2 Intelligence: concept, process, institution, and political context

What is intelligence, and what is its concept? What models are used to process intelligence? Moreover, what is its relation with its (political) context? This chapter explores insights into these aspects of intelligence.

To begin with, the concept of intelligence is presented (2.1). An explanation is given concerning the extent the field of intelligence has been developed as a discipline. This sets limits to the way issues as methods can be dealt with (chapter 3).

After this first positioning of intelligence, some basic insights in the intelligence process are given (2.2), starting with different models of the intelligence process. This gives a context to the analysis (which is object of study of chapter 3). In these models, the input and output of information play an important role. Therefore, separate attention is paid to the different types of intelligence collection, and the different types of intelligence products. Concerning the intelligence products, more in-depth discussion explains the issue of warning.

After this introduction of concepts and processes, attention is paid to the more general context of intelligence analysis. First, the organizational aspects are dealt with (2.3). Insights are explored on the relationship between organization and quality. The concept of a Review Section is discussed. In addition, there is a discussion about training and education.

This introductory chapter is concluded by setting intelligence in its political context (2.4). Because intelligence functions as part of a political (or a corporate) system, attention is paid to the relation between intelligence and politics. In this way, a division is made between chapter 2 and 3. Where as chapter 2 emphasizes the relation between analysts and politics (relevance, acceptance), the emphasis in chapter 3 is on the relation between analysts and the investigation (validity, reliability, robustness). Part of the discussion on analysis and politics, concerns also the relation between openness and quality. As there is more to openness and quality than just a political aspect, this issue is dealt with as a separate – and final – issue of this chapter.

2.1 Concept

What is the concept of intelligence? To what extent has intelligence studies been developed as a discipline? Together with some very basic features, these questions are discussed in this section.
The concept of intelligence

What is intelligence? There are many definitions of intelligence. Sometimes it is used to describe a product, sometimes to describe a process, or both. In this study, the concept of intelligence is used for the analysis of information processes within public and private organizations, which play a role in the prevention and repression of (organized) crime, fraud, and infringement of a democratic legal order.¹ Intelligence is information that is gathered, processed, and/or analyzed for actors or decision makers. If these actors are national decision makers, it is often called national intelligence – intelligence on international security issues. Yet, intelligence may also be used by companies or for domestic security.²

As noted, there are many definitions of intelligence. Sometimes, in contrast with the actual reality of agencies the definition of intelligence is restricted to secret information (yet, open sources form the majority of information); information that is designed for action (but, not always the case); information, which is meant for national public policymakers (but intelligence can also be meant for sister agencies or even companies); or to information about countries or national intelligence (excluding intelligence on persons or domestic intelligence).³ The chosen definition does not have these drawbacks mentioned.

Intelligence has the power to multiply the value and effectiveness of the forces used by policymakers and other actors to combat a danger. Yet, intelligence is a fallible asset. It is likely that you can find for every successful application of intelligence, as a force enhancer, a counter example where intelligence failed to live up to its potential.⁴ Furthermore, intelligence is generally not the only information on a certain issue that reaches an actor or a decision maker.

Intelligence is often referred to as the division between domestic and international security. Domestic security refers to security within the national boundaries. Its aim is to counter threats manifesting itself within the country. Foreign intelligence relates to actors or matters beyond the national boundaries. It is aimed at operating abroad and getting information on anything that an agency wants to know about foreign actors.⁵ Of course, there are overlaps. Foreign intelligence is about issues such as verification of arms treaties, warning for war and international terrorism, strategic planning, or the nature, capabilities,

¹ Van der Aart/editorial, “Erasmus Centre for Police Studies,” NISA Newsletter, Spring 1997, No. 1, Year 6, 19.
³ Ibid., 13-14. In Intelligence en de oorlog in Bosnië, it is explained that many definitions have some serious limitations (Wiebes, Intelligence en de oorlog in Bosnië 1992-1995, 2002, 14-16). The definition used in this study does not have the limitations that are evaluated here. Still, it is oriented towards democratic legal orders, in regards to its phrase on ‘infringement of a democratic legal order.’
⁴ Probst, “Intelligence as a Force Enhancer,” CIA’s Studies in Intelligence (CIA/SII), Winter 1987, 61, 67.
and intentions of foreign opponents. Domestic security relates to issues such as counterespionage, terrorism, or political violent activism.

**Intelligence and security agency reports and intelligence studies: a characterization**

Following this first definition of the field, we will now provide an overview of how this field has been developed.

Within intelligence, several activities take prominence. First, there is the collection of information and the production of intelligence and security agency reports. Second, there are activities as operations, security and counter intelligence measures, and covert diplomacy. As this study is on the quality of intelligence and security agency reports, the focus is on the first activity – to collect information and to produce reports. This first activity is characterized by some general features. Although these features do not apply to all individual cases of producing reports, they do help us to gain an overview of what takes place. These features also show that the practice of producing a report is a difficult one. The features that will be described here will be return to in chapter 3 to discuss the characteristics of different types of intelligence research, and to help develop the criteria of the ex ante instrument. In general, the production of intelligence and security agency reports is characterized by the following features:

1. **Interdisciplinary.** In many cases, analysts combine methods, data, and findings from completely different professional fields into one analysis. What methods and concepts are adequate, given a certain question? Moreover, how should data from different perspectives be integrated?

2. **Future oriented.** To serve politics, intelligence is future oriented. As the future is unknown, it is by definition a hard field to explore. An element of speculation is often included in intelligence and security agency reports. This element of speculation is more prominently present than in science. The risks that analysts take into account when speculating, make their job a vulnerable one.

3. **Inaccessible data.** Agencies often deal with opponents and hidden factors. The resulting inaccessibility of data can be described in two ways. First, there is a greater chance than in most disciplines that information is safeguarded or manipulated – especially by opponents. Second, a feature of intelligence is that key information is often absent – for example, concerning the intentions of an opponent.

4. **Small chance - high impact.** To assess risks, analysts often deal with events that are hard to predict, because they are characterized by a small chance the event will actually take place, but if it takes place the impact is high. This

---


7 This is often referred to as an (intelligence) mission – in which one person, or a group of people, carry out an intelligence assignment.
also highlights the costs of failure. To predict – or to predict in a precise way – is complicated as such events often depend on a chain of conditions.

5. **Specific and applied nature.** Intelligence deals with expectations that are often more concrete and specific than in science. The expectations are about issues of a particular period and area. It is very much an applied discipline. The combination of being applied and interdisciplinary sets a difficult task to combine several concepts and findings in an overreaching model.

6. **The position as supplier.** Agencies are in most cases suppliers of intelligence products – an exception being when reports are directly used in operations. In general, the intelligence community does not make the decision on the policy to be carried out. Intelligence subsequently can only serve as a force enhancer. This is a sub-ordinate, dependent, position.

7. **Control is complicated.** Public agencies take a special position within the governmental bureaucracy. Secrecy of an agency and the fear of politicians being compromised with the knowledge of ‘political touchy’ information can hamper control. Lack of adequate control has the risk that problems will pile up eventually.

The first five features, described above, are directly related to knowledge itself. The sixth and seventh features are institutional. The methods used in producing a report must fit the first six features. This is not an easy task. A further complication is the nature of the literature on intelligence. Much attention is paid to practice and aberrations. Yet, relatively little is published on how to do the research, especially in relation to theory and methodology. This study has to cope with this state of affairs. Therefore it has set limits to the questions researched and to the solutions presented.

Although intelligence is a relatively new discipline, it can be positioned between other disciplines. In order to provide an overview, the locus and focus of intelligence studies are presented in comparison with political science, law, and economy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>intelligence studies</th>
<th>political science</th>
<th>law</th>
<th>economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>locus</strong></td>
<td>security, threats &amp; risks</td>
<td>public policy</td>
<td>conflict</td>
<td>distribution of productive income and capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>focus</strong></td>
<td>anticipation</td>
<td>power</td>
<td>what ought to be</td>
<td>scarcity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a discipline, more is needed than just the locus and focus. A discipline also rests on definitions, concepts, methods and the continuous development of a body of theories. The following table illustrates elements that are present or absent in intelligence studies.
Table 2.2 Intelligence studies as a discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements discipline</th>
<th>Already known/developed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>locus</td>
<td>yes: security, threats &amp; risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus</td>
<td>yes: anticipation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definitions/concepts</td>
<td>yes: many definitions of key concepts are formulated;³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>some general agreement on concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>methods</td>
<td>hardly any arrangement in the choice and use of methods;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>white spots/methods need to be developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of theory</td>
<td>no explicit theory; body of knowledge:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>based on intuition and experience, not formulated explicitly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following this introduction to intelligence, now attention is paid to an issue that is more closely related to the issue of intelligence and security agency reports themselves – the research process that leads to the production of intelligence and security agency reports.

### 2.2 INTELLIGENCE PROCESS

What do intelligence processes look like? What are their in- and output? The central research question of this study focuses on the quality of intelligence and security agency reports. Such reports are the output of an intelligence process. For a detailed understanding of the issue of the quality of reports, it is helpful to obtain some insights into this process. In this section, the production of intelligence is explored. There are several models that describe this process – including the often quoted ‘intelligence cycle’. These models and their different phases are presented and explained. Each of these models (2.2.1) – used within the intelligence community – is thought to give a specific yet different perspective. Models are by definition a simplification of essential features of an external phenomenon.

In all models, analysis plays a crucial role. As the analysis is so crucial – especially for the quality of a report – it is the object of study in chapter 3. A discussion of the models is presented here to provide understanding for chapter 3, and to set it in context.

In addition, extra attention is given to the input and output of information that these models produce – collection and report. In 2.2.2, information is given on the different types of intelligence collection. In 2.2.3, information is given about the different types of intelligence products. Warning is a special and

---

³ The issue of definitions is widely known and an old one within the literature. It is even practice in related fields, such as studies on the police (for example: Frost & Morris, *Police Intelligence Reports*, 1983, III-VII). In Dutch publications for example, terms are also well defined, as in De Graaf & Wiebes, *Villa Maarheeze*, 1998, 493-497.
characteristic type of such an intelligence product – and therefore is also given attention.

2.2.1 Three models

Intelligence and security agency reports are the result of collecting, processing, and analyzing information. To describe the intelligence process, different models are used – the intelligence cycle, the intelligence matrix, and the warning cycle. Each model provides a specific perspective of the research process. We start with the model that is most referred to in the literature on intelligence – the intelligence cycle.

The intelligence cycle

The intelligence cycle is described in many ways. However, in all descriptions, the following phases can be distinguished – to design, to collect, to process, to analyze, to report, and to disseminate. The intelligence cycle is a phase-model of the research process.

*Design*[^9]

Almost every research process starts with a design. This means an inventory of the needs and consumers within the whole intelligence issue. The central research questions are formulated. In such a phase, literature is explored and key intelligence requirements are arranged. In such requirements, special issues or areas are identified that are thought to be of special interest for policymakers.[^10] This phase influences decisions to be made later on in the process. By having defined the consumers and their needs, the goal of the intelligence issue at hand is formulated. This leads to the definition of the problem. In turn, it also indicates the methods that could be used to carry out the investigation.

*Collection*

The second phase of the research process is the collection of information. Collection involves the gathering of raw data. Collection is the acquisition of

[^9]: In one presentation of the intelligence cycle, the design is split into two steps. In this approach, the first step is the identification of the need for intelligence and the translation of this need into requirements. The second step is the tasking (Hulnick, “The Intelligence Producer-Policy Consumer Linkage,” CIA/SII, Winter 1985, 75-76). In the literature on intelligence, the design is sometimes referred to as planning and direction. Yet, the problem with this characterization is that for some authors this implies the first phase only, while others stress that with planning and control actually is means the management of the entire intelligence effort – from the identification of the need for data to the final delivery of a report to a consumer. Compare, for example Johnson, *America’s Secret Power*, 1989, 76-77 with: Milberg, *The U.S. Intelligence Community*, 1980, Appendix I-3. For an alternative presentation of the intelligence cycle as a figure, see: Gordon, “Winners and Losers,” *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence*, Fall 1986, 5.

specified information, from denied and open sources and regions, using both human and technological means, and that is relevant to a security policy.\footnote{This definition deviates from the one by deGraffenreid. He argues, for example, that collection is made by special means, while ordinary means are increasingly important for the research process (de Graffenreid, “Intelligence and the Oval Office,” \textit{Intelligence requirements for the 1980’s}, 1986, 11).}

\textit{Processing}

The third phase is about processing. This concerns the conversion of the vast amount of information that comes into the system to a form more suitable for the production of intelligence and security agency reports. Processing involves activities such as language translations, decryption, and sorting information by subject matter. Processing also includes data reduction and interpretation of information stored on film and tape.\footnote{Milberg, \textit{The U.S. Intelligence Community}, 1980, Appendix I-3.} Processing serves as the most dominant filter.

\textit{Analysis}

The fourth phase of the research process is the analysis. This is the conversion of basic information into an intelligence analysis. It includes the integration, evaluation, and analysis of the data available.\footnote{Ibid.} In this phase, analysts integrate and evaluate the often fragmentary and contradictory raw material.\footnote{Ibid.} They draw the conclusions concerning the central questions.

\textit{Report}

To report is the fifth phase of the research process. This is different from the preceding phase, as it does not concern the analytical aspect of the research process. It deals with items such as presentation techniques, writing strategies, the information presented, and the structure of a report.

\textit{Dissemination}

This is the sixth and the last phase of the intelligence cycle. This is the distribution and the handling of the finished intelligence product to the consumers. Consumers can be people within the intelligence community, or, for example, domestic and foreign policymakers. This phase also concerns the reception and eventual feedback of the policymakers.

\textit{Limitations of the model of the intelligence cycle}

The intelligence cycle is a model that distinguishes different phases within the research process. This model, however, does not serve to interpret all aspects of
the research process. While the research process does not often end with finished intelligence, the semi-finished product is still intelligence.

Furthermore, there are standing requirements for intelligence that do not need to be defined repeatedly every time, such as design.

Above all, the research process is often deviated from when passing through all the phases of the intelligence cycle. This happens, for example, in times of crises when policymakers are especially interested in raw intelligence (collection).

Finally, not all the information enters the intelligence cycle. This happens as an effect of the compartmentalization and the need-to-know principle within agencies. This effect may also be enhanced by competition between agencies or units. 15

In practice, the research process is not as straightforward as the model indicates. Sometimes, steps are passed over. On even more occasions, there are loops and feedback moments to earlier phases of the intelligence cycle during the research process. To cope with such aspects and to obtain a different type of insight, another model has been developed – the intelligence matrix.

The intelligence matrix

The intelligence matrix – a newer model than the intelligence cycle – differs from the intelligence cycle in terms of the type of understanding that is obtained. Where the intelligence cycle is oriented on the phases of the research process, the intelligence matrix is product-oriented. It is based on the idea that the research process is organized – that there is a division of labor. Within the CIA, some prefer the intelligence matrix as it makes the various aspects of the intelligence-policy relationship more clear.

The traditional intelligence cycle describes accurately the phases of the research process, whether or not the steps of the model have a sequential nature. Nevertheless, within the intelligence community there was a need for a newer model, as the process is more complex than indicated by the intelligence cycle. First, there is a large difference between the requirements for the collection and the requirements for the analysis. While collection requirements are usually a result of finding gaps in existing data, the analytical requirements are focused in another direction – the need for a policy response on an issue. Second, during the collection, energy is also put into analysis – to evaluate raw data, to put data in a usable format, to put data in their perspective, or to remind users about other reports on the same issue. Third, some parts of the research process work sequentially, but other parts are carried out almost autonomously.

To meet these demands, a model was developed in which the process is understood as a matrix of interconnected parts rather than a sequence of activities – the intelligence matrix. In the intelligence matrix, it is assumed that the steps may take place synchronously. There is feedback as the steps are

passed through and the streams of activities deviate from a chronological sequence. In the intelligence matrix, the process is seen as three parallel streams of activities:
1. collection;
2. production;
3. support and services.\footnote{16}

Collection and production – the first two pillars – have many parallel features. The most important ones are:

- **Requirements.** To fill in gaps in collection capabilities (collection) or to formulate requirements for analysis, research and evaluation (production).
- **Management and planning.** To assign collection requirements to appropriate collection resources (collection), or to translate political issues into a question for analysts (production). In both cases, monitoring is needed.
- **Collection.** In most large organizations, this is unique for the collection pillar.
- **Analysis.** Collectors also analyze to evaluate raw data. They analyze to see if information is significant, reliable, accurate, or unambiguous. Collectors may add analytical commentary.
- **Production.** This often takes the shape of constructing a standardized format. It also permits the protection of the sensitivity of material.
- **Dissemination.** The consumers receive the information they need. This applies to raw reporting from the collection pillar, as well as reports from the production pillar.
- **Evaluation.** There are different views on this step. Some see it as a function of management, while others argue it is an independent or autonomous process carried out by professionals.\footnote{17}

From the perspective of the relation between producer and consumer, most of the elements of both the collection and production pillars have a link with the consumer. In this model, it can be defined more clearly how important these links are, and what priorities should be assigned to such links. The importance and priorities will vary with the type of intelligence products, as each product has a particular impact on the policy process.\footnote{18}

Support and services is the third pillar. It deals with items as physical and personnel security, counter-intelligence, psychological warfare/propaganda operations, library services, or translations.

\footnote{16}{Hulnick, “The Intelligence Producer-Policy Consumer Linkage,” CIA/SII, Winter 1985, 76-79.}
\footnote{17}{Ibid. See also: Hulnick, “Managing Analysis Strategies for Playing the end Game,” *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence*, Fall 1988, 323-326.}
\footnote{18}{For more, see Hulnick, “The Intelligence Producer-Policy Consumer Linkage,” CIA/SII, Winter 1985, 79-85.}
If applied to the production of intelligence and security agency reports, the intelligence matrix can be presented as follows.\textsuperscript{19}

\begin{table}
\centering
\caption{The intelligence matrix}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|}
\hline
 & Collection of data & Production of report & Support & Services \\
\hline
project ——— report 1 & management requirements & management requirements & administration \\
& tasking & tasking & security \\
& collection & analysis & counter-intelligence \\
& collation & production & covert action \\
& & dissemination & inspection & audit \\
& & evaluation & liaison \\
\hline
project ——— report 2 & & & \\
\hline
project ——— report 3 & & & \\
\hline
project ——— report n & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

As noted, this model leaves more room for feedback procedures, and is in this respect closer to the actual proceedings than the intelligence cycle, in which feedback procedures are less well represented. It also focuses more directly on the parallels between collection and production – it makes the various links between the pillars and the consumers more clear (the intelligence-policy relationship). Moreover, the advantage of the intelligence cycle is that it describes the phases of the research process more clearly.

There is also a third model. However, this model does not stem from the intelligence community, but from a completely different discipline – psychology.

\textbf{The warning cycle}

The warning cycle is developed from another perspective. The steps of the warning cycle – also characterized as the cognitive warning cycle – were compiled by psychologists in the natural disaster branch of warning.

The type of understanding obtained from the warning cycle, differs from that of the intelligence cycle (phases of the research process) and the intelligence matrix (streams of activities). The warning cycle is action-oriented. In the warning cycle essential questions are ‘is the recognized danger genuine,’ ‘when do you warn’ and ‘how do you reach and stimulate the decision maker to act?’

In the warning cycle, the following six steps are distinguished. The first four concern intelligence, the last two relate to decision making. These final two steps mean a different approach compared with the intelligence cycle and the intelligence matrix, because decision-making is explicitly included.

\textsuperscript{19} This is a reworked version of: Hulnick, “Controlling Intelligence Estimates,” \textit{Controlling Intelligence}, 1991, 84. Hulnick’s version was actually a representation in three columns – it was not represented as a matrix.
Intelligence

1. **Recognition.** Early recognition is often the weakest link because the information available is limited and ambiguous.\(^{20}\)

2. **Validation.** The danger is genuine, and not a product of imagination. Validation usually involves some additional collection and analyzing. Prior hypotheses are tested and new ones are formulated to accommodate new information on the danger.

3. **Definition.** The agency fills in the blanks about the danger in terms of: nature, gravity, probability of occurrence, timing, and duration.

4. **Communication.** In this model, the producer of intelligence does not only warn a consumer, but also stimulates them to take action.

Decision-making

5. **Evaluation.** The decision maker evaluates independently the threat.

6. **Action.** The decision maker acts.

Though presented sequentially, the six steps are best understood as nearly simultaneous, continuous, interactive, and iterative. In the literature, it is argued that one of the conditions for success is that the participants in the warning cycle understand each other (2.4.1).\(^{21}\)

In presenting the warning cycle as six successive phases, the model illustrates similarities with the intelligence cycle. By understanding this model as nearly simultaneous and interactive, it also illustrates its similarity with the intelligence matrix. Despite this, the warning cycle differs from both models. It focuses on decision-making and on when and how to act. In this section, only the warning cycle itself is discussed. Warning as a *product* is part of the section on intelligence products – 2.2.3.

All three models – the intelligence cycle, the intelligence matrix, and the warning cycle – are useful to formulate activities and products. All three provide a partial insight – from different perspectives – to set priorities and to steer a course. To obtain insights from different perspectives supports the planning and coordination of intelligence, especially if problems occur or large tasking is at hand. Concerning the field of application, each model appears to be useful in a particular way:

- The intelligence cycle is most suited to explain the *research process* of intelligence.
- The intelligence matrix is most suited to provide insight into the *links of different intelligence products* – especially in relation to the importance and priorities of links, from the collection and production pillars with the *consumers*. It also provides insight in the parallels between collection and production.

\(^{20}\) It may be that the conceptual framework to recognize indications are also underdeveloped.

• The warning cycle is most suited to obtain insights of the interaction between producers and decision makers from the perspective of *when and how to act* by a decision maker, in order to deal with the danger.

Now that these three models on the intelligence process are discussed, it is time to explore the types of input and output products – respectively types of collection, and types of intelligence products.

### 2.2.2 The input – types of collection

In the following two sections, the input and output of the intelligence process are presented. On the input side, there is a wide variety of sources that agencies use. Within this wide variety, three main types of collection can be distinguished – collection from open sources, human intelligence, and technical intelligence. Each type is composed of different sub-types. The main characteristics of each type of collection are described.

#### Open sources

Open sources include a variety of sources. These can be sources such as papers, periodicals, books, governmental and scientific publications, radio and TV broadcasting, internet, commercial on-line services, and limited access electronic data basis – as maintained, for example, by universities and businesses. They are anything that is published in print, broadcasted, or electronically accessible – also when it has to be paid for.

In terms of quantity, open sources are the main sources of information. It is estimated that most agencies currently receive approximately 80-85% of their information from open sources. However, the contribution from the different fields varies. Open sources rarely contribute to target assistance, for example, in the case of denied area coverage by classified sources. For strategic economic intelligence, however, almost all information will come from open sources.22

Although the majority of incoming information is from open sources they have received relatively little attention in intelligence studies. This has changed somewhat over the last years. This change in attention has also led to a new arrangement of open sources. In this new division, two types of open sources are distinguished. First, the open source information that is legally available, and is obtainable at a relatively low cost. This does not mean, it does not have to be paid for, as for example in the case of databases (e.g. from Lloyd’s). The second open source is open proprietary information, relating to products. Such products are legally obtained, but some costs are required in order to commission reverse engineering studies to extract information from the product. For example, a missile is bought in order to study the missile guidance software and hardware.23

---


Human intelligence (HUMINT)

There are two main types of covert data collection – human intelligence (HUMINT) and technical intelligence (TECHINT). Of these two, human intelligence is sometimes characterized as the classical form of espionage. HUMINT is information that stems from a human source. It includes a wide range of activities from direct reconnaissance and observation to the interviewing of informants and spies.24

Not all of these activities need to be covert. Under such circumstances, open human sources are a possibility, as for example contacts with academics, journalists, or leaders and operators of organizations.25 Nevertheless, overt HUMINT does not necessarily mean sources are open to anyone. Such examples of HUMINT refer to collection through reports by diplomats and attachés, or official contacts and correspondence with foreign intelligence and security agencies. It also includes systematic debriefing of refugees, immigrants, defectors, or released hostages. All these types are considered overt or non-secretive, contrary to the covert or clandestine HUMINT. Clandestine HUMINT is normally obtained by the use of a case-officer and his stable of agents. It often provides information that is obtainable in no other way.26

In the literature, several divisions of types of HUMINT are made, for example:

- strategic HUMINT (long term, more high level sources) and tactical HUMINT (collected in the field – field HUMINT – and time-sensitive);
- HUMINT by interrogation of unwilling sources (e.g. prisoners of war), and HUMINT by debriefing (e.g. refugees, defectors, deserters).27

Technical intelligence (TECHINT)

The second type of the covert collection is technical intelligence (TECHINT). TECHINT is about the technical collection of information, the covert collection through technical means such as photography, film, or electronic interception. TECHINT is – compared to HUMINT – the modern form of covert intelligence, and has become increasingly more important.28 The methods of TECHINT involve normally scientists and technical operators with their equipment.29 There are three main groups of TECHINT – signals intelligence (SIGINT), imagery intelligence (IMINT), and measurement and signature intelligence (MASINT).

25 Steele, Open Source Intelligence, 1996, chapter 2, section 2013.
Signals intelligence (SIGINT)

Within TECHINT, an important place is reserved for signals intelligence (SIGINT). SIGINT is a source which includes a wide variety of types of electronic interceptions. Yet, there is more to SIGINT than just a source – it is a more generic term for describing both the interception, processing, and analysis of electronic interceptions. This applies to all the different forms of TECHINT's.\(^30\) The INT’s that are presented here are types of sources that focus on how (or where) they generate their data from – rather than their product. SIGINT comprises activities such as COMINT (communications intelligence),\(^31\) ELINT (electronic intelligence),\(^32\) or TELINT (telemetry intelligence).\(^33\)

Imagery intelligence

Imagery intelligence (IMINT) deals with the exploitation, development, and dissemination of multi-sensor imagery products in support of war-fighting operations and other activities. Likewise, this form of TECHINT is not only limited to collection. What is collected, interpreted, analyzed, collated and evaluated is imagery to determine the number, type, dimensions, location, and the significance of subjects such as industrial installations, transportation, networks, military offensive and defensive systems, installations, and activities. Data can be obtained by, for example, airborne reconnaissance, border photography, satellite imagery, or even open sources. IMINT is par excellence the activity that allows the commander to see the battlefield in real time as the operation progresses.\(^34\)

Measurement and signature intelligence (MASINT)

Measurement and signature intelligence (MASINT) refers already to a product, rather than a source. Nevertheless, it also refers to special sensor disciplines that are a clue for the sources. MASINT as a product is obtained by data analysis

---

\(^{30}\) Ibid., 41.

\(^{31}\) COMINT is technical and intelligence information derived from the interception of (foreign) communications by individuals or groups who are not the intended recipients (Richelson & Ball, *The ties that bind*, 1985, 101, 175). Some main activities are cipher/code breaking and traffic analysis.

\(^{32}\) ELINT is information derived from (foreign) non-communications, electromagnetic radiations emanating from other than atomic detonation or radioactive sources (Richelson & Ball, *The ties that bind*, 1985, 101, 176). Some common ELINT targets are transmissions by radar stations and navigation systems.

\(^{33}\) TELINT is aimed at the telemetry of missiles. Telemetry is the set of signals by which a missile, or stage of a missile, or a missile warhead sends back to earth data about its performance during a test flight. It is a source, for example, to monitor compliance with SALT agreements. To make it more complicated, TELINT is also a subcategory of FISINT – foreign instrumentation signals intelligence. Foreign instrumentation signals are electromagnetic emissions associated with aerospace, surface, and subsurface systems. FISINT includes, among others, telemetry, beaconing, electronic interrogators, tracking/fusing/arming/command systems and video data links. Sources: Richelson & Ball, *The ties that bind*, 1985, 102, 177; www.fas.org/irp/doddir/usaf/afpm/14-210/part16.htm.

derived from sensing instruments, other than those generally used for communications, electronics, or imagery collection. The quantitative and qualitative analysis concerns types of data such as metric, angle, spatial, wave length, time dependent, modulation, plasma, and hydro-magnetic data. MASINT collection and processing is shifting with the fielding of modern weapons systems. The last five years there have been significant developments for the relatively new field of MASINT.  

Confusion

TECHINT varieties are a source of confusion, not only because there are so many types. First, it is a field of almost endless abbreviations. Even in a relatively early publication of 1985 on this field – *The Ties That Bind* by Richelson and Ball – it opened with nine pages of acronyms and abbreviations.

A second source for confusion lies in the prospect that an abbreviation is not a direct clue for its meaning, especially if there are so many. Moreover, there is a probability it will lead to explicit or implicit doubles. This actually does occur with, for example, the abbreviation EW. In the same publication, in one instance EW stands for early warning. A few pages later, however, in the abbreviation REWSON, EW stands for electronic warfare.

A third source for confusion is caused by different classifications of types of TECHINT’s. In one publication, it is possible RADINT is characterized as a type of SIGINT, while in another publication it is seen as a type of MASINT.

As noted, the TECHINT’s do not refer to only collection. Yet, by naming the TECHINT’s, especially from the perspective ‘from which’ or ‘on what’ data is gathered, insights can be gained from the input of an intelligence community. In the following section, the focus shifts to the output.

2.2.3 The output – intelligence products

In this section, the output of the intelligence process is presented. This provides a closer idea of the intelligence process concerning the different types of products that reaches a consumer. The types presented do not refer so much to a classification by area or subject, but to the nature of the product itself. As we

---

35 MASINT includes, among others, the following special sensor disciplines: radar intelligence (RADINT), acoustical intelligence (ACINT/ACOUSTINT), nuclear intelligence – including sampling radio-active materials and seismology records (NUCINT), unintended radiation intelligence (RINT), electro-optical intelligence (ELECTRO-OPINT), event-related dynamic measurement photogaphy (DMPINT), laser intelligence (LASINT), radio frequency/electromagnetic pulse intelligence (RF/EMPINT), chemical and biological intelligence (CBINT), directed energy weapons intelligence (DEWINT), infrared intelligence (IRINT), spectroscopic intelligence, materials intelligence, or effluent/debris collection. Source: www.fas.org/irp/doddir/usaaf/afpam/14-210/part16.htm; www.fas.org/irp/ program/masint.htm.

36 Reconnaissances, Electronic Warfare, Special Operations and Naval Intelligence.

37 Richelson & Ball, *The ties that bind*, 1985, XI and XV.

will see, such output products do not necessarily have to pass through all the
stages of processing.

After the presentation of the output products, special attention is given to the
issue of warning. The warning as an output will illustrate more closely the
relation between product and implementation of intelligence.

**Types of intelligence products**

Each type of intelligence product has a particular impact on the policy process. Therefore, each product has a different level of importance for the relationship
between producer and consumer.

- The first type of product warns – warning intelligence. Policymakers want
  an agency to discover crisis events, and want to rely on its vigilance to alert
  them. For this, an agency may develop a list of indicators. With the help of
  this list, an agency monitors targets on a regular basis. It analyzes whether
  deviations from a steady state suggest the possibility of change. Depending
  on the priority and importance, some targets are monitored constantly, but
  others only periodically.

- A second type of product is the information on a daily basis – current
  intelligence. An agency has to ascertain what policymakers would ask, if
  they could. Current intelligence is often used to alert policymakers to
  problems at the pre-crisis or sub-crisis level. It has more a journalistic than
  an estimative content.

- The third type of product is the compilation of encyclopedic data – basic
  intelligence. It is often used in research on policy matters. It often includes a
  feedback aspect. It is then used to decide what gaps in basic knowledge
  ought to be filled, what questions ought to be addressed, and what issues
  will probably need attention.

- The fourth type of product is estimative intelligence. Its function is as an
  input to the policy process and it has the greatest potential impact. In
  reports, analysts make both an analysis and an assessment. Based upon
  these elements, analysts provide estimative judgments of future
developments and recommendations.

- The last type of product is raw intelligence. Although it is sometimes
  referred to as unevaluated reporting, it is often evaluated by collectors, but it
  is not compared with reports from other sources. Raw reports have become
  a more regular intelligence product. It has the danger of bias if policymakers
do not review all relevant material.  

---

intelligence is usually from a single source (Britt Snider, “Congress as a User of Intelligence,”
http://www.odci.gov/csi/studies/98unclas/congres.html, under heading ‘How Intelligence-sharing
Works’).

Different classifications of types of output are possible, see for example: Herman, *Intelligence*, 1996,
this study is of a general nature and oriented towards the actual product.
As with the input, the demarcation between output and other – and preceding – phases of the processing is not always that sharp. An output product as raw intelligence bears all the features of the collection phase.

The receptivity by policymakers of different types of intelligence products may differ. The receptivity of basic intelligence is uniformly high. Current intelligence – with its journalistic content – is often criticized as being superficial. The greatest criticism concerns estimates, especially when policymakers do not like the conclusions. Subsequently, these policymakers view them as undermining the policy process.\(^{40}\)

Other classifications are possible.\(^{41}\) In the literature on intelligence, it is claimed that policymakers value the product based on brevity, being on time, and relevance, and they value it in that order. Intelligence producers tend to reverse those priorities.\(^ {42}\) In the following section, a further example is given of the relation ‘output – consumers’, with particular emphasis on product warning.

**On warning**

This section serves two functions. First, it explores the important issue of warning. Furthermore – as this also is an aim of chapter 2 – some elementary insights are explored concerning the relation between producer and consumer (2.4). In 2.2.1, the warning cycle as an action-oriented model was presented. In this section of 2.2.3, the relation between the producer of warning and its consumer is illustrated from this action-oriented perspective.

There are three primary warning outcomes: success, failure, and false alarm. Success often takes the nature of a self-denying prediction. If there is a danger,\(^ {43}\) and adequate measures are taken, the harm it predicts will be deterred, avoided, contained, or cushioned. Therefore, a warning is considered a success when it leads to a process that develops deliberate, well-reasoned measures, which avoid surprise and harm. Early action generally leads to the lowest costs.


\(^ {41}\) For example, more in line with the INT’s presented in 2.2.2. There is also another classification concerning types of intelligence. This classification is based upon the spectrum of policy fields: biographic, political, sociological, geographic, military, economic, and scientific intelligence (Thomas, “Geographic Intelligence,” CIA/SII, A2. Compare: Wiebes, “Hookers and sports cars?” 1996, 14). The reports by the Shipping Research Bureau (SRB) – the first case study – are an example of economic intelligence. The SRB-reports resemble encyclopedic intelligence most. The quarterly survey by the BVD is a mixture of sociologic-political (the Movement Against Nuclear Energy) and biographic intelligence (Joost van Steenis). In terms of intelligence products, the BVD-report is somewhere between current intelligence and an estimate. It is best described as just background information.


\(^ {43}\) ‘For a threat perception, there are three necessary conditions: an assumption of the rival’s hostility, the vital nature of the issue or area under observation, and a subjective sense of vulnerability’ (Cohen, “Early Warning Systems,” CIA/SII, Fall 1989, 45). Compare to J.D. Singer’s formula: deterrence = estimated capabilities x estimated intentions.
a reasonable doubt.\textsuperscript{44} For the intelligence community, the ultimate failure is the lack of warning in the face of immense danger, such as war. Nevertheless, there are false alarms and misses. A false alarm is a danger that has been identified, but that later turns out not to exist. Yet, warning of a danger that proves to be a near miss is a warning success.\textsuperscript{45}

Agencies have a tendency to embed in reports a bias towards worst-case scenarios. This is understandable in a setting where analysts receive most criticism when their estimates are too optimistic.\textsuperscript{46} In a worst-case scenario, each piece of evidence that points to a calamity is presented, while little evidence that indicates a different conclusion is presented.\textsuperscript{47} In such a scenario, analysts describe all evil an opponent is capable of, and then estimates how the opponent may undertake them all, irrespective of the consequences to the opponent’s larger objectives. This approach has two disadvantages. First, the consumers will in the course of time tire and pay no attention to a report that contains bad news and subsequently takes no accurate measures. Second, the consumers may pay attention to it, but they may be frightened into immobility or may take a drastically wrong policy decision. In short, an overproduction of worst-case scenarios may lead to permanent hysteria or hopeless apathy. Therefore, it is argued that it is crucial that analysts warn selectively. Selectivity involves rejecting small risks, and potential danger. Within the literature from the intelligence community, the opinion is that an occasional miss is preferable to continuous over-prudent warnings of the worst-case scenario type.\textsuperscript{48}

In the literature, it is explained that it is difficult for analysts to provide an unambiguous warning. In case of a warning, they are advised to illuminate and to evaluate the critical or decisive aspects of the threat.\textsuperscript{49} Analysts then give their best estimate of how a particular situation will evolve. Furthermore, they also examine less likely outcomes if they have significant implications.\textsuperscript{50} For a warning of an actual threat, analysts are advised to pay attention to:

1. \textit{Necessity}. Is the threat unavoidable or optional?
2. \textit{Unambiguousness}. Are the opponent’s moves preparations for hostilities or may these serve other purposes as well?
3. \textit{Monitoring}. What indicators are at our disposal to observe the threat?

In the literature, it is advocated that the answers to these questions provide analysts with an idea as to whether, and to what extent, an opponent is prepared or is preparing to act. Nevertheless, it does not provide a complete picture. An estimate of the opponent’s intentions will remain the biggest problem. Does the

\textsuperscript{44} McCreary, “Warning Cycles,” Fall 1983, CIA/SII, 74-75.
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., 75-76.
\textsuperscript{46} Donovan, “Intelligence Rams and Policy Lions,” CIA/SII, Fall 1986, 67.
\textsuperscript{49} Howells, “Intelligence in Crisis,” CIA/SII, Fall 1983, 8.
\textsuperscript{50} Boatner, “The Evaluation of Intelligence,” CIA/SII, Summer 1984, 73.
opponent intend to attack, does the opponent fear we may attack, or does the opponent bluff in tacit negotiation? For these more elaborate questions, systematic analysis is needed (chapter 3).

A difficult warning process is the repeated warning about a gradually developing danger. Repeated warnings to the consumer give rise to the conditioning phenomenon that they can handle the danger. Analysts, however, can do more in subsequent alerts than only repeat the original alarm. They can make explicit that the danger has become more severe. If analysts label the danger unjustly – or exaggerate it – in an earlier phase, they will have difficulties to explain the evolutionary and growing gravity of the threat. It may postpone necessary action, and consequently the warning process can be transformed into a warning disaster.

Finally, the most difficult intelligence exercise is the negative warning. A negative warning means that analysts conclude there is no danger. This requires a thorough and detailed investigation before it can be confidently claimed that an opponent cannot attempt something that may cause a threat. A successful example of a negative warning by the allies was the analysis of the atomic bomb project by the Nazi’s in the Second World War. A negative warning could be given after the Norwegian heavy water production operation was knocked out since this prevented the Nazi’s from completing their vital experiments.

This discussion has illustrated the issue of warning concerning the relation between producer and consumer. We will return to this relationship in more detail in 2.4. Before this, a closer look is given to the relation between quality of reports and the intelligence organization.

2.3 ORGANIZATIONAL ASPECTS

What is the relation between the quality of an analysis and the organization in which the analysis is produced? In this section, some insights are presented about the secondary processes of making analyses. This section focuses on aspects that help the organization to produce reports of high quality. Furthermore, training and education are discussed.

---

53 Jones, “Scientific Intelligence,” CIA/SII, Summer 1962, 76. In respect to such intelligence achievements, Jones argues that it is likely that the most successful intelligence organizations are those that employ the smallest number of individual minds with the greatest possible ability (ibid, 59-60). Concerning the aspect of size, this may, to some extent, correlate with the notion as put forward by Wilensky. He argues that the further we go from data collection to policy decision, the less knowledge and the more error may creep in (Wilensky, Organizational Intelligence, 1967, 81).
2.3.1 Organization and quality

In the relation between organization and quality, three issues are addressed. First, general aspects to optimize an organization are presented. Second, the limitations of such improvements are given. Third, an Israeli experience is presented. This experience is of special interest for countries with small agencies, such as the Netherlands.

To optimize the organization

Good employees are a core requirement of an agency. This implies the importance of the recruitment process. Optimizing the relationship with the academic world can potentially contribute to the secondary process to optimize quality, since it may lead to better options for recruiting employees.

Moreover, there is the issue of professionalization. In the intelligence community, it is advocated that professionalization is seen as a continuing process, not a static end. Professionalization then reflects a state of mind. The intelligence professionals accept responsibility for their own professional development. Professionalism means expertise, to master skills, to broaden your own perspective, to serve the bureaucratic clients, and to expand your awareness of how you contribute to the intelligence process.\(^\text{54}\)

In terms of the attitude of employees, the intelligence community distinguishes a link between the issue of balanced information and high quality analysis on one hand, and the issue of integrity on the other hand. Integrity refers to commitment without coercion, to deeply held priorities and values. This implies that this commitment to these values is maintained even when they go against one’s self-interest to do so. In practice, this means analysts need to always speak the truth, to power bases, both within the agency and the policymakers that they serve. The issue of integrity is not restricted to the role of analysts. Organizational integrity plays a central role. This implies an organization wants to deal with problems effectively. Within the intelligence community, it is advocated that problems are brought into the open before they become too serious to manage. Subsequently managers encourage dissent and accept bad news, instead of ‘shooting the messenger’. This requires constant organizational effort.\(^\text{55}\) Organizational integrity will have a positive influence on reporting integrity, and thus on the quality of producing balanced information.

Another issue is coordination. An accurately coordinated intelligence community embodies cooperation. Important reports are the product of the contribution of all departments involved. It can be of great importance when all the resources have been brought to bear on the problem. Different points of view are evaluated. As a result, true analytical differences of opinions may occur.


Within the intelligence community, it is advocated that analysts should never water down their assessments to the lowest common denominator just to obtain consensus with their colleagues. If possible, a dissenter is forced to dissent within the context of a generally agreed discussion and not in a separate paper.56 If everyone agrees on an issue, something may be wrong. Self-reflecting practitioners argue that the analytical process has potentially fallen into a ‘group-think’ mentality. ‘Differences of opinion are healthy because they force both sides to make their case on the field of intellectual battle.’58

Another possibility to improve the quality is to commission an investigation twice for topics of a central interest. Subsequently, policymakers evaluate both reports. Thus, the possibility of overlooking or misinterpreting crucial clues of threatening developments is reduced. The different perspectives of different approaches may also lead to a better understanding of the problem in question. This would encourage competition, which is thought to have a positive effect on the quality of reports.59 In the 1980’s, both public (like the BVD) and private (like Control Risks) organizations investigated arson attacks by the Dutch anti-apartheid group called RARA (9.4, footnote).

Quality of research, whether produced by a public or a private organization, is crucial for intelligence. It is possible that a small think tank working solely on the basis of open material provides more valuable information than a large and non-well functioning agency which is using classified information.60 Sometimes, the working pressure shows a peak. Especially in times of crisis, this should not result in a decreased quality of the analyses. To cope with this

57 Groupthink can be defined as ‘a mode of thinking that people engage in when they are deeply involved in a cohesive in-group, when the members’ strivings for unanimity override their motivation to realistically appraise alternative courses of action’ (Janis, Victims of Groupthink, 1972, 9).
In the USA, the intelligence community has had a positive experience with dissents. A dissent directly points the policy maker to the core of the discussion or to possible bottlenecks. Examples with a Dutch connection are “Dissent of the Office of Naval Intelligence” of ORE 40-49 and “Dissent of the Intelligence Organization Department of State” of CIA/RR 6-50. These reports were respectively on the consequences of the Dutch police actions in Indonesia and the repercussions on the Netherlands of Indonesian independence (Consequences of Dutch ‘Police Action’ in Indonesia; ORE 40-49, 27 January 1949, CIA, 5. Repercussions on the Netherlands of Indonesian Independence; CIA/RR 6-50, 19 December 1950, CIA, 11. Not all reports necessarily have a dissent. An example of a document without a dissent is Basic Dutch-Indonesian Issues and the Linggadjati Agreement; ORE 20, 9 June 1947, Central Intelligence Group).
In the dissent of ORE 40-49, the Office of Naval Intelligence was of the opinion that the Dutch police actions strengthened the position of Indonesian extremists and communists. The position of more moderate local leaders – who were seen as more capable and more American oriented – was weakened by continuous economic and social destabilization. The Office of Naval Intelligence set its dissent in the context of the communist threat in South-East Asia (ORE 40-49, 5). Thus, the dissent focuses immediately the attention of the consumer to a crucial issue.
working pressure, an option is to create an intelligence reserve. Such a reserve would most likely come from annuitants and former intelligence employees.\textsuperscript{61}

Finally, in the intelligence community it is claimed that unless the intelligence community tries constantly to improve its performance, it is bound to deteriorate,\textsuperscript{62} because the outside world is competitive, especially its opponents. The initiative for improving the impact of analysis is seen as to lie within the intelligence community itself.\textsuperscript{63}

**Limitations of measures to improve the organization**

Insights and causes, such as scandals, can lead to reorganizations. From experiences, self-reflecting practitioners claim that organizational solutions are hampered by three factors:

- Most procedural reforms tend to introduce or accent other problems.
- Changes in the analytical process will never fully transcend the ambiguity and ambivalence of information.
- More rationalized information systems cannot fully compensate for personal factors as character traits and lack of time.\textsuperscript{64}

These limitations mean that intelligence failures always will occur. If reforms are marginal, the following measures tend to be preferred:

- *On the side of the producer*: reforms that facilitate dissent and access to the consumer.
- *On the side of the consumer*: measures that facilitate skepticism and scrutiny.

Hard to realize are measures that increase the time available for reading and reflection.\textsuperscript{65} Are there promising experiences with such organizational measures?

**Review Section**

In Israel, an interesting experience is made with a specific organizational measure – the installation of a so-called Review Section within the Israeli Military Intelligence Research Unit. It is presented as a relatively inexpensive way to improve the quality of reports. This Review Section – whether asked or not – comments and writes reports. The Review Section has direct access to the Director of Military Intelligence. It deals with military and non-military intelli-

\textsuperscript{61} Probst, “Triage in Intelligence,” CIA/SII, Spring 1990, 5.
\textsuperscript{63} Donovan, “Intelligence Rams and Policy Lions,” CIA/SII, Fall 1986, 74.
\textsuperscript{64} Betts, “Analysis, War and Decision,” CIA/SII, Fall 1979, 52, 54. A complicating factor of intelligence research is the need to make judgments before all the evidence is in (Heuer, “Biases in Evaluation of Evidence,” CIA/SII, Winter 1981,31).
\textsuperscript{65} Betts, “Analysis, War and Decision,” CIA/SII, Fall 1979, 52, 54.
gence and evaluates completely independently. The Review Section does not test whether an analysis is right or wrong, but whether it is self-consistent:

1. Does the conclusion of the assessment arise from the available data?
2. Is another legitimate conclusion possible?
3. Has all relevant data been taken into account, and are the facts not taken into consideration capable of altering the product’s basic premises?
4. Do the conclusions exaggerate or underrate the description of the situation?
5. Are there incongruities between two reports that deal with the same issue?66

It is only a small step from testing the self-consistency of techniques to testing or confirming findings. Techniques can be used as: checking for representativeness; checking for researcher effects; triangulation; weighting the evidence; making contrasts/comparisons; checking the influence of outliers; using extreme cases; ruling out spurious relations; replicating a finding; checking out rival explanations; looking for negative evidence; or getting feedback from informants.67

The Review Section also examines problems of the intelligence gathering process. It scrutinizes unpublished analyses. The Review Section investigates the accuracy of an analysis concerning the intentions and preparedness to act by an opponent. Often, the Review Section examines the issue from a different angle. In addition, it may play the role of the devil’s advocate to comment on an assessment. Despite this, it rarely makes use of this role and instead tends to produce vigorous responses while ignoring the Review Section’s elements that cast real doubt on the original assessment. The role of the devil’s advocacy may erode the value and credibility of the Review Section.

Furthermore, the Review Section has become an instrument for the expression of minority and dissent opinions by other analysts who do not want to present a written dissent themselves. The Review Section may include these viewpoints in its reports. Intelligence officers who have such a dissent or minority opinion are thus less vulnerable, but their viewpoints are still transmitted to higher echelons. The important point is that the adverse view be heard.68 It prevents the ‘group think’ scenario.69 The creation of a Review Section is more explicitly focused on the quality of reports than the role of a quality manager or a Staff Department Quality Control.70

---

67 Miles & Huberman, Quality Data Analysis, 1984, 230-243.
70 After the reorganization in 1990, the BVD appointed a quality manager. A Staff Directorate Quality Control is advocated in: Andersson, Elffers & Felix, “Een nieuwe BVD,” 1990, 31. Until 1998, the quality manager was part of D6 (Directorate 6) of the BVD. In 1999, this directorate was renamed as the Management Directorate (Directie Bedrijfsvoering). The main difference is that in this new directorate a new division is added: the Division Registration, Documentation, and Archive (Besluit
However, the creation of a Review Section has some disadvantages. Its criticism may lead to outbursts. This effect is tempered by the Review Section addressing the top in addition to criticizing papers, rather than people. Sometimes, officers who reacted against criticism by the Review Section on their report congratulate it for expressing their own criticism of a colleague’s product. The overall experience with the Review Section is said to be a positive one.\(^{71}\)

In addition to improving the organization or introducing a Review Section, there is another type of measure than can have positive effects on the quality of reports – training and education. The following section focuses on this.

### 2.3.2 Training and education

The preparation of employees through education is crucial. It affects directly their capabilities needed for the primary processes of analysis. In addition, training (on the job) is a vehicle for improvement.\(^{72}\)

The possibility for training and education should not be limited to analysts only. A broader accessibility – such as research and university level studies – will lead to a general improvement of the quality of the political and societal debate on this issue.

Training and education – its availability, and how it can be organized – belong to the secondary processes of the intelligence analysis. It is assumed, these secondary processes can have a positive effect on the quality of intelligence.

### Education

In the Netherlands, possibilities for education in the field of intelligence are limited. Contrary to the USA, it is not possible to obtain an academic degree in this field. A first step – to develop a bibliography – is slowly developing. While there are a few academic subjects available there are no faculty based academic programs offered. In the absence of such an academic program, there is no place where the teaching of intelligence is consigned as part of a broader framework within a discipline, or as an interdisciplinary subject matter on its own. The Netherlands Intelligence Studies Association (NISA), founded in 1991, recognizes the need for academic research and education in the field of intelligence.\(^{73}\)


\(^{73}\) De Graaff & Wiebes, *Hun crisis was de onze niet*, 1994, 7 and 135.
Course material

In the literature – including those outside the Dutch context – there are many gaps, preventing intelligence studies from becoming a fully developed discipline. This especially is the case with conceptual and analytical publications. Almost absent in the Netherlands are materials such as case studies, simulations, or adjunct expertise. Nor are there readers that combine essays and case studies. Intelligence war games are absent, at least publicly. Also lacking are grants and fellowships for graduated students interested in intelligence.74

Despite this, promising initiatives and developments – focused on organizing professional and/or academic conferences. In particular, NISA was successful, for example, in organizing, November 1999, an international SIGINT-conference, an international conference on peacekeeping and intelligence in November 2002, and on German-Dutch intelligence relations in 2005.75 These initiatives led also to the first (informal) network of experts – working or retired – of intelligence and academic professionals. In related fields, more mature networks do already exist, as SISWO – the Dutch institute for social sciences that hosts platforms where experts and academics exchange experiences and insights. Former head of the BVD, Doctors van Leeuwen, for example, participated in SISWO’s public administration network.

In the Netherlands, the state of affairs in relation to academic development and support is poor. Recommendations relating to this will be made in chapter 14. In this section, the discussion focuses on the relationship between organizational aspects and quality of reports. In the following section, another context of intelligence is presented – the politics in which intelligence functions.

2.4 POLITICAL CONTEXT

What is the political (or corporate) context of intelligence? Intelligence is not an entity on its own. Intelligence functions as part of a political or corporate system. For a good understanding of intelligence and security agency reports, some attention is paid to the relation between intelligence and politics.76

One issue is the reception of a report. As such, the reception of a report is not a main clue of the quality of such a report. Yet, when this is presented in combination with the expectations producers and consumers have of each other, a better understanding is obtained of the context in which reports are dissemi-

---

75 SIGINT-conference ‘The Importance of SIGINT in Western Europe in the Cold War’ 27 November 1999, hosted by the Netherlands Intelligence Studies Association. The conference on ‘Peacekeeping and Intelligence. Lessons for the future?’ of 15/16 November 2002, was organized by both NISA and the Netherlands Defense College.
76 Comparable Dutch information on this issue is absent. To discuss this issue, sources from within the (American) intelligence community were chosen, in order to also include the insights and demands of this community.
nated. High quality analysis is one issue, but a good understanding and communication is also needed for a more likely chance that this high quality analysis functions as a support for decision-making. In 2.4.1, attention is paid to aspects that are mainly related to understanding and communication.

However, there is a need to highlight another issue – political control and its relationship with legislative power (2.4.2). The way control is carried out will not only have its effect on the quality of the intelligence community, it may also have consequences for the budget.

A final issue is the relation between openness and quality (2.4.3). This relationship goes further than just a constitutional (or political) debate. There is also a technical aspect to this debate. The relation between openness and quality will be dealt with in a separate – the final – section.

These issues relate, albeit in a remote way, to the quality of reports. The context, in which intelligence functions, influences the quality of the analysis.

2.4.1 Relation producer and consumer

As noted, the relationship between intelligence and politics is an important one. Politics are a main consumer of reports. Insight and understanding into each other’s world are needed for an optimal interaction between producers and consumers of intelligence and security agency reports.\textsuperscript{77}

Starting points in the relation intelligence-politics

High quality information may lead to high quality intelligence. High quality intelligence may help to produce good policy. Nevertheless, the connections are highly mediated.\textsuperscript{78} In the literature on intelligence, it is argued that the increased importance of intelligence is not matched by an increased understanding of what it is or how it may and should be used to improve decision-making.\textsuperscript{79} High quality analyses to some extent can only, compensate for weaknesses of policymaking. Self-reflecting practitioners expect that intelligence is likely to feature many of the characteristics of the society or environment in which it is embedded. Likewise, poor intelligence can sometimes ruin a policy that would otherwise succeed.\textsuperscript{80}

Intelligence is a dependent phenomenon. In practice, intelligence is a junior partner of policy.\textsuperscript{81} Intelligence is a prerequisite for an effective policy or strategy, but it never is a substitute. In the absence of an effective policy, even

\textsuperscript{77} It is about the distinction between the mode of calculation and the locus of decision. The locus of decision is on exchange and bargaining – aimed at correcting error and securing agreement, and administered by reacting to other actors rather than sending orders and expecting obedience (Wildavsky, \textit{The Art and Craft of Policy Analysis}, 1987, 123).

\textsuperscript{78} Jervis, “Strategic Intelligence and Effective Policy,” CIA/SII, Winter 1989, 18.


\textsuperscript{80} Jervis, “Strategic Intelligence and Effective Policy,” CIA/SII, Winter 1989, 19.

\textsuperscript{81} Donovan, “Intelligence Rams and Policy Lions,” CIA/SII, Fall 1986, 64.
the best intelligence will be of no avail. High quality intelligence will at most contribute to a higher quality of the political analysis or of the political debate. It can however, prevent the use of unsound arguments, and help to indicate where positions are internally contradictory or where they rest on biased or mistaken readings of the evidence. Within the intelligence community, it is accepted that a decision maker has the right to disregard the advice of intelligence, because of additional considerations. It is the responsibility of decision makers to evaluate them all and to introduce their personal priorities. This shows the limited latitude of intelligence. In this context, the relation between the BVD and policymakers has been described as follows.

'It is the task of the Agency to warn, to inform, and to advise; after that, it is up to the responsible authorities – primary administration, legislator, Public Prosecutor, and investigative bodies – to take steps they consider to be necessary on the basis of the advices presented by the BVD.'

A self-image of intelligence is that of a body presenting information as objectively as possible to policymakers. Referring to this image, an agency would be able to supply policymakers with less biased information than, for example, pressure groups. Yet, in politics and in intelligence similar processes can occur. For example, the pressure for corporate intelligence consensus is not likely to differ from the pressure for corporate policy consensus. Also like politics, the intelligence community is not monolithic. There are a wide range of views on virtually every issue. Internal debates may be fierce and brutal. This makes the type of conspiracy theories as advanced by the Dutch journalist Rudie van Meurs unlikely. Within the intelligence community, it is also felt that other similarities with politics include the sharing of risks and incremental steps and that intelligence is marked by delay. A problem occurs when intelligence becomes politicized. It has been warned that politicization has a profound impact on the morale of analysts and managers alike. It may foster distortions in analyses. The (self) image of providers of objective information does not mean agencies and their analyses are free of bias (see 4.1.1).

84 Gazit, “Intelligence Estimates and the Decisionmaker,” CIA/SII, Fall 1988, 32.
87 Donovan, “Intelligence Rams and Policy Lions,” CIA/SII, Fall 1986, 63.
89 Van Meurs, De BVD, 1978. The position of Van Meurs not being valid seems to be supported by, for example, the discussion raised by former head of the intelligence unit of the police forces at Zaanstad Sjoerd Bos. Bos criticized the methods used (10.2.2 footnote; also 13.1.1). Furthermore, according to unconfirmed reports, the internal course of the BVD was the object of fierce internal discussions (de Volkskrant, 11 March 1992).
Different worlds of expectations

Politicians and members of the intelligence community often suppose they speak the same language. Some reflective intelligence practitioners think this is a misconception. They think more attention on different positions, interests, and ways of working will lead to a better understanding of each other’s world. First, the most common mutual reproaches are evaluated. Second, issues are discussed that give a better understanding of each other’s world.

The producer

The producer is normally someone from the intelligence community. The consumer may be a policy maker. Colleagues of the producer may also be the consumers of intelligence and security agency reports. The larger the intelligence community is, the more often consumers are from within the intelligence community. Producers know their own way of working. Sometimes, consumers criticize this way of working. Without being exhaustive, some of the main points are discussed.

One reproach is that intelligence fails to reduce uncertainty concerning future developments. This reproach is seen as not correct when the reports contain an accurate analysis of possible future developments. A high quality report is not an oracular prophecy, but an estimate – an analytical judgment resting carefully on defined and clarified assumptions.

Another reproach is that intelligence restricts the options of policymakers. This is seen as not true when an accurate analysis shows that the policymakers indeed have no elbow room to maneuver. The reproach is given when analysts are unaware of the real objectives of a policy. For example, a certain regime will not be forced to bring about changes through oil sanctions. An agency draws these as correct conclusions. Still, government decides to impose these sanctions. The sanctions, though unsatisfactory in terms of direct effects, are a strong signal, without endangering worrisome consequences. They are imposed to satisfy the popular need to express the nation’s sense of outrage. In this case, domestic considerations are the dominant objective, not the overthrow of a foreign regime. If analysts are focused on analyzing the foreign aspect, they cannot be expected to consider these domestic considerations.

Furthermore, government and an agency may differ in opinion. Policymakers may sense that their policy is undermined.

Another problem occurs if a report containing ambiguous intelligence evidence reaches the public. It may provoke a public controversy. In general, policymakers are not happy with this kind of situation. They fear that the public debate will lead – concerning the threats – to selecting a worst-case scenario. In addition, intelligence and security agency reports often contain vague concepts and descriptions. This may be caused by a weak analysis, but it may also be
caused by uncertainty concerning future developments. Controversies and vagueness make life for policymakers more difficult.  

Finally, some reports are windy. It does happen that producers want to demonstrate their knowledge while policymakers with their overburdened agenda want a terse report. Sometimes, it is best that producers write that no new developments worth mentioning took place.  

The consumer  

Reproaches by producers against consumers – especially policymakers – partly overlap the issues already mentioned. Yet, the approach differs. Intelligence practitioners mention the following reproaches.

A first reproach is that consumers fear the unknown and uncertain. It is argued that decision makers also do not want to be reminded of their limited capacity to influence events.

Another reproach is that consumers use intelligence as an instrument of public persuasion. Producers fear such action may lead to security breaches. This reproach was heard, for example, after president John F. Kennedy unveiled to the UN photographic intelligence on the presence of Soviet missiles in Cuba.

According to Robert Gates (USA Director of Central Intelligence, 1991-1993) the usual response of policymakers to intelligence when there are disagreements or when they find situations unpalatable, is

‘to ignore it; sometimes he will characterize it as incomplete, too narrowly focused, or incompetent (and sometimes rightly so); and occasionally he will charge that it is “cooked” – that it reflects a CIA bias.

[...] Policymakers have always liked intelligence that supported what they want to do, and they often try to influence the analysis to buttress the conclusions they want to reach. They ask carefully phrased questions, they sometimes withhold information; they broaden or narrow the issue; on rare occasions, they even try to intimidate.’

---

93 Such reports do exist. In 1985, for example, the ministry of Defense informed the ministry of Foreign Affairs and several intelligence authorities. The text on new developments was ‘concerning the Middle East in general and the Lebanon in particular, no new relevant developments took place the last weeks’ (Foreign Affairs, Code 9, 1975-1984, 902, File 3757. Official secret coded message from ministry of Defense to Foreign Affairs, 10 April 1985). It is a perfect example of a succinct report.
94 The BVD makes a distinction between consumers and a target group. The BVD provides this last group uninvited with information (Lower House, session 1990-1991, 21819, no. 5, 2).
98 Gates, “The CIA and American Foreign Policy,” CIA/SII, Fall 1987, 33-35. For more, see 2.4 ‘Reaction by policymakers.’
Another complaint of producers is that policymakers see intelligence as a tool to make policy look good, instead as a tool for making good policy. If this is the case, it is difficult for an agency to correct the misuse of intelligence, because it is then vulnerable to being criticized as disclosing classified information.  

This issue is of interest for the case study on the BVD. On the one hand, former minister of Home Affairs Ed. van Thijn denied that the Dutch peace organization Stop the Neutron Bomb was the object of investigation by the BVD. On the other hand, the BVD called Stop the Neutron Bomb a communist front organization. Van Thijn said to have read the BVD-report in which Stop the Neutron Bomb actually was the object of investigation.

Another reproach concerns the unwillingness or inability of policymakers to spend enough time on longer-range issues, or in helping to guide or direct an agency’s long-term efforts. As policymakers run the country for a shorter period than analysts work at an agency, the intelligence community thinks these policymakers are more biased towards solutions of acute crises.

A last reproach is implicitly mentioned in the one above: most policymakers fail to give the intelligence community the guidance and the feedback it needs. This issue is repeatedly claimed in articles by intelligence employees. They argue that decision makers are responsible for guiding the activities of the intelligence system subordinate to them. Yet, these employees feel that decision makers often fail to inform their subordinate networks.

**Insight in and understanding for each other’s world**

Reproaches from both parties stem from differences in the role they play and the unfamiliarity – sometimes even incomprehension – with the role, the other party plays. The intelligence community is part of the permanent administration. Politicians play a transient role. Agencies are not so willing to advocate a certain policy.

According to some authors, the distinctions stem not only from the difference in position, but also from differences in personality. To explore this more deeply some characteristics of both groups are discussed to draw attention to the features of an ideal type. Although generalizations are hazardous, an insight in some common differences may further a better understanding.

The view of policymakers is perceived like the view from a bridge. Their approach is decision oriented, decisive, and confident, rather than avoiding making a decision, contemplative, and reflective. In this ideal type characteriza-
tion, policymakers have a strong interest in the success of their policies. Policymakers find themselves perpetually embattled with criticism. This attitude does not contribute to an enthusiastic breeding ground for reflection or for ambiguous intelligence and security agency reports. Apart from this, policymakers are – because of their position – more vulnerable to mistakes than intelligence employees are. Policymakers are in the center of the political game, an agency is more on the side. They use intelligence for bureaucratic power games. They pay a lot of attention to negotiations, making concessions, and maneuvering. Policymakers judge intelligence for its value to describe developments, to comment alternatives, to estimate obstacles, and to enhance their influence.

In contrast, the ideal characteristics of analysts are generally contemplative, who examine an issue extensively, and avoid making decisions that call for action. They avoid oversimplification, and believe the real world is ambiguous and uncertain. Only rarely, a judgment indicates a course of action. By effect, if not intent, they will often convey caution, if not indecision. Intelligence and security agency reports often warn in a way that impedes making a decision. In their reports, analysts do not tell so much, what will happen, but they represent what policymakers should worry about most of all. Yet, policymakers want confidence. This way of reporting is a cause for tension for policymakers who want to act quickly. Policymakers want to influence a situation. Only on rare occasions, the position of policymakers towards decisiveness is parallel to intelligence impulses. For policymakers, politics is highly personalized. Analysts, on the contrary, tend to identify themselves with the problems. An understanding of such differences will improve linking expectations.

In an American study on the thinking of policymakers, some trends were found. There are, generally spoken, differences in the approaches of issues policymakers and analysts have to deal with. Policymakers think in the here-and-now and are thinking about or taking action. Their period is almost open ended and they will seldom completely give up a goal. They keep open as many options as they can. Policymakers are more likely to aim at incremental changes than at sweeping ones.

Analysts, on the contrary, are much less comfortable with incompatible objectives. Analysts break apart the goals of policymakers into achievable sub-goals and sets priorities. This way of setting goals is complicated when many goals and linkages are involved. In such cases, they want to identify possible incompatibilities and sacrifice some goals for others. At the same time, they prefer to focus on the big picture, the future possibilities, and the abstract patterns and principles that underlie and explain facts.

Both groups tend to attract and reward contrasting clusters of personality and cognitive traits. The strength of policymakers is they understand how to use bureaucratic procedures to accomplish their plans. Analysts tend to be critics who often disclose flaws in current policy solutions of the policymakers they are serving.  

For analysts it is important to know when policymakers are receptive for information and analysis. Issues often evolve through four stages. In the first stage, the issue exists as part of the portfolio of analysts, but it does not affect policymakers. In the second stage, the issue has become relevant to policymakers, but they do not yet make a decision. Policymakers are most open to factual intelligence and to analysis that stimulates ideas about how to respond. In the third stage, policymakers have made up their position and viewpoint. Their interest in information and analysis is now narrowed to only that which immediately informs them on the implications and prospects of their decision. The fourth stage concerns the implementation of the policy. Analysts whose reports cast doubt on the success of the implemented policy become part of the enemy camp. The most suitable stage for analysts to promote ideas is at the second stage.  

Analysts are likely to be effective if they present information in such a way that it meets the need of policymakers. To do so, analysts need to be oriented toward policy and action. Above all, their intelligence is just one input of information policymakers receive. The above insights – sometimes presented as generalizations – may promote a better understanding. They do not say anything on the quality of a report, but rather focus on communication and understanding. High quality is the central issue of this study, but good communication and understanding is needed to ensure that the interaction between producers and consumers is of the highest quality.  

**Traditionalist and activist approach**  

In the above, the relation between the producer and consumer was described from the perspective of understanding. A last aspect of this issue concerns the discussion between traditionalists and activists.  

There are two views concerning the relationship between intelligence consumers and producers. These two views are presented here as ideal types. The first group – the traditionalists – advocates responding to specific requests for data and analysis rather than initiating direct interaction with consumers. This means the consumer identifies the desire or need for intelligence. Traditionalists tend to present descriptive factual background information from which policymakers have to draw implications. They want to protect their objectivity.  

---  

108 Ibid., 5-6.  
The second group – the activists – advocate a closer working relationship between producers and consumers through the development of a two-way flow of information and feedback. Activists are of this opinion because they think this is needed to provide consumers with relevant reports and analyses. Activists routinely want to appraise the consumer’s reaction to reports and constantly be aware of new consumer problems. They also want to monitor reactions after a policy decision has been reached. Generally, activists pay more attention to the presentation.\textsuperscript{110}

Activists reproach traditionalists as they – because of their strict independence – provide intelligence irrelevant to policymakers’ actual problems. In addition, activists think intelligence failures are more easily corrected.\textsuperscript{111} In turn, traditionalists argue that activists may put too much effort in serving policy well. By striving too hard in this direction, intelligence may become another policy, and an unwanted one at that.\textsuperscript{112} Too much identification with policy may lead to a situation where analysts ignore facts and dangers that stand in contradiction to that policy.\textsuperscript{113} Activists say this danger can be coped with by giving policymakers inconvenient information and if responsible intelligence officers do not act in this way, they lack sufficient backbone and are not worthy of their position.\textsuperscript{114}

Whatever the view is, one opinion seems undisputed. Intelligence analysts inexperienced in political and bureaucratic processes are likely to be at a disadvantage.\textsuperscript{115} The discussion between traditionalist and activist is useful in thinking about how intelligence can be served best. In the following section, the relation between producer and consumer is shifted towards another relation between intelligence and politics – that of the legislative power on the side of politics.

\subsection*{2.4.2 Intelligence and the legislative power}

In the relationship between producer and consumer – as a part of the political system – the consumer is largely representative of the executive power. In this section, attention is paid to another relationship – the relationship between the intelligence community and the legislative power.

In nearly all countries, the intelligence community has the closest links with the executive power – the government. Governments are not only the main consumers of intelligence; they also monitor and determine the policy of the agencies. The situation in the Netherlands is likewise.

In some countries – such as Australia, Canada, and the United States – the legislative power holds a stronger position concerning the intelligence commu-

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{115} Gries, “Intelligence in the 1990s,” CIA/SII, Spring 1991, 10-11.
nity. In the mid-seventies, these changes took place in the United States because of a series of affairs. These changes did not only concern control, but also budgeting and reports. The reforms carried out led to satisfaction both at the CIA and with the politicians. The outcomes may be of interest for the Dutch situation. It may be a source of information to reconsider the limited role of Dutch parliament in intelligence matters.

**Need of oversight**

There is a need to control agencies. First, agencies that are not controlled by legislative bodies or the public may pose a threat to peace and civil freedoms. Second – and this argument fits with the American political tradition – agencies need public support, participation and cooperation of the legislative to carry out their assignment. Third, a vigorous oversight prevents problems accumulating. William H. Webster, director of the CIA from 1987 until 1991, placed emphasis on the need for control by the legislative power. A continuing process defines and redefines the value our society expects to be applied by its institutions.

**What is supervised?**

Supervision covers both the quality of intelligence and possible abuses. Abuse refers to issues such as the use of illegal means, to achieve illegitimate goals, and fraud. Quality is related to the effectiveness and efficiency of an administration. It refers to issues as the effectiveness of spending the budget and the quality of the activities of agencies.

In the American experience, the active role of the legislative led to the establishment of a detailed and, to a large degree, public legal code for the conduct of intelligence activities. The oversight included the covert action program and hearings on the budget. Notwithstanding, a member of the legislative may not want to know too many details of a particular intelligence operation, in order to avoid moral ambiguities and deeply troubling decisions.

**Results of the intensified oversight and cooperation**

In the American experience, the intensified oversight by the legislative power resulted in some benefits for the intelligence community. Because of the interest

---

in the agencies, their annual budgets grew faster for a number of years than, for example, the budget of the Department of Defense. Moreover, there was a growth in requests for analytical briefings and publications. The need for high quality intelligence was accepted. Furthermore, the agencies are now firmly planted in American society.  

Another effect is a shift in the balance of power on international security issues between the executive and legislative, in favor of the legislative. The growing role of the legislator adds stress to the relationship between the agencies and the government. The legislator is better informed on international security issues because of information and assessments by the intelligence community. Now both parties – the executive and legislative – obtain intelligence and security agency reports, which may enhance the quality of the political debate. Furthermore, ‘because Congress has access to intelligence, it has sometimes managed to avoid irrational legislative responses to world events, responses that would have created serious diplomatic problems for the incumbent administration,’ Agencies gained independence from the executive. They are poised nearly equidistant between the executive and legislative.

To guard against side effects

Some problems may occur because of the intensified role of the legislative. Already mentioned is the extra stress on the relationship between the intelligence community and the administration. Another issue is secrecy. In the new situation, more people have access to classified documents. There is a need for a proper discretion in the handling of classified information. It appears that the executive has leaks more often than the legislative. A third issue to avoid is the micro management of intelligence programs. ‘Because oversight committee members rarely have the time to address a full range of intelligence issues, the tendency to concentrate on single issues is strong, and in some cases the temptation to become involved in day-to-day management of these issues is irresistible.’ The system seems to work best when these two functions – control and management – are kept separate.

Improved supervision does not necessarily lead in all cases to more clarity. Criticism for example may be, dictated by party political considerations. Criticism may also be only lip service, but such problems already occur in situations where there is only a limited control.

133 An example preceding the improved oversight concerns the role of the CIA in Laos during the Vietnam War. Some members of the legislative publicly criticized that the CIA should had put a stop
The positive experience of the intensified oversight does not mean affairs will belong to the past. To work on the quality of the intelligence community and its products is a continuous process, and not a static goal.

In this section, the need for adequate control by the legislative and the fear of leaks was addressed. This implies a certain relation between quality (by adequate control) and openness (by leaks). This goes beyond the direct relationship between intelligence community and politics and is therefore discussed separately in section 2.4.

2.4.3 Openness, secrecy, and quality

There is a continuous debate about the dichotomy openness/secrecy. This discussion is not only of importance for the acceptance of intelligence, for the possibility of third parties to use it, or to control the quality of the intelligence products, but also for the relation between quality and openness.

The dichotomy quality - openness goes beyond the context of the relationship intelligence – to politics. Actually, there are two discussions on the issue of openness and quality – a technical one, and a constitutional one. Before these two discussions are dealt with, a discussion about what has to be kept secret and what can be public is presented.

In the ‘Studies in Intelligence’, it is argued that the matters that need to be kept secret must be reduced to a minimum. The underlying idea is that when everything is classified, then nothing is classified. When material not worthy of being withheld for the public is classified, it devalues the case for secrecy about truly sensitive data. The fewer the secrets are, the more serious the real secrets will be protected.

A complicating factor is that a government may keep documents secret for its own interest. A government may stifle debate, protect itself from embarrassment, or carry out a policy or program that will not win parliamentary or public support.134

The use of the term ‘security’ is alone an inadequate base for a secrecy classification system.135 Superfluous secrecy can be seen as a habit, not as culture.136 The call for more openness is not only limited to society, but also advocated within agencies. It meets the demand of society for more freedom of

---


136 ‘The “culture” of secrecy, so often given as an explanation for the continued classification of information, is less a culture than a habit. It could be quickly changed by strong, emphatic leadership.’ Quote in foreword written by Warren F. Kimball (Rutgers Univ.), Chair, Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation to the U.S. Department of State in: “The Report of the Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation to the U.S. Department of State,” Perspectives, American Historical Association Newsletter, Vol. 36 No. 1 January 1998, 41.
Intelligence spreads more into the political, the economic, and the societal arenas. If intelligence analyses on such problems are communicated, the public can understand and support necessary programs in order to manage and solve them. Therefore, more information will be shared with more people.

A more normative argument is that openness is the main advantage that democracy has over totalitarianism. Katharine Graham – who was the publisher (1969-1979) of *The Washington Post* – said: ‘The record of history shows that a government that operates in secrecy, hidden from scrutiny, shielded from examination, is neither accountable nor ultimately faithful to the people it exists to serve.’ This does not mean you have to inform the public about everything, but rather which matters have to be, or not, kept secret.

**Secrecy**

In our society, relationships of secrecy and confidentiality are accepted, as in lawyer-client or doctor-patient relations. While agencies also know relationships of secrecy, the position of these relationships is different. The ultimate goal is more abstract.

To understand the need for secrecy, a difference is made between the information itself and the way this information was obtained. Source protection is crucial, and it is a recurring issue in pleas for secrecy. Sometimes, information stems only from a single source. In that case, the release of information may endanger the source. Often, the authentication of this source gives authority and credibility to the intelligence and security agency report. This is important in case of public controversy. However, it is exactly in these kinds of cases that it is more likely a report is leaked. If an error has been made in the judgment of protecting a source, it may become harder to attract additional sources. Sources do not want to run any risk. Furthermore, an agency should take into consideration that – if the channel through which the information is obtained is disclosed – an opponent may manipulate the information. Source protection and protection of method generally are legitimate and reasonable, but they may also be pushed too far. While it is advocated that operations should be kept secret, it is the principles and the way an agency is directed and controlled that should be discussed.

Opinions differ concerning what has to be kept secret. The opinions presented are from ‘Studies in Intelligence.’ The American tradition is generally

---

139 For this, Kalugin quotes Turner in: Kalugin, “Intelligence and Foreign Policy,” CIA/SII, Winter 1989, 39.
more aimed at openness than the Dutch – but the Dutch are not the most closed European country on this issue. In the mid-1970’s, the CIA protected employees working abroad (and those in line for such assignments in the future), agents, current methods to obtain information, information dealing with cryptography and crypto-analysis, details of the processing and analysis of information, and finished intelligence publications. The security adviser under president Kennedy – McGeorge Bundy – identified six classes of secrets: defense information, current diplomatic negotiations, covert activity abroad, covert collection of information, material whose capacity for international embarrassment outweighs its value for informing the public, and legitimate secrets relating to the process by which the cabinet makes a decision.\footnote{Donnalley, “Declassification in an Open Society,” CIA/SII, Fall 1974, 13-14. Concerning this last point, Donnalley referred to the president of the USA. However, the Netherlands has a parliamentary democracy, instead of a presidential one.} The issues and aspects to be kept secret are subject of a continuing discussion, also within the Dutch intelligence community.

**Openness**

In the discussion on secrecy and openness, different views were advocated based upon different assumptions. In the 1970’s there was a trend towards almost complete openness. This trend was based on the following assumptions:

- An agency can function – and even better – in a democratic society under the supervision of outside officials.
- The disclosure of secrets by leaking is part of an unofficial system of checks and balances.
- There is no fundamental clash between secrecy and the right to know.
- It is usually more important to protect the citizen against intelligence abuses than to shield agencies against its opponents.

These assumptions put emphasis on the value of freedom. It is also assumed that there is no immediate danger.\footnote{Laqueur, “The Future of Intelligence,” Spring 1986, CIA/SII, 50.}

There are other reasons to advocate openness. Former director of the CIA – William E. Colby – wanted, as a starting point, reports to be made public and then determined the best way to do this. He argued that the advantage of releasing reports is the additional expertise that is gained from independent and external criticism. Academic experts, political advocates, media, and even foreigners will point out aspects of the assessment that appears faulty from their point of view. It will raise the standard of intelligence products, and make them more reliable and useful.\footnote{Colby, “Intelligence in the 1980s,” CIA/SII, Summer 1981, 38.} From a slightly different angle, Ben-Israel argues that the intelligence community as a closed society is potentially a major obstacle to the development of intelligence
These theories are helpful in producing accurate estimates, and improving forecasts (3.1 and 3.2.3).

In some cases, secrecy may be superfluous, because the information needed is openly available. In most cases, this applies to economic information needed for policy formulation.\footnote{Ben-Israel, “Philosophy and methodology of intelligence,” \textit{Intelligence and National Security}, Vol. IV, October 1989, 695.} Even if detailed economic information is needed, this is often available. In the case study on the Shipping Research Bureau – the first case study (chapters 6, 7 and 8) – the South African government took a series of measures to try to keep data on oil supplies secret. While oil-traders manipulated the data, the Shipping Research Bureau managed to trace a growing number of shipments.

**Two debates**

In the preceding section, two parallel discussions are addressed. The first debate is more a technical one, about the relationship between openness and quality. It is argued that a policy of openness is needed to obtain additional expertise. This opinion is opposed by those who fear the loss of sources, the disclosure of methods, and the manipulation or shielding of information by third parties. In essence, this discussion concerns the best optimum possible for the relation between openness and quality. The second debate is a constitutional one; the extent a government should be public and the extent secrecy is allowed in a democratic legal order. This puts the emphasis on aspects such as legitimacy and acceptance. The technical and constitutional debates are complementary. If put in a table from the perspective of the effects of the disclosure of reports, the elements of both debates can be composed as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>positive effect on the quality of a report</th>
<th>positive effect on the agency</th>
<th>negative effect on the quality of a report</th>
<th>negative effect on the agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>additional expertise on data and methods by outside criticism</td>
<td>legitimacy; an agency is the backbone of the democratic legal order instead of a necessary evil</td>
<td>possible cut off from sources, by lack of source protection</td>
<td>opponents have insight in data and methods used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critics can help to improve assumptions underlying the conclusions</td>
<td>acceptance; the agency is part of public government</td>
<td>third parties manipulate and shield off information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theory building is stimulated by outside criticism and openness</td>
<td>recruitment: to show what you are capable of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>political commitment: enlarged budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\footnote{Casey, “Economic Intelligence for the Future,” CIA/SII, summer 1982.}
The debates do not stimulate a conclusion. If source protection had been the only disadvantage, measures to protect the sources in case of disclosure can be established quite easily. This means that for reports composed of past methods on past issues, there is no reason to keep these sub rosa. On the contrary, such reports will yield the benefits of a disclosure.

For other reports, not only the pro’s and con’s have to be weighed, but also the conditions of disclosure in relation to these pro’s and cons. This will lead to a more balanced picture in this debate, which has to be considered also from a political perspective. Regrettably, both debates are completely absent in the Dutch political arena. This is also an indication of lack of commitment at the level of politics. The absence of debate may not only affect the quality of reports, but also the legitimacy of agencies.

To further this debate, and to, in particular, gain more insight in relationships concerning the quality of intelligence, three hypotheses are developed. They address issues on which the literature is ambivalent or implicit.

**HYPOTHESIS 1:** If the dominant forum function is performed by political or diplomatic feedback, this will influence the quality of the intelligence and security agency report in a negative way.

A returning issue in the CIA-literature is the politicization of intelligence. This coincides with the CIA-literature that focused on biases caused by the psychology of analysts and by the organization (4.1.1 ‘Findings’). It may be, therefore, that a plea for openness is also inspired by the implicit assumption that if – as a result of secrecy and limited distribution – the dominant forum function is performed by political and diplomatic feedback, there is a risk of extra bias and self serving analyses. To make this possible relationship explicit, it is presented as a hypothesis.

**HYPOTHESIS 2:** If intelligence and security agency reports are publicly shared, this will lead to a worsening of the information position caused by a decrease and manipulation of sources – especially of secret sources.

What is the actual effect of intelligence and security agency reports, on your information position, when they are made public? There is speculation on this issue. The extent of effects remains unknown. The reports in the first case study were publicly available which provides the opportunity to investigate these effects.

**HYPOTHESIS 3:** If intelligence and security agency reports are publicly shared, their quality will increase because the positive effect caused by the feedback from different forums will dominate.

Colby’s starting point is that reports must be made public. An implicit assumption is apparently that feedback from different forums will result in a better quality, than feedback from a limited forum. Nevertheless, other effects will also occur because of the disclosure. If all the effects are put together, what is the overall effect? Are there conditions to be set, resulting from, for example, hypothesis 1 and hypothesis 2?

With this discussion on openness and quality – and the hypotheses to be tested in the case studies – this introductory part concludes. Besides an introduction, some links were also made to – especially the secondary processes of – the quality of reports. The following and last section provides an overview.

### 2.5 CONCLUSIONS AND INFLUENCE ON THE RESEARCH QUESTION

This chapter focused on providing an introduction to intelligence. By providing an overview of the field of intelligence, direct links have been made to the research questions.

First, insight on the development of intelligence as a discipline was explored. There is a limited development of theory on intelligence. It is a body of knowledge mainly based on intuition and experience. Moreover, a methodology of intelligence is not as developed as in more established disciplines. Methods are available from other disciplines (and widely used), but there is still a need of more arrangement and some methods need to be developed. This sets limits to the possibilities to test theory. It also means that there are limitations in carrying out this study compared to research in a more established field. This becomes clear in chapter 3 and 4.

There is information available to write on the pragmatics of intelligence analysis and its aberrations. There are some well developed techniques. This applies to intelligence as a trade, especially for the field of TECHINT. TECHINT is also the field in which there is an intense cooperation with scientists, often because of its breaking new grounds technology.

Second, issues were presented that related to the quality of intelligence. These were mostly related to secondary processes of the analysis. In this chapter, the primary processes of the analysis were not addressed – this is part of chapter 3.

Important as secondary processes, for the quality of intelligence products, are coordination, management, and organization of an agency. To explore insights on the relation between these and intelligence products, three ‘intelligence producing’ models were presented. In combination with the case studies, the
causes of poor or high quality reports will be traced, such as setting appropriate priorities during the design, and the way filters are built for processing data.

The literature addresses how an organization can influence positively the quality of reports in an indirect way. For example by promoting dissent in reports, commissioning a crucial research twice, or establishing a Review Section.

Part of the secondary process is also the way training and education can be carried out. In the Netherlands, there is no academic degree in intelligence studies. There is hardly anything available that specializes on intelligence studies within the academic community. This is not an optimal situation for the recruitment of highly qualified personnel. Subsequently the focus is on ‘on the job’ training.

On a different note, there is a plea for accurate external control. This plea is strongly promoted from within agencies to prevent problems building up over the long term. Different aspects of the ongoing technical and constitutional debates on the relation openness and quality were identified.

Attention was paid to the need of mutual understanding between producers and consumers. While this is not so much related to the quality of reports themselves, it directly affects the receptivity of (high quality) intelligence by consumers. This is important for high quality intelligence to play a role as a force enhancer of a security policy. Furthermore, the increased understanding can lead to a better feedback by consumers (4.2.2). This feedback is related to the issue of high quality reports. It may point, for example, gaps in the design phase, in the collection of data, or policy issues that need to be addressed.

The insights on quality presented in this chapter are mainly of an indirect nature, and belong mainly to the secondary processes. As such, these insights will – combined with the findings of the two case studies – be used to determine what factors contribute to a high or low quality of a report.

Finally, the main elements, from which criteria can be derived, will be presented in chapters 3 and 4 where issues of the primary process, such as methods and techniques are discussed. Chapter 2 also identified some of these. The elements mainly concerned warning. A few were on information and presentation.

Chapter 2 was primarily an introduction. The following chapters focus on issues as validity, robustness and on how to be resistant against misleading factors. These belong to core issues of producing high quality analysis.