

Unit 5

Comparative Intelligence Systems – US, Russia, Europe, and China

Fundamentals of Intelligence: History and Theory

MASSIVE OPEN ONLINE COURSE (MOOC)

Project N. 2023-1-IT02-KA220-HED-000161770

ANALYST - A New Advanced Level for Your Specialised Training

Alessandro Vivaldi



Comparing Intel System

- Not all intelligence organizations are the same – they reflect their nation's political system, history, and strategic needs. In this unit, we compare how some major powers approach intelligence. We'll see differences in structure (how agencies are organized and controlled), in strategic focus (what they prioritize), and in methods (for example, levels of transparency or aggression in operations). Understanding these differences helps analysts anticipate how various countries might behave and also highlights that “intelligence” is a broad practice not monolithic worldwide.



United States

United States Intelligence Community: The U.S. has a **decentralized intelligence community** with multiple agencies specializing in different types of intelligence, all coordinated (imperfectly at times) under a central framework. Key agencies include the **CIA** (external human intelligence and analysis), **NSA** (signals intelligence and cybersecurity), **FBI** (domestic security intelligence and counterintelligence), **DIA** (Defense Intelligence Agency, focusing on military intel), and several others (geospatial, reconnaissance, etc.).



United States

As of the mid-2000s, a Director of National Intelligence (DNI) oversees and coordinates these agencies. U.S. intelligence culture historically emphasizes technological collection (satellites, surveillance systems) and has massive resources. The U.S. has also placed a strong emphasis on **intelligence oversight** – e.g., congressional committees that review intel activities to ensure they stay within legal bounds, a practice that grew after scandals in the 1970s. In recent decades, U.S. intelligence has faced challenges adapting to **new threats** (terrorism, cyber warfare) and integrating information across agencies (e.g., before 9/11, the lack of info-sharing between FBI and CIA was a problem). Current priorities include counterterrorism, cyber defense, monitoring great power rivals (Russia/China), and counter-proliferation (stopping WMD spread).



Russia and former USSR

- Russia's intelligence system has its roots in the Soviet era and even earlier (the Tsarist secret police). During the Soviet period, the KGB was a powerhouse – combining foreign espionage, counterintelligence, and internal security under one roof. The KGB engaged in classic espionage (spies in Western governments), active measures (influence operations, disinformation), and strict domestic surveillance. After the Soviet Union collapsed, the KGB was split in the 1990s primarily into the SVR (Foreign Intelligence Service) for external espionage, and the FSB (Federal Security Service) for domestic security and counterintelligence. The GRU (military intelligence) also remains a major player, carrying on from Soviet times. Modern Russia's intelligence approach is often characterized as aggressive and chess-like – they excel at human intelligence operations (cultivating agents, as seen in various spy cases) and have revived active measures (for example, cyber disinformation campaigns in other countries).



Russia and former USSR

- Russian intelligence also plays a big role in statecraft: President Putin, himself a former KGB officer, leans on intelligence services both for internal stability (the FSB keeping a lid on dissent) and external influence. We see Russian intelligence implicated in things like election interference abroad, cyber hacks, and even targeted poisonings of dissidents – indicating a high tolerance for risky operations. Russia’s agencies are less openly accountable than Western ones, given the autocratic tilt of the government; their successes and failures are harder to gauge from the outside, but historically they have had notable successes (stealing nuclear secrets in the 1940s, for instance) and infamous failures (agents defecting to the West, etc.).



Europe and the EU

- Europe is diverse – each country has its own intelligence system shaped by its government structure. For example:

United Kingdom: The UK's model influenced many others. It has MI6 (foreign intel), MI5 (domestic security), GCHQ (signals intelligence), and others, functioning under a parliamentary oversight system. The UK has a long tradition of intelligence (as we saw historically) and works very closely with the U.S. (the "Five Eyes" alliance: US, UK, Canada, Australia, New Zealand share intelligence heavily).



Europe and the EU

- Europe is diverse – each country has its own intelligence system shaped by its government structure. For example:

France: France's services include the DGSE (external intel) and DGSI (internal security). French intelligence has a reputation for being very autonomy-seeking and sometimes industrially focused (there have been cases of economic espionage linked to France). They also have military intelligence units. Oversight is increasing but traditionally they had a lot of executive branch control.



Europe and the EU

- Europe is diverse – each country has its own intelligence system shaped by its government structure. For example:

Germany: Germany, given history, built in strong oversight and legal constraints to its intel after WWII. The BND (foreign intel) and BfV (domestic) plus a couple of others operate under strict laws to protect citizen rights (a reaction to Nazi and Stasi abuses). Germany also is cautious on international operations, though they do participate in allied efforts (e.g., in Afghanistan).



Europe and the EU

- Europe is diverse – each country has its own intelligence system shaped by its government structure. For example:

Other Europe: Smaller countries have smaller services, often focusing on regional issues. Italy, Spain, the Nordics, etc., each have multiple agencies too. Cooperation within Europe can be tricky – there's no single "EU intelligence agency". There is some coordination (e.g., Europol for law enforcement intel sharing, the EU Intelligence and Situation Centre for sharing insights among diplomats, and NATO's intelligence fusion for military matters). But Europe's fragmentation means intelligence often stays at national level. This fragmentation can be a vulnerability – for example, one country might have information on a terrorist suspect that doesn't get to another country in time due to bureaucratic or trust issues. That said, in areas like counterterrorism and counterintelligence (especially against common adversaries like Russian espionage), European agencies do collaborate through formal and informal networks.



Challenges in the EU Intel

- The diversity of priorities is one challenge – e.g., a country like Poland might be very focused on the Russian threat, while Spain might be more focused on North Africa and migration issues. Sharing intelligence also requires trust; historically, some European nations have been wary of sharing their deepest secrets even with neighbors (except in tight groups like Western Europe during the Cold War or now within NATO to an extent). Language barriers, legal differences (what's allowed in one country might be illegal in another) and occasional political disputes make a truly unified European intelligence system difficult. The closest thing to a unified effort is through NATO for military threats and ad-hoc task forces for specific problems.



China

- China's intelligence structure reflects the Chinese Communist Party's emphasis on state security and its global ambitions. The primary civilian agency is the Ministry of State Security (MSS), which handles domestic counterintelligence and foreign espionage (akin to a combined FBI/CIA role). The MSS is known for focusing on political and economic intelligence – for instance, gathering scientific and technological information from other countries to boost China's development, which many countries label as economic espionage. On the military side, the People's Liberation Army (PLA) has its own intelligence departments – including the PLA's Intelligence Bureau and the Strategic Support Force (which likely handles cyber and technical intel). China's approach heavily leverages the global Chinese diaspora and extensive cyber espionage. Cases of industrial espionage by China are numerous, targeting everything from defense secrets to corporate R&D.



China

CHINA'S INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM

- Internally, China maintains strict surveillance through its security organs – including advanced use of technology (facial recognition, internet monitoring) to prevent dissent. Culturally, Chinese intel often plays a long game (patiently cultivating sources), and they blur the lines between civilian and military, and between state and corporate – many Chinese companies can be tasked to support intelligence collection (e.g., providing data access).



China

- Key focus for China includes: gaining technological know-how, monitoring political developments that affect the Communist Party's hold on power, tracking U.S. and allied military activities in Asia, and supporting China's economic initiatives worldwide (like Belt and Road projects) by assessing host countries. Cyber intelligence and cyber operations are a major arena – China is considered one of the most active actors in hacking for intelligence. Chinese intelligence successes are often not publicized, but one example is their ability to roll up CIA spy networks in China around 2010 (they identified and arrested or executed several alleged CIA assets – indicating a strong counterintelligence effort).

