing societies: Challenges for research in and on the military

Societal changes have sped up in the last decades, partly due to the acceleration of social time, "information dependency", and mediatization of all aspects of life, including security and defence. These processes, together with a rapidly changing threat landscape, place unprecedented demands on the military. At present, we see for example, how global powers become more confrontational regarding economic, political and social issues. At the same time, we see the rapid development in technology in terms of artificial intelligence and the use of drones, which is changing the nature of war, as well as the role and functions of armed forces and relations between states. Within states, the rise of populism, increasing authoritarianism, xenophobia and racism are giving rise to new forms of insecurities and risks, often drawing the military into internal security roles. All these aspects in turn affect civil-military relations, defence transformation and military/police relations? To address these issues, there is the need for high quality research to contextualize the effect these societal forces are having on the role and functions of the military. Accordingly the aim of this 16th biennial ERGOMAS conference, together with RC01 in Tartu aims to bring together novel theoretical and methodological issues in the field of military studies. More detailed information about ERGOMAS and the Working Groups can be found at the ERGOMAS website: http://www.ergomas.ch/ and at the RC01 Website https://www.isa-sociology.org/en/research-networks/research-committees/rc01-armed-forces-and-conflict-resolution/

We encourage discussion in these areas, as well as other key topics of research in the military and society domain. ERGOMAS Working Groups include:

- Morale, Cohesion and Leadership
- Public Opinion
- Mass Media and the Military
- Gender and the Military
- Military Profession
- Civilian Control of the Military
- Warriors in Peacekeeping
- Military Families
- Recruitment and Retention
- Military and Police Relations
- Violence and the Military
- Veterans & Society
- Military Conflict Management and Peace Economics
- Critical Military Studies
- Total Defence Force

In addition to this, RC01 panels for the joint 2021 conference will be along the following themes:

- COVID-19 Implications for defence and security and civil-military relations*
- African security threats and armed forces
- Cyber-security domain and the military
- Human resource management and defence transformation
• Technological change and future war
• Violence, conflict resolution and security

*Special panel presentations are invited on COVID-19 Implications for defence and security and civil-military relations. The intention is that the papers submitted for this panel will be the basis for a monograph on this timely topic.

**SUBMISSION INFORMATION**

*Abstracts for conference presentations should be a *maximum of 200 words.*
Submission deadline: 1 February 2021
Submission platform will be open soon!

***Please note that no individual may participate with more than two presentations as first presenter.***

**Presentation Formats:**
The following types of presentations will be included in the conference:

**Individual presentations:** Stand-alone oral presentations based on original research or empirical inquiry (15 minutes in length). *Note that the provision of the research papers to the conference organizers is not required unless requested by the respective WG coordinator.*

**Panel presentations:** Panels will comprise 4 inter-related oral presentations (each 15 minutes in length; see additional details below).

**Round tables:** Round tables will include 7-8 presentations that are 5 minutes in length. These will entail a quick brief overview or summary based on original research or empirical inquiry. *Note that submissions that are not accepted as individual presentations may be invited to present in the round table format instead.*

**Panel Submissions:**
Proposals for full panels should be submitted directly to the appropriate working group coordinator, and cc’d to Irina Goldenberg (Irina.Goldenberg@forces.gc.ca). The description of each working group, along with the contact information for the working group coordinators can be found at [http://ergomas.ch/index.php/working-groups](http://ergomas.ch/index.php/working-groups).

Abstracts for panel proposals should contain no more than 4 presentations (with a maximum of 200 words per presentation). **The overall panel description, as well as the abstracts and names of the presenters for each component presentation should be included in the submission.**

**Please note the following important dates:**
Submission deadline: 1 February 2021
Acceptance decisions: 1 March 2021
Draft program: 15 April 2021
Deadline for early registration: 15 May 2021
Deadline for registration: 15 June 2021
The IV ISA Forum of Sociology is to be held in Porto Alegre, Brazil, 14-18 July with the theme Democracy, Environment, Inequalities and Intersectionality. Fifty-two Research Committees and all our seven Working and Thematic Groups have confirmed their participation in this event. This is a major event for the ISA and a fantastic opportunity to foster global dialogues with strong insights from Latin American colleagues. RC01, has three panels at the ISA Forum next year, hosted as an online conference. These are:

- Sociología de los militares en América Latina [5 participants]
- Role & Conditions of Women in Conflict & Post-Conflict Zones [9 participants]
- New Professionalism in Armed and Security Forces / Nuevo profesionalismo en las Fuerzas Armadas y de seguridad [7 participants], JOINT SESSION WITH RC52

A big word of thanks to the Vice President of RC01, Celso Castro for organising these sessions. For further information on other panels see: https://www.isa-sociology.org/en/conferences/forum/porto-alegre-2020.

**BOOK PROJECT: COVID-19 AND COMPARATIVE DOMESTIC MILITARY DEPLOYMENTS**

**Coordinators: Lindy Heinecken and Christian Leuprecht**

In the course of the COVID-19 pandemic, militaries in several countries deployed to support civilian national authorities. This demand for military assistance comes on top of a quantitative and qualitative change in domestic military operations due to climate change, notably in containing wildfires and flooding and increasing deployment in public order duties in some countries. Enhanced demands and deployments have implications for operations, readiness, doctrine, policy, equipment, training, force generation, force employment, force structure, civil-military relations as well as federal and multilevel governance. This project intends to capture country specific observations, identify comparative findings, and draw out broader implications around the deployment of the military in domestic roles, whether law enforcement or dealing with other state emergencies. Here it would appear that the military’s main task in domestic operations is not capacity building but capacity replacement – the ability to surge specific competencies on short notice, but without an ability to sustain this over the medium term.

Similarly, the Covid-19 pandemic has brought about forth many challenges to both human and national security, as the military deployed in tasks not normally associated with their mandated roles and responsibilities. For this project, we are particularly interested in establishing how and in what roles the military was deployed, what challenges this posed in terms of their capacity, as well as overall governance and multisectoral cooperation. On the one hand, politicians may want to be seen as doing something; so, they call in the military even though that may not be the optimal response. On the other hand, the military presents a moral hazard for politicians, especially where armed forces are ill-equipped, trained and prepared for these tasks, or found guilty of human rights abuses. But, depending on the nature of the deployment and roles performed, this deployment could also be an opportunity for the armed forces to enhance their public profile, image and value.
In this regard, it is imperative to examine how the public perceives the deployment and what accountability measures are in place, if, or where abuses are reported.

*For this project we require contributors to look at the following:*

**General context**

- *What is the constitutional and legal basis for domestic military deployments:* How do domestic operations differ from Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief abroad? What sort of deployments are permissible, under what conditions and what civil authority must authorize such a deployment? How and under what conditions can substate entities ask for military assistance, and of what kind? Which institution ultimately decides on the mandate of the operation? Is deploying the military the sole prerogative of the political executive? If legislative approval required? Is there legislative or other oversight? In other words, is there civil oversight? Who decides on the rules of engagement?

- *Deployments:* What is the extent of domestic deployment (length, number of personnel, what personnel, what roles)? Describe the types of domestic military deployments (ideally over the past 25 years). Have deployments changed quantitatively or qualitatively? Are demands greater/different today than they were previously?

**Covid-19 and military deployment**

- *Mandate.* What was the constitutional and legal basis for the deployment of the military during Covid-19? Was this subject to legislative oversight and approval? Where the oversight mechanisms effective, or violated?

- *Planning, Intelligence and Command.* Is there sufficient planning, exercise and coordination between the military and civilian institutions? Is there a command structure defined in law for civil-military domestic operations? What is the scope of civilian (health) intelligence? Does the military only get involved when its operational support is requested? The failure of the Global Pandemic Health Intelligence Network aside, there was adequate intelligence to spur action, yet little or none was taken: “the allure of deferred decision” in the words of Richard Betts – by the civilian and political leadership.

- *Institutions.* Who were the principal other civilian institutions with which your armed forces interacted? Were these institutions adequately prepared to coordinate with the military? What Emergency Services Organizations (coordination capacity) exists to facilitate the response to Covid-19 and where did the military fit into the process. Have military operational norms such as having well-defined SOPs and command structures been problematic when working with civilian agencies and NGO’s in domestic operations?

- *Roles and tasks.* In what roles were the military deployed? Was it mainly in law enforcement, public order, border control or in humanitarian assistance or a combination of all. How has the military adapted to this change in domestic operations and operational tempo?

- *Force structure.* Who was deployed, the regular force, reserves, what branches or components were deployed and for how long? For example medical corps, infantry, engineering corps
• **Resourcing**: What state resources were made available to respond to the challenges posed by the Covid-19 pandemic? Are its civilian counterpart institutions sufficiently resourced? What challenges or shortcomings were experienced by the military in terms of personnel, equipment, funding in terms of the roles in which they were deployed.

• **Readiness**: How did your country’s military react to operational demands arising out of Covid-19? Have the demands of the pandemic caused your country’s military to rethink the balance between domestic operations and combat? How does frequency of domestic deployment impact overall combat readiness? How does the train and equipping of National Guard / Reserve units fit in the overall readiness and demands to generate general purpose combat capable forces?

• **Effectiveness**: How effective is the military at domestic operations and what sort of organizations challenges emerge as a result of domestic operations, in general and specifically with regard to Covid-19.

• **Culture**: Do the armed services accept domestic assistance as a legitimate role with an equal status to combat, or do they regard it as either an “other related duty” for which little preparation needs to be done or at worst an impediment to “real soldiering.” To what extent did military culture facilitate or hamper the deployment during Covid-19? Was the military culture problematic when working with civilian agencies, NGOs and interacting with the civilian population?

• **Public opinion**: What is the public image of the armed forces? And how does that shape its role in domestic operations (“Force of Last Resort” or “Force of Immediate Effect”)? What sort of debates are there about the deployment of the military in an internal role/policing/humanitarian aid? Has acceptance/non-acceptance of the domestic assistance role affected public opinion regarding the legitimacy and salience of the armed services? Have the norms of combat operations affected how the armed services carry out their domestic role?

• **Accountability and transparency**: What oversight mechanisms existed to regulate the deployment and conduct of the military? How were human rights or other violations by the military dealt with? To whom where they reported and how were they addressed?

• **Future**: How has the Covid-19 pandemic opened up debates on the future force design/structure and/or organisational transformation of the military?

If you are interested in participating in this book project, please email Lindy Heinecken, Lindy@sun.ac.za or Christian Leuprecht, christian.leuprecht@rmc-cmr.ca by January 2021. We plan to have a round table discussion on this topic at the Ergomas/RC01 conference.
BOOKS

2020
Social media has changed communication and interaction in today’s society. Its omnipresence affects the armed forces as well and presents opportunities and risks. The book covers the impact of social media in the everyday life of military personnel and analyses the extent to which social media influences their performance. Special attention is paid to the appearance of gender in military social media channels. Another focus is the new form of follow-up discussion on social media. The public perception of the armed forces shapes the public's opinion about them and can be used by the armed forces as a monitoring tool of society's attitudes towards them. The context in which armed forces are discussed is oftentimes beyond their sphere of influence and potentially leads to a loss of control. A severe manifestation occurs when social media is used to strategically distribute misinformation in order to shape public opinion and national security. https://www.springer.com/gp/book/9783030475109

Following up on the previous book on “Sociology and Military Studies” (Routledge, 2018), this book connects findings and insights authored by famous scholars in management and organization studies with challenges the military is facing today. Now the authors to be discussed are not sociology’s founding parents such as Max Weber, Karl Marx, Georg Simmel, Emile Durkheim, Jane Addams, W.E.B. Du Bois, Norbert Elias, Arlie Hochschild and others, but scholars such as Henry Mintzberg, Karl Weick, Mary Parker Follett, James March, Chester Barnard, Chris Argyris, Micheal Porter, Jeffrey Pfeffer, Rosabeth Moss Kanter, Nils Brunsson and others. Organizational sociology is what ties these two books together. https://www.routledge.com/Management-and-Military-Studies-Classical-and-Current-Foundations/Soeters/p/book/9780367198978

This book examines how the South African National Defence Force has adapted to the country’s new security, political and social environment since 1994. In South Africa’s changed political state, how has civilian control of the military been implemented and what does this mean for ‘defence in a democracy'? This book presents an overview of the security environment, how the mission focus of the military has changed and the implications for force procurement, force preparation, force employment and force sustainability. The author addresses other issues, such as: the effect of integrating former revolutionary soldiers into a professional armed force; the effect of affirmative action on meritocracy, recruitment and retention; military veterans, looking at the difficulties they face in reintegrating back into society and finding gainful employment; gender equality and mainstreaming; the rise of military unions and why a confrontational, instead of a more corporatist approach to labour relations has emerged; HIV/AIDS and the consequences this holds for the military in terms of its operational effectiveness. In closing, the author highlights key events that have caused the SANDF to become ‘lost in transition and transformation’, spelling out some lessons learned. The conclusions she draws are pertinent for the future of defence, security and civil-military relations of countries around the world. https://www.springer.com/gp/book/9783030337339

Rivera-Paez, S. (2020) *Military and Identity. Self-representation and peace-building in the officer corps of the Colombian Armed Forces*. This book discusses who are the officers of the Military Forces in Colombia and what are their perceptions, convictions and discussions about a vital issue in the country: peace-building. In the midst of the current ideological, political, social and economic disputes, which imply short, medium and long term transformations of the military organization, this book aims to build bridges between social sciences and the military environment, to explore new scenarios of cooperative work. This is a completely new research in the country on the composition, mentality and identities of the Colombian military officers' corps, made in the framework of the Doctorate of Social and Human Sciences of the Pontificia Universidad Javeriana.

2019


Levy, Y. (2019) *Whose Life Is Worth More? Hierarchies of Risk and Death in Contemporary Wars*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. Modern democracies face tough life-and-death choices in armed conflicts. Chief among them is how to weigh the value of soldiers' lives against those of civilians on both sides. The first of its kind, *Whose Life Is Worth More?* reveals that how these decisions are made is much more nuanced than conventional wisdom suggests. When these states are entangled in prolonged conflicts, hierarchies emerge and evolve to weigh the value of human life. Yagil Levy delves into a wealth of contemporary conflicts, including the drone war in Pakistan, the Kosovo war, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and the US and UK wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Cultural narratives about the nature and necessity of war, public rhetoric about external threats facing the nation, antiwar movements, and democratic values all contribute to the perceived validity of civilian and soldier deaths. By looking beyond the military to the cultural and political factors that shape policies, this
book provides tools to understand how democracies really decide whose life is worth more. [https://www.sup.org/books/title/?id=30360](https://www.sup.org/books/title/?id=30360)
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We hope that you enjoyed reading this issue of RC 01’s newsletter.