JSOU

Partners or Competitors?

The Evolution of the Department of Defense/Central Intelligence Agency Relationship since Desert Storm and its Prospects for the Future

Joint Special Operations University

7701 Tampa Point Boulevard

MacDill AFB FL 33621

https://jsou.socom.mil

David P. Oakley
JSOU Report 14-2
May 2014

Joint Special Operations University
and the Center for Special Operations Studies and Research

The Joint Special Operations University (JSOU) provides its publications to contribute toward expanding the body of knowledge about joint special operations. JSOU publications advance the insights and recommendations of national security professionals and the Special Operations Forces (SOF) students and leaders for consideration by the SOF community and defense leadership.

JSOU is the educational component of the United States Special Operations Command (USSOCOM), MacDill Air Force Base, Florida. The JSOU mission is to educate SOF executive, senior, and intermediate leaders and selected other national and international security decision makers, both military and civilian, through teaching, outreach, and research in the science and art of joint special operations. JSOU provides education to the men and women of SOF and to those who enable the SOF mission in a joint and interagency environment.

JSOU conducts research through its Center for Special Operations Studies and Research (CSOSR) where effort centers upon the USSOCOM and United States SOF missions:

USSOCOM mission. Provide fully capable Special Operations Forces to defend the United States and its interests. Synchronize planning of global operations against terrorist networks.

USSOF mission. USSOF conducts special operations to prepare the operational environment, prevent crisis, and respond with speed, precision, and lethality to achieve tactical through strategic effect.

This publication is available on the JSOU public web page located at https://jsou.socom.mil.

On the cover. Left: The Pentagon building in Washington, DC.

Right: Aerial view of CIA headquarters, Virginia.

Photos used by permission of Newscom.

JOINT SPECIAL OPERATIONS

JSOU

UNIVERSITY

Partners or Competitors? The Evolution of the Department of Defense/ Central Intelligence Agency Relationship since Desert Storm and its Prospects for the Future

David P. Oakley

Contents

Acknowledgements

I want to thank my wife, Kristen, and our children, Taylor, Tanner, Tatum, and Tyler. I would not have completed my monograph without their love and encouragement. I cannot thank them enough for their continued support and patience. Thanks to my parents, Don and Pat, and my brother, Chris, for years of support, love, and encouragement.

The research for this project involved numerous individuals, without whose support I would not have been able to complete it. Thanks to Dr. Butler-Smith and Colonel Aitchison for their leadership, support and mentorship in my monograph process. Thanks to Beth Bochtler for linking me up with the Central Intelligence Agency's (CIA) Studies in Intelligence and CIA Headquarters. I would not have been able to do this project without her support. Thanks to Dr. William Knarr and Mr. Robert P. Nalepa and the other folks at the Joint Special Operations University for funding my research and supporting my efforts. Thanks to both the CIA's Center for the Study of Intelligence and the office of the Associate Director of Military Affairs for all their support with my research. Thanks to all the leaders and experts who provided their insight into the CIA/Department of Defense (DOD) relationship (a complete listing of these individuals is included in the bibliography). I appreciate them generously giving of their time for me to better understand this important and interesting topic. I also want to thank former colleagues and mentors within the CIA and DOD who provided tremendous insight and support in this endeavor. Although I cannot name some of these individuals openly, their support is much appreciated. Thanks to Mrs. Ann Chapman for her work formatting the monograph. Thanks to the Arthur D. Simons Center for Interagency Cooperation at Fort Leavenworth for their support and recognition. Finally, thanks to my School of Advanced Military Studies instructors and fellow students in Seminar #5 for helping make this an enjoyable and intellectually challenging year.

<div align="right">

David P. Oakley, Major
United States Army

</div>

Foreword

Although the CIA and DOD relationship expanded significantly following the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the author contends its foundation was set 10 years earlier in the aftermath of Desert Storm and in the Cold War. During the 1990s, congressional policy pronouncements and organizational changes within both institutions increased the opportunity for communication and liaison partnerships between the CIA and DOD. Conflict, war, and terrorist threats provided a common focus for development and integration, but it was the existence of a structure coupled with policy direction developed in the 1990s that set the conditions for the rapid maturing of that partnership post-9/11. Over time, the relationship morphed from intelligence support to the warfighter into a more comprehensive, mutually supporting partnership in pursuit of America's most important operational and strategic objectives. There is little doubt the relationship would have matured during operations following 9/11, but the growing pains experienced over time would have been much greater absent the organizational and policy changes of the early '90s.

To understand the historical and contemporary context of the CIA/DOD relationship, Major David Oakley draws on secondary sources of academic journals, historical and current affairs accounts, and various media reports supplemented by primary sources. But it is the primary sources of personal interviews with two former Chairmen of the United States Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, interviews with previous and current DOD and CIA leadership, government documents, and written first-person accounts that add a new dimension and uniqueness to this research. Major Oakley takes those policymakers and executors back in time to reflect on those legislative actions and how they affected the development of today's capabilities.

The CIA/DOD partnership appears to be closer than ever before, but there are certain issues and conditions that could, for better or worse, affect how the partnership evolves in the future. Understanding how the CIA/DOD relationship has evolved since Desert Storm will provide an appreciation for the future trajectory this partnership might take.

Kenneth H. Poole, Ed.D.
Director, Center for Special Operations Studies and Research

About the Author

Major David P. Oakley is an Army strategist currently serving with United States Army North at Fort Sam Houston, San Antonio, and a Ph.D. candidate in Kansas State University's Security Studies Program. Prior to returning to active duty in 2007, he served as a Staff Operations Officer in the Central Intelligence Agency and as a contractor within the National Counterterrorism Center's Directorate of Strategic Operational Planning.

Major Oakley has a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science from Pittsburg State University, a Master of Public Administration from the University of Oklahoma, a Master of Military Arts and Sciences in Conflict and Security Studies from the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, and a Master of Military Arts and Sciences in Theater Operations from the School of Advanced Military Studies.

His articles include: "Ten Years of GWOT, the Failure of Democratization and the Fallacy of Ungoverned Spaces" (co-authored with Pat Proctor), *Journal of Strategic Security*; "Taming the Rogue Elephant?", *American Intelligence Journal*; "Perfection of Process Does Not Equal Perfect Understanding: Reflections on Design and How it is Taught at SAMS," *Military Review* (pending); "Adapting to Change: Strategic Turning Points and the CIA/DOD Relationship," *InterAgency Journal*.

Professional Memberships include, Term Member Council on Foreign Relations and the International Institute for Strategic Studies. Major Oakley conducted the research for this monograph while attending the School of Advanced Military Studies at Fort Leavenworth.

Introduction

Since 11 September 2001, the United States Department of Defense (DOD) and the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) have worked closely in Iraq, Afghanistan, and during counterterrorism operations. Various media accounts, personal memoirs, and current affairs literature discuss the integration of these organizations. Several operations highlight both the significance of the relationship and the degree to which each organization depends on the other. While various accounts cover the contemporary integration of the two organizations, their operational exploits, and areas of institutional friction, there is a lack of literature that looks at how and why the CIA/DOD relationship has evolved. An appreciation of the current relationship and the possible future course this relationship might take is dependent on an understanding of how this relationship evolved over time.

To appreciate the contemporary relationship between the CIA and DOD, one must begin well before 11 September 2001. Although the CIA and DOD relationship expanded significantly following the 9/11 terrorist attacks, its foundation was set 10 years earlier in the aftermath of Desert Storm and in the Cold War's twilight glow. During this period, congressional policy pronouncements and organizational changes within both institutions increased the communication and liaison partnerships between the CIA and DOD, establishing the foundation for greater interoperability after 1992. The changes made in response to Desert Storm and the end of the Cold War established conditions that enabled the blossoming of the relationship since 2001. Although conflict, war, and terrorist threats provided a common focus for partnership development and integration, existence of a structure coupled with previous policy direction resulted in organizational familiarity and partnership prior to operations. Over time, this relationship morphed from intelligence analysis support for the warfighter into a more comprehensive partnership that has come to involve the mutual and reinforcing pursuit of America's most important operational and strategic objectives. There is little doubt the relationship would have matured during operations, but the growing pains experienced over time would have been much greater absent the organizational and policy changes of the early 1990s.

The purpose of this monograph is to understand the evolution of the CIA/DOD relationship since Desert Storm and determine its current standing. To understand the historical and contemporary context of the CIA/DOD relationship, the author draws on primary and secondary sources. Primary sources include interviews with two former Chairmen of the United States Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, interviews with previous and current DOD and CIA leadership, government documents, and written first-person accounts. The secondary sources include academic journal articles, historical and current affairs accounts, and various media reports.

Although specific events in the 1980s that helped shape the subsequent CIA/DOD relationship are highlighted, this monograph focuses on the two decades following Desert Storm and breaks those 21 years into two periods: post-Desert Storm/Cold War (1991-2001) and post-9/11 (2001-2012). The first period looks at how the perceived failures of the intelligence community to support the warfighter during Desert Storm, coupled with the security and fiscal realities of the post-Cold War world, led to congressional investigations, Executive branch committees, and policy changes that affected both organizations. It then considers how the investigations and committee proposals resulted in institutional changes that increased the level of interaction between the CIA and DOD. While the first period considers the strategic environment that encouraged organizational change, the second period focuses on the strategic and operational environments that tested and institutionalized these changes. This period begins in the aftermath of 9/11 and looks at the policy, organizational, operational, and individual choices that shaped the relationship. Informed by history, the monograph then transitions from an understanding of the past into a focus on the present. This section looks at the current state of the CIA/DOD relationship, considering the conditions and attributes that should continue to shape the partnership and the friction that could stymie or even derail efforts to increase the partnership.

1. Literature Review and Methodology

Despite significant amounts of literature on both the CIA and DOD, to include primary and secondary accounts of organizational interaction during military operations, there is a dearth of literature on the evolution of their relationship and its implications for future partnership efforts. The existing academic literature usually focuses on the operational implications of the CIA/DOD relationship or offers recommendations on how the relationship should evolve. In a 2002 article titled *Tug of War: The CIA's Uneasy Relationship with the Military*, Dr. Richard Russell, a former CIA analyst and current National Defense University professor, argues that overwhelming the CIA with support to the warfighter requirements could have severe consequences for CIA support to policymakers.[1] Dr. Russell covers the CIA/DOD history to include Desert Storm and the establishment of CIA's Office of Military Affairs (OMA) and poses some valid concerns regarding analytical support. A valuable account of the relationship, particularly from an analytical support standpoint, the School of Advanced International Studies published the paper in 2002, therefore it does not capture the evolution of the relationship since.

Another informative paper that captures some of the issues involved with the CIA/DOD relationship is Colonel Kathryn Stone's "All Necessary Means-Employing CIA Operatives in a Warfighting Role Along-side Special Operations Forces."[2] Colonel Stone's paper tackles the Title 10 vs. Title 50 debate and explores the confusing topic of legal authorities. Jennifer Kibbe's 2007 paper, "Covert Action and the Pentagon," and Frederick Hitz's 2012 paper, "U.S. Intelligence in the Wake of September 11: The Rise of the Spy Commando and Reorganized Operational Capabilities," update this discussion and add to the body of academic literature for this very important topic.[3] In addition to the issue-focused literature, papers by James Lose, Garret Jones, and Daniel Moore consider the value of CIA/DOD interaction and/or provide recommendations on how they can improve the relationship.[4] Although all these papers provide valuable information on the CIA/DOD relationship, there is no comprehensive account that covers the evolution of the relationship from the early 1990s until today. Understanding how the CIA/DOD relationship has evolved and appreciating the environment that shaped it is important to any projection of how the relationship might develop in the future.[5]

2. Shaping the Future

Organizational attitudes and environmental conditions are contingent on events and decisions made years earlier; making other decisions or choices would result in a much different environment. Although it is nearly impossible to account for all the individual choices made by the CIA and DOD in the years preceding Desert Storm, there are four significant policy and organizational decisions made in the 1980s and 1990s that set conditions for a closer relationship between the two organizations. The four decisions were the 1986 passage of the Goldwater-Nichols Act, the 1986 establishment of the United States Special Operations Command (USSOCOM), the 1986 establishment of the CIA's Counterterrorism Center (CTC), and the 1992 establishment of the Defense Intelligence Agency's Defense Human Intelligence (HUMINT) Service. The intent of these decisions, or actions, was not to strengthen the CIA/DOD relationship, but the decisions unintentionally created conditions that positively affected the future partnership.

The interoperability failures during Operation Desert One and Operation Urgent Fury highlighted the inability of the United States military to conduct joint operations. In response to these failures, Congress looked for ways to increase inter-service understanding and cooperation to enable successful joint operations. The passage of the Goldwater-Nichols Act did not completely eradicate parochial mind-sets, but it did help weaken the service centric attitudes. The eroding of service stovepipes accustomed the services to embrace non-parochialism beyond their cloistered environments, a small yet significant step in shaping how they developed relationships with non-military government agencies.[6]

As part of defense reorganization in the wake of Goldwater-Nichols, Congress, supported by former and current defense officials, looked for ways to both strengthen and raise the "clout" of Special Operations Forces (SOF). In pursuit of these goals, congress passed legislation establishing USSOCOM as a functional combatant command responsible for SOF within all the services.[7] Other measures had been undertaken to increase service jointness, but it was the failures of Operation Desert One and Operation Urgent Fury that convinced policymakers of the need to create a joint SOF command structure. The tragic 1983 Marine Corps barracks bombing in Lebanon raised the

specter of low-intensity conflicts and identified the need for a joint structure to command unconventional forces likely to fight in these environments.[8] The centralization of SOF capabilities under a single command increased efficiency of resource management and improved interoperability.[9] Although not an articulated justification for USSOCOM's establishment, establishing a joint SOF command also enabled future collaboration with CIA paramilitary elements following 9/11. USSOCOM now meant CIA had a direct plug-in to all DOD SOF elements, making collaboration less complex.

In the aftermath of terrorist attacks, such as the 1983 Marine Corps barracks bombing and the 1984 kidnapping and murder of the CIA's Beirut Chief of Station, the CIA increased its focus on terrorism.[10] The CIA established the CTC in response to the Reagan Administration's desire to have a single entity within the U.S. Government focused on the international terrorist threat.[11] Although it is doubtful that the Reagan administration could have predicted the future importance of United States' counterterrorism efforts, the creation of CTC provided another venue for future CIA/DOD collaboration—a venue that would become valuable during joint CIA/DOD counterterrorism operations after 9/11.

The fourth organizational change that shaped the future CIA/DOD relationship was the centralization of DOD HUMINT under the Defense HUMINT Services in 1992.[12] This gave the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency "centralized management" of all DOD HUMINT activities, ensuring more collaborative efforts and standardized practices. Although the establishment of DHS did not necessarily increase CIA/DOD HUMINT collaboration, centralization of DOD HUMINT activities was a necessary first step in shaping future CIA/DOD partnership efforts.[13]

3. Responding to the Gulf War Critique

In June 1991, General Norman Schwarzkopf criticized the intelligence community's performance during Operation Desert Storm.[14] His criticism highlighted a breakdown in the integration of strategic intelligence and military forces that resulted in poor communication and a lack of common understanding of the operational environment. Schwarzkopf's testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee not only unveiled a crack in the perceived sterling edifice of the battlefield victory, but also illustrated the need for structural and policy changes within the intelligence community.

The Gulf War controversy centered on two issues: battle damage assessments and national intelligence support to the combatant commanders.[15] Regarding battle damage assessments, the military believed they destroyed a higher percentage of Iraqi combat power during initial bombing operations than the CIA assessed. The analytical disagreement, based on different calculation criteria and means for assessing damage, resulted in policymaker confusion.[16] The second criticism, concerning intelligence support to the combatant commander, focused on the quantity and quality of the intelligence provided to the commander. The report identified the absence of a unified intelligence effort to provide the combatant commander the highest quality intelligence without being contradicting.[17]

General Schwarzkopf first identified a need for greater national intelligence support during the planning phase of Desert Storm. Dissatisfied with conflicting analysis and repetitive reporting, the DOD resurrected the Joint Intelligence Center (JIC) concept to integrate the capabilities of the national intelligence organizations in support of the warfighter. Although helpful in bringing together the different organizations in support of the combatant commander, the loose and largely informal nature of the organization limited its effectiveness. The JIC's ad hoc nature also meant the intelligence organizations had to pull resources from other intelligence operations to support the effort. Postmortem congressional reports criticized the CIA specifically for not providing adequate support to the JIC. The House Armed Services Subcommittee report referred to the CIA's "handoff approach" as one of the reasons the combatant commander did not have an adequate and unified intelligence picture.[18] In response, the CIA stated they supported the

JIC concept, but their limited resources stretched their capacity for supporting the organization with an analyst. Instead, they provided a liaison officer who was able to facilitate communication between General Schwarzkopf's staff and the CIA.[19]

Appreciating the potential value integrated intelligence provided combatant commanders, the House Armed Services Committee identified the importance of building a unity of effort in support of the combatant commander during wartime. Since understanding the capabilities, needs, and requirements of the partner organization could not happen overnight, construction of the DOD/intelligence community relationship would need to begin in peacetime. In 1991, realizing the benefit of ongoing national intelligence support to the combatant commander, then-Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney ordered all combatant commanders to establish permanent JICs.[20] The intelligence community also identified the requirement to create a deployable surge capability in support of military operations. To meet this need, members of the intelligence community came together to establish National Intelligence Support Teams (NIST).[21] Similar to the JICs, the NIST sought to provide intelligence support to commanders, but unlike the JICs, were non-permanent structures that came together to support a joint task force during operations.[22]

DOD and the intelligence community thought the establishment of permanent JICs and on-call NISTs would result in better support to wartime commanders. In later years, the CIA developed its own deployable support asset to military operations to ensure better integration and responsiveness. These teams, known as Crisis Operation Liaison Teams, provide commanders direct access to CIA products and personnel.[23]

The intelligence community also identified the requirement to create a deployable surge capability in support of military operations.

Accepting the Desert Storm critiques and realizing the burgeoning fluid post-Cold War environment, the CIA also looked for ways to facilitate and manage their integration with military warfighters. In 1992, the CIA established the Office of Military Affairs "to enhance information flow and increase cooperation" with the DOD.[24] OMA's creation symbolized an evolving mindset within the CIA. The CIA traditionally focused resources and attention on providing policymakers intelligence to enable decision-making. Although the CIA and DOD had signed previous agreements regarding the

CIA/military relationship during wartime and the CIA provided support whenever possible, its "support to military operations" was always a second tier mission to the higher priority "support to the policymaker."[25] The establishment of an organization focused on improving support to the "military customer" demonstrated the evolutionary changes occurring within the CIA.

In some ways, congressional reaction to the intelligence community's performance during Desert Storm was a response to changing global conditions. The critiques provided an initial peek into the how the changing national security environment and fiscal concerns would affect the organizations responsible for waging the Cold War. The waning of the five-decade-long Cold War brought about a new found sense of security. Although America's defense expenditures would not go back to pre-World War II levels, the changing conditions within the international environment presented an opportunity to focus more on domestic economic concerns and less on external security considerations. In hindsight, the critique of the intelligence community signaled an evolving congressional definition of the role certain national security organizations have in a post-Cold War environment. This definition was developed in a political environment where defense cuts and fiscal responsibility were shaping the debate.

4. End of the Cold War and the "Peace Dividend"

The timing of Schwarzkopf's criticisms was as important, if not more so, than the words he uttered. Less than a year after coalition victory in Iraq, the Soviet Union disintegrated and the Cold War ended. The collapse of the Soviet Union resulted in identity loss for the United States who had seen world through bipolar lenses for 50 years. Although victory in the Cold War brought a degree of pride and satisfaction to the national security professionals who waged it, they also realized it resulted in a less understood world. Despite this newfound confusion, organizations such as the CIA would no longer enjoy Cold War-level funding to develop this understanding. After more than 50 years of containment, arms races, and proxy wars, the United States was looking for a "peace dividend." A significant portion of this peace dividend involved an increasingly austere national security budget and the call for a more streamlined and integrated national security apparatus.

Sensing the final collapse of the Soviet Union and realizing its significance on the "changing international landscape," President George H.W. Bush ordered the executive agencies to identify what those changes meant for the United States national security apparatus.[26] Domestic fiscal concerns regarding an ongoing recession threatening America's economic health partially drove President Bush's review. After the fall of the Berlin Wall, President Bush had called for national security spending cuts amounting to approximately 25 percent. The President and other national leaders believed the United States' global standing was not only contingent on a strong defense, but also on its economic health. The reunification of Germany and the Soviet Union's steady emergence as the new "sick man of Europe," provided the United States an opportunity to leverage the "peace dividend," and put America's fiscal house in order.[27]

In the 1990s, Congress, also driven by the ongoing recession and informed by the recent collapse of the Soviet Union and the lessons of Desert Storm, initiated reviews of the intelligence community to determine how it should transform to be effective in the post-Cold War era.[28] Although the commissions acknowledged the importance of intelligence to understand

a post-Soviet world, they also highlighted the need to reduce intelligence expenditures. These reviews looked at ways to cut redundancy and streamline the intelligence community to make intelligence organizations more responsive and integrated, but at a cheaper cost to the American taxpayer. Although these reviews focused on the broad structure of the intelligence community, there is little doubt the criticisms of intelligence integration during the Gulf War informed them. Whatever spurred their actions, it is apparent they sought to remedy the relationship between military operations and national intelligence for both practical and fiscal reasons.

The desire to leverage the post-Cold War environment to strengthen the sickly American economy did not end with the George H.W. Bush presidency. Running on the memorable quip, "it's the economy stupid," Bill Clinton entered the White House with an electoral mandate to strengthen the economy. Part of the Clinton administration's strategy to revitalize the economy was a determined focus to make the U.S. Government more effective and efficient. Sharing the

> *...it is apparent they sought to remedy the relationship between military operations and national intelligence for both practical and fiscal reasons.*

Bush administration's belief that a new unipolar world presented an opportunity to cut national security significantly, the Clinton administration continued the trend of reduced defense spending initiated by their predecessor. Part of this reduction meant looking for opportunities to leverage existing capabilities to cover requirements, and the intelligence needs of post-Desert Storm warfighters was one of those identified requirements.

In 1995, then-Vice President Al Gore's committee seeking efficient and effective governance identified intelligence support to the warfighter as a continued failing that needed to be remedied.[29] Responding to the reverberating argument for increased support to the warfighter, President Clinton ranked intelligence support to military operations as the number one priority for the intelligence community and established the Commission on the Roles and Capabilities of the United States Intelligence Community, known colloquially as the Aspin-Brown Commission.[30] Informed by previous post-Cold War intelligence reform attempts and motivated by operational lessons, the committee identified a continued lack of support to operational commanders.[31] Understanding the increasing importance of operational support to the warfighter, the CIA moved the Associate Deputy Director

of Operations for Military Affairs out of the Directorate of Operations and created the Associate Director of Central Intelligence for Military Support (ADCI/MS).[32] This meant a flag officer responsible for ensuring CIA/DOD partnership would report directly to the Director of Central Intelligence and not through the Deputy Director for Operations.[33] After 9/11, the CIA consolidated the ADCI/MS and OMA into the office of the Associate Director of Military Affairs (ADMA).[34]

The end of the Cold War created an opportunity to reshape the intelligence community's focus and the dire economic conditions at the time made the opportunity a political imperative. The lessons of Desert Storm provided policymakers with an event that highlighted the need for national security structural changes and mission refocusing in the post-Cold War era. Responsive to the changing environment, the CIA made structural changes to their organization and their leadership embraced the importance of supporting the warfighter.[35]

5. Collaboration in the Jungle: Somalia and the Balkans

During his February 1993 Senate confirmation hearing, then-Director of Central Intelligence nominee James Woolsey quipped, "Our two surrounding oceans don't isolate us anymore. Yes, we have slain a large dragon, but we live now in a jungle filled with a bewildering variety of poisonous snakes. And in many ways, the dragon was easier to keep track of."[36] The CIA and military were no longer chasing the Soviets or preparing to meet them on the plains of Europe; they were now trying to understand a confusing world while undergoing significant institutional downsizing and turmoil. Compounding this confusion were the cuts in both personnel and budgets introduced during the George H.W. Bush administration and incorporated during President Clinton's tenure.[37] Despite declining budgets from 1990-1996 and mainly "flat budgets" from 1996-2000, the intelligence community had to satiate an increasing intelligence appetite of a multiplying policymaker consumer trying to come to terms with a post-Soviet environment and America's role in this world.[38] Although many pundits and experts thought the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe signaled irrepressible progress towards a liberal democratic world, the splintering of existing orders highlighted a tumultuous and unpredictable environment.

In response to this splintering, the United States conducted various peacekeeping and humanitarian operations in the Balkans and Africa. Whereas the Desert Storm critiques centered on analytical support to the combatant commander, the new missions required more operational integration between CIA and DOD operational elements. While the dialogue engaged and the structures emplaced following Desert Storm helped enable the relationship, successful integration in these operations other than war depended largely on the personalities of the individual officers representing both organizations.

In 1993, the United Nations (UN) decided to transition the mission in Somalia from a peacekeeping operation to a nation building operation.[39] To build Somalian institutions, advisors within the Clinton administration believed it was necessary to remove impediments to development such as clan leader Mohammed Aideed. A special operations element led by Major

General William Garrison was tasked with apprehending General Aideed.[40] In order to increase intelligence capabilities in support of military operations, senior CIA official Garrett Jones quickly integrated his operations with Major General Garrison. The tragedy of Somalia is well known, but the collaboration between the CIA and the military is less known. Despite a lack of HUMINT sources, Jones and his officers integrated their operations as best they could with Garrison's command. According to a Senate Armed Services Committee after-action review, the military and intelligence community "effectively integrated" and while some military officers were not satisfied with the available HUMINT intelligence, the senior leadership was satisfied with the performance of the intelligence community.[41]

During the same period that Somalia was spiraling out of control, Yugoslavia was fracturing into ethnic pieces. In December 1995, the UN authorized the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to conduct military operations to ensure enforcement of the Bosnian Peace Agreement.[42] Even more so than Somalia, Operation Joint Endeavor validated the institutional actions taken following Desert Storm.[43] The integration of military operations with national intelligence at the tactical, operational, and strategic levels was even more remarkable when one considers this occurred within multinational operations.[44] Understanding that support to the warfighter in multinational operations involved providing intelligence support to allies, the Director of Central Intelligence had a task force develop procedures that would ensure U.S. and allied warfighters received the necessary intelligence, while protecting CIA sources and methods.[45] The interaction between the CIA and special operations also increased in the Balkans with SOF ground teams working closely with CIA officers.[46]

...the CIA and DOD were operating together in peacekeeping and nation-building operations that brought the two organizations closer.

While debates over the future of the intelligence community were occurring in committee rooms on Capitol Hill, the CIA and DOD were operating together in peacekeeping and nation-building operations that brought the two organizations closer. Although policymaker pronouncements highlighted the need for integrated CIA/DOD operations and structural changes displayed CIA/DOD willingness to adapt, operations were required to solidify the relationship. During the 1990s, peacekeeping and humanitarian operations provided a small-scale venue for CIA/DOD relationship

building.[47] The decade looming on the horizon would bring two large-scale operations and a shared mission focus that had been absent since the end of the Cold War. This experience would further solidify the relationship.

6. Identifying the Snake: 9/11, Afghanistan, Iraq and a Burgeoning Partnership

Ten years had passed between General Schwarzkopf's congressional testimony criticizing intelligence support to the warfighter and the 9/11 attacks. During the intervening years, structures were built to institutionalize the relationship, and the effectiveness of the structures was tested during humanitarian operations. The military and CIA became more familiar with each other during the mid to late 1990s, but the lack of a significant unifying threat to the United States kept CIA and DOD collaboration at low levels. But out of tragedy often grows common purpose; the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon gave the United States' national security apparatus a new focus and helped establish a common purpose for the CIA and DOD. Organizational changes made in the aftermath of Desert Storm supported the pursuit of this common purpose. These changes set the foundation for increased interactions, providing structure in which to engage each other.

The policy pronouncements and organizational changes made in the early 1990s conditioned the environment for greater CIA/DOD interoperability. Major General David Baratto, former ADMA, commented that he saw a vast difference in the CIA/DOD relationship from his time as the commanding general of the

The 9/11 tragedy significantly altered the CIA/DOD partnership by giving them a common purpose.

U.S. Army Special Warfare Center and School from 1988-1992 compared to his time as the ADMA from 1994-1995.[48] Although the new policies and structures increased partnership, the absence of a significant common mission focus meant the operational environment did not necessitate an immediate transformation of the partnership. The 9/11 tragedy significantly altered the CIA/DOD partnership by giving them a common purpose. The wars in Afghanistan, Iraq, and global counterterrorism operations served as a forcing mechanism to bring the two organizations closer together and increase their mutual familiarity. The partnership was also encouraged by Post-9/11 congressional investigations that highlighted the importance of interagency collaboration in the war on terror. Leading the effort to expand the CIA/

DOD partnership were leaders within both organizations who understood the importance of breaking down organizational barriers in pursuit of national interests. Without these non-parochial public servants, the policy and structural changes would not have been as effective.

The CIA/SOF partnership took off shortly after 9/11 when combined cross-functional teams supported the Northern Alliance's efforts to overthrow the Taliban.[49] Although these composite teams did not always agree and friction did occur, the CIA/DOD partnership strengthened out of a need to leverage the other's capabilities.[50] The melding together of the DOD's military capabilities with the CIA's intelligence and paramilitary capabilities provided a good template for counterterrorism operations that were increasing in importance for both organizations. Since 1986, the CIA's CTC served as the leading intelligence organization focused on international terrorism.[51] Although USSOCOM was created partially in response to terrorist attacks in the 1980s, its primary focus was on small intensity conflicts.[52] In July 2002, then-Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld identified USSOCOM as the lead in the global fight against terrorism and gave them authority to coordinate and wage the DOD's counterterrorism fight across the different geographic combatant commands territories. In addition to USSOCOM, Central Command (CENTCOM) and Northern Command also identified counterterrorism as a primary mission.[53] The elevation of USSOCOM as the DOD counterterrorism lead helped ensure the further formalization of a relationship that had already grown out of necessity.

During the run-up to the Iraq War, the CIA/SOF partnership continued to grow. In the summer of 2002, CIA teams operating in Kurdistan and adjacent countries began introducing SOF soldiers to Iraqis who could help them convince Iraqi soldiers to surrender prior to conflict initiation.[54] These CIA teams assisted with the preparation of the battlefield and military planning by developing relationships that would enable future operations and by providing intelligence to CENTCOM in support of planning efforts.[55] At CENTCOM, the designated CIA lead in Iraq worked with General Tommy Franks and his staff during the preparation for war.[56] In Iraq, the integration of DOD/CIA operations manifested both formally and informally. Formally, CIA officers were feeding real-time information to the "warfighter" and their locations were coordinated with military elements to protect against accidental fratricide.[57] Informally, military and CIA personnel on the ground were reaching out to each other and developing partnerships.

In 2003, Colonel David Perkins was a Third Infantry Division brigade commander leading the "Thunder Run" into Baghdad. Now commanding the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), Lieutenant General Perkins recalled during an October 2012 interview how a CIA officer arrived at his Tactical Operations Center on the eve of the assault on Baghdad. The CIA officer, who turned out to be the future Baghdad Chief of Station, asked if he could accompany Colonel Perkins into Baghdad. Then-Colonel Perkins not only agreed, but also upon arrival to Baghdad the CIA and Colonel Perkins began to cooperate and support each other's operations. Although unplanned, this fortuitous encounter set a positive tone for future CIA/DOD interactions.

Beyond presenting a common operational focus, 9/11 also led to significant changes to America's national security structure. Organizationally, the 9/11 Commission Report highlighted the lack of a counterterrorism "unity of effort" throughout the government and made recommendations to ensure closer collaboration.[58] Although it is contestable whether or not all the measures enacted following the passage of the 2004 Intelligence Reform Terrorism Prevention Act streamlined the country's counterterrorism efforts, the passage of the legislation coupled with greater focus on "interagency efforts" and increased funding helped break down barriers between the different organizations.[59] The legislation also mandated further operational "coordination and deconfliction" measures between DOD and CIA entities and agreement on the strategic objectives being pursued when they are conducting joint operations.[60] Although much of the congressional reaction to 9/11 seems visceral, it is hard to deny that some goodness, such as closer collaboration, has resulted from congressional efforts.

Complementing both the operational necessity and the structure were the leaders who embraced a non-parochial approach. These leaders ensured that mission success trumped organizational interests. Encouraging the forging of a stronger CIA/DOD relationship in battle was the support of leadership back in the United States. Organizational leaders such as George Tenet and General John Abizaid set the tone of teamwork for professionals planning and executing operations.[61] The non-parochial attitude that originated at the top echelons of the CIA and DOD helped nourish a collaborative environment at the operational level. The support of these leaders allowed for the creation of grass-root joint organizations that increased collaboration and leveraged individual organizational strengths for the collective good. This

is not to say that friction did not occur at the operational level; it is merely stating that without the support of organizational leaders, operational collaboration would have been more difficult and sporadic.[62]

The wars in Iraq, Afghanistan, and counterterrorism operations worldwide provided a common mission focus for CIA and DOD, resulting in increased collaboration since 9/11. Policy and organizational changes made in the 1980s and 1990s enabled the evolving partnership. The policy pronouncements highlighted the importance of the relationship to policymakers and weakened institutional stovepipes. The organizational changes created structural conditions for collaboration, to occur. Operational necessity provided a purpose for collaboration and the process of collaboration both strengthened the existing structures and spurred new partnership endeavors that further reinforces the partnership.

7. The Relationship Today: Stronger than Ever

The evolution of the CIA/DOD relationship over the last 20 years is both encouraging and astounding. Although there might be nuanced disagreement over why the relationship has improved, there seems to be universal agreement among the current senior leaders that the relationship has never been better. Mr. Garry Reid, the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Special Operation's and Low-Intensity Conflict and a former special operations soldier with over 28 years of service, stated, "overall the relationship has never been stronger across the board."[63] Another retired Army officer who is now a Senior Intelligence Service officer in the CIA's National Clandestine Service compared his experience as a military liaison in the late 1980s and early 1990s to today. When he first arrived at the CIA, there were only a handful of liaison officers located at CIA headquarters in Langley, Virginia.[64] Today, there are hundreds of uniformed personnel (active, guard, and reserve) serving in the building and nearly half of those individuals are active duty service members.[65] In addition, the CIA has representation at dozens of military commands and professional military schools.[66] Despite the relationship being closer than it was in previous years, it appears that it grows closer every year. About five years ago, the two organizations established the enhanced programs to enable cross-organizational support. The CIA uses this system to leverage logistics support, support which has increased every year for the past five years, with an increase of 33 percent over that period.[67]

Historians within the CIA's Center for the Study of Intelligence stated that interviews with CIA personnel highlight significant improvement in CIA's relationship with other government organizations since 9/11. These improved partnerships have resulted in less parochialism and increased mission success. Most important, the officers recognize the value of these partnerships and are now more receptive to engaging their interagency colleagues instead of operating alone. Even during periods when the structure has not completely evolved to enhance partnerships, officers find new and innovative ways to work around the constraints.[68] While these officers still understand and appreciate the differences in their two organizations'

missions and culture, they now view each other as indispensable members of the larger U.S. national security profession.

Although ADMA is the formal plug-in for the military into the CIA and its contributions in developing the relationship are valuable, there is ongoing interaction between the CIA and DOD at multiple levels. CIA's Special Activities deals directly with the theater special operations commands and CIA's CTC deals directly with USSOCOM. In addition, CIA's geographic division chiefs interact with SOF personnel in their region and coordination occurs between SOF and other CIA Centers such as the Counternarcotics Center.[69] The numerous interactions between the CIA and DOD build redundancy in the relationship, which protects against organizational stove piping and enables unity of effort.

While many of these relationships develop out of necessity during operations, both organizations are making efforts during training to cultivate the partnership. Beyond serving as a gateway into the CIA, ADMA has instituted various programs focused on increasing DOD/CIA partnership, by cultivating non-parochial leaders who are familiar with both organizations and aware of the value each brings. For example, ADMA hosts numerous military professionals during visits to CIA headquarters to build a greater familiarization of the CIA's mission.[70] These visits draw a diverse number of military professionals at all levels to include general officers, brigade commanders, staff officers, embassy based service members, military intelligence officers and noncommissioned officers.[71] Recognizing the increased interaction between SOF and the CIA, ADMA has also started bringing every newly minted Special Forces detachment (18A) captain to CIA headquarters to brief them on the CIA's mission and introduce them to CIA personnel.[72] ADMA also works to educate the CIA workforce on the military mission and culture, providing pre-deployment briefs to CIA officers and serving as an accessible resource to learn about the military or obtain contact information for military units.

...ADMA has also started bringing every newly minted Special Forces detachment (18A) captain to CIA headquarters to brief them on the CIA's mission and introduce them to CIA personnel.

Cross-pollination is also strengthening the relationship. A recent training class at the CIA's training facility had over 25 percent military students, and even more telling, a significant portion of the instructors serving at the

"Farm" are from military services.[73] Beyond the networking opportunities joint training creates, the bond forged through shared training experience shapes the mindset of younger officers and results in organizational integration becoming a way of life and not merely a mandate. A senior CIA officer previously responsible for overseeing training throughout the organization stated in an interview that the "showcasing" of the military during training, the presence of military colleagues, and the operational experience in war zones are all contributing to a more "enlightened" institution and CIA officer when it comes to working with the military.[74]

A recurring theme during interviews with senior leaders from both the CIA and the DOD is the importance of personalities of leaders in both organizations encouraging a close partnership. The constant interaction over the last decade created leaders who are familiar with the other organization's capabilities. Particularly noteworthy has been the multi-organizational experience of senior leaders who not only understand the other organization's mission, but its culture as well. This "cross-cultural" knowledge is invaluable and enables a leader to identify how each organization compliments the other instead of focusing on what the other organization fails to provide. The senior CIA leader, who served as a military liaison officer to the CIA in the late 1980s and early 1990s, commented that he was "intrigued" by the lack of a relationship when he first arrived as a liaison officer. He thought the two organizations would have a greater "affinity" for each other because of the shared birthright.[75] It appears the relationship is now closer, partially owing to leaders whose organizational understanding cross the divide.

The CIA and DOD currently enjoy a strong relationship based on operational necessity; this relationship is enabled by organizational structure and pursued by non-parochial leaders who understand the value of the relationship for America's national security interests. Although the CIA/DOD relationship is probably the best it has ever been, its continued strength is contingent upon future decisions in response to changing operational environments, fiscal concerns, and outstanding issues.

8. Current Issues Between the CIA and DOD

Although the CIA/DOD relationship has grown over the last two decades and the evolution of the relationship has been mostly positive, there remain significant legal authority and organizational mission issues. While some of these issues spur debate between the CIA and DOD, it is often policymakers who voice dissent over what they see as the narrowing of separate identities, and the threat this poses to both legal and non-legal oversight. The legal issues are concerned with what authorities each organization has to conduct certain operations and the nuanced nature of the statutes that govern the authorities. There are legitimate oversight concerns that both organizations might be drifting away from their core purposes and leaving gaps in national security coverage as a result. There are also parochial congressional concerns over which committees have oversight responsibilities. While ensuring that each committee provides appropriate oversight is important, it is not always apparent if the decisions are the result of legitimate oversight concerns or due to internal congressional power plays.

Title 10 vs. Title 50: Understanding Who Can Do What and When

One of the most contentious, confusing, yet least often discussed issues with the CIA/DOD relationship is the Title 10 vs. Title 50 debate. Title 10 and Title 50 deal with authorities given each organization by the United States Code (USC). The USC is the "codification by subject matter of the general and permanent laws of the United States."[76] The USC consists of 51 titles, of which 26 are statutory law or positive law and 25 are prima facie law.[77] The USC can be thought of as an efficient way to organize legal statutes into broad themes to alleviate the need to dig through individual statutes and numerous amendments.[78] Title 10 USC covers the Armed Forces of the United States, while Title 50 focuses on war and national security. The Title 10 vs. Title 50 debate can be very confusing, especially for the non-legal professional trying to navigate the murky waters of USC. This section will not delve into the recesses of this deep water, but will merely try to highlight some of the

surface issues such as USC title applicability and interaction with executive orders, that are often confusing.

Confusion often arises in the use of the terms Title 10 and Title 50 to describe the nature of forces or the activities being conducted. Although Title 10 deals solely with the Armed Forces, Title 50 also provides the Secretary of Defense certain authorities regarding the use of DOD intelligence organizations. In addition, labeling activities or operations as either Title 10 or Title 50 is somewhat inaccurate because it focuses solely on the activity, excluding where the various organizations derive their authority. Adding to that confusion was then-CIA Director Leon Panetta's assertion during an interview with Jim Lehrer that:

> Since this was what's called a "Title 50" operation, which is a covert operation, and it comes directly from the president of the United States who made the decision to conduct this operation in a covert way, that direction goes to me. And then, I am, you know, the person who then commands the mission. But having said that, I have to tell you that the real commander was Admiral McRaven because he was on site, and he was actually in charge of the military operation that went in and got bin Laden.[79]

Panetta's loose language describing himself in "command" of the operation gave the false impression that he was part of the military chain of command. Although his role in the operation might fit the colloquial definition of command, command in military parlance has very specific legal meaning based in authorities and responsibilities.[80] In a recent article on covert action and the chain of command, Lieutenant Colonel Joseph Berger makes a sound case, that for legal reasons, raids like Abottabad might be better executed as traditional military activities.[81] While it might seem like a nuanced debate over language, Berger highlights the importance of distinguishing between covert action vs. traditional military activity and command vs. control. The absence of a clear military chain of command and ambiguity in whether or not an operation is covert places service members in a legal conundrum, possibly resulting in the loss of immunity as legally recognized combatants.[82]

Confusion also arises over what seems to be contradicting direction between Title 50 and executive guidance. Title 50 states:

> National Intelligence Program means all programs, projects, and activities of the Intelligence Community, as well as any other programs of the Intelligence Community designated jointly by the Director and the head of a United States department or agency or by the President. Such term does not include programs, projects, or activities of the military departments to acquire intelligence solely for the planning and conduct of tactical military operations by United States Armed Forces.[83]

Although this section does not preclude a CIA/DOD partnership where operations overlap, its language seems to limit this relationship to areas where common interests arise in pursuit of their individual missions. The two organizations might work together and even develop command relationship agreements outlining where they can leverage each organization's resources for mutual benefit, but their missions

Berger highlights the importance of distinguishing between covert action vs. traditional military activity and command vs. control.

are distinct and not subservient to the other. Confusion arises because this seems counter to Presidential Decision Directive 35 (PDD-35) where President Clinton made "intelligence support to military operations" the "highest priority" for the intelligence community. Title 50 places the responsibility for acquiring intelligence that "solely" supports military operations on the military departments; PDD-35 says this is the primary mission of the entire intelligence community.[84]

The confusion over how legal authorities enable or restrict CIA/DOD interoperability will continue to be an important, confusing, and often insoluble problem. Although there are professionals who understand the nuances of USC and its effect on CIA/DOD operations, this knowledge is not always resident with the individuals executing the operations. These individuals depend on legal interpretations given them by their respective institutions and subsequently base their actions on these interpretations. This can be problematic if each institution interprets USC differently in regard to specific operations. Although this is a possibility, the CIA and DOD have worked around these issues in the past, and while they might cause friction, they provide a better understanding of roles and responsibilities.

Oversight Responsibility and Organizational Roles: How Congressional Interests and Policymaker Intelligence Needs Affect the Relationship

Closely linked to the legal issues are the congressional oversight issues that surface as the distinction between military and intelligence operations become more confusing. The House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (HPSCI) and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence (SSCI) are responsible for oversight of intelligence activities, while the House and Senate Armed Services Committees are responsible for oversight of military operations. During a recent interview, former SSCI chair, now President of the University of Oklahoma, David Boren voiced concern that some military activities constitute intelligence activities and should be briefed to the intelligence committees to ensure proper oversight of the intelligence community.[85] HPSCI also raised this concern in the 2010 Intelligence Authorization Act, positing that the military often hides intelligence activities under the guise of operational preparation of the environment to avoid oversight by the intelligence community.[86] HPSCI members further argued that the potential damage of these activities were as great as other clandestine intelligence activities under HPSCI's purview and HPSCI should be briefed on these operational preparation of the environment activities.[87] The recent halt to the planned Defense Clandestine Services (DCS) shows that the concern with defense clandestine activities is not limited to the HPSCI and SSCI.

Realizing the increasing need for HUMINT, the DOD looked to develop their clandestine capabilities through the establishment of the DCS. Interestingly, the DCS garnered support from both the DOD and the CIA's National Clandestine Service. The DOD looked at the DCS as increasing their ability to collect much needed intelligence on global issues, while the National Clandestine Service embraced the idea of more DOD HUMINT collectors available to collect on military commander requirements.[88] The DCS also served as an opportunity to further break down the parochial castles by introducing a greater number of DOD case officers who were "farm" trained, thus furthering the interaction between the DOD and CIA. The new DOD case officers would work closely with CIA stations abroad, thus ensuring deconfliction of clandestine collection activities.[89]

Although the CIA and DOD support the establishment of the DCS and well-informed congressional representatives such as Senator Pat Roberts, a

former SSCI chair, sees Pentagon intelligence activities as "complementary" to CIA activities, there are some Congressmen who are not as receptive to the proposed organization.[90] Capitol Hill critiques include the seemingly contradictory notions that the DCS is just providing the CIA more case officers under another name and the assertion that the DOD does not deserve an increased HUMINT capability because of their past poor performance.[91] Whatever the true concerns are regarding the DCS, the 2013 Defense Authorization Bill slowed the development of DCS, at least temporarily, citing the past career management issues with DOD clandestine operatives. Although there might be some legitimate concern based on previous DOD HUMINT management, one has to wonder if it might also have something to do with a congressional oversight "rice-bowl" fight between the defense and intelligence committees. Despite post-9/11 congressional complaints over intelligence community parochialism, the Senate stymied a grassroots interagency collaboration effort that looked to increase operational capability while tearing down organizational stovepipes. Whatever the reasoning, it will be difficult to take future congressional complaints over organizational parochialism seriously when they appear to be encouraging continued segregation.

The stifling of DCS only increases resource concerns regarding the CIA's ability to execute its primary mission of intelligence support to policymakers, while also supporting the warfighter.

Numerous intelligence experts warn that an excessive CIA focus on military operations will eventually affect CIA's ability to understand the broader world outside the war zones. Although John McLaughlin identifies intelligence support for force protection as a top priority, he also warns that support to the warfighter necessarily takes resources away from other global missions.[92] Mr. McLaughlin was not alone in this sentiment, nor was it only held by former CIA officials. Mr. Boren articulated concern with the CIA mission becoming subordinated to military operations, stating, "I think there is great danger if the CIA becomes primarily an agency dedicated to the support of military operations it will neglect its primary role of providing objective intelligence to the policymakers".[93] Mr. Boren said the CIA's "military support roles in Iraq and Afghanistan now have resulted in reduced intelligence collection and analysis in parts of the world which are more vital to America's long term interests."[94] Mr. Boren also worries that a greater "emphasis on a military support role runs the risk of compromising the objectivity in intelligence analysis."[95] Dr. Richard Russell voiced similar

concerns, stating that CIA analytical support to certain programs are intensive and drain analytical resources from other areas. He also argued that military intelligence understandably focuses on supporting the commander's objectives, but CIA analysis needed to remain separate to ensure "unbiased analysis" for the policymakers.[96]

Mr. Boren and Dr. Russell's comments regarding objectivity highlights the friction between achieving analytical consensus and common understanding to support military commanders, while avoiding the perils of analytical group think; a tension that is all too often not considered in the aftermath of "intelligence failures." The 1992 "Final Report to Congress on the Conduct of the Persian Gulf War" criticized the "duplicative and contradictory" intelligence provided military commanders during Desert Storm.[97] Twelve years later, another report on the failure of the intelligence community in Iraq cited "group think" as an issue in the analysis of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programs.[98] These two reports seem to be at odds with each other with the first report striving for greater analytical consensus to enable decision making and the second report embracing analytical friction to protect against groupthink. Although both policymakers and commanders appreciate agreement on intelligence analysis to support decision-making, the pursuit of consensus raises the prospect of groupthink within the intelligence community. Contradictory analysis might make it difficult to decide courses of action, but there is goodness in analytical friction for better understanding the possibilities present within any operational environment.

Contradictory analysis might make it difficult to decide courses of action, but there is goodness in analytical friction...

Covert Action vs. Delayed Attribution: What is the Difference and Why are the Differences Important?

The increasing closeness of the CIA/DOD partnership, coupled with operational necessity in the counterterrorism fight and the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, have raised considerable legal issues for the CIA/DOD partnership. Exacerbating this debate is confusion over the nature of certain operations, further confounded by the global expansion of the theatre of war through technology and the difficulties in waging war against an ill-defined non-state actor not tied to specific geography.

One of the most contentious issues among practitioners and policymakers is defining whether activity is a covert action. The use of covert action by the U.S. Government has been a somewhat controversial topic since the early 1970s. In response to the CIA's alleged involvement in the overthrow of Chilean President Salvadore Allende, Congress passed the Hughes-Ryan Amendment. This amendment limited the ability of the Executive Branch to conduct covert action by requiring a presidential finding for all covert actions.[99] Subsequent covert action controversies in South America and the Middle East led to additional executive orders and legislation, further limiting its use without proper notification and oversight.

The current Title 50 definition of "covert action" exempts "traditional military activities or routine support to such activities."[100] These activities are not considered covert and therefore do not require a presidential finding. Although understandable in print, distinguishing between traditional military activities and covert actions is more problematic in practice. In 1991, Congress clarified the definition of "traditional military activities" stating that they,

> include activities by military personnel under the direction and control of a United States military commander (whether or not the U.S. sponsorship of such activities is apparent or later to be acknowledged) preceding and related to hostilities which are either anticipated to involve U.S. military forces, or where such hostilities involving United States military forces are ongoing, and, where the fact of the U.S. role in the overall operation is apparent or to be acknowledged publicly.[101]

Congress also clarified that "traditional military activities" would not include the "clandestine" recruitment of individuals in third-party countries who have access to the targeted country or the recruitment of target country citizens to "take certain actions" when military operations are initiated.[102] It also stated that the "clandestine efforts" to influence foreign population to support war efforts are not a "traditional military activity."[103] Since 2001, these expanded definitions of what constitutes covert action have become problematic.

The 1991 covert action definition was premised on a traditional nation-state military conflict within a limited and defined theater of war. Since 2001, the United States has been waging "war" against a global non-state actor.

Therefore, the military can posit that their operational preparation of the environment in the numerous countries where the identified terrorist organizations reside constitutes traditional military activities. The counterterrorism fight is not the only operational reality challenging the current covert action definition. As the use and threat of cyber conflict increases, determining if the hidden-hand activities of America's cyber legions constitute traditional military actions, intelligence activities or covert action will increase in importance.[104] While not singularly aligned with the cyber debate, the concept of covert action vs. delayed attribution will increase in significance along with cyber discussions. The legal definition of covert action does not specify time horizons, but merely states that the "role of the United States Government will not be apparent or acknowledged publicly."[105] Arguably, if the United States military plans to acknowledge an activity publicly in the undefined future, by definition it is not a covert action. In regards to cyber, if the United States military covertly conducts a cyber-attack, but plans to acknowledge at some future date, it is not apparent if this constitutes a covert action. In a recent interview, former SSCI chair Senator Pat Roberts stated that one of the specific tests of whether or not an activity is covert is if the activity will be acknowledged if it is revealed publicly. According to Senator Roberts, an activity is not covert if there is a willingness to acknowledge if revealed publicly.[106] While this definition of covert action appears to meet the letter of the law, it is debatable whether it completely meets the post-Church spirit of the law.

Paramilitary Capability: Strength Through Diversity or Unnecessary Redundancy?

In the past, the desire for streamlining has also raised the call to consolidate military actions under DOD. The 9/11 Commission Report recommended removing the CIA's paramilitary capability and placing it under USSOCOM to centralize the capability for operations and training.[107] According to Senator Pat Roberts, the 9/11 Commission made this recommendation because they believed "the CIA did not invest sufficiently in a robust paramilitary capability prior to 9/11, but instead relied on foreign proxies." Senator Roberts further stated that the CIA had developed their paramilitary capabilities and "made progress" in their coordination efforts with DOD, during the period between the commission's investigation and the report's release. Senator

Roberts stated that he "was comfortable" with the changes made and believed the new "procedures worked well to prevent conflict and duplication," which was Congress' main concern.[108]

Beyond the CIA and DOD increased coordination satisfying congressional concerns, some practical issues might arise if all paramilitary capabilities were placed underneath the DOD. One of the issues cited by the Congressional Research Service (CRS) is the various legal issues involving DOD SOF conducting covert paramilitary operations.[109] According to CRS, DOD SOF conducting deniable covert action operations might lose their combatant status under the Geneva Convention. There is also the issue of military forces possibly violating international law and the effect this violation would have on them and other military forces globally.[110] Mr. Garry Reid provided the most compelling reason when he said shifting paramilitary covert action to the DOD might run counter to the American public's image of the military as the "doer of good things." Mr. Reid accurately pointed out that "blackbag dirty stuff does not fit" the image America has of the military and that the CIA is doing a "perfectly fine job" conducting covert action (CA).[111] Although often forgotten, the narrative of American institutions is very important in ensuring continued support from the American populace. Although the narrative of the American military always being forces of good in the world is a simplistic and contestable notion, it is important to remember that in a democracy, the military requires the support of its population.[112]

In 2005, then-President George W. Bush ordered the CIA and DOD to provide recommendations on whether or not the 9/11 Commission's recommendation regarding paramilitary operations should be shifted to the DOD.[113] In response, both the CIA and DOD recommended that the CIA retain their paramilitary capabilities. Since receiving the CIA and DOD responses, Congress has shown little interest in revisiting this topic.[114] For now, it appears that the consolidation of America's paramilitary capabilities under one military command is neither wanted nor needed.

Environmental and Policy Effects on the Partnership

The future choices made by the CIA and DOD regarding their partnership will be shaped by their leaders, national security requirements, policymaker preferences, and fiscal considerations. Over the last 10 years, there have been leaders within the CIA and DOD who appreciate the partnership and

understand the importance of collaboration to achieve America's national security objectives. Although these leaders have made strides towards institutionalizing the partnership, parochial bureaucrats replacing the current collaborative leaders could halt or degrade progress. Even if the current crop of leaders remain in place, their collaborative efforts could be affected by changing national security requirements. The Global War on Terrorism and subsequent Afghanistan and Iraq wars provided real world purpose to drive interagency integration, the absence of these operations could limit the necessity of integration.

...both the CIA and DOD recommended that the CIA retain their paramilitary capabilities.

Strategic refocusing might also result in a changing partnership between the United States military and the CIA. For example, over the last decade, the CIA has largely served in a "supporting" role to the military's "supported" status.[115] In support of the war effort, the CIA staffed the two largest stations since the Vietnam War era's Saigon Station.[116] The end of the Iraq War and the planned drawdown in Afghanistan could result in significant role reversals between the two organizations. At the very least, the interaction between the two organizations will evolve from a predominantly war-focused, military-driven relationship into a non-war zone partnership. This dynamic change marks an important period in the CIA/DOD relationship, one that will determine if the comprehensive partnership of the last 10 years is permanent or fleeting.

The continued health of the relationship will also be affected by policymakers' actions and America's fiscal health. The recent Senate decision against the establishment of the DCS is an example of how congressional action might significantly affect the trajectory of the partnership. In this regard, the future health of the CIA/DOD partnership does not merely rest on the shoulders of these two organizations, but on congressional choices as well. It is important that congressional representatives remember their institution's previous findings after the Gulf War and 9/11 so they do not make decisions that recreate the conditions their predecessors labored to correct.

The current fiscal problems and declining projected budgets make it imperative for the United States Government to ensure fiscal responsibility through the effective, efficient employment of all its assets and resources. While the intelligence and special operations budgets remain largely unscathed in the current fiscal uncertainty, economic issues could force a

tightening of the budget for both organizations. Budget constraints could result in a strengthening of partnerships out of necessity or lead to a fight over the remaining scraps of funding. Although the second is a possibility, all the leaders interviewed believe dwindling budgets would result in a closer relationship.[117]

9. Conclusion: Understanding the Past and Appreciating Future Possibilities

> When I became Chairman of SSCI in 2002, a little over a year after 9/11, the CIA and the military were at the very early stages of working together in the global war on terrorism. It was evident there was a learning curve for each organization as they adjusted to their own roles in this conflict and adjusted to working together. Naturally, there were some struggles. But during my time as Chairman of the Committee, I saw the relationship improve and both organization learned to complement each other in serving the interests of the nation. – Senator Pat Roberts, January 2013

In his book *A World of Becoming*, William E. Connolly writes about how different "forks" are generated whenever a "simple system faces a new situation of disequilibrium." The selection of one of the forks "affects everything else that later emerges, without determining everything else in a simple, linear way."[118] The evolution of the DOD/CIA relationship since Desert Storm poses a non-linear conundrum similar to what Connolly is describing. Although it is apparent that the CIA/DOD relationship has grown over the last 20 years, it is difficult to segregate the variables that enabled this change. Removing any of the contextual factors that influenced the relationship over the last 20 years, such as prolonging the Cold War, not establishing OMA, or even removing individual leaders, might have had unforeseen yet significant effect on the relationship's evolution and its future trajectory.

Although identifying causality is difficult, historical appreciation of how the CIA/DOD relationship has evolved provides lessons for both guiding policy choices and appreciating the future course the relationship might take. In his famous speech titled "What is History?", the British Historian E.H. Carr said that a historian "provides general guides for future action, which though not specific predictions, are both valid and useful."[119] The economic and strategic conditions of the post-Gulf War/end of the Cold War period that helped shape the current CIA/DOD partnership offers valuable "guide-lines" for today's DOD and CIA leaders, as well as policymakers. Similar to

the early 1990s, the United States is once again facing an economic downturn, while undergoing a transitional period in national security affairs. After 11 years of fighting in the post-9/11 environment, the United States is suffering from operational weariness and budgetary constraints.[120] These realities are forcing the United States to reassess its strategic focus and the manner in which it prioritizes its national interests and employs its assets. Understanding how choices made under similar fiscal and national security conditions affected the CIA/DOD relationship can provide a better appreciation for how contemporary policy decisions might affect future CIA/DOD relations.

Organizational culture, institutional history and shared organizational history shade the current interaction of any two organizations. These relationships are not static, but socially constructed through continuous interaction. The current condition of the relationship is contingent on choices and interaction that preceded many of those within the current organization. Similarly, the actions and choices made today will shape the organization for those who follow. The contemporary relationship between the CIA and DOD is not only contingent on bureaucratic actions taken in the early 1990s, but on the subsequent operational history that shaped the partnership. In the same vain, the choices made today and the actions taken tomorrow will shape the future CIA/DOD relationship.

The policy and organizational decisions made in the early 1990s increased communication and liaison partnerships between the CIA and DOD. The foundation built in the early 1990s improved the relationship, but the lack of operational necessity ensured the relationship would evolve slowly. The whole-of-government response to 9/11 leveraged the foundation that was established over the previous decade and quickly built upon the partnership. The Afghanistan and Iraq wars provided real world purpose to expand the CIA/DOD partnership, resulting in arguably the strongest relationship ever between these two organizations.

Bibliography

Books

Barger, Deborah G. *Toward a Revolution in Intelligence Affairs.* Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 2005.

Bergen, Peter L. *Manhunt: The Search for Bin Laden from 9/11 to Abbottabad.* New York, NY: Crown Publishing Group, 2012.

Blehm, Eric. *The Only Thing Worth Dying For: How Eleven Green Berets Forged a New Afghanistan.* New York, NY: Harper Collins E-Books, 2010.

Connolly, William. *A World of Becoming. Durham,* NC: Duke University Press, 2011.

Crumpton, Henry A. *The Art of Intelligence: Lesson from a Life in the CIA's Clandestine Service.* New York, NY: Penguin Press, 2012.

Fontenot, Gregory, E.J. Degen, and David Tohn. *On Point: The United States Army in Operation Iraqi Freedom (through 01 May 2003).* Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute, 2004.

Garthoff, Douglas F. *Directors of Central Intelligence as Leaders of the U.S. Intelligence Community 1946-2005.* Washington D.C.: Center for the Study of Intelligence, 2005.

George, Roger Z. and Robert D. Kline, eds. *Intelligence and the National Security Strategist.* New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2006.

Geraghty, Tony. *Black Ops: The Rise of Special Forces in the CIA, the SAS, and Mossad.* New York, NY: Pegasus Books, 2010.

Godson, Roy, Ernest R. May, and Gary Schmit. *U.S. Intelligence at the Crossroads.* Washington D.C..: Brassey's, 1995.

Goodman, Allan E., Gregory F. Treverton, and Philip Zelikow. *In From the Cold.* New York, NY: The Twentieth Century Fund Press, 1996.

Johnson, Loch K. *National Security Intelligence.* Malden, MA: Polity Press, 2012.

———. *The Threat on the Horizon: An Inside Account of America's Search for Security after the Cold War.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Locher, James. *Victory on the Potomac: The Goldwater-Nichols Act Unifies the Pentagon.* College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2002.

Lowenthal, Mark M. *Intelligence: From Secrets to Policy.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage, 2012.

McChrystal, Stanley. *My Share of the Task.* London, UK: Penguin, 2013.

Odom, William E. *Fixing Intelligence for a More Secure America.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003.

O'Hern, Steven K. *The Intelligence Wars: Lessons from Baghdad.* Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2008.

Schroen, Gary. *First In: An Insider's Account of How the CIA Spearheaded the War on Terror in Afghanistan.* New York, NY: Ballantine Books, 2005.

Sims, Jennifer E. and Burton Gerber, eds. *Transforming U.S. Intelligence.* Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2005.

Tenet, George. *At the Center of the Storm: My Years at the CIA.* New York, NY: Harper Collins E-Book, 2007.

Tucker, David and Christopher J. Lamb. *United States Special Operations Forces.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2007.

Walker, Stephen G, Akan Malici, and Mark Schafer, eds. *Rethinking Foreign Policy Analysis.* New York, NY: Routledge Press, 2011.

Wasdin, Howard E. and Stephen Templin. *I am a Seal Team Six Warrior.* New York, NY: St. Martin's Griffin Press, 2012.

Wentz, Larry, ed. *Lessons from Bosnia: The IFOR Experience.* Washington D.C..: Department of Defense, 1997.

Victory, Bernard, ed. *Modernizing Intelligence: Structure and Change for the 21st Century.* Fairfax, VA: National Institute for Public Policy, 2002.

Journals/Periodicals

Ackerman, Robert K. "War Brings Intelligence Agency, Military Closer." *Signal.* 57, no. 2 (October 2002): 17-20.

Berger, Joseph B. "Covert Action: Title 10, Title 50, and the Chain of Command," *Joint Forces Quarterly*, Issue 67, 4th Quarter 2012, 33.

Betts, Richard K. "Analysis, War, and Decision: Why Intelligence Failures are Inevitable." *World Politics* 31, no.1 (October 1978): 61-89.

Brecher, Aaron P. "Cyberattacks and the Covert Action Statute: Toward a Domestic Legal Framework for Offensive Cyberoperations." *Michigan Law Review* 111, no. 3 (December 2012): 423-452.

Dreazen, Yochi. "Joint Special Forces, CIA Hit Teams are McChrystal's Legacy." *National Journal* (1 September 2011): 1-5.

"From the Shadows to the Front Line." *Sea Power* (February 2004): 36.

Garfinkel, Michelle, "The Economic Consequences of Reducing Military Spending." *Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Review* 72, no. 6 (November/December 1990): 47-58.

Garlauskas, Markus. "Intelligence Support for Military Operations." *Joint Forces Quarterly* (Winter 2002/2003): 102-108.

Harris, Shane. "Rolling Back Pentagon Spies." *National Journal* (10 March 2007): 46-47.

Hitz, Frederick. "U.S. Intelligence in the Wake of September 11: The Rise of the Spy Commando and Reorganized Operational Capabilities." *Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy* (Winter 2012): 245-258.

Isler, Roderick. "A Global Intelligence Mission." *Sea Power* (February 2004): 37.

Jehl, Douglas. "2 CIA Reports Offer Warnings on Iraq's Path." *New York Times*, 7 December 2004.

Jones, Garrett. "It's a Cultural Thing: Thoughts on a Troubled CIA." *Orbis* 50, no. 1 (Winter 2006): 23-40.

———. "Working with the CIA." *Parameters* (Winter 2001-2002): 28-39.

Kibbe, Jennifer. "Covert Action and the Pentagon." *Intelligence and National Security* 22, no. 1 (February 2007): 57-74.

Loeb, Vernon. "Warlords, Peacekeepers, and Spies." *Washington Post*, 27 February 2000.

McAndrew, Michael. "Wrangling in the Shadows: The Use of United States Special Forces in Covert Military Operations in the War on Terror." *Boston College International and Comparative Law Review* (Winter 2006): 1-14.

McConnell, Michael. "Overhauling Intelligence." *Foreign Affairs* 86, no. 4 (July-August 2007): 49-58.

Miller, Greg. "CIA Expanding Presence in Afghanistan." *Los Angeles Times*, 20 September 2009.

———. "DIA Sending Hundreds of More Spies Overseas." *Washington Post*, 1 December 2012.

———. "Obama's Pick for CIA Could Affect Drone Program." *Washington Post*, 24 November 2012.

———. "Senate Moves to Block Pentagon Plans to Increase Spies Overseas." *Washington Post*, 10 December 2012.

Miller, Paul D. "Lessons for Intelligence Support to Policymaking During Crises." *Studies in Intelligence* 54, no. 2 (June 2010): 1-8.

Moore, J. Daniel. "CIA Support to Operation Enduring Freedom." *Military Professional Bulletin* (July-September 2002): 46.

Moore, Molly "Schwarzkopf: War Intelligence Flawed; General Reports to Congress on Desert Storm." *Washington Post*, 13 June 1991.

Nolte, Bill. "A Guide to the Reforming of American Intelligence: Past and Future." *Journal of U.S. Intelligence Studies* 19, no.1 (Winter/Spring 2012): 57-61.

Oakley, David. "Taming the Rogue Elephant?" *American Intelligence Journal* 26, no. 2 (2008-2009): 61-67.

Richard, L. Russell. "Tug of War: The Cia's Uneasy Relationship with the Military." *SAIS Review; a Journal of International Affairs* 22, no. 2 (2002): 1-18.

Scarborough, Rowan. "Panetta Says 2013 Defense Budget to Cut Land Forces." *Washington Post*, 26 January 2012.

———. "U.S. Forces get OK to use CIA Methods." *The Washington Times*, 1 October 2002.

Wall, Andru. "Demystifying the Title 10-Title 50 Debate: Distinguishing Military Operations, Intelligence Activities & Covert Action." *Harvard National Security Journal 3* (2011):85-142.

Whisner, Mary. "The United States Code, Prima Facie Evidence, and Positive Law." *Law Library Journal* 101, no. 4 (2009): 545-556.

Woodward, Bob. "Secret CIA Units Playing a Central Combat Role." *Washington Post*, 18 November 2001.

Government Documents

Clinton, William Jefferson. *Presidential Decision Directive* 35, "Intelligence Requirements." Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2 March 1995.

Commission on the Roles and Capabilities of the United States Intelligence Community. *Preparing for the 21st Century: An Appraisal of U.S. Intelligence.* Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1996.

Department of Defense. *Final Report to Congress on the Conduct of the Persian Gulf War.* Washington D.C.: Department of Defense, April 1992.

National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States. *The 9/11 Commission Report.* Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, July 2004.

Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy. *Final Report to Congress on the Conduct of Hostilities in the Persian Gulf.* Washington D.C.: Department of Defense, April 1992.

Persian Gulf War Illness Task Force. *CIA Support to the US Military During the Persian Gulf War.* Washington D.C.: Central Intelligence Agency, 1997.

U.S. Commission on the Roles and Capabilities of the United States Intelligence Community. *Preparing for the 21st Century: An Appraisal of U.S. Intelligence.* Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1996.

U.S. Congress. House. *Intelligence Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1991, Report 102-166.* 102nd Cong., 1st sess., 25 July 1991.

———. House. Oversight and Investigations Sub-Committee of the Committee on the Armed Services. *Intelligence Successes and Failures in Operations Desert Storm/ Shield.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 16 August 1993.

———. House. Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. *R. 111-186 to Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010.* 111th Cong., 1st sess., 26 June 2009.

———. Joint. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. *S. 2198 and S.421 to Reorganize the United States Intelligence Community.* 102nd Cong., 2nd sess., 1 April 1992.

———. Senate. Committee on Armed Services. Memorandum for Chairman Strom Thurmond from Senator Warner and Senator Levin. *Review of the Circumstances Surrounding the Ranger Raid on October 3-4, 1993 in Mogadishu Somalia*, 29 September 1995.

———. Senate. Select Committee on Intelligence. *Report on the U.S. Intelligence Prewar Intelligence Assessments on Iraq.* 108th Cong., 7 July 2004.

———. Senate. Select Committee on Intelligence. S Hrg. 103-296. *Nomination of James Woolsey.* 103rd Cong., 1st sess., 2-3 February 1993.

———. Senate. Select Committee on Intelligence. S Prt. 103-88 *Legislative Oversight of Intelligence Activities: The U.S. Experience.* 103rd Congress, 2nd sess., October 1994.

Warner, Michael and J. Kenneth McDonald. *U.S. Intelligence Community Reform Studies Since 1947.* Washington, D.C.: Center for the Study of Intelligence, 2005.

Internet Sources

Atwood, Donald J. "Directive for Centralized Management of Department of Defense Human Intelligence (HUMINT) Operations, December 18, 1992." http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB46/ (accessed 7 January 2013).

Best, Richard A. "Covert Action: Legislative Background and Policy Questions." Congressional Research Service, U.S. Library of Congress. http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/intel/RL33715.pdf (accessed 22 August 2012).

———. "Intelligence Issues for Congress." Congressional Research Service, U.S. Library of Congress. http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/intel/RL33539.pdf (accessed 22 August 2012).

———. "Proposals for Intelligence Reform 1949-2004." Congressional Research Service, U.S. Library of Congress. http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/RL32500.pdf (accessed 15 November 2012).

Best, Richard A. and Andrew Feickert. "Special Operations Forces (SOF) and CIA Paramilitary Operations: Issues for Congress." Congressional Research Service, U.S. Library of Congress. http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/RS22017.pdf (accessed 22 August 2012).

"Body Believed to be CIA Agent and Hostage is Found in Lebanon." *New York Times*, 27 December 1991. http://www.nytimes.com/1991/12/27/world/body-believed-to-be-cia-agent-and-hostage-is-found-in-lebanon.html (accessed 21 February 2013).

Bush, President George H.W. "National Security Review 29: The Intelligence Community." http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/nsr/nsr29.pdf (accessed 17 November 2012).

Bond, Stephen. "Strategic Intelligence for Tactical Operations: Intelligence Requirements for Force Projection Operations," 1998. http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA343395 (accessed 15 November 2012).

Carr, E.H. "What is History?" http://library.universalhistory.net/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/What-is-history.pdf (accessed 31 January 2013).

Chesney, Robert. "Military-Intelligence Convergence and the Law of the Title 10/Title 50 Debate," February 2012. http://jnslp.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/Military-Intelligence-Convergence-and-the-Law-of-the-Title-10Title-50-Debate.pdf (accessed 14 November 2012).

CIA Public Website. "Military Affairs/History." https://www.cia.gov/offices-of-cia/military-affairs/history.html (accessed 18 November 2012).

Collins, John M. "Desert Shield and Desert Storm: Implications for Future Force Requirements." Congressional Research Service, U.S. Library of Congress. http://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=712698 (accessed 15 November 2012).

Cumming, Alfred. "Comparison of 9/11 Commission Recommended Intelligence Reforms S. 2845, S. 2774, H.R. 5024, Administration Proposal, H.R. 10, Current Law." Congressional Research Service, U.S. Library of Congress. http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/crs/rl32601.pdf (accessed 15 November 2012).

Estvanik, Robert O. "Intelligence and the Commander: Desert Shield/Storm Case Study," 1992. http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA250338 (accessed 14 November 2012).

Fischer, Eric A. "Federal Laws Relating to Cybersecurity: Discussion of Proposed Revisions." Congressional Research Service, U.S. Library of Congress. http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R42114.pdf (accessed November 15, 2012).

Goodman, Melvin. "Revamping the CIA," 2007. http://www.issues.org/18.2/goodman.html (accessed 14 November 2012).

Government Printing Office. "About United States Code." http://www.gpo.gov/help/index.html#about_united_states_code.htm (accessed 27 December 2012).

———. "The Cost of Intelligence." http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/GPO-INTELLIGENCE/html/int017.html (accessed 7 January 2013).

———. Public Law 108-458, "Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004," 17 December 2004. www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-108publ458/pdf/PLAW-108publ458.pdf (accessed 26 August 2012).

Haigler, Karl. "Intelligence Support for Military Operations." http://www.afio.com/publications/Haigler_Intel_Support_for_Mil_Ops_draft_for_future_AFIO_INTEL.pdf (accessed 14 November 2012).

History Commons. "Profile: Crisis Operations Liaison Teams." http://www.history-commons.org/entity.jsp?entity=crisis_operations_liaison_teams_1 (accessed 3 February 2013).

Intelligence and National Security Alliance. "Smart Change: Lessons of the Past Direction for the Future," May 2011. http://www.insaonline.org/assets/files/White%20Papers/INSA_SMART_CHANGE_FINAL.PDF (accessed 14 November 2012).

Johnson, Andy. "The Art of the Deal: Why the CIA needs a Diplomat, Not a Spy, to Lead It," November 2012. http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/11/29/the_art_of_the_deal%20 (accessed 10 December 2012).

Johnson, Loch K. "The Aspin-Brown Intelligence Inquiry: Behind the Closed Doors of a Blue Ribbon Commission." *Studies in Intelligence* 48, no. 3. https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/kent-csi/vol48no3/pdf/v48i3a01p.pdf (accessed 21 February 2013).

Lake, Eli. "Need to Know: The Pentagon v. the CIA on Iraq." *The New Republic* (23 September 2002). http://www.newrepublic.com/article/intelligence-test-0# (accessed 21 February 2013).

Loeb, Vernon. "Warlords, Peacekeepers, and Spies." *Washington Post*, 27 February 2000. http://www.somaliawatch.org/archivejuly/000927601.htm. (accessed 27 December 2012).

Lose, James. "Fulfilling a Crucial Role: National Intelligence Support Teams." https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/kent-csi/vol43no3/pdf/v43i3a08p.pdf (accessed 14 November 2012).

Marchio, James. "The Evolution and Relevance of Joint Intelligence Centers." https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/csi-studies/studies/vol49no1/html_files/the_evolution_6.html (accessed 15 November 2012).

Miller, Greg. "DIA Sending Hundreds of More Spies Overseas." *Washington Post.* http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2012-12-01/world/35585098_1_defense-clandestine-service-cia-spy-agency (accessed 7 January 2013).

———. "Military Wants its Own Spies." *Time* (4 March 2003). http://articles.latimes.com/2003/mar/04/nation/na-armyspy4 (accessed 21 February 2013).

———. "Senate Moves Blocks to Block Pentagon Plans to Increase Number of Spies Overseas." *Washington Post.* http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2012-12-10/world/35745387_1_defense-clandestine-service-pentagon-dia (accessed 7 January 2013).

Miller, Greg and Julie Tate. "CIA's Global Response Staff Emerging from Shadows after Incidents in Libya and Pakistan," 2012. http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/cias-global-response-staff-emerging-from-shadows-after-incidents-in-libya-and-pakistan/2012/12/26/27db2d1c-4b7f-11e2-b709-667035ff9029_story.html?hpid=z2 (accessed 26 December 2012).

The National Commission on Terrorism Attacks. "The Performance of the Intelligence Community: Staff Statement No. 11." http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/911/staff_statements/staff_statement _11.pdf (accessed 27 November 2012).

National Performance Review. "Commonsense Government: Works Better, Costs Less." http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/npr/library/nprrpt/annrpt/pdf/com02.pdf (accessed 18 November 2012).

PBS Newshour with Jim Lehrer. CIA Director Leon Panetta interview with Jim Lehrer, 3 May 3011 located at http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/terrorism/jan-june11/panetta_05-03.html (accessed on 18 September 2013).

Pick, Michael. "What the Joint Force Commander Needs to Know about CI and HUMINT Operations," 2002. http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA405644 (accessed 14 November 2012).

Porro, Alexander. "Interview: Stephen W. Preston General Counsel, Central Intelligence Agency," 2012. http://yulr.org/interview-stephen-w-preston-general-counsel-central-intelligence-agency/ (accessed 10 December 2012).

Rollins, John and Anna C. Henning. "Comprehensive National Cybersecurity Initiative: Legal Authorities and Policy." Congressional Research Service, U.S. Library of Congress. http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R40427.pdf (accessed 15 November 2012).

Sangvic, Robert. "Battle of Mogadishu: Anatomy of a Failure." http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA366316 (accessed 27 November 2012).

Schmitt, Eric. "Defense Department Plans New Intelligence Gathering Service," 2012. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/24/world/asia/defense-department-plans-new-spy-service.html (accessed 15 November 2012).

Stone, Kathryn. "All Necessary Means: Employing CIA Operatives in a Warfighting Role," 2003. http://www.fas.org/irp/eprint/stone.pdf (accessed 14 November 2012).

"The Military Commander and the Law, Tenth Addition," accessed at http://www.afjag.af.mil/shared/media/document/AFD-101025-032.pdf (accessed on 22 September 2013).

United States Special Operations Command History. http://www.fas.org/irp/agency/DOD/USSOCOM/2007history.pdf (accessed 7 January 2013).

USSOCOM. "United States Special Operations Command History," 16 April 1987. http://www.fas.org/irp/agency/DOD/USSOCOM/ 2007history.pdf (accessed 7 January 2013).

USCode.house.gov. USC 50, "War and National Defense." http://uscode.house.gov/pdf/2011/2011usc50.pdf (accessed 21 February 2013).

Waller, Douglas. "The CIA's Secret Army," 2003. http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1004145,00.html (accessed 14 November 2012).

Williams, Linda B. "Intelligence Support to Special Operations in the Global War on Terrorism," 2004. http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA424015 (accessed 14 November 2012).

Wise, David. "Why the Spooks Shouldn't Run Wars," 2003. http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1004146,00.html (accessed 14 November 2012).

Zegart, Amy. "King David: Why Generals Shouldn't Run the CIA," 2012. http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/11/21/king_david?page=full (accessed 25 November 2012).

Interviews

Baratto, David. Major General. Former CIA Associate Director for Military Affairs. Telephone interview by author, 23 January 2013.

Boren, David L. President of the University of Oklahoma and former Chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. E-mail interview by author, 20 November 2012.

B., Candace. CIA Analyst. Interview by author, Fort Leavenworth, KS, 10 August 2012.

Cichowski, Kurt A. Lieutenant General. CIA's Associate Director for Military Affairs. Interview by author, Langley, VA, 29 August 2012.

Crawford, Fred. CIA liaison to DOD Office of Secretary of Defense. Telephone interview by author, 10 September 2012.

G., Alyssa. Military liaison to CIA's Office of Military Affairs. Interview by author, Langley, VA, 28 August 2012.

Hamby, Jim. Deputy Director of Defense Clandestine Service. Telephone interview by author, 21 September 2012.

McLaughlin, John. Former Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Telephone interview by author, 19 September 2012.

M., Tom. Military liaison to CIA's Office of Military Affairs. Interview by author, Langley, VA, 28 August 2012.

National Clandestine Service Senior Intelligence Service Officer. Interview by author, Washington, D.C, 28 August 2012.

Perkins, David G. LTG. Commander U.S. Army Combined Arms Center. Interview by author, Fort Leavenworth, KS, 3 October 2012.

R., Ed. Military detailee to CIA's Counterterrorism Center. Interview by author, Langley, VA, 28 August 2012.

Reid, Garry. Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict. Telephone interview by author, 19 September 2012.

Roberts, Pat. Senator and former Chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. E-mail interview by author, 9 January 2013.

Russell, Richard L. Professor at National Defense University. Telephone interview by author, 14 September 2012.

W., Alan. Military liaisons to CIA's Office of Military Affairs. Interview by author, Langley, VA, 28 August 2012.

Endnotes

1. Richard L. Russell, "Tug of War: The CIA's Uneasy Relationship with the Military," *SAIS Review; a Journal of International Affairs* 22, no. 2 (2002): 1.

2. Kathryn Stone, "All Necessary Means: Employing CIA Operatives in a Warfighting Role," http://www.fas.org/irp/eprint/stone.pdf (accessed 14 November 2012).

3. Frederick P. Hitz, "U.S. Intelligence in the Wake of September 11: The Rise of the Spy Commando and Reorganized Operational Capabilities," *Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy* 35, no. 1 (2012): 245-258; Jennifer D. Kibbe, "Covert Action and the Pentagon," *Intelligence & National Security* 22, no. 1 (2007): 57-74.

4. James Lose, "Fulfilling a Crucial Role: National Intelligence Support Teams," https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/kent-csi/vol43no3/pdf/v43i3a08p.pdf (accessed 14 November 2012); Jones Garrett, "Working with the CIA," *Parameters* 31, no. 4 (2001), 28-39; J. Daniel Moore, "CIA Support to Operation Enduring Freedom," *Military Intelligence Professional Bulletin* 28, no. 3 (2002): 46.

5. Considering the CIA was formed at the beginning of the Cold War and the large professional (as opposed to volunteer) Army was developed in response to the Cold War. An understanding of how these two organizations adapted their relationship in a post-Cold War world is important not just for understanding their relationship but to appreciate how organizations adapt during times of extreme change.

6. Lieutenant General Cichowski's compared the evolutionary path of the CIA/DOD partnership to the path the military service relationships took following Goldwater-Nichols.

7. USSOCOM, "United States Special Operations Command History," 16 April 1987, http://www.fas.org/irp/agency/DOD/USSOCOM/ 2007history.pdf (accessed 7 January 2013), 6-7.

8. USSOCOM, 6-7.

9. Ibid., 7.

10. "Body Believed to be CIA Agent and Hostage is Found in Lebanon," *New York Times*, 27 December 1991, http://www.nytimes.com/1991/12/27/world/body-believed-to-be-cia-agent-and-hostage-is-found-in-lebanon.html (accessed 21 Feburary 2013) for information on the abduction and murder of William Buckley.

11. Henry A. Crumpton. *The Art of Intelligence: Lessons from a Life in the CIA's Clandestine Service* (New York, NY: Penguin Press, 2012), 122.

12. Donald J. Atwood, "Directive for Centralized Management of Department of Defense Human Intelligence (HUMINT) Operations, December 18, 1992," http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/ NSAEBB/NSAEBB46/ (accessed 7 January 2013) and DIA History Office, "A Brief History: Committed to Excellence in Defense of the Nation," http://www.fas.org/irp/dia/dia_history.pdf (accessed 24 January 2013).

13. U.S. Congress, Senate, Select Committee on Intelligence, S Prt. 103-88 *Legislative Oversight of Intelligence Activities: The U.S. Experience*, 103rd Congress, 2nd sess., October 1994, 26. The "Intelligence Organization Act of 1992" gave the DCI responsibility for "establishing priorities for U.S. Government intelligence-gathering and for coordinating all collection involving human sources, both overt and clandestine"; since 9/11, the intelligence community has made efforts to centralize HUMINT collection management. Intelligence Community Directive 304 (06 March 2008) identified the DCIA as the National HUMINT Manager. Management and integration of HUMINT integration are two of the National HUMINT Manager's responsibilities.

14. Molly Moore, "Schwarzkopf: War Intelligence Flawed; General Reports to Congress on Desert Storm," *Washington Post*, 13 June 1991, Section A.

15. U.S. Congress, House, Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, *Intelligence Successes and Failures in Operations Desert Storm/Shield*, 103rd Cong., 1st sess., 1993, 2-4.

16. Molly Moore.

17. U.S. Congress, *Intelligence Successes and Failures in Operations Desert Storm/Shield*, 2-4.

18. U.S. Congress, *Intelligence Successes and Failures in Operations Desert Storm/Shield*, 6.

19. Ibid.

20. Michael Warner and J. Kenneth McDonald, *U.S. Intelligence Community Reform Studies Since 1947* (Washington, D.C.: Center for the Study of Intelligence, 2005), 33.

21. Lose.

22. Ibid.

23. Michael Pick, "What the Joint Force Commander Needs to Know about CI and HUMINT Operations," 2002, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA405644 (accessed 3 February 2013) and History Commons, "Profile: Crisis Operations Liaison Teams," http://www.historycommons.org/entity.jsp?entity=crisis_operations_liaison_teams_1 (accessed 3 February 2013). These organizations were used in Iraq and Afghanistan to successfully facilitate CIA/military partnerships.

24. Persian Gulf War Illness Task Force, *CIA Support to the US Military During the Persian Gulf War* (Washington, D.C.: Central Intelligence Agency, 16 June 1997), 7.

25. Russell, 8.

26. President George H.W. Bush, "National Security Review 29: The Intelligence Community," http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/nsr/nsr29.pdf (accessed 17 November 2012).

27. Michelle R. Garfinkel, "The Economic Consequences of Reducing Military Spending," *Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Review* 72, no. 6 (November/December 1990): 49.

28. Warner and McDonald, 33-36.

29. National Performance Review, "Commonsense Government: Works Better, Costs Less," http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/npr/library/nprrpt/annrpt/pdf/com02.pdf (accessed 18 November 2012).

30. William Jefferson Clinton, Presidential Decision Directive, "PDD-35: Intelligence Reform," (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2 March 1995) and Loch Johnson, *The Threat on the Horizon: An Inside Account of America's Search for Security after the Cold War* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2011), Kindle location 243.

31. Commission on the Roles and Capabilities of the United States Intelligence Community, *Preparing for the 21st Century: An Appraisal of U.S. Intelligence* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1996), XXIII.

32. CIA Public Website, "Military Affairs/History" https://www.cia.gov/offices-of-cia/military-affairs/history.html (accessed 18 November 2012).

33. The 2005 Intelligence Reform Terrorism Prevention Act replaced the DCI with the Director of National Intelligence (DNI). Prior to 2005, the DCI was both the head of the CIA and the intelligence community. Now the head of the CIA is referred to as the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency (DCIA).

34. CIA Public Website, "Military Affairs/History" Https://www.cia.gov/offices-of-cia/military-affairs/historm.html (accessed 04 March 2013).

35. John McLaughlin, former CIA Deputy Director, telephone interview by author, 19 September 2012. Mr. McLaughlin stated that both him and Director Tenet viewed support to troops in combat should rise to the top because it meant the protection of American lives.

36. U.S. Congress, Senate, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, S Hrg. 103-206, *Nomination of James Woosley*, 103rd Cong., 1st sess., 2-3 February 1993, 76.

37. Government Printing Office, "The Cost of Intelligence," http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/GPO-INTELLIGENCE/html/int017.html (accessed 7 January 2013).

38. The National Commission on Terrorism Attacks, "The Performance of the Intelligence Community: Staff Statement No. 11," http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/911/staff_statements/staff_statement _11.pdf (accessed 27 November 2012).

39. Vernon Loeb, "Warlords, Peacekeepers, and Spies," *Washington Post*, 27 February 2000, http://www.somaliawatch.org/archivejuly/000927601.htm. (accessed 27 December 2012).

40. Loeb.

41. U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Armed Services, Memorandum for Chairman Strom Thurmond from Senator Warner and Senator Levin, "Review of the Circumstances Surrounding the Ranger Raid on October 3-4, 1993 in Mogadishu Somalia," 29 September 1995, 42.

42. Larry Wentz, ed., *Lessons from Bosnia: The IFOR Experience* (Washington, D.C.: National Defense University, 1997), 25.

43. Wentz, 54.

44. Ibid., 228-229. An article written by David D. Perkins discusses how HUMINT and CI experiences during other operations informed operations in Bosnia.

45. Ibid., 91 and George Tenet. *At the Center of the Storm: My Years at the CIA* (New York, NY: Harper Collins E-Book, 2007), Kindle location 7810.

46. Garry Reid, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict, telephone interview by author, 19 September 2012.

47. Ibid.

48. Major General David Baratto, former CIA Associate Director for Military Affairs, telephone interview by author, 23 January 2013.

49. Reid.

50. Gary Schroen. *First In: An Insider's Account of How the CIA Spearheaded the War on Terror in Afghanistan* (New York, NY: Ballantine Books, 2005) and Eric Blehm. *The Only Thing Worth Dying For: How Eleven Green Berets Forged a New Afghanistan* (New York, NY: Harper Collins E-Books, 2010). Schroen's book described a largely positive relationship between the CIA and DOD, while Blehm's book focused more on the friction in the relationship.

51. Crumpton, 122.

52. United States Special Operations Command History, 6-7.

53. National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, *The 9/11 Commission Report* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2004), 401.

54. Tenet, 6083.

55. Ibid. and Greg Fontenot, E.J. Degen, and David Tohn. *On Point: The United States Army in Operation Iraqi Freedom* (Fort Leavenworth, KS: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2004), 30.

56. Tenet, 6198.

57. Ibid., 6224.

58. National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, 407.

59. Government Printing Office, Public Law 108-458, "Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004," 17 December 2004, www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-108publ458/pdf/PLAW-108publ458.pdf (accessed 26 August 2012), 50 USC 401.

60. Richard A. Best and Andrew Feickert, "Special Operations Forces (SOF) and CIA Paramilitary Operations: Issues for Congress," http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/RS22017.pdf (accessed 22 August 2012), 3.

61. Crumpton, 187; McLaughlin,; and Stanley McChrystal, *My Share of the Task* (London, UK: Penguin, 2013), 116. All these individuals mentioned leaders who helped strengthen the partnership.

62. McChrystal, 2571. McChrystal discusses some of the tension early on between the CIA and DOD.

63. Reid.

64. National Clandestine Services Senior Intelligence Service (SIS) Officer, interview by author, Washington, D.C, 28 August 2012.

65. Lieutenant General Kurt A. Cichowski, CIA Associate Director for Military Affairs, interview by author, Langley, VA, 29 August 2002.

66. Ibid.

67. Ibid.

68. Candace B., CIA Analyst, interview by author, Ft. Leavenworth, KS, 12 August 2012. Both the After Action Review and the interview highlighted the willingness and creativity of officers to break down barriers to accomplish mission objectives.

69. Reid.

70. Alyssa G, Military liaison to CIA's Office of Military Affairs, interview by author, Langley, VA, 28 August 2012.

71. Alan W., Military liaison to CIA's Office of Military Affairs, interview by author, Langley, VA, 28 August 2012.

72. Ibid.

73. National Clandestine SIS Officer.

74. Ibid.

75. National Clandestine Services SIS Officer.

76. Government Printing Office, "About United States Code," http://www.gpo.gov/help/index.html#about_united_states_code.htm (accessed 27 December 2012).

77. Mary Whisner, "The United States Code, Prima Facie Evidence, and Positive Law," *Law Library Journal* 101, no. 4 (2009): 545-549. In regards to USC, Statutory law merely means a "Title" within USC has passed Congress in its entirety and amendments are made to the Title and not the individual Statutes. Prima Facie USC means the Title is a compilation of statutes, but amendments are made to the individual Statute and not directly to the Title. This merely means if there is a discrepancy between Prima Facie USC and the individual Statute, the individual Statute is followed. Title 10 is statutory law and Title 50 is prima facie.

78. Whisner, 546.

79. CIA Director Leon Panetta interview with Jim Lehrer, PBS Newshour, 3 May 3011 located at http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/terrorism/jan-june11/panetta_05-03.html (accessed on 18 September 2013).

80. "The Military Commander and the Law, Tenth Addition," accessed at http://www.afjag.af.mil/shared/media/document/AFD-101025-032.pdf (accessed on 22 September 2013).

81. Joseph B. Berger, "Covert Action: Title 10, Title 50, and the Chain of Command," *Joint Forces Quarterly*, Issue 67, 4th Quarter 2012, 33.

82. Ibid, 32-29.

83. USCode.house.gov, USC 50, "Title 50 – War and National Defense," http://uscode.house.gov/pdf/2011/2011usc50.pdf (accessed 21 February 2013), 66.

84. William Jefferson Clinton, *Presidential Decision Directive* 35, "Intelligence Requirements" (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2 March 1995).

85. David L. Boren, President of the University of Oklahoma and former Chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, e-mail interview by author, 20 November 2012. President Boren "First I did not think there was enough interaction between military leaders and the SSCI. The CIA reported in great detail while the Department of Defense largely reported only to the Armed Services Committee. While in theory there is always at least one joint member of both committees, gaps often developed between the knowledge of the two committees."

86. U.S. Congress, House, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, *R. 111-186 to Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010*, 111th Cong., 1st sess., 26 June 2009, 48-49.

87. Richard A. Best, "Covert Action: Legislative Background and Policy Questions," http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/intel/RL33715.pdf (accessed 7 January 2013). In response to a question on covert action, Senator Roberts commented "The CRS report is misleading. It was the concern of one member, Vice Chairman Kit Bond, about the United States Director of Intelligence's expansion of "military source operations" authority to "Committee concerns." The CRS also erroneously stated these questions were for Jim Clapper's confirmation hearing when they were in fact for Dennis Blair. Since leaving the committee in 2006, it is my understanding that Members of the Committee continue to work closely with the military to ensure that all military intelligence activities are reported to the intelligence oversight committees."

88. National Clandestine SIS Officer.

89. Ibid.

90. Senator Pat Roberts, former Chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, e-mail interview by author, 9 January 2013. When asked about DCS, Senator Roberts wrote, "I see the Pentagon's intelligence activities and authorities as complementary to the work of the CIA. The nation needs intelligence capabilities both from within the military and the intelligence community. I am confident that coordination between DOD and the CIA continues to improve. The new Defense Clandestine Service is not, in my view, an example of a new parallel authority. The DCS is essentially a renaming of the DIA's Defense Humint, an intelligence collection element that has been in existence since the early 1980s"and Greg Miller, "DIA Sending Hundreds of More Spies Overseas," *Washington Post*, http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2012-12-01/world/35585098_1_defense-clandestine-service-cia-spy-agency (accessed 7 January 2013).

91. Miller, "DIA Sending Hundreds of More Spies Overseas" and Greg Miller, "Senate Moves Blocks to Block Pentagon Plans to Increase Number of Spies

Overseas," *Washington Post*, http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2012-12-10/
world/35745387_1_defense-clandestine-service-pentagon-dia (accessed 7 January
2013).

92. McLaughlin.

93. Boren.

94. Ibid.

95. Ibid. "I do not think it is healthy when a person whose principal experience has
been in the military is asked to serve as Director of the CIA. It tends to bias
policy in a way that places too much emphasis on military intervention instead
of carefully evaluating the use of diplomacy and other policy tools."

96. Richard L. Russell, Professor at National Defense University, telephone interview
by author, 14 September 2012.

97. Department of Defense. *Final Report to Congress on the Conduct of the Persian
Gulf War* (Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense, April 1992), 388.

98. U.S. Congress, Senate, Select Committee on Intelligence, *Report on the U.S. Intel-
ligence Prewar Intelligence Assessments on Iraq*, 108th Cong., 7 July 2004, 18.

99. David Oakley, "Taming the Rogue Elephant?" *American Intelligence Journal* 26,
no. 2 (2008-2009): 63.

100. USCode.house.gov, 65.

101. U.S. Congress, House, *Intelligence Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1991*, Report
102-166, 102nd Cong., 1st sess., 25 July 1991, 29.

102. Best, "Covert Action: Legislative Background and Policy Questions."

103. There is often confusion between the terms "covert" and "clandestine." Covert
is when the activity that is occurring might be known, but who is conducting
the activity is unknown (hidden hand). Clandestine is when the activity itself is
unknown beyond those executing the operation.

104. Aaron P. Brecher, "Cyberattacks and the Covert Action Statute: Toward a Domes-
tic Legal Framework for Offensive Cyberoperations," *Michigan Law Review* 111,
no. 3 (December 2012): 425. "Cyberexploitation involves only the monitoring or
copying of data, while cyberattacks involve the manipulation of data."

105. USCode.house.gov, 66.

106. Roberts. Although Senator Roberts pointed out that under the National Secu-
rity Act, even certain intelligence activities conducted by the military must be
reported to SSCI and HPSCI, it does not solve the cyberwarfare issue. If the mere
willingness to acknowledge actions publicly makes an activity non-covert and
only intelligence activities need to be reported to the intelligence committees,
how will cyberattacks and cybercollection activities be deconflicted? Although
Cyber command and NSA share the same leader, the lack of definition and over-
sight might cause friction in the future.

107. Best and Feickert.

108. Roberts.

109. Best and Feickert.

110. Ibid.

111. Reid.

112. The author is not saying that the individual service member is not seeking to do good, but merely that the DOD is mainly built to pursue policy objectives. These policy objectives could be either in pursuit of solely American interests or in pursuit of coalition interests.

113. Best and Feickert.

114. Best and Feickert.

115. National Clandestine SIS Officer. The possibility of transitioning from a "supported" to a "supporting" role and how it would be handled was one of the issues the NCS officer brought up in our discussion.

116. Douglas Jehl, "2 CIA Reports Offer Warnings on Iraq's Path," *New York Times*, 7 December 2004, http://www.nytimes.com/2004/12/07/international/middleeast/07intell.html?_r=0 (accessed 31 January 2013) and Miller, "CIA Expanding Presence in Afghanistan."

117. One of the questions I asked the representatives from the CIA and DOD in most of my interviews was if organizations would become more parochial with the decreasing budgets. Although they did not discount it completely, everyone I asked said they think decreasing budgets would actually bring the organizations closer together out of necessity. In addition, most within the intelligence and special operations communities did not believe budget cuts would affect their organization too much.

118. William E. Connolly, *A World of Becoming* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011), 18.

119. E.H. Carr, "What is History?" http://library.universalhistory.net/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/What-is-history.pdf (accessed 31 January 2013).

120. Rowan Scarborough, "Panetta Says 2013 Defense Budget to Cut Land Forces," *Washington Post*, 26 January 2012.