



Five-Eyes Intelligence Education: A Conversation With Stakeholders From Australia, Canada, New Zealand, United Kingdom, and the United States

Dennis (Wes) Westbrooks

National Intelligence University, Washington, DC, USA

Bruce MacKay

National Intelligence University, Washington, DC, USA

The Five-Eyes Intelligence Education was established in 2018 to explore innovative and collaborative educational and research opportunities, with the goal of developing a cadre of “highly educated, skilled and effective” members in each nation's intelligence enterprise. Five Eyes Intelligence Education will place students in a safe environment that encourages creative thinking to work in scenarios at the national and defense levels. The challenges are ultimately divided into policy-based and pragmatic-based. The Five-Eyes Intelligence Education can help the U.S. better understand the analytical space between different worldviews. There are three fundamental pillars to success: experience, exposure and education.

Keywords: Five-Eyes Intelligence Education, Major General Howard, stakeholders

“Necessity Is the Mother of Invention”

World War II posed a significant intelligence challenge to the Western allies. The German government used assorted models of a specific cipher device, that would come to be known in the West as “Enigma”. The cryptographic effort against this system, led by the British, was known as ULTRA. The Japanese used its own version of this device; the cryptographic effort against this system, run by the Americans, was known as MAGIC. As the war, and the astounding effects of cryptographic success, progressed, both the Americans and British found it in their best interests to collaborate and share expertise. Personnel and data exchanges took place; the British Empire provided multiple locations from which signals interception operations could take place.

After the war's conclusion, both London and Washington agreed that continuing the wartime relationship made sense, and in 1946 both parties signed the BRUSA Agreement. Known today as the UKUSA Agreement, this pact is widely viewed as the beginning of the Five-Eyes intelligence community. This agreement would later expand to include Australia, Canada, and New Zealand (Marr-Johnson & Vandenberg, 1946; RAND, 2017).

Dennis (Wes) Westbrooks, Ph.D., National Intelligence University. Research fields: intelligence studies. E-mail: dennis.westbrooks@winona.edu.

Bruce MacKay, J.D., National Intelligence University. Research fields: interweave of law and intelligence. E-mail: bruce.mackay@winona.edu.

In 2018, a Five-Eyes joint planning effort was formed for the purpose of exploring innovative and collaborative education and research opportunities, with the ultimate goal of developing a cadre of “highly educated, skilled, and effective” members within each country’s intelligence enterprise (Department of Defense, 2018).

Interviewers: What are the existing intelligence education programs in your country, including current arrangements with civilian and government academic institutions as it applies to intelligence education?

Five-Eyes Partners: Dean Hammersen quickly pointed out that the United States has two distinct classes of “intelligence education.” The first, and by far the largest, are the programs offered by public universities and colleges that teach *about* intelligence, referencing both conventional institutions like Mercyhurst University, as well as online offerings found at American Military University and others. The second class of intelligence education is unique, conducted by NIU. The National Intelligence University is the only education and research institution in the country that is authorized to teach intelligence, in a classified environment, using actual classified material. All faculty, staff and students require security clearances.

Dr. Kennedy reported that the Australian National University’s (ANU) National Security College can also conduct classified lectures and research. The program is a joint initiative with the government. ANU’s Canberra location draws senior government officials that teach on a rotational basis and give students unique access to learning about high-level national security and policymaking issues. Dr. Kennedy went on to mention that the Australian Defence Force Academy complements the government’s approach to national security education matters through a unique partnership between the Department of Defence and the University of New South Wales. This relationship is designed to prepare future military officers for global challenges. Finally, Dr. Kennedy highlighted the importance of non-government institutions, such as Macquarie University. These types of higher education establishments focus on law enforcement intelligence and further support the nation’s intelligence and law enforcement apparatus.

Mr. Glascott described the United Kingdom’s approach, that uses a mix of education and training. King’s College London’s Intelligence and International Security program is uniquely positioned at the intersection of intelligence education, broadly defined. This is augmented by training done at the Joint Intelligence Training Group and Defence College of Intelligence located in Chicksands, Bedfordshire. Mr. Glascott was also keen on the possibility of an Intelligence Academy, if approved by Parliament, that would be run by the Cabinet Office’s National Security and Intelligence group, projected for mid-2019. The Academy is expected to have an estimated 50 faculty members and 400 students built with Five-Eyes collaboration in mind.

In Ottawa, the Centre for Security, Intelligence and Defence Studies (CSIDS) is situated within Carleton University’s Norman Patterson School of International Affairs. Mr. Cheliak cites CSIDS as a foundational element of Canada’s intelligence, security, and defence education. CSIDS also provides continuing education and training to the broader community of intelligence professionals. Additionally, the Privy Council Office conducts education and training for Canada’s intelligence members as well. Lt Col Stephens (NZ) referenced a standing arrangement with at least one tertiary institution in New Zealand, Victoria University of

Wellington’s Centre for Strategic Studies. The Centre provides a pathway for education on New Zealand’s security interests, and regional and global security challenges.

Interviewers: What do you see as the opportunities for students by creating a Five-Eyes intelligence education program?

Five-Eyes Partners: Dr. Kennedy summed it up best by saying, “It would be an excellent opportunity for

collaboration!” And the collaboration theme rang true with the other Five-Eyepartners, as well. Lt Col Stephens looked at it from a historical perspective, referencing Five-Eyes interagency operational efforts that have proven successful in recent decades that can only be enriched. Additionally, Lt Col Stephens believed that improved person-to-person connections across the breadth of the Five-Eyes intelligence enterprise may allow for a more diverse set of foundational experiences and perspectives for everyone’s intelligence professionals. Mr. Cheliak agreed, stating that the educational experience could bridge cultural differences versus studying solely in isolation in Canada.

Messrs. Glascott and Cheliak pointed to the need to establish tradecraft norms and a common vocabulary. Mr. Glascott’s contention is that through an established joint intelligence education program, over time policymakers can be assured that Five-Eyes partners are functioning with a higher level of consistency across the enterprise. He went on further to say that Five-Eyes training is already happening and that bringing education into the conversation is long overdue. In his words, “Five-Eyes intelligence education would place students in a safe environment that encourages creative thinking to work through national-level and defence-based scenarios.”

Dean Hammersen offered a practical viewpoint on the opportunities presented by the program. First, a Five-Eye intelligence education program would be great preparation for a Five-Eye duty assignment, in which the graduate would serve on the intelligence staff of a sister Five-Eye nation. Another opportunity would be preparation for assignment to a Joint or Coalition staff, in both the headquarters and the deployed environments. Finally, a Five-Eye intelligence education program would be of value to a graduate who never had an exchange assignment, by affording the graduate the ability to understand how partner nations’ intelligence systems function.

Interviewers: What do you see as the challenges to making a Five-Eyes intelligence education program work?

Five-Eyes Partners: Mr. Glascott’s advice is that a releasable-mindset must exist from the beginning. He posits that those involved should not try to take existing courses and make them releasable. The curriculum should be created with Five-Eyes partners in mind and not be overly classified. Dr. Kennedy also pointed to classification issues, asking if the program even needed to be classified. The question he put forward was, “Does studying in a classified environment constrain thinking?” Mr. Cheliak looked at the question of challenges through a fiscal lens. He doesn’t see any major challenges to making the idea of Five-Eyes intelligence education work. He thinks that the wealth of the Five-Eyes partners is an upside and the program won’t be resource constrained.

Lt Col Stephens’ concern is that those in command or management may be overcome by short-term thinking. He said that the “investment versus reward” dilemma may come into play; there may be unwise attempts to measure the return on Five-Eye intelligence education investment whilst the person is still matriculating through the program or shortly upon arrival at their next posting. He called for those in leadership positions to have patience and to understand that investing time and resources into our collective workforce is for the greater good of the entire Enterprise and will benefit us all long-term.

By Dean Hammersen’s account, the challenges are legion, but ultimately divided into two classes: the policy-based, and the pragmatic-based. At the policy level, he saw any Five-Eyes intelligence education program as requiring a common level of long-term commitment to the concept. Since all nations will ultimately act in their own self-interests, any long-term commitment would be vulnerable to changes in those self-interests. That vulnerability would affect the potential stability and viability of a Five-Eye program. This sentiment was echoed by Dr. Kennedy, who said Australia’s intelligence related areas of study tend to be regionally focused and may not be shared by the other partners.

Dean Hammersen further made the case for policy by illustrating that today's challenges have led to the preponderance of intelligence relationships being bilateral. As a rule, the greater the number of participants, the lower the level of "common denominator" topics. The inverse is also true: the fewer the number of participants, the higher the level of "common denominator" topics. The pragmatic-based challenges are all surmountable, once the policy challenges have been conquered. Access to secure workspaces, access to computers, access to data, all topics that today require a case-by-case decision would be simplified and streamlined by a policy commitment from each of the Five-Eye nations to support common intelligence education.

Interviewers: Do you see a possibility for academic collaboration with like-minded civilian and government universities in your country?

Five-Eyes Partners: Mr. Cheliak emphatically answered, "Yes", and that academic collaboration is already being done in Canada on the national and international levels. Mr. Glascott concurred, affirming King's College London's prominent role in intelligence education. He also reiterated the impact that the United Kingdom's Intelligence Academy will have on

Five-Eye education, if it comes to fruition. Lt Col Stephens said that there is room for collaboration in New Zealand, and that it is essential to work with "like-minded" as well as "non-aligned" institutions to push people out of their comfort zones and afford them an opportunity to grow intellectually.

Macquarie University in Australia was put forward by Dr. Kennedy as an excellent example for possible academic collaboration based on a curriculum that already examines the role of intelligence in a national and international context. Dr. Kennedy also indicated that Australia has hosted academics from the Sherman Kent School for Intelligence Analysis, and other countries participated. Dean Hammersen submitted that the graduate certificates NIU currently offers Five-Eyes partners on Strategic Warning and East Asian Studies as an example that works. Dr. Kennedy called NIU's certificates the gold standard!

Interviewers: What do you see as Five-Eyes research opportunities going forward?

Five-Eyes Partner: Dr. Markin is excited about the possibilities that Five-Eyes research could offer. His apprehension was based in the question of how to do it in a classified environment. He said NIU's physical space makes it difficult to have non-U.S. persons on-site every day but if NIU had an unclassified satellite campus nearby, Five-Eyes researchers could work between the two locations. What thrilled Dr. Markin most was the perspectives that the Five-Eyes partners would bring, because they approach things differently. He opined that the United States oftentimes views itself as a steady constant but that other countries view America as dynamic.

His thinking is that the Five-Eyes partners could help the United States better understand the analytical space between differing world views.

Dr. Markin was enthusiastic when he said, "Imagine the possibilities. Imagine Australian and New Zealand research fellows working with us on issues related to mainland Southeast Asia. Archipelagic Southeast Asia also becomes a possibility now because they are really the subject matter experts." He went on further to say the unique perspective the United Kingdom would offer on Europe would be one of a kind and he acknowledged the United States could benefit from Canada's knowledge of the Arctic, which is a national security issue for both countries.

Interviewers: Do you have any closing thoughts on Five-Eyes intelligence education?

Five-Eyes Partners: Dr. Kennedy posited that an important first step in the joint planning process is getting a common understanding of what the Five-Eyes partners want to achieve. What is important to each country? He asked will studying East Asia be as important to the other partners as it is to Australia and will it be part of the

academic curriculum? Lt Col Stephens questioned if the curriculum would only support the “warfighter”? He feels that it is time to register the importance of the “peace-makers” who also operate at the strategic level. This could be a shift in the intelligence community’s mindset. In closing, Dean Hammersen stated, “Five-Eyes intelligence education will likely be an evolutionary process, as the participants become more comfortable with the concept and the resulting relationships.”

Interviewers: Major General Howard, where do you see the Five-Eyes intelligence education joint planning effort now and where do you see it going in the future?

Major General Howard Remarks: After hearing the question put forward to him, Major General Howard paused and responded, “The Five-Eyes intelligence education joint planning effort is nowhere near perfect but nowhere near stationary either. The train is on the way but not sure we’ve agreed on the destination. I think somewhere in the middle is the right answer.” He then began discussing the challenges of classification issues, citing the example of a currently-serving FVEY intelligence officer who, years earlier, had been a fully-integrated intelligence analyst in an American intelligence agency, with full access to US systems and data. Today, such an assignment would not be possible. He went on to state “We are in retrograde. The Five-Eyes partners have been working together since WW II sharing intelligence and flying on Lancaster bombers together, and many other endeavors since then. What happened? Education could be what brings us back together.”

Major General Howard said there are three fundamental pillars to success: Experience, Exposure, and Education. Experience is gained with time as a practitioner. Exposure allows someone to appreciate multiple perspectives. This can be achieved by taking assignments in other countries or organizations. Exposure complements experience. However, he concluded by saying education is essential and brings it all together. He believes that’s where NIU can help.

The National Intelligence University can ensure the analytical rigor required shows up in the classroom and put the Five-Eye partners on a path to a common vocabulary in the intelligence profession, but he insisted it must be an agile and adaptive approach.

Major General Howard strongly believes in cross-pollinating the workforce, using his own experience as a Pathfinder platoon commander in both NZ and the UK as an example. He offered up the idea that future students could possibly receive “Five-Eyes joint duty assignment” credit like the joint duty assignment credit NIU full-time students currently receive. He ended by saying, “There are opportunities, but it may require deep cultural changes. Education is how we diversify analytical thoughts and mindsets and build the next generation of intelligence professionals.”

Interviewers: Major General Howard is invested in NIU and the Five-Eyes intelligence education joint planning effort. He has lectured students in the certificate and degree granting programs since taking over as the Defense Intelligence Agency’s second Deputy Director for Commonwealth Integration on January 20, 2018.

Speaking via video to a conference in San Diego, Dr. Scott Cameron, president of the National Intelligence University, stated “One of my main themes... was that delivering a truly joint, Five-Eye approach to accredited, intelligence-based higher education [requires] us to build the full breadth of partnerships with you that reflect your perspectives, your investments, and subject matter expertise in intelligence and national security based education, research and scholarship as well as the academic and public/private partnerships that strengthen our ability to educate and develop our next generation of leaders. Given that intelligence-based education is one of the priorities of our Five-Eye strategic plan, I’m pleased to say that the process of building out the foundations of our broader academic partnerships is already well underway thanks to the efforts of the Joint Planning Group, which is

aggressively pursuing an inventory of the relevant assets, programs, and resources in each of our nations. By having that collective understanding of the best minds among us — the academics, subject matter experts, researchers, and thought leaders — across our five nations, we can proceed to use those assets as building blocks in a truly joint educational endeavor.”

There are some who hold that Five-Eyes intelligence education is already happening, pointing to NIU’s Strategic Warning and East Asia certificate programs. Others believe that integrated Five Eye students, and faculty, into the degree granting programs and research fellowopportunities are the ultimate gauge of success. Both positions illustrate that Five-Eyes intelligence education could serve as a critical piece to meeting the 2019 National Intelligence Strategy’s Enterprise Objective 6 which “seeks to enhance intelligence through partnerships.”

To date, only one Five-Eyes student has graduated with a degree from the National Intelligence University. Major General Steve Meekin, AM (Retd), was an Australian officerassigned to DIA over 30 years ago. He took classes on a part-time basis and was awarded a Master of Science of Strategic Intelligence (MSSI) degree on December 16, 1987. Meekin would later retire as Australia’s Deputy Secretary of Defence in July 2016.

To the participants in this important endeavor, on behalf of the entire Five-Eyes intelligence community, as well as government and non-government academics everywhere that are eager to assist, thank you for your time and for sharing your thoughts and ideas. We wish you all the best as you continue your work on the Five-Eyes intelligence education joint planningeffort.

References

- Cameron, C., Bradley, K., and Arzan, T. (April 21, 2017). Five eyes at 70: Where to from here?, accessed on January 4, 2019, available online at: <https://www.rand.org/blog/2017/04/five-eyes-at-70-where-to-from-here.html>.
- Department of Defense (May 21, 2018). *Five-Eyes Intelligence Education Overview*.
- Marr-Johnson, P., and Vandenberg, H. (March 5, 1946). British-U.S. communication intelligence agreement, available online at: <https://www.nsa.gov/news-features/decclassified- documents/ukusa/>.