The Academization of Intelligence: A Comparative Overview of Intelligence Studies in the West

Kobi Michael and Aaron Kornbluth

"Academization of intelligence" is defined as the academic research, conceptualization, and teaching about the world of intelligence. Its goal is to study the field of intelligence's essence, activities, and influence on the national security of the state and its decision-making processes. Policymakers and political leaders have recognized the increasingly significant role of intelligence in shaping policy and decision-making processes. These developments and concerns accelerated the academization of intelligence and gave the field its due attention and prominence. As the demand for intelligence practitioners increased, American and Western universities responded to the growing need for formulating academic programs and courses devoted to intelligence, which significantly accelerated the academization of intelligence. The United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada are at the forefront of efforts to academize intelligence. In other Western countries, such as Spain, France, and Germany, the process of academicization has been slower and burdened by the darker roles played by the intelligence services at certain points in history.

Keywords: Intelligence, academization of intelligence, academy, intelligence theory, intelligence journals, intelligence associations

Dr. Kobi Michael is a senior researcher at INSS. Aaron Kornbluth is an intern at INSS and a graduate student studying international relations at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

Cyber, Intelligence, and Security | Volume 3 | No. 1 | May 2019

Introduction

Although academic programs in intelligence already existed before the "Global War on Terror," the events of 9/11 and the US-led invasion of Iraq, which are perceived as intelligence failures, raised the subject of intelligence and security to the forefront of international relations. Policymakers and political leaders recognized the increasingly vital role of intelligence in shaping policy and decision-making processes and wondered whether the training of analysts in the intelligence community produced the intellectual flexibility and analytical rigor required to deal with the complex challenges and threats of the twenty-first century. These developments and concerns accelerated the "academization of intelligence" and gave the field its due attention and prominence. This development in the United States was emulated by university programs in Britain, Canada, Spain, and Israel, albeit in a more limited fashion.

Universities offered deeper research and methodological training as well as more critical, less-institutionalized, and less-conservative approaches. As the demand for intelligence practitioners increased, American universities responded to the growing need of formulating academic programs and courses devoted to intelligence that significantly accelerated the academization of intelligence. The increased attention on intelligence within the university framework greatly contributed to the field's emergence as an academic discipline in its own right and propelled scholarly research and writing on the topic.

The Academization of Intelligence—Definition

Academization of intelligence can be defined as the academic research, conceptualization, and teaching about the field of intelligence. Its goal is to study the world of intelligence's essence, activities, and influence on the national security of the state and its decision-making processes. The process of the academization of intelligence presupposes its interdisciplinary character and its inherent connection to cognate fields of knowledge, such as political science, international relations, history, psychology, and so forth. This academic activity is pursued through existing academic disciplines and paradigms, as well as through fundamental academic tools that include critical thinking, the development of theoretical infrastructure, and the writing and publishing of professional and scholarly literature.

Methodology and Research Questions

In this comparative study, the authors sought to survey the academicization process of intelligence in various Western states, including Israel, and describe its emergence as a field of serious academic instruction and research, better known as intelligence studies. In addition, we examined the field's academic characteristics, its long-standing debates, and the various approaches used in an attempt to understand the crux of intelligence studies, which possesses both the ability and responsibility of shaping contemporary and popular understandings of intelligence. The study focuses on three questions:

1. What led to the development of the academicization process of intelligence and its expansion in recent decades and how did it affect the nature of intelligence studies programs in various Western democracies?
2. Which aspects of intelligence do the various academic programs in the Western world emphasize, and is it possible to characterize different approaches to the field?
3. What are the different approaches used to study intelligence?

This article, resulting from a larger investigation conducted by the authors, is a qualitative study based on a review of existing intelligence literature (mostly professional journals), curricula of intelligence studies programs at various Western universities, and the websites of intelligence organizations and professional associations, all with an emphasis on the United States where the topic is the most developed. So that the study remains comprehensive, correspondence with researchers in the field from the United States and Canada was conducted as well as conversations with former practitioners from the intelligence community in Israel.

The Academicization Process

The Origins of Intelligence Studies

The study of intelligence as an academic subject has its roots in the United States, which is currently the dominant player in the field. Only a few years after World War II, Sherman Kent, an intelligence practitioner and academic, began discussing what he perceived as the natural and necessary integration between intelligence and academia—through the production of an intelligence literature—as an essential tool for the professional development of intelligence. The relevancy of Kent's work, "Strategic Intelligence for American World Policy," published in 1949, was not lost on intelligence and policy officials

as the United States assumed its important role in the post-war international order.[1] However, intelligence as a field of academic instruction and research was not prioritized nor prominent in the first decades after World War II. It regained public attention following a series of US intelligence scandals during the mid-1970s, which included attempted assassinations, invasive domestic surveillance, and abuse at the hands of American intelligence agencies. The 1975–1976 United States Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities, better known as the Church Committee, led extensive investigations into the American intelligence community.[2]

In Britain, where its intelligence institutions were an open secret yet never officially acknowledged until the end of the Cold War, F. W. Winterbotham's 1974 book, *The Ultra Secret*, and other authoritative historical accounts of British intelligence's role during World War II, caused a surge in the popularity of intelligence in the United Kingdom.[3] Furthermore, the post-Cold War release of some records detailing the activities of British intelligence during World War II increased academic interest in historical archives research.

In Canada, the scandals that rocked the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in the late seventies and early eighties led to the publication of detailed annual reports by Canada's Security Intelligence Review Committee (SIRC) that was formed in conjunction with the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS). The relative transparency that was created through these incidents and investigations spurred academic interest in intelligence due to its relevancy to policy formation, especially in the conduct of international affairs during

1 See Sherman Kent, *Strategic Intelligence for American World Policy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1949). Regarding his arguments for an intelligence literature, see Sherman Kent. "The Need for an Intelligence Literature," *Studies in Intelligence* 1, no. 1 (1955): 1–11.

2 Michael Goodman mentions Roberta Wohlstetter's *Pearl Harbor: Warning and Decision* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1962) as an influential book that piqued scholarly interest in intelligence matters in the United States. See Michael S. Goodman. "Studying and Teaching about Intelligence: The Approach in the United Kingdom," *Studies in Intelligence* 50, no. 2 (2006): 57–65.

3 See Goodman, *Studying and Teaching about Intelligence*. Goodman attributes this view to Wesley Wark who, in addition to Winterbotham's book, mentions the work by J.C. Masterman, *The Double-Cross System in the War of 1939–1945* (London: Yale University Press, 1972) as contributing to this turning point in UK intelligence awareness.

times of peace and war. Coincidental to this process was the retiring of many former American intelligence practitioners, many of whom took up teaching positions at universities and introduced intelligence-related courses.

The defining events of the twenty-first century (9/11, the invasion of Iraq in 2003, the London bombings in 2005, and so forth) prompted a dramatic increase in academic attention given to intelligence and the role it played and continues to play in government and modern society. Given this background, intelligence was defined as an important element of competent governance and decision making as well as "a tool for offensive war-making and defensive national security planning."[4] Accordingly, intelligence's place within the national security of the state became the natural focus of academic attention, in addition to topics surrounding other issues, such as the organizational structure of intelligence agencies and intelligence's vulnerability to politicization. Overstepping by intelligence organizations, such as in the United States, the Patriot Act, allegations concerning the use of torture, and the Snowden revelations prompted a flood of academic research on the proper boundaries of intelligence organizations in democratic societies, domestic surveillance, and abuse by Western intelligence agencies on both citizens and non-citizens alike, thus expanding the scope of the field and increasing intelligence's relevancy to the major issues of the twenty-first century.

Intelligence Studies: Developing an Academic Infrastructure

Before 1985, only a handful of intelligence associations and their publications existed in the United States, and they were geared mostly to current and former professionals in intelligence-related industries (mainly military). The events of 1985 (the arrests of Jonathan Pollard and John Anthony Walker, for example), known as the Year of the Spy, provided a strong catalyst that year for the establishment of a number of intelligence-related associations and journals around the world. These associations and journals supplied the necessary academic infrastructure and outlet for advancing knowledge in the field of intelligence studies and for increasing interest in the subject at all stages of academic learning.

The United States is home to several associations dedicated to this purpose of intelligence education and research, such as the Association of Former Intelligence Officers (AFIO) and the International Association

4 Ibid., 58.

for Intelligence Education (IAFIE). The AFIO, established in 1975, aims to raise awareness of the career needs of the US intelligence community among students at high schools and universities across the United States and publishes the *Guide to the Study of Intelligence*, which provides intelligence instructors with a literature review of significant works in order to assist with course development. The IAFIE, created in 2004, aims to bring government and academia together to advance the teaching of intelligence and serves as a catalyst for information sharing about intelligence training and education for both current and aspiring practitioners. The *International Journal of Intelligence and Counter-Intelligence* is a major US contribution to intelligence studies and includes internationally renowned intelligence scholars and former practitioners on its editorial board.

The United Kingdom and Canada house a number of influential associations and journals as well. The United Kingdom features its top intelligence scholars, such as Anthony Glees, Julian Richards, Peter Gill, Mark Phythian, Philip H.J. Davies, and Christopher Andrew in a variety of organizations dedicated to the historical study of intelligence. These include the British International Studies Association's Security and Intelligence Studies (SISG), the Oxford Intelligence Group, Brunel University's Center for Intelligence and Security Studies, and the University of Buckingham's Center for Security and Intelligence Studies. Additionally, the United Kingdom also publishes the well-known journal *Intelligence and National Security*, which produces numerous issues per year and accompanies its American counterpart as the leading scholarly publications on the subject. All these organizations and publications have had a slow but penetrating effect on British academia's approach to the subject of intelligence. In Canada, the Canadian Association for Security and Intelligence Studies (CASIS) is the country's premier association that promotes the study of intelligence. CASIS's goals are to foster the study of intelligence at universities and colleges as well as to provide a forum for academics and practitioners to discuss intelligence-related issues within the context of the constitutional values of society. In 2018, the *Journal of Intelligence, Conflict, and Warfare* was co-established by the Political Science department at Simon Fraser University and CASIS. The Canadian Carleton University also houses the Center for Security, Intelligence, and Defense Studies, which conducts policy-oriented research in the field and other crucial functions and activities.

France, Spain, and Germany also offer important contributions to the academic infrastructure of intelligence studies. France's Centre Français de Recherche sur le Renseignement [French Intelligence Research Center] (CF2R), established in 2000, aims to conduct academic research, publish works on intelligence and international security, and consult with stakeholders in government, business, and media on pertinent issues. At the same time, CF2R also seeks to raise awareness of intelligence as well as to demystify and explain its role and purpose to the French public. Spain's main intelligence-related output began in 2006 as *Inteligencia y Seguridad: Revista de Análisis y Prospectiva* but since 2016 has published exclusively in English under the title *The International Journal of Intelligence, Security, and Public Affairs*. Since 1993, Germany has housed the well-known International Intelligence History Association, which publishes the *Journal of Intelligence History*. The establishment of the Center for Intelligence and Security Studies (CISS) at Bundeswehr University in Munich (a federal research university associated with the German Armed Forces) in September 2017 is a major step up for the presence of intelligence studies in German universities. These initiatives are big leaps on the long road to changing Europe's overall cultural attitude toward intelligence studies and its inclusion in its universities' academic offerings.

Although the highly regarded status of intelligence in Israel should allow it to assume a central role in the numerous National Security Studies programs that populate Israeli universities, most of the discussions on intelligence are conducted primarily at research institutes and think tanks, which mainly organize seminars and conferences and publish policy-oriented periodicals and research papers. The most prominent and well-known research institute is the Institute of National Security Studies (INSS). INSS produces high-quality research in the field of intelligence studies through its tri-annual journal *Cyber, Intelligence, and Security* (replacing the institute's journal *Military and Strategic Affairs*), which focuses on the booming field of cybersecurity and intelligence. INSS also publishes the online publication *INSS Insight*, the quarterly journal *Strategic Assessment*, as well as various memoranda and books related to the field of intelligence. Other prominent Israeli research institutes that conduct research on intelligence and national security include the International Institute for Counter-Terrorism affiliated with IDC Herzliya, the National Security Studies Center at the University

of Haifa, the Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies, and the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs.

The Israel Intelligence Heritage & Commemoration Center (IICC) plays a key role in the promotion of intelligence education, research, history, and commemoration of fallen Israeli intelligence operators. The IICC runs two research institutes: The Meir Amit Intelligence and Terrorism Information Center (ITIC) and the Institute for the Study of Intelligence and Policy Research (ISIPR). The ITIC conducts research and analysis on Middle Eastern affairs, with an emphasis on anti-Semitism, the Palestinian issue, and developments in terrorist-sponsoring countries, namely Syria and Iran. The ITIC also publishes two periodicals: "News of Terrorism and the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict," and "Spotlight on Iran," which reflect the views of the Israeli intelligence community and are distributed to various academic and governmental institutions.

The latter research institution, the ISIPR, is regarded as the more objective of the two and aims to focus on intelligence as a profession (echoing the calls of well-known intelligence scholar Stephen Marrin). In an effort to promote this vision and foster scholarly discussion, the ISIPR also produces a new, bi-annual, and high-quality journal focusing on intelligence methodology entitled *Intelligence in Theory and Practice*. The journal is published both in Hebrew and in English. In addition to its journal, the IICC also publishes in-depth research papers on intelligence topics. Clearly, Israeli intelligence studies already possess a strong academic infrastructure that could support the field's increased participation in university programs.

Approaches to Intelligence Studies

There are a multitude of approaches to the study of intelligence, affected mostly by "the way intelligence is defined [as it] necessarily conditions approaches to research and writing about the subject."[5] This definition has been determined in different ways, often corresponding to a country's tradition of intelligence, culture of secrecy, and ethos of governance. For example, the American definition of intelligence generally revolves around the process of creating intelligence products from both secret and open sources for use by decision makers, whereas the British definition falls squarely in the realm

5 Len Scott and Peter Jackson, "The Study of Intelligence in Theory and Practice," *Intelligence and National Security* 19, no. 2 (2004): 141.

of secret information that is obtained by furtive means. These divergent definitions have a significant impact on the emphases of intelligence programs in the two countries and the approaches utilized in its study.

Additionally, the approach taken to study the multi-dimensional subject depends largely on the academic department in which intelligence studies is nestled. An intelligence program within a history department will approach intelligence differently than an intelligence program that studies it from a political science lens. The interdisciplinary nature of intelligence allows it to behave this way and for the different schools of intelligence to emphasize one approach over another.

The various approaches to intelligence are influenced not only by the fundamental differences between academic approaches and the understanding of what intelligence is but perhaps also by the differing relationships between the countries' intelligence and academic communities. In the United States, although academic prejudice against the intelligence community's entrance and participation in the academic discourse still exists,[6] it is possible to identify a more open and porous relationship between academia and US intelligence agencies relative to other Western democracies. A well-oiled "revolving door" —frequent transitions between academic and governmental spaces— helps to maintain a consistent presence of former intelligence professionals who can offer practical and experienced insight. Additionally, the historical development of intelligence studies in the United States as a social science came as a result of public senate inquiries into the functions, operations, and politicization of intelligence. Thus, this relatively open culture enables the dominant approach to US intelligence studies to include the construction of abstract theoretical models that provide an academic basis for the subject as well as to impart students with the professional skills of intelligence analysis in order to develop qualified entry-level candidates. This process is actively encouraged by US intelligence agencies, who hope to increase public interest and awareness of the nature and activities of intelligence and, through this, enhance the intelligence community's legitimacy and build a pool of potential recruits.

6 For a discussion of academic resistance to intelligence studies in US universities, see Matthew D. Crosston, "Fragile Friendships: Partnerships Between the Academy and Intelligence," *International Journal of Intelligence and CounterIntelligence* 31, no. 1 (2018): 139–158.

In Britain, this relationship is much more limited. The "British School" of intelligence studies is grounded mainly in historical case study-research, including specific decisions made by policymakers and how intelligence has influenced these decisions. This is due in part to the distance maintained between the public and the intelligence services. The Official Secrets Act 1989 deters current and former intelligence officials from speaking about their work and no deep inquiries into the intelligence services were conducted until the aftermath of the 2003 war in Iraq; only after 1979 did historians have access to the historical archives and the sanctioned official histories of the British intelligence services during the Second World War (other methods used in parallel was to research the "adjacent files" of the Foreign Office and the Home Office, as well as the archives of intelligence allies).[7] Additionally, the belief that universities should focus strictly on subject matter knowledge correlates with the opinion that training analysts is best left to the secret services, which is also influenced by this distance maintained between government and academia.

The different approaches employed by the American and British academic communities reflect not only the challenges facing the study of intelligence but also the richness and variety of the subject. This is heavily dependent on the nature of each country's relationship between intelligence agencies and academia as well as the traditions and culture of security. Essentially, the study of intelligence can either be predominantly historical and case study-based or it can be primarily abstract, theoretical, and social science-based. The American approach is more influenced by the social sciences, whereas the British approach is essentially historiosophic. In contrast to the British approach, which emphasizes historical case studies and relies on archival documents, the American approach emphasizes theorization and has a clear preference for the technical and procedural aspects of intelligence. Due to the historical and conceptual differences between the United States and the United Kingdom, the two countries diverge in their approaches used in teaching and research. This can be described as an American-Anglo continuum.

Stafford Thomas, an early American scholar of intelligence, detailed four oft-cited paradigmatic approaches to the study of intelligence: The *historical approach* uses case studies and famous personalities and is either memoir-based

7 See Len Scott, "Sources and Methods in the Study of Intelligence: A British View," *Intelligence and National Security* 22, no. 2 (2007): 185–205.

or archive-based; the *functional approach* focuses on operational activities and processes and delves deeper into more abstract issues; the *structural approach* examines the role of intelligence and security agencies in the conduct of international affairs; the final method is the *political approach,* which addresses policymaking and governance issues and concentrates exclusively on the political dimension of intelligence, including decision making, policy formulation, and so forth.[8]

In a later paper, Wesley Wark, a Canadian intelligence scholar, identified eight different projects/methodologies used in the approach to studying intelligence: *The research project* utilizes primary source archival evidence; *the historical project* produces case study-based accounts; *the definitional project* is concerned with defining the subject; *the methodological project* applies social science concepts to intelligence; that is, using case studies to test the theoretical deliberations; *the memoirs project* is designed to offer first-hand perspectives; *the civil liberties project* is inherently not objective and is designed to reveal the surreptitious activities of intelligence agencies where they impinge on domestic life; *the investigative journalism project* typically covers topics for which there are no historical archives available; and finally, *the popular culture project*—perhaps the latest avenue of research—considers relatively obtuse topics such as the politics of James Bond.[9] These projects can be used to identify four main areas of contemporary work: research/historical, definitional/methodological, organizational/functional, and governance/policy, which are reflective of the above-mentioned four paradigmatic approaches.

Finally, Len Scott and Peter Jackson reflect on three distinct approaches[10] that scholars use in order to achieve specific objectives. The first approach, preferred by historians in particular, conceives of the study of intelligence primarily as a means of acquiring new information in order to explain specific decisions made by policy makers in both peace and war. In this approach, attention is paid to the intelligence gathering process, the nature of the intelligence source, and the organizational structure of intelligence

8 Goodman, *Studying and Teaching about Intelligence.* See also, Stafford. T. Thomas, "Assessing Current Intelligence Studies," *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence* 2, no. 2 (1988): 217–244.

9 Wesley K. Wark, "Introduction: The Study of Espionage: Past Present, Future?" *Intelligence and National Security* 8, no. 3 (1993): 1–13.

10 See Scott, *The Study of Intelligence in Theory and Practice*.

organizations as intelligence travels up the decision chain. The second approach endeavors to construct general models that can explain intelligence success and failure. This is a more political science-based approach and focuses entirely on intelligence analysis and decision making. The aim is to identify and analyze the personal, political, and institutional biases that characterize intelligence organizations. The third approach focuses on the political function of intelligence and how it is used as a means of state control. Central to this approach are ethical issues arising from the activities of intelligence organizations and state power.

The State of Intelligence Studies

United States

Although the events of 9/11 raised the value of intelligence and placed it at the forefront, intelligence studies in the United States was slow to take off. The primary reasons were the dearth of qualified instructors, a lack of means to assess instructors' credentials, and the logistics of curriculum building and program creation. Although smaller initiatives, such as the CIA's Officers-in-Residence program, were already in place, only by 2005 did US academia experience a heightened capacity for intelligence studies. In the same year, the US government, through the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), initiated the US Intelligence Community's Center of Academic Excellence program (IC-CAE), which provided government funding to host universities and was intended to meet the longer-term human resource needs of the intelligence services. This program had a profound effect on the cultivation of intelligence studies as a serious academic discipline.

Internationally, the United States has the largest audience for intelligence studies and has the greatest number of undergraduate and post-graduate courses in the field. The above-mentioned initiatives provided funding and fed the nascent field of intelligence studies, allowing it to grow as a serious form of academic study, mostly by building on existing institutional capabilities across related disciplines. That being said, contemporary intelligence studies in the United States developed mainly within the fields of political science, history, and international relations.

Research examining the curriculum in US universities concluded that, as a general framework, there are three pillars to American degree-granting intelligence programs: the procedural pillar, the core pillar, and the domain

pillar.[11] The procedural pillar focuses on the performance of intelligence tasks and the acquisition of analytical skills. The core pillar addresses the organizational, historical, and ethical content areas of intelligence and offers an intellectual and theoretical framework for understanding the central issues surrounding intelligence. Finally, the domain pillar provides knowledge about the different types of intelligence, such as national security, criminal intelligence, cyber intelligence, and competitive intelligence. National security, with a heavy focus on terrorism, is most dominant in American universities, while the least developed is the business-related competitive intelligence.

From the survey conducted it could be concluded that universities are "training" students in intelligence rather than "educating" them about intelligence. Many universities strive to adopt this "training" methodology because they claim that US agencies look for this skill set in potential candidates. A look at Mercyhurst University's undergraduate intelligence studies degree reveals this emphasis in its core courses, which impart students with functional skills. These courses include "Intelligence Methods and Analysis," "Professional Communications," "Intelligence Writing and Presentation," and "Communicating Intelligence Analysis." The degree mission statement further emphasizes this point in that it seeks to "to provide its graduates with an advanced level of analytical skills . . . and the necessary background for students to pursue careers as research and/or intelligence analysts in government agencies and private enterprise."[12]

Intelligence scholars, such as Nicholas Dujmovic and Mark Lowenthal, highlight the opportunity cost of studying intelligence with the goal of employment in an intelligence organization; studying the subject as a major in US universities would take the place of subjects that are crucial to intelligence analysis, like foreign languages and computer science. These schools train students as "generalists"—those trained in the methods and mechanics of intelligence analysis—in lieu of "specialists" with expertise in specific subject matter. It is precisely on this issue that scholars diverge

11 See Stephen Coulthart and Matthew Crosston, "Terra Incognita: Mapping American Intelligence Education Curriculum," *Journal of Strategic Security* 8, no. 3 (2015): 46–68.

12 Mercyhurst University, "Intelligence Studies, Ridge College of Intelligence Studies and Applied Sciences," *Mercyhurst University*, accessed November 11, 2018, https://www.mercyhurst.edu/ridge-college-intelligence-studies-and-applied-sciences/intelligence-studies.

on what the division of labor should be between university education and intelligence agency training. The US university learning structure offers a simple solution: major in a specialized subject matter and minor in intelligence studies.[13]

Britain

As previously stated, the way a country defines intelligence, its historical background, and the structure and makeup of a country's intelligence community all contribute to different foci when considering the study of intelligence. These factors have immense importance in the way that intelligence is manifested in the academic world. In the United Kingdom, intelligence is defined as "information acquired against the wishes and generally without the knowledge of the originators or possessors. Sources are kept secret from readers as are the techniques used to acquire the information."[14] This opposes the US definition, which is generally held to be any information, from covert and overt sources, that is turned into an end-product for the consumption of decision makers. The difference in perspective across the Atlantic could be described as intelligence as "secret information" versus intelligence as a "process."

Anthony Glees has pointed out that this focus reveals a paradox between the American and British intelligence studies programs: The narrow definition of intelligence in the United Kingdom has led to a broader study of the subject (history), whereas in the United States, the opposite holds true (analysis). Glees suggests that one reason for this may be that the British intelligence community "believes that whilst it might be useful to them if some of their intelligence officers had degrees in intelligence studies, there is no particular reason why they should."[15] In the United Kingdom, there is much more emphasis on "education" rather than "training." This is partly because many UK universities are hesitant about the idea that universities should "train" their students.

---

13 See Nicholas Dujmovic, "Colleges Must be Intelligent About Intelligence Studies," *Washington Post*, December 30, 2016. See also Alessandro Scheffler Corvaja, Brigita Jeraj, and Uwe M. Borghoff, "The Rise of Intelligence Studies: A Model for Germany?" *Connections: The Quarterly Journal* 15, no. 1 (2016): 79–106.

14 Anthony Glees, "Intelligence Studies, Universities, and Security," *British Journal of Educational Studies* 63, no. 3 (2015): 282.

15 Ibid., 288.

Although there was already some scholarly work on the history of intelligence issues (the first revelations about British intelligence successes in World War II had appeared in the 1970s) and growing concern in the American and British public about intelligence failures and scandals, the British intelligence community remained resolutely secret. Nevertheless, 9/11 and the intelligence failures in the war in Iraq spurred a change in the British awareness of the intelligence community. The release of Lord Butler's *Review of Intelligence on Weapons of Mass Destruction* and other archived material caught the attention of academics, especially historians. The academic study of intelligence in the United Kingdom has developed overwhelmingly within the discipline of international history and focuses on mostly archive-based research. This is partly due to the distance maintained between academics and practitioners. This approach is reflected in the leading British journal on the topic, *Intelligence and National Security,* as it is geared largely toward historians.

Further evidence of the "British School" of intelligence studies can be compiled by cataloging the programs in intelligence offered in the British university system. Generally, courses on intelligence are found at the graduate level. Individual courses on the subject exist (mostly within history departments), and only recently have degree-granting programs in intelligence studies been established at the undergraduate level. These courses and programs in intelligence are usually combined with relevant topics in the field of intelligence as it applies to national security in the twenty-first century and focuses on the interaction between intelligence and war, politics, and international relations. In contrast with the US programs, the curricular content does not include instruction on intelligence analysis. The undergraduate programs of Strategy, Intelligence, and Security at Aberystwyth University and Security, Intelligence, and Cyber at the University are apt examples of this description.

At the master's level, intelligence programs are simply variations of international relations programs, aiming to produce scholars of the subject, not practitioners. Additionally, the focus on intelligence mostly is done through historical case studies, supporting the fact that the subject in the United Kingdom developed primarily from the study of history and less so from the theoretical and abstract social sciences. As an example of the above, the master's program in Intelligence and International Security Studies at

the King's College Department of War Studies informs prospective students that they "will develop an awareness of the ways in which intelligence issues manifest themselves in security issues in peace and war," and they "will also gain an understanding of ethical dilemmas associated with intelligence activity."[16] Included is one core course in intelligence, entitled "Intelligence in Peace and War." Not one course on the program's elective course list imparts a skillset to students. Rather, it is mostly subject-area focused akin to an international relations program. Brunel University's master's program in "Intelligence and Security Studies" is the one exception to the rule and includes one required course on "Analytical Methodology."

Canada

Initially, most of the official government publications relating to Canadian intelligence consisted largely of the various scandals that rocked the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) during the late 1970s to early 1980s. However, since the creation of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, upon recommendation by the McDonald Commission (a commission set up to investigate the RCMP whose job at that time was both policing and security intelligence), information on Canadian intelligence began to be publicized more steadily, principally by the Security Intelligence Review Committee. Since 1984, this body has been issuing detailed annual reports that provide insight into the realm of the CSIS as well as the general field of Canadian intelligence.

The field of Canadian intelligence studies is small but healthy. Most of the writing on intelligence in Canada has been done by Canadian academics; few non-Canadians have focused on the country. Those who write about security and intelligence in Canada are mainly historians by training, with some political scientists in the mix. Many of these scholars belong to Canada's premier intelligence research center, CASIS, which has held annual conferences and has encouraged the mingling of academics with practitioners since 1985 (established one year after the creation of CSIS and SIRC). Two motivations seem to dominate Canadian participation in intelligence studies: interest and duty. The second motivation is characterized

16 King's College London, "Intelligence and International Security MA," *King's College London*, accessed June 22, 2018, https://www.kcl.ac.uk/study/postgraduate/taught-courses/intelligence-and-international-security-ma.aspx.

by some academics who feel that they are performing a public service by writing about an area that is normally hidden from public view and where the exercise of democratic controls is necessary.

Canada's universities that supply intelligence-related courses and programs are mainly on the master's level and, for the most part, utilize a historical approach. The focus is interdisciplinary and less on professional skills; it is assumed that students already have acquired critical thinking, written and oral communication skills, and analytic skills at the undergraduate level. Intelligence-related programs include Carleton University's Center for Security, Intelligence, and Defense Studies at the Norman Patterson School of International Affairs; Simon Fraser University's Terrorism, Risk, and Security Studies Program; University of Ottawa's summer course on Intelligence and Security; and the Center for Conflict Studies at the University of New Brunswick, which publishes the *Journal of Conflict Studies*.

Several historical periods draw the steady attention of researchers, including World War II, the Cold War, the events surrounding the Quebec Liberation Front (FLQ), the 1981 McDonald Commission, and the creation of CSIS. In addition, several major themes have dominated the Canadian security and intelligence literature since its inception. Especially due to the RCMP scandals, questions of the proper limits of the law and ethics have been at the core of the literature. Another theme is whether Canada should have a separate civilian intelligence service and the difficulties that it faces as well as the nature of its review and oversight by SIRC. More attention is paid to the oversight and review mechanisms than the effectiveness and practices of the Canadian intelligence community. Finally, another recent interest is the question of whether Canada should even have a foreign intelligence service.[17]

Germany

Wolfgang Krieger, a prominent German intelligence historian, wrote in 2004 that "German historians have so far shown little interest in the history of intelligence services and in the role the craft of intelligence played in national and international politics."[18] The state of German intelligence studies

17 See Geoffrey R. Weller, "Assessing Canadian intelligence Literature: 1980–2000," *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence* 14, no. 1 (2001): 49–61.

18 Wolfgang Krieger, "German Intelligence History: A Field in Search of Scholars," *Intelligence and National Security* 19, no. 2 (2004): 185.

is weak relative to the United States and the United Kingdom, as there is not even one dedicated program in the field offered in the country. A number of factors contribute to its underdevelopment: a lack of declassified documents, the complete absence of former intelligence officials at universities (no "revolving door"), and the mindset of German academia, which is not fond of research on defense and security issues as a result of Germany's Nazi and Gestapo experiences during World War II, as well as the experiences of the Cold War.[19]

However, there has been gradual change. At the end of the Cold War, Stasi archives suddenly became available along with some Russian records as well. In response a small group of German historians interested in the subject formed a study group to capitalize on this new opportunity for research. They established themselves as the International Intelligence History Association and, in 2001, started the *Journal of Intelligence History*, co-edited by Chris Moran of the University of Warwick and Shlomo Shapiro of Bar-Ilan University. The CISS plans in 2019 to begin a master's degree program in Intelligence and Security Studies at the Departmental Branch of the Intelligence Services of the Federal University of Applied Administrative Sciences (Hochschule des Bundes) and at the Bundeswehr University Munich. The program will focus on issues related to intelligence and security and professional skills, akin to the American School. The master's program will be available only to members of the German intelligence services.[20] Despite these developments, the obstacles facing German intelligence studies remain.

Spain

Since 2005, intelligence studies in Spanish academia has been increasingly supported by the Spanish Ministry of Defense and by the Centro Nacional de Inteligencia (CNI), the Spanish intelligence service that was established in 2002. The increase of Spanish academia's engagement with intelligence studies has come in response to its intelligence community's desire to correct inaccurate public perception of intelligence and to publicly promote a "culture of intelligence" through universities, also known as the CNI's Intelligence

19 Ibid. See also Corvaja, *The Rise of Intelligence Studies*.

20 See Universität der Bundeswehr München, "Center for Intelligence and Security Studies," *Universität der Bundeswehr München,* accessed November 20, 2018, https://www.unibw.de/ciss.

Culture Initiative. At the heart of this intelligence culture initiative is the CNI's development and management of its relationships with academia in order to benefit from the latter's expertise and thorough research in pertinent areas. As a result, the normalization of intelligence studies as an academic discipline in Spain has been one important outcome.

Although much has been accomplished, a number of obstacles still prevent intelligence studies in Spain from further maturation, such as a dearth of experienced faculty, a lacuna in specialized literature in foreign languages, the absence of a clear conceptual and theoretical definition of intelligence, as well as a lack of a common understanding of the word intelligence in Spain outside of its intelligence community (no culture of intelligence); increased business value in the use of the word "intelligence" even when there is no connection to the Spanish intelligence community; the slow and laborious process of declassification; and the preoccupation with intelligence conspiracy theories and legends.[21] Ultimately, "the development of Intelligence Studies in Spain will depend on the successful creation of an academic culture that understands that the study of intelligence in a democratic society is not only normal, but fundamental, and that the Intelligence Community is part of the machinery of the modern state."[22]

France

In France, there is an attitude among the public and academia that resembles Germany's relationship with intelligence studies, in that there are historic and cultural reasons for the apparent disregard for the subject. First, intelligence work has never been held in high regard by politicians, the military, academics, or economists, and "espionage" has been looked upon negatively since the Dreyfus Affair. Second, historians and political scientists traditionally had not considered intelligence to be an important parameter of statecraft, nor did they consider the intelligence services as significant stakeholders in state policy. Third, the secret nature of intelligence work did not facilitate the work of researchers, and the issue of access to documents for a long time stymied historical research.

---

21 Gustavo Diaz Matey, "The Development of Intelligence Studies in Spain," *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence* 23, no. 4 (2010): 748–765.

22 Ibid., 760.

The emergence of intelligence studies in the world of French academia is principally a result of the information revolution and ever-increasing global competition during the early 1990s. Economic stakeholders began to take a great interest in integrating intelligence into businesses. In response to this new market demand, universities specializing in business, management, and economics began to provide courses or other specialized post-graduate courses on "business-intelligence." In parallel, research and publications on the subject expanded. In addition to the comparative advantage intelligence can offer to businesses, the attacks of September 11 thrust intelligence into the spotlight as an essential instrument in domestic security, military defense, and foreign policy. However, French ideas of intelligence have mostly focused on domestic matters and internal security in defense of national interest.[23]

Israel

Security is central to the Israeli experience and intelligence studies are extremely relevant within the Israeli context. Public awareness of security issues and the unique characteristics of socio-military relations in Israel contribute to a porous relationship between the intelligence and security communities and Israeli academia. This is an advantageous condition for the growth of intelligence studies. Israeli academia is aflush with the presence of retired security and intelligence establishment personnel, or at least those who served for several years in military intelligence units during their mandatory military service. Additionally, they have accumulated rich and valuable professional experiences as well as broad networks of current and former security and intelligence officials. Research in the field of intelligence in Israel and its low barrier to entry for the general public is unique and remarkable.

Many scholars involved in intelligence-related research at universities are situated in political science departments. Nevertheless, their research methodologies are mainly historical (similar to the "British School") and focus on Israeli intelligence history, especially in regard to intelligence failure (since intelligence successes is rarely publicized). Other research topics include comparisons between the Israeli and foreign intelligence communities, international and methodological aspects of intelligence,

23 Eric Denécé and Gérald Arboit, "Intelligence Studies in France," *International Journal of Intelligence and CounterIntelligence* 23, no. 4 (2010): 725–747.

the relations between Israeli security services and the rule of law, and the organizational structure of the Israeli intelligence community. One common obstacle to Israeli scholarship in intelligence studies is Israel's strict policy regarding the declassification and publication of past intelligence-related records.

The teaching of intelligence at Israeli universities is mainly found in only a handful of courses that are part of MA-level programs in National Security and International Relations. Programs in the field of national security for students who are not part of the security establishment are few. The oldest program for civilian students in security studies is Tel Aviv University's interdisciplinary MA program in Security Studies, situated in the Political Science Department. Another program is the BA in Government with a specialization in homeland security and counterterrorism at the Interdisciplinary Center in Herzliya. There was one notable attempt in 2015 by world-renowned Professor Shlomo Shapiro and Dr. Ephraim Lapid to establish an MA-level intelligence studies program in Bar-Ilan University's Political Science Department; this program, however, no longer exists.

Intelligence Communities and the Academicization of Intelligence

The approach of intelligence agencies to the academization of intelligence depends heavily on the general and national way of life, as well as the political values, and the culture of both intelligence and of higher education. Defining "intelligence" is also an important determining factor in the approach to outside scrutiny. The difference in attitudes reflects not only on the academic relationship between the intelligence communities and academia but also on the developmental path of intelligence studies in their respective countries.

US intelligence agencies are embracing the growing interest in intelligence studies and promoting and encouraging research and teaching in this field through initiatives such as geospatial intelligence scholarships and certificates, the Intelligence Community Centers of Academic Excellence (IC-CAE), and the Officers-in-Residence program. Within the American intelligence community itself, the inclusion of an academic component to their internal training paradigm is fixated on acquiring procedural knowledge and a common analytic vocabulary. This is manifested by numerous analytic training classes

at CIA University (the CIA's training apparatus), which incorporate and emphasize certifiable Structured Analytic Techniques (SATs).[24]

In the United Kingdom, secrecy and separation characterize the academic-intelligence relationship. Although undeniably attracted to one another, the British government has maintained the separation of intelligence services and the academic study of intelligence through various means, such as the exclusion of intelligence agencies from the British Freedom of Information Act. All this makes access to archival materials tightly controlled and restricted, even though the end of the Cold War led to a gradual loosening of the government's approach to archival release. British intelligence agencies generally do not engage directly with academic intelligence programs except in more technical fields, such as cybersecurity. There has been some degree of openness in recent years pertaining to agency-academic engagement, but the trend is not widespread and remains picky and exclusionary.[25] The establishment of a closed ten-week professional development program at King's College of London's Department of War Studies following Lord Butler's 2004 report on UK intelligence exemplifies the inclusion of academic content in British intelligence's training of analysts.[26]

In Canada, when Carleton University's Canadian Center for Intelligence and Security Studies (CCISS) was founded, it held workshops for intelligence practitioners. Academic research papers of interest to intelligence were also encouraged and were printed and distributed under the Canadian intelligence budget. Currently, at most, PhD students may be encouraged to research an area of particular interest to intelligence agencies and given some access to

24 John A. Gentry, "The 'Professionalization' of Intelligence Analysis: A Skeptical Perspective," *International Journal of Intelligence and CounterIntelligence* 29, no. 4 (2016): 643–676.

25 See Helen Dexter, Mark Phythian, and David Strachan-Morris, "The What, Why, Who, and How of Teaching Intelligence: The Leicester Approach," *Intelligence and National Security* 32, no. 7 (2017): 920–934; Julian Richards, "Intelligence Studies, Academia and Professionalization," *International Journal of Intelligence, Security, and Public Affairs* 18, no. 1 (2016): 20–33; and Len Scott and Peter Jackson, "The Study of Intelligence in Theory and Practice," *Intelligence and National Security* 19, no. 2 (2004): 139–169.

26 See Corvaja, *The Rise of Intelligence Studies,* and Michael S. Goodman and David Omand, "What Analysts Need to Understand: The King's Intelligence Studies Program," *Studies in Intelligence* 52, no. 4 (2008).

files at CSIS.[27] As it applies to existing Canadian intelligence community members, the Canadian Association of Professional Intelligence Analysts (CAPIA) provides a platform for Canadian intelligence analysts to pursue advanced training, continuing education, and professional development.[28] However, as whole in the Canadian and British intelligence communities, academic research in intelligence studies is often seen as irrelevant, too theoretical, and ill-tuned to the needs of intelligence consumers.[29]

Studying intelligence in university, whether as a course or a program, is less important, especially outside of the United States. Intelligence agencies are generally "indifferent" to whether applicants have taken a course in intelligence; they are more interested in an applicant's area of study and they trust that basic critical thinking and analytical skills are already present. However, the real value and importance of intelligence courses lies in the fact that students who have taken courses in the subject are more likely to apply for positions in their respective intelligence community.[30]

Conclusion

The United States, United Kingdom, and Canada are at the forefront of academicization efforts concerning intelligence. In other Western countries, such as Spain, France, and Germany, the process of academicization has been slower and burdened by the darker roles played by the intelligence services at certain points in history.

In the past four decades, the distinction between two prominent approaches to the academization of intelligence has become clearer. The American approach is more influenced by the social sciences, whereas the British approach is essentially historiosophic. In contrast to the British approach, which has an emphasis on historical case studies and relies on archival documents, the American approach emphasizes theorization and a clear preference for the technical and procedural aspects of intelligence. The differences between the two schools are influenced not only by diverging academic approaches but also by the boundaries between the intelligence practitioner and the

27 Angela Gendron, "Re: Intelligence Studies in Canada," email message to Aaron Kornbluth. July 29, 2018.

28 Stéphane Lefebvre and Jeremy Littlewood, "Guide to Canadian Intelligence Issues," *Intelligencer: Journal of U.S. Intelligence Studies* 19, no. 2 (2012): 63–89.

29 Gendron, "Re: Intelligence Studies in Canada."

30 Ibid.

academic spaces. Despite the different approaches to the academization of intelligence and the divergent attitudes of the academic establishment toward the intelligence communities in the various countries, it seems that in all cases there is clear agreement regarding the importance of intelligence in foreign policy and decision-making processes.

With respect to Israel, the centrality and public awareness of security issues as well as of the general socio-military relations create a porous relationship between the security and intelligence establishments and academia. Israeli academia has a relatively plentiful presence of retired security and intelligence professionals who have rich professional experiences and vast networks of contacts. Despite that Israeli universities focus more on security issues than on intelligence per se, Israeli research in the field of intelligence studies, primarily conducted at research institutes and think tanks, is impressive and highly accessible to the public. The most prominent output on the subject of intelligence has certainly been the product of the IICC and INSS. Clearly, the singular conditions in Israel enable accelerated cooperation between the intelligence and academic communities and, with it, the significant advancement of intelligence studies in Israel. This would benefit not only the training and professional development of the Israeli intelligence community but also the Israeli academic community as obvious leaders in the field at the international level.