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This class will provide an in-depth look at the United States Intelligence Community (IC) – the different agencies of which the IC is comprised, their varying missions, priorities and resources - and how intelligence informs national security decision-making. It is a course designed for students who are interested in understanding and/or becoming part of our nation’s national security apparatus. Students will write strategic analytical products and simulate inter-agency coordination. They will analyze current national security issues and consider the contours of ethically fraught issues like torture, targeted killings, secrecy and leaks.

The very nature of this course will simulate the fast-paced, collaborative and sometimes virtual nature of the work of the IC. We will operate with changing and incomplete information and under tight timelines. It will be realistic, challenging and fun. And the skills you will gain in working with others and analyzing and communicating the significance of ever-evolving information and circumstances will serve all students of international affairs well as you strive to understand and contribute to a complex, dynamic, interconnected and multicultural world.

Course Goals

By the end of this course, you will achieve the following:

• Foster an in-depth understanding of the US Intelligence Community – of whom it is comprised, how it is organized, how it has changed, and its many functions and limitations.

• Hone your professional communication and writing skills, able to craft clear, concise, timely and relevant written and oral products for an executive-level audience.

• Become a savvy strategic-level analyst, with an appreciation for collaboration within an intricate organization, whose mission is to understand and predict a complex, unpredictable world.

• Become an effective collaborator, anticipating and appreciating other perspectives, succinctly and thoughtfully expressing opinions and disagreement and offering solutions, in a time-sensitive environment.

My Contact Information

Please do not hesitate to get in touch with me if you have a question or concern.

• You can email me at scraig@wustl.edu.

• You can send me a note via Canvas – I will get a text notification of this immediately.

• You can call me at (314) 594-7442. I will answer if we have a scheduled appointment; if not, please leave a voicemail and I will get back to you as soon as possible.

• We can meet in person before/after class or I am on campus on Tuesdays and Fridays. My office is located in the Danforth University Center, Room 203.
My Background

I spent 7 years in the Intelligence Community – as a counterproliferation analyst with the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), a China analyst with the US Army, a Red Team Leader at US Pacific Command in Hawaii, and most recently, as the DIA’s Devil’s Advocate, where it was my job to help analysts across the entire agency challenge assumptions and think differently. Having worked in a number of different specialties, agencies, and locations, I have rare insight into a very diverse, complex and secretive organization. (That said, there is still much I don’t know…one person has only so much “need to know!”)

Required Texts


The Key to this Course: Collaboration, Engagement and Reflection

While the major assignments are designed to hone your professional written and oral briefing skills, the bulk of our weekly efforts will be working together to compile and synthesize excessive and incomplete information, reflect on what it means, and draw connections to current events or our own lives.

This means you’re expected to:
(1) come prepared to our class meetings,
(2) do the reading and thinking necessary to contribute to our collective objectives and 
(3) stay up-to-date on what’s happening in the world so you can draw connections to our coursework.

There will be five collaboration activities throughout the semester (worth 25 points each). These will be graded on the relevance, timeliness and respectfulness of your collaborative efforts. The engagement and reflection activities will be more frequent, low-risk activities (worth 10 points) where you’ll be asked to demonstrate engagement with the material or reflect on how it impacts your thinking. This may be your contribution to an in-class exercise, a short in-class reflection, quiz, or pre/post meeting online post. This allows for frequent feedback – for you and me.

The reason I emphasize collaboration is because the topics we are covering are very complex, and there is no way to master them on our own in such a short time period. Just as in the Intelligence Community, we will depend on each other to develop expertise in specific aspects of an issue. Then, through active and ongoing collaboration, we will be able to achieve a sophisticated, in-depth understanding of the issue as a whole. Your classmates will be depending on you, which should motivate you to do your part!

Note the class schedule on page 6 for a week-by-week breakdown of how collaboration and engagement will be incorporated throughout the semester.
Assessing Professional Written and Oral Communication

The more formal assignments are meant to simulate the professional writing and presentation skills done in the Intelligence Community. The written products will be assessed on:

- **Knowledge of the topic** – demonstrate nuance and an explanation of what you don’t know
- **Organization** – bottom line up front, clear main points, formatting for maximum readability
- **Audience** – knowledge of the level of detail needed, appropriate tone, timely to his/her decision
- **Clarity** – use of precise language, sufficient detail and concise

The oral presentations will be assessed on your ability to communicate a significant amount of information in a clear, concise and relevant way, with a knowledge of your audience.

There are 1000 points possible in this course. They are distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 pts.</td>
<td>Agency Perspective Powerpoint Brief (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 pts.</td>
<td>Drone Debate (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 pts.</td>
<td>Crisis PDB (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 pts.</td>
<td>Concept Paper for Final Project (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 pts.</td>
<td>NIE (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 pts.</td>
<td>Final Project (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 pts.</td>
<td>Final Project Oral Brief (7.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 pts.</td>
<td>Collaboration (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 pts.</td>
<td>Engagement and Reflection (10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The grading scale is as follows:

- 92.5-100 A
- 89.5-92 A-
- 86.5-89 B+
- 81.5-86 B
- 78.5-81 B-
- 76.5-78 C+
- 71.5-76 C
- 69.5-71 C-
- 66.5-69 D+
- 60-66 D
- 0-59 F

Turning In Assignments

Canvas is our learning management system and will be where you submit written assignments. All assignments are due before midnight (11:59 pm) on the date indicated. Late assignments are not accepted, just like they wouldn’t be accepted in a work environment. Your analysis is not helpful if it isn’t timely. That said, life can sometimes get in the way. If something arises which prevents you from completing an assignment on time, you just need to communicate with me. The sooner, the better.

I will review all assignments within one week and provide detailed feedback. You can keep up-to-date on your progress in class by checking the “Grades” link in Canvas. I will embed comments in your assignments, so be sure you are able to see these and let me know if you can’t.
University College Policies

Academic Honesty
Students are bound by the University College policy on academic integrity in all aspects of this course. All references to ideas and texts other than the students' own must be indicated through appropriate footnotes, whether the source is a book, an online site, the professor, etc. All students are responsible for following the rules outlined in the document regarding the university academic integrity policy. All students are expected to abide by proper citation and attribution techniques.

Inclusive Learning Environment
The best learning environment is one in which all members feel respected while being productively challenged. At Washington University in St. Louis, we are dedicated to fostering an inclusive atmosphere, in which all participants can contribute, explore, and challenge their own ideas as well as those of others. Every participant has an active responsibility to foster a climate of intellectual stimulation, openness, and respect for diverse perspectives, questions, personal backgrounds, abilities, and experiences, although instructors bear primary responsibility for its maintenance.

A range of resources is available to those who perceive a learning environment as lacking inclusivity. If you think our classroom is not fostering this environment, please speak with me. Alternatively, you should feel free to bring concerns to another trusted advisor or administrator (such as an academic advisor, mentor, department chair, or dean). All classroom participants—including faculty, staff, and students—who observe a bias incident affecting a student may also file a report (whether personally or anonymously) utilizing the online Bias Report and Support System.

Disability Resources
Washington University is committed to providing equal opportunity for students with disabilities. The Disability Resource Center (DRC) assists students with disabilities by providing services and arranging for reasonable accommodations. Students wishing to request services or accommodations must register and provide appropriate documentation to the DRC at cornerstone.wustl.edu.

Accommodations Based on Sexual Assault
The University is committed to offering reasonable accommodations to students who are victims of sexual assault. Students are eligible for accommodation regardless of whether they seek criminal or disciplinary action. If you need to request such accommodations, please direct your request to Kim Webb (kim_webb@wustl.edu), Director of the Relationship and Sexual Violence Prevention Center.

If a student comes to me to discuss or disclose an instance of sexual assault, discrimination, or harassment, I will keep the information as private as I can, but as a faculty member of Washington University, I am required to report it. If you have any questions, concerns or are in need of a confidential conversation, I encourage you to call or visit the Relationship and Sexual Violence Prevention Center. It is located on the 4th floor of Seigle and the phone is (314) 935-8761.
Campus Resources
You are entitled to all the privileges of a student taking a course on the WU campus. You are encouraged to use the library, bookstore, counseling services, computer labs and all other campus facilities and services. I recommend the following specifically:

- **Cornerstone** provides mentoring, helps hone studying and test-taking skills and is a great resource for first-generation college students.

- **The Writing Center** is a great resource; call in advance to make an appointment.

- **The Career Center** offers workgroups and one-on-one advising for students considering their future – be it graduate school, a new job, a career transition or even study abroad. I co-lead a workgroup for students interested in government and public policy – a great way to learn about careers in government, policy and advocacy and network with like-minded peers and alums.
### Course Schedule and Assignment Due Dates

*Please note that assignments are not always due on the same day of the week, and are often due prior to or after our in-person meeting to accommodate collaboration and discussion.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 1: Jan 17</strong></td>
<td>Introductions</td>
<td>Engagement (10 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 1: Understanding the IC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2: Jan 24</td>
<td>Strategic Context</td>
<td>Engagement (10 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3: Jan 31</td>
<td>Who’s Who in the IC</td>
<td>Agency Perspective Brief: Thurs, Jan 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement (10 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4: Feb 7</td>
<td>The Relationship Between Intel and Policy</td>
<td>Engangement (10 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5: Feb 14</td>
<td>Case Study in Intel Failure: Iraqi WMD Simulation</td>
<td>Collaboration (25 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6: Feb 21</td>
<td>Reforming the IC</td>
<td>Collaboration (25 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 2: Collection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7: Feb 28</td>
<td>HUMINT and EITs</td>
<td>Engagement (10 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8: Mar 7</td>
<td>Technical Collection and Drones</td>
<td>Engagement (10 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 9: Mar 14</td>
<td>SPRING BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 10: Mar 21</td>
<td>The Drone Debate</td>
<td>Group Paper: March 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration (25 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 11: Mar 28</td>
<td>Secrecy, Leaks and Oversight</td>
<td>Engagement (10 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 3: Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 12: April 4</td>
<td>Analytic Standards</td>
<td>Final Project Concept Paper Fri, April 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 13: Apr 11</td>
<td>Current Intelligence</td>
<td>PDB Peer Review: Thurs, April 11 Final: Sat, April 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration (25 pts)                          Engagement (10 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 14: Apr 18</td>
<td>National Intelligence Estimate: Key Questions, Assumptions and ACH</td>
<td>Engagement (10 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 15: Apr 25</td>
<td>NIE Coordination</td>
<td>NIE: Fri, April 26 Collaboration (25 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 16: May 2</td>
<td>Final Project Presentation</td>
<td>Final Paper and Elevator Brief Thurs, May 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement (10 pts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Syllabus

*Please note that given the timely nature of our course, I reserve the right to update readings or include additional ones – or even change topics altogether! It’s the nature of this field...and we would be remiss to not adjust if current events intersect with (or crash into) our learning objectives.*

**Week 1: 17 January**

**Introductions**

This week we will get to know one another as well as the course and its objectives. We will discuss the current disconnect between intelligence and the President and begin honing our powers of observation and attention to detail – critical skills in the field of intelligence.

Greg Miller, “Gap continues to widen between Trump and intelligence community on key issues,” *The Washington Post*, December 11, 2018 [https://wapo.st/2ruXTIR?tid=ss_mail&utm_term=.60b87321c5ef](https://wapo.st/2ruXTIR?tid=ss_mail&utm_term=.60b87321c5ef)

**Part 1: Understanding the Intelligence Community**

**Week 2: 24 January**

**The Strategic Context**

We will explore the major strategy documents that (are supposed to) guide our national security policy in order to provide the necessary strategic context in which the Intelligence Community functions. We will explore the convergence and divergence of the three strategy documents – and how they differ from the President’s view of the world.


**Assignment:** Pick one of the 16 agencies within the IC and consider its priorities and perspective. Prepare a 3 slide, no more than 4 minute brief explaining the agency’s priorities, perspective and constraints. Who is its primary customer, and how does this impact their work? How does their work overlap and/or complement other agencies? Conduct additional research if necessary to consider these questions. *Come prepared to present in-class on January 31.*
Week 3: 31 January
Who’s Who in the IC
In this week, we will get to know the vast and varied intelligence bureaucracy – the sixteen agencies, their missions, priorities, constraints – and how they relate to one another.

http://projects.washingtonpost.com/top-secret-america/articles/a-hidden-world-growing-beyond-control/


Week 4: 7 February
The Relationship between Intel and Policy
The relationship between the policymaker and the intelligence analyst is very important, yet it is fraught with misunderstanding and even ill will (more so than usual lately). We will examine these misunderstandings and the competing priorities and perspectives from which they derive. We will get to know what intelligence support to policy looks like and consider the threats posed to the relationship by both politicization and irrelevance.

Hayden, Playing to the Edge, pgs. 428-429

John McLaughlin, “Serving the National Policymaker,” Analyzing Intelligence, pgs. 71-81 (on Canvas)


Paul Pillar, “Intelligence, Policy and the War in Iraq” Foreign Affairs, March/April 2006
https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/bush/pillar.htm

Graham Allison, “How it Went Down” Time, May 7, 2012 (on Canvas)

http://warontherocks.com/2015/09/on-the-politicization-of-intelligence/


**Week 5: 14 February**

**Iraqi WMD: Simulation in Intelligence Failure**

This week we will explore first-hand the relationship between analyst and policymaker. We will simulate the drafting of the 2002 National Intelligence Estimate on Iraqi WMD and brief policymakers on this assessment. We will then read the NIE, as well as the Commission Report that details the poor tradecraft that led to the NIE’s flawed conclusions.


Michael Hayden, *Playing to the Edge*, pgs. 48-52

**Week 6: 21 February**

**Reforming the IC - ONLINE**

This week will be devoted to understanding the history of Intelligence Community reform, and the negotiation and implementation of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act specifically. We will examine the impact of oversight and politics on intelligence and we will emulate “new analysis” by collaborating on a wiki that assesses the process, status and future of reform.
Part 2: Collection

Week 7: 28 February
HUMINT and Enhanced Interrogation Techniques
We will explore the collection of human intelligence (HUMINT) through the controversial “enhanced interrogation techniques” used to elicit it post 9/11. Our readings will provide some insight into the context in which decisions about EITs were being made and the diverging perspectives of the well-intentioned professionals who were debating and executing those decisions. We will also gain insight into Congress’ role in oversight and the highly political overtones to the debate centered on the effectiveness of the techniques. This debate – once considered over – has been revived with Trump’s campaign promise to reinstate torture and the appointment of a CIA Director who played a prominent role in the policy’s execution.

“Secrets, Politics and Torture,” Frontline, PBS.org, May 19, 2015
http://video.pbs.org/video/2365492758/

Ali Soufan, Testimony before the U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary, May 13, 2009
http://www.judiciary.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/soufan_testimony_05_13_09.pdf


Adam Serwer, "Can Trump Bring Torture Back?" The Atlantic, January 26, 2017


For further reading: (there's so much on this topic!)


**Week 8: 7 March**

**Technical Collection: Drones**

We will learn about the UAV’s evolution from a tactical surveillance and signals collection platform to a vehicle from which to conduct “targeted killings.” We will do a lot of reading during this week in preparation for next week’s debate. You will be divided into work groups to begin drafting a position paper either for or against the use of armed drones.


Hayden, pgs. 331-344


https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/3232594/Read-the-Obama-administration-s-memo-outlining.pdf


For further research:

“Drone Warfare,” Bureau of Investigative Journalism
https://www.thebureauinvestigates.com/projects/drone-war


**Week 9: 14 March  SPRING BREAK**

**Exercise:** Debate the advantages and drawbacks of the use of armed drones. Consider the military, political, diplomatic, informational, psychological and legal implications of their use. In your assigned work groups, prepare a no more than 2 page opening statement. *Come prepared on March 21 to present your testimony, rebut the other group’s statement and respond to questions from the Senate panel.*

**Week 10: 21 March**

**The Drone Debate**

You will present testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee, debating the advantages and drawbacks of the use of drones, the evolving policies regarding their employment, and whether they should fall under the purview of the CIA or DOD. After presenting your opening statements, your group will have to field questions from the distinguished panel of Senators.
Week 11: 28 March
Secrecy, Leaks and Oversight
This week we will consider how the Intelligence Community came to collect information on millions of Americans, how we found out about this collection, and changes that are occurring as a result of this knowledge. We will explore the tension between national security and civil liberties, the role of the media, Congress and the courts in oversight of intelligence activities, and the impact of leaks – on intelligence, diplomacy, the press and decision-making.

Dianne Feinstein, “How to Rethink What’s Top Secret for the Internet Age,” The Washington Post, December 16, 2016 http://wapo.st/2hY3MYd?tid=ss_mail&utm_term=.0f6bf6422304


Hayden, pgs. 21-26, 64-126, 403-426


Part 3: Analysis

Assignment: Write a 1-2 page Concept Paper for your final project. Choose your topic, your product type and your customer. Identify his/her requirements, your key questions, and key sources. Lay out a research plan and outline your line of argument. Due on Friday, April 5.

Week 12: 4 April
Analytic Standards
We will spend this first week in our analysis block familiarizing ourselves with the critical thinking skills and tools necessary for writing rigorous analytical products. You will learn about the questions, techniques and tradecraft that you will employ through the rest of the course in your production of intelligence analysis. We will jump right in to the writing. Bring a draft of your concept paper to class.
and we will work collectively to hone your topic and approach. We will also identify the topic for our current intelligence product, a draft of which is due the following week.


Assignment: Write a 1 page article for the President’s Daily Brief. As part of the review process, review and provide feedback to a classmate, using the Principles of Analytic Writing Checklist. Article is due to your partner for review prior to class on Thursday, April 11 and the final draft is due Saturday, April 13.

Week 13: 11 April
Current Intelligence
We will work collectively in the lead-up to this meeting to identify sources that will help us get smart on the week’s most pressing national security issue. You will come to class with a draft of your PDB article and we will workshop them, simulating the analytic review process.


Week 14: 18 April
NIE on Counterintelligence Threats to US: Identifying Key Questions, Assumptions and Hypotheses
Over the course of two weeks, we will collectively build expertise on the threats facing our country from adversaries who are actively undermining our democracy. We will consider counterintelligence threats from China, Russia, Iran, North Korea and Cuba and consider both their capabilities and intentions in pursuing information on US citizens and intellectual property. We will work together to simulate the interagency writing and coordination of a National Intelligence Estimate on the topic. In this first week, we will complete the first two steps in the analytic process: identifying key questions and assumptions, in order to generate hypotheses regarding adversaries’ intentions. We will then employ the Analysis of Competing Hypotheses structured analytic technique to assess the strength of theses hypotheses.

The readings for this week will be vast and varied, and can be done as a group. I’ll provide a more exhaustive list when we get here, but here is a great introduction to the topic:

Assignment: As a class, you will research, organize, write and coordinate a National Intelligence Estimate on Russia’s cyber activities. Each student will be assigned an agency or role in the drafting process. The final draft is due Friday, April 26.

Week 15: 25 April
NIE Coordination
You will spend this week in “coordination” – collaborating with your classmates to draft and edit your NIE. You will each emulate an agency’s perspective and negotiate both substance and delivery, based on your respective roles.

Assignment: Complete the research and writing project outlined in your Concept Paper by drafting an intelligence product on a topic and to a customer of your choice. Demonstrate good analytic tradecraft and knowledge of your agency’s priorities and purview. Once completed, prepare a 1-minute brief on your project for your chosen customer. Final draft and briefing is due Thursday, May 2.

Week 16: 2 May
Final Project Briefings
During our last meeting, we will listen to one another’s final briefs and discuss the various topics and take-aways, as well as some over-arching conclusions from the course.