

Government 7.12**Intelligence and National Security**

Prof. Jeff Friedman (jeffrey.a.friedman@dartmouth.edu)

Office hours: Mondays, 3:30-5:30pm

Silsby 224

**Dartmouth College
Winter 2019**

MWF 2:10-2:15pm

x-period: Thursday, 1:20-2:10pm

[Classroom TBD]

This first-year seminar explores challenges and controversies of U.S. intelligence analysis. Almost all important issues in intelligence are surrounded by secrecy and uncertainty. It is inherently difficult to know “what works” in intelligence, to define “good” analysis, or to make sound recommendations for improvement. Specific controversies we examine include the September 11 terrorist attacks, assessments of Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction, CIA methods of “enhanced interrogation,” and Edward Snowden’s disclosure of classified programs. In analyzing these topics, we engage broader debates about what it means to address high-stakes controversies in a manner that is both rigorous and useful.

Learning objectives:

Through reading, writing, and discussion, this course seeks to develop students’ ability to:

- *Perform close and critical readings.* For example, we will compare the Senate’s official critique of “enhanced interrogations” with CIA’s defense of these practices. How well does each side of this debate deploy logic and evidence to support its claims?
- *Distinguish opinions and beliefs from researched claims and evidence.* Intelligence is a controversial field. Many participants in intelligence debates have stakes in the outcome, and do not always argue their positions objectively. Especially since the public usually has limited information about intelligence matters, how can we distinguish between rigorous arguments and political advocacy?
- *Understand what makes for a good research question.* Social sciences revolve around combining logic and evidence to draw inferences that are interesting, useful, and rigorous. Many important questions in the field of national security are not tractable enough to be analyzed in this way. And many questions that social scientists ask are not interesting or useful! Finding the overlap between these areas – asking questions that we *want* to answer and that we *can* answer – is one of the central challenges in the social science disciplines.

Intelligence analysis is an ideal subject for a writing seminar, because it is a field that depends on clear, useful, sound argumentation. By discussing declassified intelligence analyses, scholarship, and students’ draft writing, we aim to cultivate the ability to:

- *Advance a clear thesis, supported by a synthesis of logic and evidence.*
- *Take a piece of writing through the process of revision and editing.*
- *Perform critical readings of one’s own writing and the writing of others.*

We will also see that the production of intelligence also involves the robust, constructive, confident interchange of ideas among analysts, and this is one of the cornerstones of academic discourse as well. For a broader list of first-year seminar learning objectives, see <http://dartmouth.edu/writing-speech/teaching/guidelines/first-year-seminar-course-outcomes>.

Assignments/grading:

Written assignments for this class are designed to give students an opportunity to build solid work in stages. All students complete three 3-page papers; convert these short assignments into two 5-page papers; and convert one of those longer assignments into an 8-10-page paper. Students receive feedback at each of these stages. Here is the distribution of grading for assignments:

- *Class participation (20 percent)*. Students are expected to contribute to each class session based on careful reading of course material. Class participation includes providing constructive peer reviews of your colleagues' work. One useful strategy for class participation is to come to each class ready to discuss one specific argument in each reading that you found to be interesting/useful and one specific argument in each reading that you consider to be unsound. Your views on this subject will be a key component of class discussion.
- *Group intelligence estimate (10 percent)*. One week of this course will be devoted to a simulation exercise in which we practice corporate writing by producing intelligence estimates in groups.
- *Satisfactory completion of three 3-page papers (10 percent)*. Students complete three 3-page writing assignments on a pass/fail basis. Each passing grade is worth 3.33 points towards a student's final grade. Students provide peer reviews of each 3-page paper.
- *Two graded 5-page papers (20 percent)*. Students complete two 5-page papers for this course, one on the 2002 National Intelligence Estimate regarding Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programs, and one on CIA's "enhanced interrogation" program. Students receive instructor feedback on each 5-page paper.
- *Final paper (40 percent)*. Each student expands one of their papers into an 8-10 page analysis. This is the capstone project for the term.

Website:

All course materials (including readings, assignments, guidelines, handouts, and additional resources) are uploaded to the course website. Thus there are no course materials required for purchase. Please check the website regularly for updates on scheduling and assignments.

Office Hours:

Office hours are in Silsby 224, from 3:00-5:00pm on Wednesdays. I post a signup sheet on my office door, though students are always welcome to stop by to take unreserved spaces on the schedule. If you have a regular scheduling conflict, please contact me for appointments.

Course Schedule:

1. Introduction. What Can We Expect from National Security Analysis?

Richard K. Betts, *Enemies of Intelligence: Knowledge & Power in American National Security* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006), pp. 19-52.

Richard P. Feynman, "Cargo Cult Science," Caltech commencement address (1974). See link on website.

2. "The System Was Blinking Red": Intelligence on Al Qaeda Before 9/11

National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, *9/11 Commission Report* (2004), pp. 254-277, 339-360.

3. Was 9/11 an Intelligence Failure?

Richard A. Posner, "The 9/11 Report: A Dissent," *New York Times Book Review*, August 29, 2004, 3pp.

Richard K. Betts, *Enemies of Intelligence: Knowledge & Power in American National Security* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006), pp. 104-114.

4. Discussion of 9/11 Intelligence

Due by noon on [date]: Upload to Canvas 3 pages of double-spaced text explaining the extent to which you believe 9/11 was an intelligence failure. You can base this paper solely on the sources listed on the syllabus. This paper will be graded on a pass/fail basis.

You will be assigned to provide peer review feedback on one of your classmates' papers. Please come to class prepared to provide specific reactions to your colleague's work.

5. Research Toolkit I: Finding Academic Sources Online

National Intelligence Estimate 2002-16HC, *Iraq's Continuing Programs for Weapons of Mass Destruction* (October 2002), pp. 5-9.

Betts, *Enemies of Intelligence*, pp. 114-123.

6. The 2002 National Intelligence Estimate on Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction Programs

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, "*Report on the U.S. Intelligence Community's Prewar Intelligence Assessments on Iraq* (July, 2004), pp. 84-119, 129-141, 143-148, 152-157, 187-194.

7. Was the Iraq WMD Estimate an Intelligence Failure?

Find three additional sources online that debate whether the Iraq WMD Estimate was or was not an intelligence failure. One of these sources must be Robert Jervis's article on "Reports, Politics, and Intelligence Failures" from the *Journal of Strategic Studies*. Please come to class ready to discuss where you found those sources and what they said.

8. Discussion of the 2002 Iraq WMD Estimate

Due by 6pm on [date]: Upload to Canvas 3 pages of double-spaced text explaining the extent to which you believe the 2002 Iraq WMD Estimate was an intelligence failure. This paper should cite at least five sources that are not listed on the syllabus and that you found online. You will be assigned to provide peer review feedback on one of your classmates' papers. Please come to class prepared to provide specific reactions to your colleague's work.

**9. Research Toolkit II: Using Dartmouth's Library Resources
with James Adams**

No assigned readings: work on expanding your papers on the Iraq WMD Estimate.

10. The U.S. Senate Democrats' Criticisms of CIA Torture

Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, *Committee Study of the Central Intelligence Agency's Detention and Interrogation Program*, Executive Summary (December, 2014). Read the summary of findings before the table of contents and then Section III.F, "The Eight Primary CIA Effectiveness Representations," pp. 217-310. (You'll find that the report reads fast.)

Due before class: Revise and expand your paper on Iraq WMD in light of our class discussion. Upload 5 pages of double-spaced text on this subject to Canvas. No peer reviews are required for this assignment.

11. Friday, January 27. CIA's Defense of Enhanced Interrogation

Central Intelligence Agency, *Comments on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Report on the Rendition, Detention, and Interrogation Program*. Read Brennan's preface and then the report's annex responding to the case studies in the SSCI report (starting on page 84 of the pdf, pp. 2-21).

12. Discussion of Torture/Enhanced Interrogation

Due by 8pm on Sunday, January 29: Upload to Canvas 3 pages of double-spaced text explaining whether you believe that the CIA's interrogation program produced valuable information. Include five sources other than the reports listed on the syllabus.

You will be assigned to provide peer review feedback on one of your classmates' papers. Please come to class prepared to provide specific reactions to your colleague's work.

13. Research Toolkit III: Reading Qualitative Social Science

Rob Johnston, *Analytic Culture in the U.S. Intelligence Community* (Center for the Study of Intelligence, 2005), pp. 9-29, and read at least one additional chapter carefully.

14. Secrecy and the Press

James Risen and Eric Lichtblau, "Bush Lets U.S. Spy on Callers Without Courts," *New York Times*, 16 December 2005, 4pp.

Gabriel Schoenfeld, "Has the New York Times Violated the Espionage Act?" *Commentary*, 1 March 2006, 12 pp.

Bill Keller, "Dealing with Assange and the WikiLeaks Secrets," *New York Times Magazine*, 26 January 2011, 17pp.

15. The Snowden Disclosures

Perform your own research on the content and impact of the Snowden disclosures. Using Dartmouth Library resources, read through the special forum on "Implications of the Snowden Leaks" in *Intelligence and National Security*, Vol. 29, No. 6.

Due before class: Revise and expand your paper on CIA interrogation in light of our class discussion. Upload 5 pages of double-spaced text on this subject to Canvas.

16. Research Toolkit IV: Reading Quantitative Social Science

Leaf Van Boven, Charles Judd, and Mark Travers, "Do You Wanna Know a Secret?" *New York Times*, 28 June 2013, 4 pp.

Mark Travers, Leaf Van Boven, and Charles Judd, "The Secrecy Heuristic: Inferring Quality from Secrecy in Foreign Policy Contexts," *Political Psychology*, Vol. 35, No. 1 (February 2014), pp. 97-111.

17. The Tradecraft of Intelligence Analysis

Richards J. Heuer, Jr., "Limits of Intelligence Analysis," *Orbis* (Winter 2005), pp. 75-94.

Optional: Skim the CIA Tradecraft Primer (link online) to get a sense of some structured analytic techniques which intelligence officials employ.

18. Special Office Hours

In lieu of class meeting, please sign up for office hours to discuss the final paper assignment.

19. Communicating Uncertainty in Intelligence

Sherman Kent, "Words of Estimative Probability," *Studies in Intelligence* (Fall 1964), 13pp.

Michael Schrage, "What Percent is Slam Dunk?" *Washington Post*, 20 February 2005, p. B01.

20. Evaluating Intelligence I: Conceptual Foundations

Stephen Marrin, "Evaluating the Quality of Intelligence Analysis: By What (Mis)Measure?" *Intelligence and National Security*, Vol. 27, No. 6 (2012), pp. 896-912.

David R. Mandel and Alan Barnes, "Accuracy of Forecasts in Strategic Intelligence," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, Vol. 111, No. 30 (29 July 2014), pp. 10984-10989.

21. Evaluating Intelligence II: Declassified Estimates

The National Intelligence Council publishes a large volume of declassified estimates online. (See website for link.) Scan through these estimates. Identify one example of an estimate that you think represents quality analysis, and one example of an estimate that you think falls

short of that standard. Upload links to each document to Canvas before class, along with a paragraph explaining why you selected them. We will then discuss a few of these examples students provided.

22. Group Estimation I

23. Group Estimation II

24. Group Estimation III

During this week of class, we will create group intelligence estimates, analyzing an issue in current events. Use these class periods in order to conduct background research and coordinate your workload.

25. Discussion of Group Intelligence Estimates

Due before class: Submit your group's intelligence estimate (3 pages, double-spaced) to Canvas by 6p.m. on [date]. Read each other's estimates before class.

In this class period, we will "coordinate" different estimates, in an attempt to reach a group consensus.

26. Paper workshop II

Due by 6pm on [date]: Upload to Canvas a draft of your final paper, which should now be 8-10 pages in length, and should include substantially more research than the original 5-page version. You will be divided into groups in order to give each other feedback on your writing. This assignment is ungraded. Please read your groupmates' work carefully and prepare comments.

27. Conclusion

Michael C. Horowitz and Philip E. Tetlock, "Trending Upward: How the Intelligence Community Can Better See into the Future," *Foreign Policy*, 6 September 2012, 10 pp.

David Ignatius, "More Chatter than Needed," *Washington Post*, 1 November 2013, 3 pp.

Due before class: Upload a copy of your final paper to Canvas and bring a hard copy to class.

Course Policies:

Grades for written work. Written work that is “about the quality expected” in a first-year seminar will receive a B+. In order to receive a higher grade, students must make arguments that are especially clear, supported by especially rigorous evidence. We will talk frequently in class about what this entails.

Honor principle. Students are responsible for understanding Dartmouth’s Honor Principle and its rules on academic integrity. For more information on sources and citations in particular, see <https://writing-speech.dartmouth.edu/learning/materials/sources-and-citations-dartmouth>. For more information on the Honor Principle itself, see <https://student-affairs.dartmouth.edu/policy/academic-honor-principle>.

Class attendance is required unless you have a scheduled commitment. Please let me know well in advance if you cannot attend a specific session. If you have a religious observance that conflicts with your participation in the course, please meet with me before the end of the second week of the term to discuss appropriate accommodations.

Extensions. All written assignments for this class are posted on Canvas at the start of the term. Please do not ask for an extension unless you have encountered an unforeseeable emergency. Please cc: your undergraduate dean when making an extension request.

Late submissions. Late submissions receive a one-grade penalty (e.g. B+ to C+) which recurs every 24 hours.

Formatting written work. All written work should be double-spaced, with 12-point font, one-inch margins, letter-sized paper, and normal character spacing. Citations do not count against the space limit if you use endnotes. Abnormal formatting will receive the same one-grade penalty as late work.

Students who may need disability-related academic adjustments and services for this course are encouraged to see me as early in the term as possible. Students requiring disability-related academic adjustments and services should consult the Student Accessibility Services office (603-646-9900, Student.Accessibility.Services@Dartmouth.edu). Once SAS has authorized services, students must show the originally signed SAS Services and Consent Form and/or a letter on SAS letterhead to their professor. As a first step, if students have questions about whether they qualify to receive academic adjustments and services, they should contact the SAS office. All inquiries and discussions will remain confidential.