

The Rise and Fall of an Intelligence Discipline— and Its Uncertain Future

James B. Bruce*

Formal Intelligence Community efforts to understand and counter foreign denial and deception have experienced a rollercoaster ride in post-WWII US intelligence history.

There is no single facet of the warning problem so unpredictable, and yet so potentially damaging in its effect, as deception. ... [A study of deception cases] will only reinforce a conclusion that the most brilliant analysis may founder in the face of deception and that the most expert and experienced among us on occasion may be as vulnerable as the novice.

— Cynthia Grabo, *Anticipating Surprise*¹

Formal Intelligence Community (IC) efforts to understand and counter foreign denial and deception (D&D) have experienced a rollercoaster ride in post-WWII US intelligence history. Champions have been few, resources uncertain, and appreciation of its importance lacking. Two exceptional periods provided high points. Under the leadership of Directors of Central Intelligence (DCIs) William Casey (1981–87) and James Woolsey (1993–95)—buoyed by help from outside the IC—counter-D&D enjoyed strong support, and CIA and the IC developed a discipline to work

effectively in the field. Yet the discipline was not sustained.^a

This article surveys the origins of the counter-D&D discipline, its notable accomplishments, and the failure to sustain a durable counter-D&D capability. It also examines the implications of a mercurial history, argues that the capability is still needed, and suggests approaches to achieving it in the present. This interpretation is largely based on direct experience; interviews and correspondence with key participants; and informed critiques of previous drafts, though without the benefit of internal classified records. This article examines the two periods in which countering foreign D&D became a recognized IC priority. Each period presented an uncommon convergence of a DCI favorably disposed toward D&D with an external constituency insisting on more of it. And both periods demonstrated the responsiveness of IC leaders to strong, high-level Executive Branch and congressional engagement.

The substantive D&D focus of both periods was on the question

a. In IC terminology, analytic disciplines refer to fields of analysis that require specialized knowledge, tools, training, and standards of quality.

* During the Casey period, the author served as a senior analyst with the newly established Foreign Intelligence Capabilities Group (1984–86), which began the first D&D portfolio in CIA’s Directorate of Intelligence (DI) (now Directorate of Analysis [DA]). During the Woolsey period (1994–95), the author served as assistant to National Intelligence Council (NIC) Vice Chairman Lynn Hansen, who worked with Woolsey to re-establish the counter-D&D capabilities that had declined precipitously after Casey’s departure; and later with the DCI (now DNI) Foreign Denial and Deception Committee (1995–2004).

The views, opinions, and findings of the author expressed in this article should not be construed as asserting or implying US government endorsement of its factual statements and interpretations or representing the official positions of any component of the United States government. © James B. Bruce, 2020.

of potential foreign deception of intelligence—and, therefore, potential deception of US policymakers. Secondly, both periods addressed foreign denial that had degraded the capability of US intelligence to collect against the hardest targets. These were mainly the USSR under Casey, and Russia, China, and other state and non-state actors under Woolsey and later. Where deception intends to mislead policymakers, denial by impeding collection and starving analysis is meant to impair policymaker decisionmaking by weakening intelligence support to policy.²

Well before the 1980 election of Ronald Reagan and William Casey's arrival as DCI, antecedents in the D&D field helped set the stage for Casey and Woolsey. Though US intelligence had no identifiable, organizational counter-D&D capabilities, episodic attention to foreign D&D did exist:

- The first traceable study was done in 1946 by the Office of Naval Intelligence, "A Study on the Capabilities of the Russians to Employ Covert Deception Against the United States." That was followed a decade later, in 1957, by the first IC intelligence estimate, led by CIA, on foreign D&D, entitled "Soviet Capabilities for Deception," Special National Intelligence Estimate 100-2-57. This community D&D product grew out of a recommendation of the *Killian Report* and the National Security Council (NSC).³
- Arguably CIA's most significant penetration of the Soviet Union,

Defining Denial & Deception

Denial refers to activities and programs designed to eliminate, impair, degrade, or neutralize the effectiveness of intelligence collection within and across any or all collection disciplines, human and technical.

Deception refers to manipulation of intelligence collection, analysis, or public opinion by introducing false, misleading, or even true but tailored information into intelligence channels, including open sources such as social media, with the intent of influencing judgments made by intelligence producers, and/or the perceptions of their consumers.

GRU Col. Oleg Penkovsky, had provided before his execution in 1963 at least two documents on D&D (maskirovka) practices with Soviet mobile missiles.⁴

- CIA's former imagery component, the National Photographic Interpretation Center, undertook a range of studies in the 1970s of camouflage, concealment, and deception (CC&D) surrounding Soviet military forces, weapons, and installations.
- CIA's Office of Research and Development in the late 1970s, lacking internal expertise, contracted with consultants to examine deception methods. In addition to its instructive case studies, a notable study identified 10 deception maxims of theoretical relevance rooted in the experience of deception planning.⁵
- The Air Force Special Studies Group had a highly focused pro-

gram in the late 1970s and 1980s, which addressed Soviet CC&D calculated to protect Soviet military targets of possible interest to US strategic planners. This group's discovery of the deception involving deep underground command facilities at Russian sites highlighted possible Soviet preparations for protracted nuclear warfare.

Driving such concerns in the mid- to late-1970s were difficult arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union. The IC took on the responsibility of monitoring compliance with key arms control treaties of the day and the Nuclear Threshold Test Ban Treaty for addressing policymaker concerns about whether maskirovka and CC&D would degrade US intelligence reporting.^a Some in the White House and Congress worried that successful Soviet espionage may have enhanced its CC&D and thus neutralized or blunted US space-based intelligence.

It is against this 35-year backdrop of relatively few relevant studies, little demonstrable expertise in the doctrine and practice of foreign D&D and the means to defeat it, and growing policymaker concerns about the capacity of intelligence to support strategic decisions, that leaders under DCI Casey had little choice but to ramp up IC counter-D&D capabilities.

a. These treaties included the Strategic Arms Limitations Treaties (SALT I and SALT II), the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, and the Biological and Chemical Weapons Conventions,

William J. Casey and the Launch of D&D

I have decided that a more aggressive and focused US program is essential to better understand and counter Soviet CC&D activities.

—President Ronald Reagan, 1983⁶

DCI Casey brought unique D&D credentials to the job. An Office of Strategic Services veteran who served in the European Theater during World War II, he later wrote a book on the American Revolution that highlighted the importance of deception. Casey’s personal library contained a good collection of books on that topic, and he had a solid understanding of military and political deception, including Soviet active measures, before he became DCI.

Casey carried this passion for deception with him to the job. Robert Gates, CIA Deputy Director for

Casey carried this passion for deception with him to the job. Robert Gates, DDI under Casey for four years, identified Soviet deception as one of the several topics that “really got [Casey] fired up.”

Intelligence under Casey for four years, identified Soviet deception as one of the several topics that “really got [Casey] fired up. His appetite in these and related areas was insatiable.”⁷ As Reagan’s campaign manager and with the standing of a cabinet member,^a Casey’s access and potential influence was unmatched by any previous DCI. Apart from Casey himself, the key Executive Branch institutional players were the White House, its NSC staff, and the President’s Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB), now called the President’s Intelligence Advisory Board. In Congress, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence (SSCI) played a vital role.

President Reagan himself had a strong interest in deception.⁸ Senior Director for Intelligence Kenneth deGraffenreid recalled the president

saying that “deception is the mother’s milk of tyranny,” referring to lessons he had learned from the attempted communist takeover of the actors’ guild that Reagan had led in Hollywood years before. Other senior White House staffers—seasoned cold warriors all, including Richard Allen, Judge William Clark, Bud McFarlane, and John Poindexter—aligned well with the president on the significance of Soviet deception.

Two early White House documents spotlighted its importance: National Security Study Directive 2, issued in February 1982, focused on hostile foreign intelligence collection, human and technical, against the United States, as well as active measures (covert influence operations), including subversion and disinformation inimical to US interests. A pointed critique of US counterintelligence, NSSD-2 called for an “urgently needed” review of the capabilities, resource priorities, and vulnerabilities of the US government to “detect and counter this hostile threat in its totality.”⁹ White House concerns about foreign spying were amply reinforced with the Integrated Damage Assessment, an interagency study produced by a team of CIA, DIA, and NSA analysts during 1982–83. That landmark study examined significant Soviet spy cases resulting in revelation of major secrets of US imagery and signals



Director Casey briefing President Reagan, Secretary of State George Shultz, and Treasury Secretary Don Regan on 2 September 1983 on Soviet attack on KAL 007 Korean airliner. Photo, NARA Ronald Reagan Library, C16798-17.

a. Both the director of National Intelligence (DNI) and director of CIA were made cabinet-level positions in February 2017. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-trump-administration/the-cabinet/>.

Detecting Deception at Deep Underground Facilities near Chekov and Sharapovo

Beginning in the late 1940s, the Soviet Union began building deep underground facilities at Russian sites. Those near Chekov and Sharapovo, both outside of Moscow, were notable for their heavily concealed national command authority wartime relocation functions. Disguised to look like research and development facilities to US overhead collection, they thus conveyed a deceptive imagery signature to analysts. Only persistent analysis in the early 1980s by the US Air Force Special Studies Group based on anomaly detection and change comparison over 10 years of imagery coverage eventually exposed the facilities' true purposes.

Designed principally to ensure the survivability of the top leadership and provide continuity in command and control during wartime, these exceptionally well-hidden, deep underground, facilities implied Soviet intentions and capabilities to prepare for protracted nuclear war. This discovery caught the attention of the Reagan White House and strategic targeting planners in the Pentagon.¹⁴

intelligence collection from space-based platforms.

Other deception-related developments the White House found unsettling included the discovery of well-hidden, deep underground facilities at Chekov and Sharapovo (See textbox above.) and the continuing foreign espionage revelations that culminated in the 1985 "Year of the Spy," so named when the John Walker, Jonathan Pollard, Ronald Pelton, Edward Howard, and Larry Wu Tai Chin spy cases broke into public view.

Following the NSC study directive in 1982, a seminal D&D policy document, National Security Decision Directive-108, appeared the following year. It noted that "the Soviets have established a program to counter Western signal and imagery intelligence collection [and] may be attempting to deceive the West regarding the intent and purpose of basic policies, e.g., arms control."¹⁰ NSDD-108 directed the creation of an organized national deception analysis capability. It specifically discussed the Soviet doctrine of strategic

maskirovka, which employs camouflage, concealment, and deception and consists of "measures to deceive or mislead the enemy with respect to Soviet national security capabilities, actions, and intentions."¹¹

Over President Reagan's signature, the decision directive states that "immediate actions shall be taken to identify, train, equip, and assign adequate resources devoted specifically to analyzing, and, where appropriate, countering Soviet CC&D."¹² Assigning the implementation of the decision to the DCI, the intent of these White House documents was to allocate greater IC resources to address deception and to make the rationale more explicit.¹³

The key drivers at the NSC, Senior Director deGraffenreid and Soviet expert and NSC Director John Lenczowski, who had come over from State, both had strong interest in countering Soviet expansionism. Both also appreciated the constructive role that intelligence could play in a new strategy to support a robust posture to counter, even roll back, Soviet ambitions in strategic and

conventional arms, and geopolitical competition with the United States in Europe, Asia, and Third World. Both also strongly suspected that US intelligence was underperforming against the Soviet target; and if US intelligence wasn't already a victim of Soviet deception, then it soon would be. To them, CIA and the rest of the IC stood naked as vulnerable targets of highly-skilled Soviet deception planners. NSDD-108 warned of possible Soviet deception of their basic policy intentions.

For example, the NSC had noticed similarity in the themes being pushed in Soviet active measures and propaganda aimed principally at Western academic, journalist, and think-tank audiences. These included themes contemporaneously appearing in classified reporting. This raised the question of why the overall KGB narrative of a more benign Soviet Union was also being echoed in clandestine US intelligence reporting, often presented as "unevaluated intelligence."

Skeptics at the NSC began to question whether the IC could be complicit, if unwittingly, in legitimating Soviet disinformation themes under the imprimatur of intelligence—poorly vetted reports but judged good enough to disseminate. Such concerns added impetus to growing policy-driven incentives to engage the IC in focusing on strategic deception, in part to improve intelligence, but also to identify its own susceptibility to being deceived. Some skeptical senior customers began wondering whether CIA reporting was any more trustworthy than suspect materials issuing from American academics and journalists, often viewed by Reagan-era

policymakers as naive in their gullibility to Soviet propaganda.¹⁵

As the White House was gearing-up to prompt a real IC push against Soviet deception, related concerns were surfacing at the Department of State. There, the Active Measures Working Group, set up in 1981 as an interagency effort to better understand and counter the Soviet propaganda apparatus, began a different focus on another key aspect of strategic deception that employed KGB covert influence operations.¹⁶ These operations presented disinformation themes that characterized the USSR as a non-threatening, non-communist, and even pluralistic superpower.¹⁷ The Active Measures Working Group helped focus IC attention on the neglected propaganda aspect of deception. Enjoying support from CIA and others in the IC, the group succeeded in elevating the collection priorities for reporting on Soviet disinformation and clandestine influence operations, demonstrating along the way that analysis of high-interest issues suffers without good collection.

At PFIAB, where Casey himself had served as a member during 1975–76, two of its new members were staunch advocates of developing better counter-D&D capabilities at CIA and elsewhere in the IC. Ambassador Sy (Seymour) Weiss, and former Director of Livermore National Laboratories Johnny Foster, then at TRW, which did sensitive classified contract work for US intelligence and defense clients, became

The upshot of the Casey period is that foreign D&D gained the stature—at least to some of its external advocates and internal practitioners—of a new and necessary, if still quite limited, intelligence effort.

the PFIAB spokesmen for the cause. Both had Reagan’s ear.

The Department of Defense also advocated a greater focus on D&D through such voices as Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger, Director of Net Assessments Andy Marshall, and senior DIA analysts Jack Dziak and David Thomas.

In Congress, the SSCI, prodded by its chairman, Senator Malcolm Wallop (R) of Wyoming, also played an influential advocacy role for better D&D capabilities. Wallop was ably supported by two key SSCI staffers, Angelo Codevilla and William (Bill) Harris. Both were staunchly conservative, and both viewed US intelligence as a puny weakling when compared with its cunning Soviet adversary.

Including the DCI himself, when taken together with the White House and NSC, PFIAB, and SSCI, this constellation presented a formidable array of senior policy-level and congressional oversight forces to champion the importance of understanding and countering foreign D&D. From his perch at the NSC, deGraffenreid crafted study documents and policy directives addressing deception and demanded briefings on what CIA was doing to get its act together. Weiss and Foster at PFIAB raised concerns about D&D implications of recent espionage cases involving technical collection, and proposed conferences

on such topics as Soviet propaganda and disinformation. They also reminded CIA leadership of strong White House interest in Soviet deception. Senator Wallop and his staffers, Codevilla and Harris—perhaps the toughest outside critics—requested briefings on progress and sent letters to IC leaders demanding more of it.^a

Effects of the Newly Emerging D&D Environment

The upshot of the Casey period is that foreign D&D gained the stature—at least to some of its external advocates and internal practitioners—of a new and necessary, if still quite limited, intelligence effort. These gains happened despite internal resistance from some CIA managers jealously guarding their own resources and from influential skeptics in both the DI and the Directorate of Operations (DO) that deception was a non-problem and a distraction from higher-priority intelligence needs. Palpable resistance to deception in the DO reflected its searing experience during the preceding period (1954–74) when James Angleton had been chief of counterintelligence (CI).

Largely driven by the divisive case of Soviet defector Yuri Nosenko, whose bona fides were clouded by decade-long suspicions of a Soviet “master plot” theory of deception through the mid-1970s, senior DO

a. When perceived as politically motivated, policy outsiders who demand intelligence reforms are often resisted as unwelcome kibitzers by IC professionals. According to Gates, both deGraffenreid and Codevilla were “politicals” on the Reagan transition team and, along with other hard line conservatives, “found little they liked at CIA.” Gates, *From the Shadows*, 191.

Nearly 40 years after CIA's founding, the Foreign Intelligence Capabilities Group became the first CIA element of its kind.

officers were living in a post-Angle-ton recovery period, fiercely unsympathetic to claims of strategic deception. Counterintelligence excesses during Angleton's tenure as CI chief were premised on an exaggerated image of all-pervasive Soviet deception.¹⁸ As the DO was trying to recalibrate its CI focus on a less deceptive Soviet threat after Angleton's forced retirement, it became increasingly, if understandably, resistant to outside calls for greater emphasis on what, to them, was an imagined threat that had earlier proven to be counter-productive to its operations. A few managers in both directorates even felt that this new account area amounted to pandering to the recently empowered conservative Republicans then in the White House and in Congress, or even politicization. Notwithstanding some internal pushback, notable counter-D&D accomplishments of the period were substantial.

Emergence of an external constituency for D&D intelligence

With policy interest at the level of the White House and congressional oversight led by the chairman of the SSCI, the DCI was far from standing alone in his recognition of a glaring intelligence weakness in its ability to comprehend and counter foreign denial and deception. Others in senior policy positions cared about this issue too and, as long as they did, it was hard for intelligence leaders to spurn the demand or appear tone

deaf or non-responsive to persistent, high-level consumer and oversight expectations for tangible progress in this neglected area. External pressures forced internal change.

DCI Establishment of an IC Denial and Deception Analysis Committee (DDAC)¹⁹

DDAC began in 1984 as one of four IC committees operating under NIC auspices and formally established by DCI directive (DCID) the following year.^{a,20} These interagency committees played important advocacy roles, highlighting intelligence problems at risk of neglect or understated priority. The newly-established DDAC operated under the supervision of the National Intelligence Officer for Foreign Denial and Intelligence Activities (NIO/FDIA), an artifact of the early- and mid-1980s.^b DDAC was chaired by a CIA officer, the committee's only chairman for its 10 years, 1984–94.

Just before DDAC's establishment, a small group of representatives from CIA, DIA, and NSA undertook a significant analytical product during 1982–83, an integrated damage assessment (IDA) of major spy cases. Here the Soviet espionage cases of William Kampiles (CIA), Christopher Boyce (contractor) with Andrew Daulton Lee, and the British Jeffrey Prime (GCHQ—Government Communications Headquarters), were examined for

D&D implications of compromised space-based collection systems.

DDAC operated in an atmosphere of unusual secrecy, partly because of its work with sensitive espionage cases and because it became an IC focal point for special collection programs to defeat foreign D&D. This special-access focus was based on the idea that traditional collection capabilities at the TS/SCI level were already well understood by the Soviets—chiefly through US classified information having been acquired through espionage as documented in the IDA, and from serious press leaks—and thus vulnerable to complex D&D countermeasures. The justification for some special collection initiatives was their potential to defeat foreign D&D, and DDAC advocated for several new and promising compartmented programs.

CIA's establishment of the Foreign Intelligence Capabilities Group (FICG)

Stood up in 1982, this new DI analytic component was initially focused on damage assessments from technical collection compromises to alert collectors and analysts to foreign denial and/or deception implications that might result from such losses of classified sources and methods. Foreign deception emerged as a dedicated account area.

Nearly 40 years after CIA's founding, FICG became the first CIA element of its kind. Its creation was not without controversy. As described by the new DDI (and future DCI

a. The others were the Scientific and Technical Intelligence Committee, the Joint Atomic Energy Intelligence Committee, and the Weapons and Space Systems Intelligence Committee.

b. Three senior officers served as NIO/FDIA until it was disestablished; each served one-year terms: Rutledge "Hap" Hazard, Fred Hutchinson, and Murat Natirboff.

and secretary of defense), Robert M. Gates, arguably Casey's most influential deputy, the FICG was "at last" established "to study Soviet and other foreign covert actions and deception activities around the world."²¹ Unmentioned in his memoir, but understood by some analysts at the time, Gates rejected objections from the DO to another group that would, in effect, study the KGB.^a

First established as a staff component in the DI's Collection Requirements Evaluation Staff (CRES), the new D&D group was reassigned to the DI's Office of Global Issues (OGI) in 1985 as a line organization with analytic production responsibilities. Though labelled a "group," its actual size and organizational ranking were equivalent to a DI branch, with fewer than 10 analysts, a GS-15 chief, and placed as a subordinate element in a DI office-level component. The justification for the move from CRES, a staff element, to OGI was said to be that the placement of the function into a DI line, analytic unit would better institutionalize and enhance the discipline than leaving it in a staff element not accustomed to preparing analysis for broad dissemination. In principle, this seemed a good idea. In practice, it later failed, as had FICG.^b

At DCI Casey's request, the NIC produced its first National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) on Soviet deception in nearly 30 years, the two-volume NIE 11/11, Soviet Strategic Deception, for the Reagan administration in 1985.

Convening of a major conference joining D&D advocates and opponents

A noteworthy accomplishment in FICG's short life was sponsorship of a conference in 1984 that engaged key proponents (nearly all external) and opponents (all internal) of an IC counter-D&D program. Held at the TS/SCI level, the two-day gathering assembled roughly 75 senior officials and experts for "a good substantive thrashing," as then described by Tom Callanen, chief of FICG. The seniority of the attendees revealed the emerging prominence of the issue. The advocates included DCI Casey, SSCI Chairman Wallop, PFIAB members Weiss and Foster, senior staffers deGraffenreid and Lenczowski from the NSC, and Codevilla from the SSCI.

Opponents included National Security Agency Director Lincoln Faurer, CIA's chief of counterintelligence, and the DO's senior Soviet reports officer. C/NIC and DDI Gates along with an array of seasoned IC analysts and operations officers from key agencies were favorable to D&D or generally open to it; a few opposed. The most controversial discussions—and not settled there—hinged on whether the Soviets

had ever conducted or even would or could conduct strategic deception against the United States. Tactical or operational deception was not an issue. An after-action report prepared for the DCI by the present author, labelled those making the case for counter-D&D capabilities as "believers," those opposed as "non-believers," and the undecideds—mostly analysts—as "agnostics." While few if any minds were changed during the conference, the agnostics gained a much better appreciation of the assumptions and implications of the polar views expressed by the others.²²

The first CIA and IC deception course

A conference recommendation proposed establishing a course in deception analysis. DDI Gates tasked that action to CIA's Office of Training and Education (OTE) which began a seven-day course in 1985, enrolling students from across the IC.^c The course greatly increased D&D awareness and pioneered counter-deception analytic methodologies.²³

The Second NIE on Deception

At DCI Casey's request, the NIC produced its first National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) on Soviet deception in nearly 30 years,

a. At this time, the DO claimed a monopoly on KGB reporting as its exclusive prerogative at CIA, and it opposed the creation of a DI component that would study Soviet intelligence. Presumably with DCI Casey's backing, Gates simply disregarded the objection. In his memoir, Gates also alluded to his efforts to overcome strong DO resistance to giving analysts access to DO operational files to improve understanding of Soviet covert action. *From the Shadows*, 207.

b. The assignment of FICG to OGI was a controversial move since, with a Soviet focus, the Office of Soviet Analysis (SOVA) might have been a more logical home for the new capability. But its assignment to SOVA, or to the Office of Scientific and Weapons Research, was apparently spurned by both offices. Even the receiving office, OGI, was conflicted about the acquisition. Apparently not seen as a long-term commitment, just a few years later the fledgling capability was disassembled, and its analysts reassigned.

c. Increasingly restricting attendees from the IC, OTE dropped the course about six years later, claiming lack of interest at CIA.

the two-volume NIE 11/11, *Soviet Strategic Deception*, for the Reagan administration in 1985. Managed by NIO for Strategic Programs Lawrence Gershwin, the estimate produced an in-depth and balanced analysis. Regarded as highly informative to readers in the policy and intelligence communities, it nevertheless failed to fully satisfy the IC's most persistent critics on the SSCI staff.

Elevated visibility of D&D as a "legitimate" account area

To many, even intelligence professionals, deception was a new interest area. Until then, with the sole exception of the Air Force Special Studies Group, where D&D analysis was its exclusive mission before the Casey period, no other such components appeared elsewhere in the IC. A focus on D&D also served as an unexpected, internal quality assurance function in that any discovery of a successful deception against US intelligence would unavoidably

expose intelligence failure. It is an inescapable feature of D&D analysis that comes with the territory, as illustrated in the Rabta deception. (See textbox below.) As the discovery of successful deception exposes earlier failure, its study thus predictably generates few allies in the DI or the DO, and managers of many line analytical components failed to find virtue in supporting its work.

Unique Attributes of the Casey Period

The convergence of both an emerging external constituency and a rare DCI favoring focused attention to D&D—excepting the lone Woolsey case summarized below—is not likely to be often repeated. To sum up, the Casey period established and empowered a new counter-D&D capability in the IC because it successfully combined:

- A constellation of external decisionmakers who forcefully argued

the need to understand and counter foreign D&D.

- Effective engagement of the key US government institutions.
- Constructive oversight and congressional support to resource this needed capability.
- A DCI, C/NIC, and DDI who favored a counter-D&D capability and exercised effective leadership to achieve it.

A pioneering achievement of the Casey period was the emergence of a counter-D&D mission for US intelligence, and the beginnings of a new intelligence discipline with the mandate, focus, and developing expertise to carry it out.

James Woolsey and the Relaunch of D&D

Not teaching deception to intelligence analysts is akin to a navy that does not teach its sailors how to swim.

—James Woolsey, 1993²⁵

Casey's departure in January 1987 and the attrition of the Reagan-era constituency that valued D&D turned the period into a transient moment in the life of counter-D&D capabilities as the emphasis given to the topic rapidly atrophied.²⁶ Lacking sustained customer and oversight interest, and with other priorities competing for attention, successive DCIs William H. Webster (1987–91) and Robert M. Gates (1991–93) did little or nothing to ensure that the fledgling D&D capabilities built under Casey would remain a permanent fixture at CIA or institutionalized elsewhere in the IC. Perhaps ironically, Gates had a solid

Deception Detected: The Rabta Chemical Weapons Plant

No Fire After All—The Plant Still Works

The double-edged sword that a detected deception may also unearth previously erroneous analysis is illustrated in an important discovery made possible only through focused attention on potential foreign deception of US intelligence. In March 1990, a freshly-trained D&D alumnus of CIA's Deception Analysis course begun under Casey discovered that a fire had been staged at a chemical weapons plant at Rabta, where the Libyans sought to show that the CW plant there had become inoperable due to a putative fire. Apart from its substantive importance, this case highlighted the organizational sensitivities of revealing how US intelligence had gotten spoofed and why that mattered.

Earlier published intelligence reporting of that presumptive fire was corrected by using a newly innovative counter-D&D analytic tradecraft (Analysis of Competing Hypotheses). The new analysis revealed the deception showing painted burn marks on the factory walls, burned tires accounting for the smoke, and even ambulances dispatched to the scene implying casualties. In actuality, that intact plant was perfectly functional. It had suffered no fire and was continuing its CW production apace. The publication of this significant multi-INT deception case was controversial as it necessarily exposed earlier analytic error as an unintended consequence when successful counter-D&D analysis uncovered it.²⁴

grasp of Soviet strategic maskirovka as it related to arms control verification and Soviet strategic nuclear and conventional forces, as well as of active measures; and no DCI or DNI since could claim a comparable understanding.

Yet both Gates and Webster had higher priorities. D&D resources were not an issue under Webster, and neither he nor Gates seemed attentive to consolidating past gains. Not long after Casey's death in May 1987, for example, the DI's FICG was disassembled in a two-stage process: by incrementally rotating some of its analysts to the DO's new Counterintelligence Center to complete their work there or move on to other topics; and by repurposing the previously dedicated D&D billets to other analytic priorities. Absent its external constituency and abetted by the 1991 collapse of the Soviet Union and the subsequent "peace dividend" that much reduced intelligence appropriations, the standing and limited resources earlier assigned to D&D were destined to decline in the early post-Cold War period. And they did.

Reversing the Post-Casey Demise

DCI Woolsey, President Clinton's unlikely neoconservative appointee, effectively restored the D&D effort, eventually at levels that would exceed even those under Casey. Like Casey, Woolsey too had an abiding interest in deception. Shortly after his February 1993 arrival at CIA Headquarters, he reportedly had asked how much and what kind of work was being conducted there on the topic. When he visited a CIA training site, he specifically asked

about training in deception analysis. Learning there was none—cancelled, he was told, due to lack of interest, according to an attendee—Woolsey replied that this approach to intelligence was akin to a navy that did not teach its sailors how to swim. He also invited R.V. Jones, the noted British deception scholar-practitioner, to CIA to present him an award for his scientific accomplishments in technical countermeasures against both German air attacks and defenses in World War II.²⁷

Woolsey's time at CIA fortuitously coincided with unconnected stirrings in Congress for elevated attention to foreign D&D. In the fall of 1994, shortly before the November elections, Congressman Newt Gingrich called for a series of briefings on deception and intelligence. Three D&D analysts were assembled for the task, each briefing on separate occasions: David Thomas

from DIA, an NRO analyst, and the present author from CIA. Gingrich was joined by other members, including Representatives Dick Armey and Henry Hyde, along with several congressional staffers.

I concluded from my own interaction with Gingrich that his interest was substantive and not political; he seemed genuinely concerned whether US intelligence was outmatched in its ability to detect and counter strategic deception. He focused primarily on Russia and China. I also gathered from our exchange that Gingrich was discouraged by what he had learned in the briefings and resolved to do something about it.

When Congress reconvened after November and well into 1995, new Speaker of the House Gingrich acted. In a series of letters and in numerous questions for the record on countering foreign denial and deception, Chairman of the House Permanent



DCI Woolsey (near right) at 23 March 1994 meeting about Bosnia in the White House Situation Room. Counterclockwise from the DCI's right: Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman General John Shalikashvili, Secretary of Defense William Perry, President Clinton, Secretary of State Warren Christopher, National Security Advisor Tony Lake, UN Ambassador Madeleine Albright. (Photo: William J. Clinton Presidential Library)

Following production of the NIE, the FDDC, empowered for the first time with a solid understanding of foreign D&D conducted by 10 state actors, developed a strategic roadmap to counter it.

Select Committee on Intelligence Larry Combest peppered the DCI, secretary of defense, and some agency heads (NRO was a frequent recipient) about this issue. On-site staff visits, requested briefings, and hearings to monitor progress soon followed. The message was unmistakable: As with the SSCI during the Casey period, HPSCI leadership now also fully grasped the importance of foreign D&D. Supported by influential congressmen and knowledgeable staffers, Congress again helped move D&D back out of the closet and onto a front burner.

In another fortuitous coincidence of timing, the NIC itself had been independently gearing up for the same objective. The new vice chairman of the NIC for evaluation, Ambassador Lynn Hansen, like Woolsey and Casey, arrived at his job already savvy about D&D and its centrality to good intelligence. Hansen's earlier experience as an arms control negotiator had prepared him well for his unexpected new task. He valued intelligence support to policy and insisted that it be right—i.e., uninfluenced by the targets on whom intelligence is reporting and fully capable of identifying attempted deceptions.

Hansen commissioned an internal analysis, akin to a zero-based review, to inventory and assess IC-wide capabilities and make recommendations to address shortfalls.²⁸ The study results showed a dramatic decline in D&D analysis capabilities since the end of the Casey period. It recommended a substantial increase in billets and concerted leadership attention to elevate the priority of D&D, and to redress the shortfalls.

Concurring with study findings, Hansen moved swiftly to get a memo from NIC Chairman Joe Nye to DCI Woolsey reporting these results and recommendations, along with an accompanying draft DCI action memo to all IC agencies directing corrective actions. Woolsey did not hesitate to concur with the findings and recommendations, or to sign and send an action memo to the IC and to otherwise support the proposed turnaround in assigned resources for D&D that his memo directed.

A significant action called for in the 1994 Woolsey memo was the rejuvenation of the IC-wide effort under DCI leadership to coordinate community actions: This meant replacing the moribund DDAC. NIO/S&T Lawrence Gershwin was named chairman of the new Foreign Denial

and Deception Committee (FDDC), and the author became its executive secretary. FDDC's newly expanded subcommittee system was staffed by IC agencies, and monthly meetings of agency representatives were held to report and assess progress, consolidate gains, and undertake new actions.

Though Woolsey left CIA in January 1995, the favorable climate he set carried over for nearly a decade after, notably under DCI George Tenet, who ably extended the period of accomplishments. During this time, FDDC Chairman Gershwin, in his NIO capacity, also initiated for the first time a comprehensive NIE to assess the D&D capabilities of multiple adversary states. The estimate grew out of Gershwin's initiative, but it was also driven by the secretary of defense's request for an NIE, which reflected broader D&D customer interests across the Defense Department and the combatant commands.^a The scope of the study selected the top threat countries identified in PDD-35.^b Completed in 1998, the NIE assessed the full range of foreign capabilities to deny US collection against these priority targets and their associated capabilities to deceive US intelligence and thus mislead its customers. It also helped develop a diverse cadre of talented analysts.

a. The Reagan-era spike in White House-level interest in foreign D&D risks obscuring the longer-term demand for such intelligence from military customers. From the origins of the Cold War to the present, the Department of Defense, the combatant commands, and the military services have been the largest and most persistent of its customers at strategic, operational, and tactical levels. These D&D intelligence users have demonstrated more continuity of interest in the subject than the more transient political appointees in other national security positions.

b. Presidential Decision Directive-35 then served as the White House document that prioritized collection and analysis. It preceded the National Intelligence Priorities Framework, which began shortly before the establishment of the office of Director of National Intelligence in 2005 and firmly took root after that.

Following production of the NIE, the FDDC, empowered for the first time with a solid understanding of foreign D&D conducted by 10 state actors, developed a strategic roadmap to counter it. Building on a key NIE-generated insight—the D&D implications of the growth of foreign knowledge about US intelligence, and how exploiting that knowledge results in countermeasures to defeat collection—the FDDC roadmap issued in 2000 crafted a comprehensive counter-D&D architecture, or strategy. Requiring community-wide engagement to succeed, the strategy focused on actions addressing intelligence collection, analysis, training, research and development, and security and counterintelligence.²⁹ With the full engagement and contributions from all major IC agencies, achievements in these five areas aimed to correct resource shortfalls and to prioritize counter-D&D work and its effectiveness throughout the IC.

Although dating the end of this Woolsey-driven period of reinvigorated D&D activity must be imprecise, it is fair to surmise that its productivity—with the notable exception of FDDC’s advanced D&D studies initiative (below)—peaked roughly in the early 2000s, and, in all D&D areas other than education and training, its period of decline started shortly thereafter. In the wake of 9/11 and the Iraq WMD failure, the irony of a needed D&D focus for successful counterterrorism and counterproliferation efforts can only be noted here.

Though also short-lived, the D&D restoration started under Woolsey and subsequently led by DCI Tenet and NIO Gershwin would advance considerably

D&D Revival: Effects of the Woolsey Period

Though also short-lived, the D&D restoration started under Woolsey and subsequently led by DCI Tenet and NIO Gershwin would advance considerably, with gains rivaling those achieved under Casey:

Provided evidence-based rationale

The path-breaking NIE laid the substantive foundations for much improved understanding of foreign D&D throughout the IC; defused much of its “political” controversy; established an empirical basis justifying the resources required to address it; and helped legitimize the work, not as a favored topic of a politically conservative customer base but rather as a necessary and integral element of effective intelligence.

Recovered analytic capabilities

During this period many of the capabilities originally started under Casey were restored and in some cases they were exceeded. For example, the number and strength of D&D analytical components in the community, numbers and skills of analysts who populated them, and development of broader awareness of the topic and appreciation for its importance all grew.

Expanded training and education resources

Also greatly improved were the quality and quantity of D&D training and education in the IC, chiefly through the FDDC-sponsored graduate-level Denial and Deception Advanced Studies Program. The DDASP was offered initially at the

Joint Military Intelligence College (JMIC) and then at the National Intelligence University (NIU). (See textbox below.) Notably, this program moved D&D study beyond 101-level training to establish graduate-level education designed to cultivate in-depth research skills and substantive expertise in the IC. Its impact was unprecedented in the number of intelligence officers certified in the program; in its academic outreach to the service intelligence centers and to colleges and universities with an intelligence studies program; and in embedding the DD ASP into the Australian Intelligence Community.

The Denial and Deception Advanced Studies Program

From 2002 to 2015, DDASP offered a five-course accredited graduate certificate program at the Joint Military Intelligence College and later the National Intelligence University. Starting with a class of 12 in its first year, at its height the program graduated 60-plus students a year with a total of more than 750 graduates throughout the IC and US government. It expanded to the Five Eyes community through its program offered in Australia and also to the US combatant commands at CENTCOM, SOCOM, and SOUTHCOM. With DDASP graduates becoming senior leaders in the FBI, EUCOM, DIA, SOCOM, CENTCOM, and NSA, and at other government agencies, many of the FDDC initiatives and production ideas in recent years were a direct result of DDASP graduates reaching out to the FDDC leadership.

Through a HPSCI initiative, congressional funding for a major D&D awards program designed and managed by the FDDC was mounted to recognize and reward significant contributions to successful counter-D&D analysis, collection, and leadership.

A related accomplishment, like DDASP also engineered by FDDC Vice Chairman Kent Tieman, was the establishment of the Barton Whaley Deception Reading Room in the CIA Library. Developed to support in-depth academic research from a multi-disciplinary perspective, its holdings, a gift of America's leading scholar of deception, Whaley's personal library collection added significantly to CIA's previously limited resources on the topic.^a Finally, although CIA- and DIA-sponsored D&D training courses preceded Woolsey, by this time the other large agencies also offered their own 101-level courses tailored to their unique intelligence requirements. For example, courses at NSA emphasized SIGINT D&D, while those at NIMA and its NGA successor emphasized imagery vulnerabilities; NRO training focused on D&D correlates with orbital dynamics and novel technologies and collection concepts to defeat foreign D&D targeting spaceborne platforms and sensors.

Professional incentives

Through a HPSCI initiative, congressional funding for a major D&D awards program designed and managed by the FDDC was mounted to recognize and reward significant contributions to successful counter-D&D analysis, collection, and leadership. For over a decade beginning in the mid-1990s, hundreds of IC professionals of all ranks

and from all agencies were honored with awards, mostly monetary, at an impressive annual ceremony in the 500-seat CIA auditorium. Program speakers included DCI John Deutch, DDCIs General Gordon and John McLaughlin, ADCI for Collection Charlie Allen, and senior IC leaders Joan Dempsey, General Burgess, and Larry Kindsvater. The D&D awards program ended due mainly to a lack of funding to sustain it.

Testing effectiveness of CC&D materials

The FDDC analyzed the technical effectiveness of various materials adversaries could use for denial and deception purposes, notably to conceal and camouflage activities and objects of interest to US and allied intelligence. This work enhanced understanding of foreign use of countermeasures to collection and improved US and allies' abilities to defeat them.

Leaving the fringe for the mainstream

Much assisted by the NIE and greatly expanded training, D&D collection and analysis as intrinsically important attributes of competent agencies were largely "mainstreamed." Notwithstanding that only a relatively small number of analysts could claim D&D as their principal area of subject matter expertise, it was no small achievement that by the end of this period, many, perhaps most, analysts in the

IC came to understand that D&D was an accepted, "normal," and even a needed area of intelligence focus. Evidence of this emerging cultural shift was increasingly expressed in routine interactions of D&D experts and non-experts in D&D courses and in FDDC's routine activities, monthly meetings, and annual award ceremonies.

Emergence of a new discipline to support a new, if secondary, mission

Recovering and even extending the Casey-era gains under Woolsey and after, the idea gained traction solidly within the D&D community that countering foreign D&D was integral to both the foreign intelligence and counterintelligence missions. A key element of the still-developing D&D infrastructure to accomplish that was having skilled experts in specialized collection, analysis, and training who collaborated with each other to build new knowledge. Under able IC leadership and that of their own varying agencies, D&D advocates and specialists built the makings of a new intelligence discipline where none had existed before Casey, and which, even after the Woolsey-period gains, was then still too new and too fragile to assume its permanency.

Finally, among notable differences between the Casey and Woolsey periods was the IC's leadership role. FDDC, the NIC's interagency D&D committee, performed much more effectively than did its more secretive and insular DDAC predecessor under Casey. Aided by a broader charter, FDDC expanded D&D knowledge by leveraging the substantive work of the NIE and in building analytical

a. The collection has recently been relocated to the Intelligence Community's National Intelligence University in Bethesda, MD.

capacity, collection requirements, advanced education and greater training, and outreach to related communities such as R&D, security, and counterintelligence. In this approach, FDDC succeeded in forging a broad IC consensus on many D&D issues as integral to good intelligence. Attention to D&D was good government. But institutionalizing such gains proved more daunting.

Despite these impressive accomplishments, the key failure of the period was the failure of IC leaders to institutionalize counter-D&D work as an intelligence topic worthy of the resources to sustain it over the long haul. Ironically, “mainstreaming” of the discipline would underpin arguments against institutionalization of organizational aspects of the discipline—i.e., “every analyst should be a D&D analyst,” a refrain similar to arguments opposing creation of formal warning institutions.

After Woolsey: Stasis and Decline

Seen from a D&D optic, the transition from DCI Woolsey to Tenet was seamless. (Between them, DCI John Deutch’s posture appeared D&D-neutral and largely indifferent.) Perhaps reflecting his earlier assignments with the SSCI and the White House, George Tenet (1997–2004) brought to his new job an enlightened appreciation of D&D. The NIE on foreign denial and deception was begun under Tenet, and it was Tenet who took the completed NIE to the National Foreign Intelligence Board for IC approval. Without hesitation, he approved and signed out the comprehensive DCI counter-D&D “roadmap,” the March 2000 FDDC

Fully mainstreaming it risks losing the specialized expertise and institutional memory it requires for both effectiveness and institutionalization.

strategy document that mobilized a concerted IC focus on this renewed collection and analysis priority. Perhaps even more so than Casey, he surpassed all previous DCIs in addressing the threat that media leaks of classified intelligence pose to sensitive sources and methods.

Indeed, Tenet vigorously advocated legislation to better hold leakers accountable for their illegal and damaging revelations.³⁰ An important achievement under Tenet was the inclusion of D&D as a discrete priority, thus assuring some continuing level of resources for counter-D&D collection and analysis. While Tenet didn’t need to start from scratch or rebuild the counter-D&D mission as Casey and Woolsey did, he successfully sustained its previous resources and prioritization. He must be credited as a strong proponent who effectively extended the mission and discipline out to the end of his tenure in 2004, even as its demise began a few years earlier.

Unfortunately, lacking influential D&D customers and intelligence skeptics in the Executive Branch or a powerful D&D constituency in Congress—and with the notable internal exception of the ADCI for Collection Charlie Allen—Tenet had few discernible senior-level allies of the kind needed to sustain D&D resources over the longer haul. His successors have done no better. Indeed, for all their plusses, DCIAs Goss, Hayden, Panetta, Petraeus, and Brennan, along with DNIs Negroponte, McConnell, Blair, and Clapper, preoccupied with counterterrorism, warfighter support,

intelligence reform, IC integration and other issues, have generally demonstrated indifference to the subject.

While no fixed date can easily pinpoint the effective death knell of the hard-won counter-D&D capabilities started by Casey and restored under Woolsey and after, they were clearly on life support not long after 9/11 and probably near comatose within a year or two of the 2002 WMD intelligence failure in Iraq. But today champions of this vital intelligence discipline struggle to advance its use.

Three causes account for its decline: Poor organizational fit, overconfidence borne of seeming mainstream acceptance of the new discipline, and lesser urgency when compared with more immediate threats.

- To a bureaucracy D&D is neither fish nor fowl. An intelligence-wide mission, it is not mainly about collection or analysis or counterintelligence. It is all these and more. And its work spans both line and staff functions. But the organizational odysseys of the D&D components at CIA, DIA, and NSA demonstrate persisting managerial discomfort no matter where they are slotted in the line-and-block chart. Unceasing reorganizations seem never to solve whatever issues prompted them in the first place.
- Notwithstanding the “mainstreaming” gains of “every analyst a D&D analyst,” abolishing this

specialty has forfeited the advantages of developing and collocating in-depth subject matter expertise in D&D doctrine, techniques, and countermeasures, as well as institutional memory. Such losses in substantive depth, specialized expertise, and needed management focus ensure a much-degraded counter-D&D capability IC-wide.

- Because intelligence priorities are largely threat-related, the more immediate and tangible threats have historically fared better in the resource competition. Here, the D&D value-added must seem remote. Given the infrequency of discovering major deceptions,^a sustaining steady resources over the longer haul poses a higher bar. Failing to demonstrate relevance to immediate threats, counter-D&D mission proponents have failed to make a compelling case for scarce resources.

Yet, owing to its centrality in achieving information assurance through maximally effective intelligence, I believe the counter-D&D mission must be an integral element of collection, analysis, and R&D no matter how it is organized; that fully mainstreaming it risks losing the specialized expertise and institutional memory it requires for

both effectiveness and institutionalization; and that underestimating the D&D intentions and capabilities of our highest priority intelligence targets can only result in suboptimal intelligence about them.

Looking Forward: The Case for Rebuilding a Battered Discipline

*Where the role of intelligence is to penetrate the secrets of an adversary, the process of counterdeception is not a niche activity within intelligence; it is at the core.*³¹

The case against any increases for counter-D&D priority and resources is straightforward: Given tight resource constraints, other more pressing priorities, and the perceived adequacy of present capabilities in the absence of compelling rationale for more, the resource status quo would seem about right. Denial is more properly addressed by collectors, and major deception is always a very low probability in any case. These are reasonable arguments.

Still, the perception of adequacy can be questioned, and it would take a solid zero-based review, something akin to a DoD Capabilities Based Assessment to answer it fully, objectively, and empirically.^b It is true that countering denial is principally

a collector's responsibility. But that ignores the crippling effects of denied collection on analysis. A study by the author of eight major intelligence failures demonstrated that effective denial of collection was a causative factor in all of them.^c And, to be sure, major deception is infrequent. But it too was a causative factor in six of eight failure cases. A systematic, data-based study of 161 deception cases between 1914 and 1972 has shown that while it is rarely attempted, deception is the silver bullet that, when fired, nearly always hits the bullseye—its success rate exceeds 90 percent.³²

Persistence of the D&D threat

Foreign D&D did not cease with the collapse of the Soviet Union. Even lacking an updated NIE or zero-based review, recent cases reported in the media suggest that foreign adversaries continue to use D&D countermeasures apace. Notably, intelligence on a half-dozen of the top intelligence priorities—Russia, China, North Korea, Iran, terrorism, and WMD—is encumbered with significant D&D impairments to complete and reliable intelligence. (See textbox on facing page.) What we don't know, or what we judge with low confidence, is nearly always the result of successful denial. Intelligence gaps on priority targets don't happen by accident; they happen on purpose, caused by denial

a. Cynthia Grabo attributed the "scant attention to deception" largely to the infrequency of its occurrence. *Anticipating Surprise*, 119.

b. A Capabilities-Based Assessment (CBA) is an early step in the JCIDS process, the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System. The CBA conducts analysis to identify capability needs and gaps, and recommends approaches to address the gaps. It becomes the basis for validating capability needs and results in the potential development and deployment of new or improved capabilities. *Manual for the Operation of the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System*, July 2009.

c. Cases included Pearl Harbor, the Cuban Missile Crisis, the Yom Kippur War, Iranian revolution, Soviet biological weapons, Indian nuclear testing, 9/11, and WMD in Iraq. James B. Bruce, "The Missing Link: The Collector-Analyst Relationship," in Roger Z. George and James B. Bruce (eds.), *Analyzing Intelligence: National Security Practitioners' Perspectives*, 2nd ed. (Georgetown University Press, 2014), 157–77.

Recent or Ongoing Cases Where Collection Denial or Deceptive Practices May Have Impaired Intelligence Analysis and Warning

Russian power projection and expansionism including its:

- Covert intervention in the 2016 and 2018 US national elections through weaponizing cyber operations, and its intentions for the 2020 elections.
- Seizure of the Crimea in 2014, and its continuing covert support of pro-Russian forces in the Donbass region intended to extend its control over neighboring Ukraine.
- Significant re-engagement in the Middle East beginning in 2015 starting with military support to Syria, after having almost no role in that region since 1973.

Chinese power projection into the South China Sea such as in terraforming reefs into islands; cyber intrusions to steal sensitive and propriety US data; and significant efforts to manipulate perceptions through social media and specific targeting of US universities through the Confucius Institute and the 1000 Talents Program. Related perception management operations target American youth through movies and gaming, and even investing in US K-12 public and charter schools with objectives being a more China-sympathetic next generation.

North Korean intentions and capabilities regarding nuclear weapons and missile basing and deployments.

Iranian intentions to adhere to the 2015 multilateral agreement (the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action) to limit its nuclear programs.

Optimally performing counter-D&D capabilities can neutralize and defeat denial countermeasures against collection and expose attempted deceptions, all calculated to impair or degrade US intelligence effectiveness against top-priority targets.

countermeasures deployed by smart intelligence targets.³³

Successfully countering D&D, for example, is the only viable path to arms control verification of adversary states. Senior consumers who may be unsatisfied with intelligence on pressing or controversial issues in these six topic areas should demand a significant counter-D&D infusion into our present efforts. And intelligence professionals should educate these consumers on the importance of D&D when collection and analysis may be underperforming. That will not only explain why intelligence is

incomplete and uncertain in many cases; it will also highlight our vulnerability to surprise and error—a message reluctantly given and similarly received. Lacking outside understanding and advocacy for addressing foreign D&D, IC leadership has a bigger responsibility to educate customers of its importance.

Alternative Courses of Action

If improving the standing of the counter-D&D discipline becomes a viable option—as is urged here—any of three alternative approaches to

organizing analysis, or some combination of them, could work. Each has its own pros and cons.

(1) Dedicated analytic units

This, of course, was the model tried under the Casey and Woolsey and later. Despite the managerial discomfort and mercurial attempts at “fit,” it is an otherwise proven model. The record of production and accomplishments of these components at CIA, DIA, and NSA should be examined closely and impartially to ascertain the pros and cons of their reconstitution.^a

(2) D&D analytic cells

Well-trained subject matter experts in foreign D&D could be organized in standalone cells to support multiple analytic units in the larger regional and functional line components, or they could be joined with existing division- and office-level tradecraft cells at CIA and at other agencies that have tradecraft support components. Structured analytic tradecraft has proven its worth in adding rigor and mitigating cognitive bias,³⁴ which are essential goals of counter-D&D analysis as well. Where existing tradecraft cells lack D&D expertise, it should be added. This important skill—like structured analytic tradecraft itself—can challenge conventional wisdom, identify hard-to-detect problems, connect the seemingly disconnected, and underwrite an important insurance policy against surprise and analytic failure.

(3) Integrated D&D expertise

The least disruptive option (perhaps the weakest without a strong management commitment to make it

a. Often well-provisioned with trained D&D analysts, the various DIA analytic units, for example, appear to have produced substantially, accurately, and with insight for its demanding and diverse military customer base.

Lacking the most effective means to defeat foreign D&D all but assures we cannot achieve intelligence at its best.

work) is to integrate substantive and methodological D&D expertise into the first-line regional and functional analytical units. Such D&D analysts should be assigned the same responsibilities in these line units as would be assigned to them in the tradecraft cells, namely to mentor and supervise analysts who lack the expertise to assess and counter the effects of adversary denial on the analysis of issues in their assigned components and in exploring and testing the deception hypothesis where appropriate.

An effective counter-D&D analytic capability is, in my judgment, the single most important component of the complex measures required to defeat the D&D countermeasures adversaries deploy against our collection disciplines. When SIGINT is effectively degraded through encryption, landlines, and couriers; when imagery is weakened through camouflage and concealment, underground facilities, and scheduling activities between predictable satellite overflights; and when human intelligence is neutralized by foreign

counterintelligence, the result is starved or misled analysis. Weakened analysis—including especially warning intelligence—deprives policy customers of the information advantage and decision advantage that intelligence is expected to bring. When total intelligence budgets reach tens of billions of dollars annually, it is fair to ask for measures of cost-effectiveness. Intelligence at its best will, or should, overcome intended foreign impediments to its effectiveness.

Lacking the most effective means to defeat foreign D&D all but assures we cannot achieve intelligence at its best. Fully-performing counter-D&D analysis will enhance collection through focused expertise in defeating foreign countermeasures. Enhanced analysis through countering denial will better assess the impact of missing information on intelligence judgments, provide collection guidance, and determine when to test the deception hypothesis with powerful counter-D&D analytic tradecraft. And it will support research and development in both

collection and analysis by identifying the most and least promising approaches on the drawing boards to overcoming the D&D impairments that diminish collection effectiveness and analytic accuracy and completeness.

As we learned from Directors Casey and Woolsey, once DCI-level leadership legitimated the beginnings and later re-establishment of a concerted counter-D&D effort, the IC agencies successfully focused on issues most relevant to their respective customer bases. As this is an IC-wide issue with no single agency well-positioned to lead the others in this challenge, only forceful IC leadership at the DNI and DDNI level with a well-staffed and highly effective FDDC-like committee can lead the counter-D&D discipline to play its essential role in ensuring fully-performing intelligence. The loss of these capabilities—and the loss of this discipline—invites the biggest risk, namely the potential for being misled or manipulated by our key adversaries, perhaps leading to an unwelcomed surprise on any of the most consequential issues this nation faces.



The author: James B. Bruce served in various D&D assignments for half of his 24-year career, including as the first executive secretary and vice chairman of the DCI (now DNI) Foreign Denial and Deception Committee, 1995-2004. Formerly deputy national intelligence officer for science and technology, he served in the NIC, and in CIA's Directorates of Intelligence (Analysis) and Operations in analytic and managerial roles before retiring as a senior intelligence officer in 2005. He is an adjunct researcher at the RAND Corporation.

Acknowledgements: The author thanks William A. Parquette, former chairman of the DNI Foreign Denial and Deception Committee, for his initial research support and Lawrence K. Gershwin, along with (alphabetically) Charlie Allen, Thomas Callanen, Kenneth deGraffenreid, John Lenczowski, Shelby Pierson, Karl Spielmann, David Thomas, and Kent Tiernan—all at various times key participants in the events reported here. In interviews and in comments on earlier drafts, all have provided missing details, corrected errors, and added perspective. Dennis Bennett and Tom Kay also provided helpful suggestions. Each would surely tell the story differently than related here, and all are absolved from any remaining errors of omission or commission.

Endnotes

1. Cynthia M. Grabo, *Anticipating Surprise: Analysis for Strategic Warning* (US Government Printing Office, 2002), 119. The book is also available online at https://www.ni-u.edu/ni_press/pdf/Anticipating_Surprise_Analysis.pdf.
2. With appreciation to David Thomas for little-known historical insights, and for numerous suggestions throughout in correspondence and telephone interviews of 23 June, 12 July, 26 October, 5 and 20 November, and 7, 11, and 14 December (all in 2018); and to Kent Tiernan in telephone interviews of 23 October 2018, and 16 June and 11 August 2019, each providing a more detailed understanding of the work of Air Force Special Studies Group, including the discussion of the Soviet deception at Chekov and Sharapovo.
3. Special National Intelligence Estimate 100-2-57, *Soviet Capabilities for Deception*, declassified but redacted, was produced by CIA with the Departments of State, Army, Navy, and Air Force, the Joint Staff, and the Atomic Energy Commission participating; accessed at https://www.cia.gov/library/readingroom/docs/DOC_0000269470.pdf. The Killian Report, presented to President Eisenhower in February 1955, addressed US vulnerabilities to a Soviet surprise attack. The 1946 ONI study is declassified and available in the National Archives.
4. Declassified along with other Penkovsky reporting on the Cuban Missile crisis as the IRONBARK documents and available in the FOIA reading room at www.cia.gov. See also James H. Hansen, "Soviet Deception in the Cuban Missile Crisis," *Studies in Intelligence* 46, No. 1 (March, 2002).
5. *Deception Maxims: Fact and Folklore* (Everest Consulting Associates and Mathtech, Inc., April 1980), summarized in Michael Bennett and Edward Waltz, *Counterdeception Principles and Applications for National Security* (Artech House, 2007), 34–36.
6. National Security Decision Directive (NSDD)-108, "Soviet Camouflage, Concealment, and Deception," 12 October 1983; declassified but redacted, and available at <https://fas.org/irp/offdocs/nsdd/nsdd-108.pdf>.
7. Robert M. Gates, *From the Shadows: The Ultimate Insiders Story of Five Presidents and How They Won the Cold War* (Simon & Schuster, 1996), 201. Casey examined the deception tactics General Washington employed at Jamestown and Yorktown in William J. Casey, *Where and How the War was Fought: An Armchair Tour of the American Revolution* (Morrow, 1976).
8. This discussion is based chiefly on correspondence of 16 June and 8 November 2018 with Kenneth deGraffenreid, NSC official during the period discussed, and consultations and correspondence with John Lenczowski of 14 June and 1 November 2018. Lenczowski then served at both the State Department and the NSC.
9. National Security Study Directive (NSSD)-2, "Detecting and Countering the Foreign Intelligence Threat to the United States," 16 February 1982; declassified and available at <https://fas.org/irp/offdocs/nssd/nssd-2-82.pdf>.
10. NSDD-108, "Introduction."
11. *Ibid.*
12. *Ibid.*, "Decision."
13. *Ibid.*, "Decision" and "Implementation."
14. US Department of Defense, *Soviet Military Power* (Defense Intelligence Agency, 1988), 59–62.
15. Views expressed by several attendees at a conference in 1984 (discussed on "Convening of a major conference joining D&D advocates and opponents" on page 19).
16. Fletcher Schoen and Christopher J. Lamb, *Deception, Disinformation, and Strategic Communications: How One Interagency Group Made a Major Difference* (National Defense University Press, June 2012).
17. John Lenczowski, "Themes of Soviet Strategic Deception and Disinformation," in Brian D. Dailey and Patrick J. Parker (eds.), *Soviet Strategic Deception* (Lexington Books, 1987), 55–75.
18. See David Robarge, "The James Angleton Phenomenon: 'Cunning Passages, Contrived Corridors': Wandering in the Angletonian Wilderness," in *Studies in Intelligence* 53, No. 4 (December 2009).
19. Discussion here and in the following two sections benefited greatly from interviews with Thomas Callanen, including correspondence of 12 and 19 June, 18 October, and 1 November 2018.
20. Director of Central Intelligence Directive (DCID) 3/16, "Foreign Denial and Deception Analysis," 7 Oct. 1985.
21. Gates, *From the Shadows*, 206. Gates also commented on the "struggle" to get the CIA bureaucracy to do more on Soviet covert action and subversion as "painfully hard and eventually took on a political edge." *Ibid.*
22. The classified conference proceedings were published by CIA/DI/Office of Global Issues.
23. OTE's Tom Murray, the author, and contractor Richards Heuer cotaught the first iteration. See Richards J. Heuer's memoir, *Rethinking Intelligence: Richards J Heuer Jr. s Life of Public Service* (Pherson Associates, 2018), 30–33.
24. James B. Bruce, "Remembering Richards J. Heuer: A Brief Intellectual History," *Studies in Intelligence* 62, No. 3 (September 2018), ix–x; and Robert M. Clark and William L. Mitchell, *Deception, Counterdeception, and Counterintelligence* (CQ Press, 2018), 153–54.
25. On the occasion of the new DCI's visit to a CIA training site, as reported by several who were there.
26. This discussion draws from the author's "Countering Denial and Deception in the Early 21st Century: An Adaptation Strategy When All Else Fails," *American Intelligence Journal* 32, No. 2 (2015), especially 22–23.
27. See *Studies in Intelligence* 38, No. 5 (I 995) for a report on the ceremony and a transcript of R.V. Jones's remarks on 26 October 1993.
28. The analysis was conducted by the author in a NIC/Evaluation staff study.

29. See *Commission on the Intelligence Capabilities of the United States Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction, Report to the President of the United States*, 31 March 2005 (US Government Printing Office, 2005), 374, and note 23.
30. George Tenet, Testimony before the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, “The Impact of Unauthorized Disclosures on Intelligence,” 3 November 1999.
31. Bennett and Waltz, *Counterdeception Principles and Applications for National Security*, 2.
32. Based on calculations made by Richards Heuer using data compiled by Barton Whaley. Cited in Donald C. F. Daniel, “Denial and Deception,” in Jennifer E. Sims and Burton Gerber (eds.), *Transforming US Intelligence* (Georgetown University Press, 2005), 138.
33. James B. Bruce and Michael Bennett, “Foreign Denial and Deception: Analytic Imperatives” in George and Bruce, *Analyzing Intelligence*, 198–201.
34. Stephen Artner, Richard S. Girven, and James B. Bruce, “Assessing the Value of Structured Analytic Techniques in the US Intelligence Community,” RR-1408-OSD, RAND Corporation, 2016; https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR!408.html.

