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# Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aman</td>
<td>Central Israeli military intelligence unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Counterterrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGSE</td>
<td>Direction Générale de la Sécurité Extérieure (French foreign intelligence service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPSD</td>
<td>Direction de la Protection et de la Sécurité de la Défense (French military intelligence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DST</td>
<td>Direction de la Sécurité du Territoire (French domestic intelligence service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histaarevut</td>
<td>An Israeli disguised as an Arab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMINT</td>
<td>Human intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAF</td>
<td>Israeli Air Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Intelligence community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDF</td>
<td>Israeli Defense Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsas</td>
<td>Mossad case officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossad</td>
<td>The Institute for Intelligence and Special Tasks (Israeli foreign intelligence service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSINT</td>
<td>Open source intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO</td>
<td>Palestinian Liberation Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayanim</td>
<td>Worldwide network of volunteer Jews providing information to Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCLAT</td>
<td>Service pour Coordination de la Lutte Anti-Terroriste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDECE</td>
<td>Service de Documentation Extérieure et de Contre-Espionage (precursor to the DGSE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shin Bet</td>
<td>General Security Service or Shabak (Israeli domestic intelligence service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGINT</td>
<td>Signals intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLAT</td>
<td>Unite de Coordination de la Lutte Anti-Terroriste</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STRENGTHENING COUNTERTERRORISM HUMINT COLLECTION

“Measuring the effectiveness of counterterrorism strategy is critical...to ensure the effectiveness of the plans and underlying action, and to provide policy makers with insight into whether counterterrorism efforts are actually making a difference.”

Evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of past counterterrorism strategies remains an important task for scholars of international security, as numerous countries continue to face a persistent threat of terrorism. Many counterterrorism (CT) practitioners assert that human intelligence (HUMINT) is an integral component of any CT strategy. As Burton Gerber, a retired Moscow Chief of Station and veteran CIA case officer, has succinctly stated, “Countering terrorism – recruiting sources, uncovering plots, and understanding how terrorist organizations develop and grow – is chiefly a HUMINT task.”

Therefore, countries seeking to improve their CT strategy would benefit from a better understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of a HUMINT collection system operating against terrorist groups.

The evaluation of HUMINT in CT could be approached from several angles; however, I will focus solely on testing the explanatory power of part of the intelligence theory put forth by Jennifer Sims, which proposes that the number, integration, and range of an intelligence service’s collection systems, together with their centralized

---


1
management constitute one of four critical keys to that service’s effectiveness in providing policymakers an edge over competitors in the international arena – an objective known as “decision advantage.”

Indeed, Sims’ argues that contests of maneuver, such as counterterrorism, are ones in which collection matters relatively more than the other intelligence attributes. As laid out by Sims, the five components of collection include command and control, platforms, sensors, processing and exploitation, and data exfiltration. Collection managers must successfully manipulate the five components to maximize their ability to collect on a specific target. This function can only be performed if the components of collection are plentiful, wide-ranging and each reasonably well integrated into one or more collection systems.

According to Sims’ theory, optimizing an intelligence system against any target requires good knowledge and control of all five components of collection – a “centralization” of management that can be accomplished either in the field or at headquarters. I will apply this theory to create a theoretical HUMINT collection system model operating against international terrorists. Bruce Hoffman, an expert on terrorism and insurgency, defines terrorism as “the deliberate creation of and exploitation of fear through violence or the threat of violence in the pursuit of political change.” I will add to that definition that the HUMINT collectors in my model and ensuing case studies gathered intelligence about terrorist organizations based outside of the intelligence

---

4 Meeting with Jennifer E. Sims, 17 February 2010.
service’s home country (therefore excluding domestic organizations, such as Action Directe).

After creating a theoretical HUMINT collection system, I will apply the theoretical model to the Israeli and French HUMINT collection systems operating from 1970 until 1990. I will extract and compare the key lessons learned from the HUMINT collection systems in each country, specifically the systems’ ability to gather intelligence on international terrorist organizations. The extent of the collection system’s HUMINT capabilities will be determined by looking at the number of HUMINT collection systems, the integration of the systems, the range of the systems over the competition, and the quality of management in each country. Comparing two countries with such disparate intelligence communities will help illuminate the viability of Sims' theory of collection if the system that is more robust, according to the measures indicated above, also proves more successful at providing decision advantage to leaders responsible for counterterrorism efforts.

There is substantial scholarly literature covering the importance of HUMINT in CT operations, including articles written by Burton Gerber (2005), Neal Pollard (2009), and Troy Thomas (2004). In addition, many scholars have written about the intelligence services of Israel and France, most notably Douglas Porch (1995), Roger Faligot and Pascal Krop (1989), Michel Wieviorka (1990 and 1991), Gordon Thomas (2004), Ami Pedahzur (2009), and Ephraim Kahana (2006, 2005 and 2002). 6 I have not found; however, any source that compares the CT efforts of both countries. This gap is

---

6 All these works are referenced in the Bibliography.
important to fill because the comparison of two intelligence communities with such
different styles of intelligence collection will best illustrate the strength of the theory for
intelligence collection in support of CT efforts. Additionally, contributing to studies in
comparative intelligence policies will be useful for counterintelligence professionals
seeking to gain a better understanding of other intelligence services.

I recognize that certain gaps and weaknesses are unavoidable in my study of
HUMINT. Most significantly, the availability of information is limited due to the
classified nature of the issue; however, the historic timeframe will help alleviate this
problem. Additionally, the importance of the decision maker in the intelligence cycle
cannot be ignored, particularly as HUMINT collectors may sometimes provide credible
information about terrorist activity that decision makers choose not to act on because of
some broader strategy or political agenda. I will assume, for the purposes of this study,
that successful terrorist attacks indicated poor HUMINT collection capabilities, while
successful disruption of such attacks, including arrest, rendition, or prosecution of
plotters, indicates good capabilities. Focusing solely on case officers clandestinely
collecting information (as well as information clandestinely exchanged through liaison
with other intelligence services) and excluding other forms of HUMINT, such as
information gathered by diplomats or law enforcement officers, may also skew results.
Finally, I recognize that other means of collection, such as signals intelligence (SIGINT),
open source intelligence (OSINT) and imagery, contribute to CT efforts; however, I will

---

7 For a more detailed analysis of incorporating intelligence gathered from several
different sources to improve counterterrorism measures, see Jennifer Sims, “Intelligence
assume that clandestine human collectors are capable of providing the most timely and high quality intelligence about terrorist activities.\(^8\)

**HUMINT IN CT: A THEOREtical model\(^9\)**

Sims’ theory of intelligence offers a method with which to measure the performance of intelligence, defining intelligence as the collection, analysis, and dissemination of information for national security decision makers involved in a “competitive enterprise.”\(^10\) According to this theory there are four attributes of intelligence: collection, anticipation, transmission, and efforts to degrade an opponent’s efforts to do the first three.\(^11\) As mentioned previously, Sims argues further that in contests of maneuver, including CT measures, collection is relatively more important than the other attributes. Decision makers have a near instantaneous need for precise information about terrorist activities to maintain a decision advantage – protecting national security interests from an attack. It is important to note that decision advantage

\(^8\) Similarly, Jennifer Sims and Bob Gallucci questioned the importance of all-source analysis if it delays delivery of intelligence or fails to recognize a critical piece of intelligence. They argue that delivery of intelligence from a single collection system may be more crucial at times than fusing intelligence from several different collection systems. (Jennifer Sims and Bob Gallucci. “Why Intelligence Sharing Can’t Always Make Us Safer” in *Washington Post*, 8 January 2010, accessed online on 24 January 2010 at http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/01/07/AR2010010703242.html)

\(^9\) The model outlined below is based in large part on the intelligence theory by Jennifer Sims, outlined in “A Theory of Intelligence and International Politics.”

\(^10\) Sims, “A Theory of Intelligence and International Politics, 62.

\(^11\) Ibid, 67.
is a relative concept. Intelligence only provides an advantage if the information is delivered to the appropriate decision maker in a timely, relevant manner, giving that decision maker an edge over an adversary with inferior intelligence.

There is no one ideal collection system because effective intelligence systems delivering decision advantage vary depending on the target and the competition in which decision makers are engaged. For example, a collection system that produces high quality intelligence, providing decision advantage, about the Soviet Union is unlikely to do the same against a nontraditional target such as the Japanese terrorist organization Aum Shinrikyo. Metrics used to determine the performance of collection systems should take into account the varying nature of the targets pursued by an intelligence service, which must remain flexible enough to collect on a variety of wide ranging targets at any one time. Ultimately remaining one step ahead of the target by providing decision advantage to decision makers responsible for winning the competitive enterprise is the key to a successful intelligence system.

Decision makers engaged in the CT competition must focus more on tactical victory than strategic gain because thwarting attacks often leads to strategic gains (disrupting one attack may uncover clues to dismantling a group). Searching for strategic gains can become impossible when the adversary blends into the population and manipulates CT efforts into propaganda campaigns to gain recruits, expanding the challenge for security forces. As Sims notes, “To be good, intelligence must be tightly
bound to the nature of the decisions that competitors must make.”\textsuperscript{12} Therefore, intelligence supporting CT efforts must seek to provide decision advantage superior to the intelligence of the decision maker in the terrorist group, whether that decision maker is the terrorist group leader or the suicide bomber, who must decide when and where to detonate his vest.

Each of the five elements of a collection system – command and control, platforms, sensors, processing and exploitation, and data exfiltration – must be optimized, integrated, and tailored to the CT competition. The best intelligence system must have a high number of collection systems compared to its competitor. These different systems must also be well integrated, both horizontally between collectors in the field and vertically up to senior management. Additionally, these collection systems must be wide-ranging with the ability to collect information about multiple threats. Finally, a manager with good knowledge, control and awareness of all five elements of the collection system, as well as other systems owned by the intelligence service, can evaluate what tradeoffs will optimize the performance of the collection system.\textsuperscript{13} In my study, I will only be testing this theory against a HUMINT collection system in which the sensors are recruited agents and the platforms off which they or their handlers work include government facilities or commercial businesses (known as official and non-official “cover”).

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid, 65.
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid, 68-71.
The metrics I will use to judge the effectiveness of the management of a given country’s HUMINT collection system to gather information about terrorist groups will be indicators such as productivity, efficiency, tunability, connectedness, usability, robustness and boosting of other collection systems (I refer to these metrics as ‘PETCURB’). In the most effective CT collection system, productivity correlates to the tempo of terrorist activity targeting Country X. If no terrorist group wants to attack Country X then less HUMINT collection about terrorist groups is necessary, compared to a country with a high level of terrorist activity. The second metric, efficiency, is essentially the productivity of the HUMINT collection system against all its targets compared to the cost of gathering the information. Tunability in CT HUMINT collection means the ability of the system to change from one terrorist group to another as new threats emerge. The intelligence services of Country X may be able to do this easily if membership in the different terrorist groups overlap and an informant in one group can also provide information about the capabilities of another group. However, tunability is a common weakness of HUMINT because of the long time it takes to form relationships with trusted, reliable sources. The fourth metric, connectedness, depends on the ability of

---

14 The “PETCURB” metrics are derived from Jennifer Sims’ course, “Theory and Practice of Intelligence” taught at Georgetown University in Spring 2009.
15 An absence of terrorism does not correlate to a complete lack of collection because, as Sims notes in her theory, anticipation is one of the functions of intelligence. Terrorist groups may one day possess the intent to target Country X, therefore, the collection system’s manager must anticipate a decision maker’s future need (or current requirement, regardless of the low threat) for intelligence on terrorism. Country X may also use this HUMINT collection of terrorist groups in liaison to warn allies of an impending attack.
16 Tunability can also mean the ability of the HUMINT collection system to gather information unrelated to terrorism and then quickly switch to gathering CT information as the terrorist threat increases.
the five components of collection in the HUMINT systems to communicate with each other and the ability of the system to communicate back to decision makers in a timely manner.\textsuperscript{17} Country X’s ability to use an asset against a target without jeopardizing decision advantage is the usability of the information. Similarly, the ability of Country X’s case officers to avoid detection and train their assets to avoid exposure is the robustness of the system. Finally, a HUMINT system that achieves a high level of boosting augments the PETCURB of another collection system by providing CT information that allows the other system to better target its collection efforts.\textsuperscript{18}

Foreign intelligence liaison presents a HUMINT collection system with an opportunity to increase its range, but collection managers must employ good counterintelligence practices to ensure that the relationship is producing high quality information. An intelligence liaison may prove particularly useful for HUMINT case officers collecting information about international terrorists because of the difficulties of gathering information from an often insular, close-knit group of individuals. Liaison relationships can be either simple – trading intelligence for intelligence – or complex – trading intelligence for a mix of intelligence, political, military, economic or other goods through intelligence channels. Ideally intelligence services hope for a symmetrical

\textsuperscript{17} For example, a manager of a HUMINT collection system must balance the risk of asking agents to communicate often (increasing productivity and connectedness) with the risk that such communication will jeopardize their safety, potentially decreasing the efficiency of the system if the adversary catches them.

\textsuperscript{18} Former British intelligence officer Michael Herman uses the example of espionage boosting signals intelligence. A human source can pass along copies of codes and cipher material to decipher SIGINT. (Michael Herman, \textit{Intelligence Power in Peace and War}. (Cambridge, Great Britain: Cambridge University Press, 1996) 65-66.)
arrangement in which the exchange of information and goods benefits both sides equally. Asymmetric exchanges, however, benefit one country more than another, potentially causing the benefiting country to rely too heavily on the liaison intelligence or to become manipulated or penetrated by the liaison partner.¹⁹

LOOKING AT ISRAEL AND FRANCE

During the years 1970 until 1990, Israel and France approached intelligence from widely different perspectives, which are reflected in the differences between the HUMINT collection systems of each country. Israel maintained numerous HUMINT collection systems, consistently seeking to increase the range of these systems to collect information about terrorist groups as it became apparent that terrorism posed a significant long-term threat to Israel’s national security. Despite the increasing tempo of terrorist attacks threatening France’s national security during this time period, French intelligence officers were not well placed to provide leaders with decision advantage. France maintained a number of HUMINT collection systems, however, French systems lacked Israel’s extensive integration, range, and command and control. Ultimately, France’s inability to develop clear CT policies and chronic conflicts within the intelligence community (IC) inhibited HUMINT collectors’ ability to provide policymakers with decision advantage.

¹⁹ Jennifer Sims, “Foreign Intelligence Liaison: Devils, Deals, and Details” in International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence, 19.2, (Summer 2006), 195-217.
**Number of Collection Systems**

Israel has traditionally held the practice of intelligence in high regard, particularly intelligence collection of terrorists’ activities, as a result of the prevalence of terrorist attacks directed against Israel since the founding of the country in 1948. Initial rivalries in the Israeli IC were smoothed over in 1951 with the creation of the “Institute for Coordination” (Ha Mossad le Teum), otherwise known as Mossad, which was assigned the task of collecting intelligence abroad. The rest of the IC included Shin Bet (domestic intelligence), Aman (military intelligence), air force intelligence, and naval intelligence.  

Additionally, a worldwide network of volunteer Jews, called sayanim, supplemented HUMINT gathered by the Israeli IC. Israel had the challenge of collecting intelligence on a vast array of targets with a comparatively small number of intelligence officers, and the sayanim network helped the Mossad katsas (case officers) somewhat lessen this problem.

Conversely, French policymakers have a turbulent history with their intelligence services, routinely distrusting intelligence officers and creating rifts within the IC. The American historian Douglas Porch has blamed this tumultuous relationship, most apparent during the Fifth Republic (the current republican constitution of France, which began in 1958), on the political strength of policymakers after comparatively weak leaders during the Fourth Republic (1946-1958) allowed civil servants to exert more

---

21 Meir Amit, who headed Mossad in the mid-1960s, created the sayanim network (Thomas, 63).
independence. As a result of the more powerful Fifth Republic leaders, civil servants lost this independence and many policymakers felt threatened by secret services that routinely became embroiled in political controversies.\textsuperscript{22} Although presidents of the Fifth Republic consistently created their own personal intelligence services, the three major players in the French IC between 1970 and 1990 were the Direction de la Surveillance du Territoire (DST) responsible for domestic intelligence, the Direction Générale de la Sécurité Extérieur (DGSE, created in 1982 from the Service de Documentation Extérieur et de Contre-Espionage) responsible for foreign intelligence, and Direction de la Protection et de la Sécurité de la Défense (DPSD, created in 1981 from the Sécurité Militaire) responsible for military intelligence.\textsuperscript{23}

\textit{Integration of the Systems}

Throughout the 1970s and 1980s Israel experienced intelligence reorganizations that undoubtedly affected the integration of its HUMINT collection systems, but overall the systems operated in a well-coordinated and cohesive manner. Conversely, French HUMINT collection systems, however, were not only poorly integrated but the systems routinely attempted to undermine each other. The closely integrated nature of Israel’s collection systems highlights the importance of horizontal communication between

collection systems, particularly when operating against a target as dangerous and adaptable as terrorist groups.

The end of the 1967 War temporarily redefined the responsibilities of Israel’s different intelligence agencies during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Controlling national intelligence responsibilities, Aman directed the collection efforts of both Mossad and Shin Bet. Intelligence officers, and those in Mossad in particular, were instructed to increase targeting and penetration of Palestinian groups largely neglected before the war. After the Yom Kippur War in 1973, however, Aman’s poor analysis was blamed for failing to predict the war, and the resulting IC reorganization stripped Aman of the overall responsibility for national intelligence. The Agranat Commission, a group tasked to look into the intelligence failure, sought to create a pluralistic IC, unintentionally impacting both intelligence analysis and the integration of the HUMINT collection systems. Without one agency directing collection priorities, the theory predicts that collection should suffer and, in fact, a certain degree of overlapping and competing HUMINT collection systems became inevitable. Indeed, the natural proclivity of international terrorists to operate from several different countries further complicated the spheres of HUMINT responsibility. One terrorist group may operate in the Gaza Strip (Shin Bet’s area of responsibility), Arab countries (Aman’s area of responsibility) and European or Latin American countries (Mossad’s area of responsibility). Subsequent CT

---

26 Ibid, 316-317.
tactics, such as the IDF’s invasion of Lebanon, created friction between Shin Bet and Aman. Israel’s prolonged presence in Lebanon meant that the two organizations launched parallel intelligence gathering operations, sabotaged each other’s collection efforts and hindered overall HUMINT collection productivity.\textsuperscript{27}

The strains created by this reorganization hindered integration temporarily but Israel’s HUMINT collection systems remained tightly integrated with each other and to the decision makers key to CT efforts as a result of historically close ties. For example, the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) successfully linked intelligence collection with operational counterterrorism efforts in the Gaza Strip in the early 1970s. General Ariel Sharon, then head of IDF command, formed the Rimon Unit, which used Shin Bet intelligence to create cover stories for IDF intelligence officers as fishermen, taxi drivers or Palestinian women. The undercover officers were able to collect far more information about terrorists operating in the Gaza Strip than if they were dressed in their Israeli military uniforms. The unit was eventually disbanded in 1972, when Israeli Southern Command headquarters believed the entire terrorist infrastructure in the Gaza Strip was destroyed.\textsuperscript{28} Another instance of closely connected intelligence to decision makers was a 1970 IDF raid on a Palestinian target. The raiding battalion included 46 trained prisoners of war interrogators who questioned captives and examined Palestinian Liberation

\textsuperscript{27} Ami Pedahzur, \textit{The Israeli Secret Services and the Struggle Against Terrorism}, (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009), 71-2.
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid, 34-5.
Organization (PLO) documents uncovered in the raid, increasing operational awareness of the adversary as the raid unfolded.\textsuperscript{29}

Even after the reorganization, the HUMINT collection systems remained closely integrated and facilitated the successful rescue of the Air France Flight 139 hostages in Entebbe in 1976. Although Israeli HUMINT collectors failed to detect the terrorist plot before it took place, once news of the hijacking reached Israel all intelligence was thoroughly reviewed to devise a plan to rescue the passengers.\textsuperscript{30} HUMINT gathered before the rescue operation was launched included the debriefings of the freed passengers in Paris, interviews of IDF officers who served in Uganda, and descriptions from employees of the Israeli company that had constructed the Entebbe airport. This HUMINT directed (or boosted) searches of open source information andimagery that was taken over the airport by Mossad agents pretending to be tourists,\textsuperscript{31} ultimately allowing the IDF and Mossad officers to develop a coherent picture of the situation on the group before departing for Uganda. The rescue operation was only successful because of the close integration between the HUMINT collectors of the military and Mossad.

Another instance of close integration was the 1985 bombing of the PLO headquarters in Tunis. The Israeli Air Force (IAF) carried out the attack successfully due to detailed intelligence, again largely derived from HUMINT sources. Mossad passed

\textsuperscript{29} Black and Morris, 265.
\textsuperscript{30} After landing in Entebbe, the terrorists released all the passengers who were not Jewish or Israeli. The freed passengers flew back to Paris within twenty-four hours of their release in Entebbe.
\textsuperscript{31} Pedahzur, 56-57.
along information about the precise function of each of the buildings, leading the IAF raid to kill 75 people, including 60 PLO men.\footnote{Black and Morris, 453-454.}

During this time period, successes against terrorist groups were rare in France, where integration between HUMINT collection systems was almost nonexistent. Strained relations between the DST, the domestic intelligence service, and the DGSE, the foreign intelligence service, prevented the easy exchange of intelligence for CT purposes. In one instance, the Interior Minister refused to share intelligence about terrorism with the DGSE, accusing the foreign intelligence agency of poor counterintelligence practices.\footnote{Jeremy Shapiro, “France and The GIA” in Democracy and Counterterrorism: Lessons from the Past, ed. Robert J. Art and Louise Richardson, (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2007) 137.} The lack of a clear CT policy exacerbated these tensions between the services because frequently French diplomacy, law enforcement and intelligence efforts were uncoordinated and in direct conflict with one another.\footnote{Michel Wieviorka, “France Faced with Terrorism” in Terrorism, 14.3 (1991), 166-167.}

Instead of boosting the CT collection capabilities of the DGSE or DST, French President Mitterrand created his own CT intelligence service within the Elysée Palace that he filled with his own trusted personnel. Mitterrand was hardly the first French leader to create his own parallel intelligence service, as French politicians beginning with Charles de Gaulle used parallel intelligence services to collect information about their political opponents, as well as conduct covert operations abroad.\footnote{Porch, 437-447.}
coordination between a president’s new organization and the existing agencies.\textsuperscript{36} The mistrust between the presidents’ own intelligence services with the established intelligence agencies was so severe that the parallel networks of Jacques Foccart, a presidential advisor,\textsuperscript{37} dominated parts of Western Africa and worked with intelligence services from communist countries to discredit the DGSE.\textsuperscript{38} Additionally, the “intelligence officers” of the parallel networks were not necessarily qualified to collect HUMINT on terrorists, let alone act in any role as an intelligence officer, further hindering the quality of intelligence collection.

\textit{Range Over Competition}

Despite numerous challenges Israel faced in expanding the range of its HUMINT collection systems against the largely Arabic terrorist groups threatening its national security, Israel proved far more successful at establishing wide-ranging collection systems than France. British historian Nigel West notes that although Mossad often ran intelligence operations under diplomatic cover, the Israelis had almost no diplomatic representation in Arabic countries where terrorists (largely Palestinians) targeting Israeli

\textsuperscript{36} Shapiro, 137.
\textsuperscript{37} Jacques Foccart headed the Service d’Action Civique (SAC), the first formal parallel network. The SAC was established to protect Gaullist politicians, going so far as to infiltrate the government with men loyal to de Gaulle. The group was also the channel through which de Gaulle carried out his African policies. (Porch, 437-440).
\textsuperscript{38} Porch, 448.
interests were most likely to seek safe haven or plan attacks.\textsuperscript{39} Coupled with an almost complete lack of Arab walk-ins, the inability to use diplomatic cover in hostile countries required Mossad katsas to use deep-cover operations to obtain intelligence about the Palestinians.\textsuperscript{40} These challenges initially hindered the productivity of Israeli HUMINT but the sayanim expanded HUMINT collection and Israel’s recognition of the increased threat of terrorism in the late 1960s led to a further expansion of operations abroad.

Despite the successes of HUMINT collection in the early part of the decade the later part of the 1970s brought growing intelligence challenges for Israeli HUMINT collectors, particularly as the counterintelligence awareness of terrorists increased and the Israeli IC faced the repercussions of the Yom Kippur War intelligence failure. As Palestinian terrorists realized the pervasiveness of Israeli HUMINT collection throughout the West Bank and Gaza, the terrorists began to move much of their activities abroad. Initially Palestinians’ poor operational security combined with rumors that Israel had a detailed file on all key Fatah officials, led to a sense of paranoia amongst terrorists operating out of Gaza and the West Bank.\textsuperscript{41} However, as Palestinians were taught to use better countermeasures to evade Israeli security forces, Mossad case officers were increasingly forced to run agents in hostile or neutral countries, exposing HUMINT

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid, 180.
\textsuperscript{41} Black and Morris, 244-5.
operations to a greater risk of detection, but also increasing the range of the collection system.  

The growing number of terrorist attacks abroad in the early 1970s increased work for Mossad, as the HUMINT collectors attempted to keep pace with terrorist activities. One of the more significant attacks occurred in September 1972 when eight Palestinian terrorists, later revealed to belong to a group called Black September, held nine Israeli athletes hostage in their Olympic Village residence, killing two hostages in the initial moments of the attack. The ensuing rescue efforts by the German Police resulted in the death of all nine hostages and prompted Israeli Premier Golda Meir to covertly authorize the assassination of any individual involved in the attack, an operation known as the “Wrath of God.”  

This attack is clearly an intelligence failure for Mossad, and illustrates the difficulty in quickly expanding the range of a HUMINT collection system, even in friendly countries such as Germany.

Operation Wrath of God demonstrated the growing range of Israeli HUMINT collection systems after the Munich massacre. As a result of Mossad’s mandate to assassinate all those involved in the Munich massacre Israel instilled a pervasive sense of fear into the members of the Black September group. The assassinations were coupled by obituaries in the local paper arranged by local Arab sayanim and the targets’ families

42 Ibid, 280.
received condolence cards and flowers before each assassination was carried out. The assassinations undermined Mossad’s intelligence gathering ability as Palestinian terrorists increased counterintelligence measures, often killing suspected Israeli informants and sending a series of reprisal attacks to Israeli and Jewish figures throughout the world. The wide-range of Israeli HUMINT to locate each suspected terrorist, however, illustrates the ability of the collection system to provide decision advantage to leaders advancing a policy of targeted assassinations.

Repeatedly the sayanim network proved crucial to the range of Israeli HUMINT collection, assisting katsas around the world and occasionally providing Mossad with actionable information about terrorist plans to target Israel. In 1973, a sayanim, working in Rome’s central telephone exchange, overheard a suspicious phone conversation and alerted Mossad katsas to an assassination attempt against then-Prime Minister Golda Meir. The assassins planned to launch rockets at Meir’s plane as she landed in Rome for her meeting with Pope John Paul II. Preparations for the attack were discovered only moments before Meir’s plane touched down and Mossad katsas were able to successfully disarm the assassin. Without the range of the sayanim network, Mossad is unlikely to have detected and thwarted the attack in time.

Mossad’s HUMINT also grew independently of the sayanim network. One example was the network of Palestinian informants that Mossad case officer Baruch Cohen established in the early 1970s. Cohen had Palestinian contacts throughout Europe.

---

44 Thomas, 80.
45 Pedahzur, 42-3.
46 Thomas, 219-221.
that he coerced into providing information using the practice of instilling fear into potential informants, similar to tactics employed by the Mossad in Operation Wrath of God. Showing evidence of his knowledge of their personal lives and threatening retribution to family members if the contact did not cooperate, Cohen gathered information about Palestinians throughout Europe to assist in Israeli CT efforts. Nevertheless, the head of PLO intelligence eventually uncovered Cohen’s extensive network and turned one of Cohen’s informants into a double agent. Possibly as vengeance for Operation Wrath of God, the PLO initially instructed the double agent to feed Cohen misinformation and at the end of 1972 the agent killed Cohen. As discussed previously, Operation Wrath of God was a success because it delivered decision advantage but hindered the capabilities of Israeli HUMINT collection systems to continue to collect information from established sources. In the case of Cohen, Palestinians’ increased counterintelligence awareness hurt productivity from his European network but the wide-ranging nature of Israel’s collection system prevented this from resulting in a significant loss of intelligence collection.

Israeli HUMINT also relied on a process dubbed “histaarevut,” meaning to disguise oneself as an Arab. Originally conceived by the Jewish information service before the formal creation of the state of Israel, the process was used to blend in with an Arab population to “collect information and engage in special clandestine operations.”

IDF intelligence officers used the process again during the First Intifada (1987), so they

---

47 Black and Morris, 267-8.
48 Pedahzur, 42.
49 Ibid, 19.
could easily associate with Palestinian youths, sometimes even participating in the demonstrations against the IDF.\textsuperscript{50}

Foreign intelligence liaison was another aspect of Israeli HUMINT collection that increased the range of collection. In one liaison relationship, the Lebanese Christians asked Israel for help to weaken the PLO stronghold in Lebanon in the early 1980s. Israel had maintained intelligence links with the Maronite Christians as early as the 1950s, strengthening ties through the 1970s as a result of a shared adversary (Syria).\textsuperscript{51} Proving to be both an asymmetrical and complex liaison agreement benefiting the Lebanese Christians, Mossad shipped arms into Lebanon and placed its own officers within the Christian command. The Mossad presence was ostensibly to maximize the use of the weapons, but they also provided intelligence that led to a series of successful attacks against the PLO.\textsuperscript{52} Eventually the liaison relationship jeopardized the reputation of the Lebanese Christians far more than it benefited their cause, ending in the late 1970s, however, once again the extensive range of Israeli intelligence through the sayanim and clandestine collection prevented this intelligence set back to severely hamper their CT efforts.

The controversial relationship between French leaders and the IC significantly impacted the range of intelligence collection systems, particularly those HUMINT collectors directed against terrorist groups. The phenomenon of terrorism was nothing

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid, 80-81.
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid, 68-69.
\textsuperscript{52} Thomas, 148-9.
\end{flushright}
new to France (in fact the word originates from the French revolution\(^53\)) and in the decades before the timeframe of this study France endured terrorism emanating from Algeria as well as violence from domestic far-left groups, which continued to launch attacks through the late 1980s. However, international terrorist groups rarely targeted France before the 1980s, only occasionally inflicting collateral damage on French interests in the 1970s.\(^{54}\)

Part of the reason terrorist groups avoided French targets was because France’s “sanctuary doctrine” was a policy aiming to make the country as neutral as possible with respect to international terrorism. French policymakers believed this doctrine would lead terrorists to believe they “would have nothing to fear and nothing to achieve in France, where their members could operate with impunity, as long as they did not perpetrate acts of terrorism within France or against French interests.”\(^{55}\) The sanctuary doctrine even led France to release Abu Daoud, the supposed mastermind behind the 1972 Munich Olympics massacre, after his arrest by French counterespionage agents because France did not want to become a target of the PLO.\(^{56}\) As a result of the perceived low priority of the terrorist threat and strained political relations between the policy makers and the IC, France’s IC lacked a cohesive counterterrorism strategy or any established collection
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\(^{53}\) Hoffman, 3.


\(^{56}\) Bruce Hoffman, “Is Europe Soft on Terrorism?” in *Foreign Policy*, No. 115 (Summer 1999) 64.
capabilities specifically tasked to collect intelligence about international terrorists. When Pierre Marion began his tenure as the head of DGSE (still SDECE at the beginning of his term) in 1981, only one intelligence officer was assigned to cover counterterrorism and the agency had no plans to infiltrate any terrorist group.\(^{57}\)

Although Giscard d’Estaing, president from 1974 until 1981, gave DST responsibility for CT, the domestic intelligence agency was not much more successful at collecting HUMINT about terrorist groups. The DST only assigned twenty-five agents to CT, hardly enough to establish networks of sources to provide actionable intelligence about the activities of international terrorist groups. Compounding the DST’s inability to collect intelligence relevant for CT efforts was the service’s perception that their primary mandate was counterintelligence, specifically detecting penetrations by the Eastern bloc services.\(^{58}\) Additionally, the internal service was not well placed in the French IC to collect on international terrorists that are typically based in several countries, and the strained relations with the DGSE did not facilitate easy exchanges of intelligence.

As a result of the limited range of HUMINT collection systems to gather information on terrorist activities, France’s reliance on liaison relationships far outweighed any Israeli foreign intelligence liaison relationships. President Mitterrand allegedly reached an agreement with Syria in 1986 in which Syria gave the DST intelligence on Lebanese terrorists in exchange for arms, economic aid and refraining

\(^{57}\) Porch, 433-4.

\(^{58}\) Ibid, 435-6.
from reprisal when Syrian-sponsored terrorist groups targeted the US and Israel.\textsuperscript{59} The complex liaison proved to be extremely asymmetrical and disadvantageous for the DST, as France relied heavily on Syrian information and still could become if not the target then collateral damage of terrorist attacks targeting the US or Israel. Ironically, only a few years earlier the DGSE had attempted to assassinate a Syrian spy in Madrid in retaliation for a suspected Syrian-sponsored bombing in Paris,\textsuperscript{60} which illustrates once again the conflicting agendas of the two services.

France was also a member of several multilateral intelligence liaison groupings. The KILOWATT group included representatives from the counterterrorism agencies of all the European Community countries, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, Canada and Israel. The group’s focus was specifically exchanging intelligence about Arab terrorism, largely Palestinian extremists.\textsuperscript{61} France’s other multilateral intelligence liaison was dubbed the “Safari Club.” After signing a secret agreement in 1976 with the heads of the external intelligence services from Saudi Arabia, Iran, and Egypt, the SDECE (the precursor to the DGSE) agreed to provide communications equipment for the groups’ efforts to monitor Soviet efforts to instigate insurgencies in Africa. In addition to furthering French interests in Africa, the Safari Club increased SDECE awareness of the activities of Arab countries, including the activities of Palestinian terrorists.\textsuperscript{62} Although there is limited information available regarding the volume or quality of intelligence

\textsuperscript{59} Ibid, 452.
\textsuperscript{61} West, 187.
\textsuperscript{62} Faligot and Krop, 257-258.
actually exchanged in either group, France likely relied more heavily on information provided by other countries in these groups than it contributed because of its limited ability to collect on terrorist activities.

French HUMINT collectors did manage to gather some information about terrorist groups without the help of liaison. French CT officials were fortunate that a Tunisian volunteered intelligence about a terrorist cell living in France in 1987. The Tunisian’s information led to a series of arrests that undoubtedly thwarted attacks, although it was not clear if the attackers were plotting to attack French national interests. The DGSE allegedly had at least one penetration of the PLO in Beirut in 1984, although it is uncertain how much actionable information she had access to in her capacity as an interpreter. Finally, a defector allegedly informed France of an overall terrorist offensive to target French interests in the Middle East during the early 1980s. Although the information was still unable to prevent a series of bombings in the first part of the decade, including the October 1983 attack on the French troops in Lebanon, the defector’s intelligence is credited with a significant reduction in terrorist attacks targeting France by the end of the 1980s. The information gathered by volunteers and one PLO penetration, however, did not adequately make up for the limited range of the DGSE and DST, as they failed to provide consistent decision advantage.

63 Porch, 452.
64 West, 187.
65 According to the article, the defector was code-named Jaber (Shapiro and Suzan, 73-4).
Quality of Management

The three previous sections illustrate the strong command and control of Israeli HUMINT collection systems compared to the decentralized, conflicting systems in France. Israeli managers consistently manipulated the five elements of collection to produce high quality intelligence for decision advantage. Israeli managers exhibited awareness of the benefits of other HUMINT collection systems as well as strong command and control of their own individual system. Whether the intelligence provided decision advantage by locating terrorists for targeted assassinations or detecting terrorist activity to thwart attacks, Israeli managers proved adept at increasing their PETCURB at the price of their competitors – in this case, terrorist groups.

Despite strong Israeli HUMINT capabilities, terrorists still carried out several significant attacks. In 1972 terrorists hijacked a plane flying from Brussels to Tel Aviv, landing at Lod airport and demanding Israel release over 300 Palestinians prisoners. Israeli troops successfully stormed the plane, using a strategy based on a preplanned rescue operation.66 Another failure was the First Intifada (in 1987), as it took Shin Bet several weeks to recognize that the increasing tempo of terrorist attacks was different from the usual bouts of violence emanating from Gaza and the West Bank.67 The local nature of the violence increased the need for wide-ranging HUMINT collection systems because information gained from one neighborhood was unlikely to reveal anything on

66 The Israeli troops killed two of the four hijackers and one passenger (Black and Morris, 269).
terrorism originating from another area in the occupied territories. Nevertheless, these intelligence failures illustrate the difficulty in monitoring all terrorist activities all the time. Overall, Israeli HUMINT managers proved able to manipulate their PETCURB to best provide decision advantage to both policymakers involved in CT and law enforcement and military personnel responsible for quelling terrorist attacks.

Although strong management in French HUMINT collection systems was clearly lacking in the 1970s and early 1980s, France attempted to fix its CT deficiencies in 1986 with the creation of antiterrorism legislation that aimed to ameliorate the inherent conflict of interest between the judiciary and intelligence services. The French IC regularly hid important information from the judiciary out of fear that the magistrates would publicly reveal sources and methods, compromising collection. Magistrates, following the example of France’s presidents, created their own parallel sources to use in judicial proceedings. The 1986 legislation created the Service pour Coordination de la Lutte Anti-Terroriste (SCLAT) within the Ministry of Justice to complement the existing Unite de Coordination de la Lutte Anti-Terroriste (UCLAT) within the Ministry of the Interior. The two organizations were responsible for coordinating information related to terrorism between the intelligence and police services within their respective ministries, providing personal working relationships on the lower levels of the ministries to facilitate trust and consequently an intelligence collections system more connected with its decision makers. Therefore, managers became more aware of the capabilities of other HUMINT
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systems and could theoretically use intelligence provided by other systems to boost their own.

This transformation in France’s legal system took place too late in the time period evaluated for this case study to notice any discernable different in management of HUMINT collection systems. HUMINT by its very nature often involves long established relationships with well-placed sources and mutual trust between the case officer and his agents. The parallel services created by French presidents prevented the creation of any strong HUMINT networks collecting on international terrorist activities because of the fleeting status of the systems. Each new presidency brought a new parallel service, often filled with officers with little experience in intelligence and a poor working relationship with the established intelligence agencies. One of the reasons cited for Marion’s abrupt departure from the DGSE was because President Mitterrand believed the foreign intelligence service proved inept in CT, since Marion usually arrived to Inter-ministerial Committee for the Fight Against Terrorism with no intelligence to share.\textsuperscript{70} As one unnamed DGSE officer put it:

\begin{quote}
It is difficult to infiltrate terrorist networks that are very tenuous, mobile both in time and space, very scattered, and capable of sudden disappearances. To take only one example, to disentangle Shiite connections in the Middle East requires long and minute preparation, as well as luck, and DGSE has still not mastered this.”\textsuperscript{71}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{70} Faligot and Krop, 286-7.
\textsuperscript{71} Ibid, 287.
Good command and control of intelligence systems depends in large part on the extent that the systems are integrated and trust each other, and French intelligence lacked both of these attributes.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR INTELLIGENCE SERVICES**

Terrorism remains a key issue of concern for the international community, and intelligence services seeking to provide leaders with decision advantage over terrorist groups. This study illustrates the importance of maintaining numerous, wide-ranging and integrated HUMINT collection systems with strong management to gather information on terrorist activities. Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge that even the theoretical model is unlikely to detect all terrorist activities as some of them will inevitably be spontaneous or targets of opportunity with little or no intelligence available to detect in the first place. The case study of Israeli HUMINT collection systems discussed above, however, indicates that systems closely aligned with the theoretical model are more likely to collect high quality intelligence and provide policymakers with decision advantage. The case study of French HUMINT collection systems implies that regardless of the number of systems, if they are not wide-ranging, well integrated or clearly managed they will not only produce lower quality intelligence but the systems will also degrade each other’s efforts to collect intelligence.

Ultimately the resurgence of terrorism in the late 1980s forced Israel to rethink its CT strategy. Ami Pedahzur, a terrorist expert, notes that Israeli’s CT efforts often
appeared to aim more at avenging Palestinian attacks against Israeli interests, rather than inflicting any permanent damage to the capabilities of the PLO.\textsuperscript{72} Another terrorism and counterterrorism expert Boaz Ganor takes the analysis one step further and asserts that the 1987 Intifada changed Israel’s goal from completely eradicating the terrorist threat to only limiting the damage caused by terrorists.\textsuperscript{73} Although the Israeli IC regularly proved able to produce a vast quantity of intelligence from closely integrated and wide ranging HUMINT collection systems, over the long-term Israel’s CT methods jeopardized the effectiveness of its HUMINT collection systems. Palestinian terrorists used the harsh tactics of Israel’s security services to gain more recruits and refined their operational security as they learned more about Israeli intelligence gathering through double agents and targeted assassinations. These measures increasingly impaired the ability of Israeli HUMINT collectors to provide policymakers with decision advantage. By the end of the 1980s Israeli policymakers narrowed Israel’s CT goals, reshaping the competitive enterprise and giving HUMINT collectors a greater chance to provide consistent decision advantage without damaging the range of their systems.

Perhaps as counterterrorism professional Neal Pollard suggests, CT intelligence serves not only to provide decision advantage but also to establish metrics to help policymakers measure the overall effectiveness of a country’s CT efforts.\textsuperscript{74} Israeli

\footnotesize
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\textsuperscript{74} Neal Pollard lays out the first three roles of intelligence in counterterrorism as understanding the threat, giving warning of adversaries’ intentions and capabilities, and
HUMINT collection systems exemplified this trait, as policy makers gradually became aware that their CT policies, particularly targeted assassinations, threatened to undercut the long-term effectiveness of the collection systems. Conversely, French policy makers held onto the sanctuary doctrine for so long that HUMINT collection systems could not provide any type of metrics of the overall effectiveness of the French CT strategy. Although ostensibly the sanctuary doctrine implied that political authorities maintained lines of communication with terrorist groups, this was rare in practice.75 Without insight into the activities of terrorist groups, French policymakers had little ability (outside of increased terrorist attacks) to assess if individual terrorist groups were actually abiding by the doctrine. HUMINT collection systems cannot provide decision advantage if they do not know the competition in which their policymakers are engaged.

Collection systems are inextricably tied to the decision makers that they serve. This study highlights that a decision maker’s policy can inadvertently undermine intelligence collection. However, an integrated, wide-ranging collection system with centralized control is best placed to still be able to understand the competition in which the policymaker is engaged, and provide decision advantage at least for the short-term. Unless the policymaker adjusts his strategy, the long-term effectiveness of the intelligence collection system will likely be hindered.

finding and disrupting the adversary (Pollard, 117). I equate all three roles to the concept of decision advantage.

75 Wieviorka, “France Faced with Terrorism,” 160.
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