

# CHALLENGES FOR THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY

Fasial Mir & Zulfqar Khan\*

## Abstract

*The nature of national security threats faced by the Intelligence Community (IC) is multidimensional, complex, and requires historical and present-day perspectives. Moving from the Cold War into a multipolar world order, intelligence networks must now contend and penetrate the world of non-state actors and transnational networks that threaten the internal security of a state. Nevertheless, these new developments transform the understanding of the state's sovereignty into a multidimensional phenomenon. The increased dependence on the continental approach to analysis post 9/11 resulted in an optical imbalance, a contradiction of security and societal rights. These factors, however, imply that the Intelligence Community should always remain ethical and that public trust is of utmost importance for its effectiveness. As such, reform and inter-agency collaboration to deal with these interrelated challenges are critical to ensuring and maintaining national security in the broader social and political environment. The reflective paradigms proposed here call for flexibility and responsibility in resolving the rapidly evolving global population problems.*

**Key Words:** Intelligence Community, Cooperation, Intelligence Policy, Intelligence landscape, Adaptability

## Introduction

Globalization<sup>1</sup> has impacted the state structure, including the various functions of the state's intelligence mosaic. It has appeared as a significant challenge that enhanced the need for integration or coordination as the key to accomplishing the correct end state. In particular, the 9/11 incident underscored the gaps in the contemporary intelligence community in ensuring timely information sharing and addressing the gaps within the domestic intelligence framework.<sup>2</sup> The definition of intelligence in today's context goes beyond the traditional scope of the intelligence community and includes other players who are out to achieve particular objectives.<sup>3</sup> Such actors acquire intelligence and employ information technologies to optimize their intelligence systems. The intelligence community is facing new challenges, which include terrorism, sub-national movements with the support of non-state actors or proxies, cyber threats, and disinformation campaigns that undermine national security.

---

\*Mr Fasial Mir is working in National Institute of Intelligence and Security Studies (NIISS). He is currently pursuing his Ph.D. from the Department of Strategic Studies, National Defence University, Islamabad and Professor Dr Zulfqar Khan is former Dean of FCS National Defence University, Islamabad, Pakistan. The authors' email address is faisal440@gmail.com

The intelligence community comprises diversified components: federal agencies, state or provincial intelligence frameworks, military intelligence units, and other specialized organizations, which function across various activities. The purpose of this mosaic is to protect a state's national interests and security. In the current intricate security environments, a state's intelligence framework oversees national security, irrespective of a stated or declared national intelligence policy. The policy aims to articulate the fundamental purpose of intelligence, specifically elucidating the what, why, and how of a task—the 'raison d'être' of intelligence.<sup>4</sup>

The article explores the evolution of the intelligence community (IC) and its challenges due to the evolving nature of threats in the 21st century. The research would also examine the effects of political polarization on the intelligence community and its impediments. Finally, it would offer a resolution on how the intelligence community should be prepared to tackle a state's contemporary challenges in this new millennium.

### **Evolution of the Intelligence Community**

China significantly used intelligence throughout recorded history from 6000 B.C.E. to 220 C.E. The state employed spies disguised as merchants, academics, and ordinary residents. Sun Tzu regarded intelligence as "foreknowledge" and maintained that military leaders who effectively employed spies in statecraft accomplished high levels of success. In the Napoleonic era, diplomatic officials frequently assumed the roles of informants while acting as representatives for their sovereigns and chief executives.<sup>5</sup>

The transformation in intelligence support from World War I to World War II marks the shift from a 'military strategy' to an 'operational art,' logic, or effectiveness, which is new relative to previous practices. The development from primitive information collection approaches towards advanced, orderly, and synthesized intelligence systems fundamentally changed how nations prepared for, fought, and strategized a war<sup>6</sup>. The outcomes of World War I were monumental failures that taught the global military authorities to change their philosophy towards planning the war and prioritizing intelligence collection and analysis, along with coordination between the agencies.<sup>7</sup>

The intelligence domains witnessed a change in the 21st century due to the alteration of technology, globalization, and the emergence of contemporary and hybrid threats, which changed the aspects of national security. The application of advanced data collection and analysis systems redefined the bounds and features of intelligence work. Furthermore, the significance of collaboration and coordination amongst agencies marks another crucial shift as an answer to more complex and globalized threats.<sup>8</sup>

## **National Security and Intelligence Community**

National security encompasses the intricate workings of a nation's protection from both internal and external threats to the citizens' security and the nation's credibility<sup>9</sup>. However, modern national security has become much more complicated, requiring a thorough understanding of an evolving intelligence and its environment as constantly changing technical and geopolitical factors combine to ensure that states achieve their interests. The significant shift in the intelligence paradigm is further aggravated by the overwhelming rise of cyber threats that require more than conventional responses but a preemptive and aggressive solution. The transnational dynamics also skew the focus of the intelligence communities because the state's authority is contested; even non-state actors, splinter groups, and international networks that operate outside of traditional state forms can assert themselves into spheres of global politics and security in a flash manner.

The dimensions of the national security crises precipitated by the 9/11 attacks were numerous, both at the national and international levels, which called for a rethinking of the whole concept of national security<sup>10</sup>. After the events, the focus of the US government shifted to both domestic and foreign challenges, with particular emphasis on the new asymmetric warfare attacks posed by terrorism and other non-state actors. The need to secure vital assets while restraining civil liberties in the name of surveillance and counterterrorism measures poses an intricate problem that demands setting priorities. Towards this end, it has become necessary to strengthen international cooperation to fight terrorism and secure international peace and security, thus making us ask how such cooperation can be effectively organized. National security, militarily mainly focused on defense against external attacks, today has transformed into a more comprehensive approach that encompasses cyber terrorism, among other aspects. The emphatic addition of the revised strategy acknowledged the nature of contemporary threats, including their complexity, and the corresponding necessity for complexity in the response, which thus raised societal resilience in dealing with vulnerabilities created by the attacks.

Intelligence agencies are critical to national security as they protect the nation from any potential threat that would harm the country. According to this view, the flexibility and speed of the intelligence services contribute to the maintenance of national security in a complicated environment where the capability to adapt and foresee is needed to meet the demands of a fast-changing globe; this is to protect the country and her people while pragmatically attempting to balance freedom and security. Likewise, the connection between national security and intelligence is a key aspect of governance.

The intricate combination of engaging in an intelligence cycle of operation and national security policy empowers a system of mitigating different threats and spotting gaps in the system. The relationship is the one that, in the first place, consigns defensive actions, rather than waiting for the threat to occur, to be the primary focus, built on extensive investigation and concrete proof.

### **Intelligence's Role in Shaping National Security**

The role of intelligence is becoming paramount in ever-changing global perspectives of national security, given the changing face of national security challenges. Intelligence has multiple uses; it not only serves to caution national policymakers about global and regional risks and threat developments but also helps formulate a preventive and anticipatory doctrine of a national security strategy that addresses future predicaments, working to dilute the harm of more potential threats. In developing a strategy against the complex new challenges of great power competition between states, terrorist threats, and cyber threats, the intelligence community of nations needs to evaluate the means and methods of advanced information gathering and processing technologies that will give effective results to address the new threats. Pursuing such capabilities increases the difficulty of achieving privacy and freedom in terms of the political system, especially in liberal democracies where the struggle between personal freedom and safety is the order of the day. The uncontrolled expansion of digital extraction devices increases the tendency to violate the rights of individuals while protecting the state from external influences<sup>11</sup>.

### **Interplay between Intelligence and Policy Makers**

The relationship between intelligence services and policymakers in a state is complicated and contains several layers<sup>12</sup>. The two entities are of tremendous importance when making decisions and creating policies that determine a state's direction. The essence of this cooperation is the sharing of critical information and the policymakers' use of the wisdom derived from the intelligence community. Security agencies work together to analyze and provide the government with processed relevant information. Decision-makers are required to carry out effective policies and make appropriate decisions based on the intelligence provided to tackle the problems and prospects of the state<sup>13</sup>. In politics, the intelligent integration of facts and active imaginations within a political framework is vital for mature leadership, decisive responses, and efficient policy development, especially where societies face multi-dimensional threats and need to be carefully considered.<sup>14</sup>

Intelligence is a foundational element that shapes and influences policy directions by providing critical analysis and actionable insights to guide leaders in their choices.

## **Evolving Dynamics of Conflict and Intelligence**

The peculiar relationship between intelligence frameworks and conflict dynamics underwent tremendous alteration in the age of globalization due to the changing character of global threats and developing technologies. Understanding these dynamics requires the intelligence mosaic to change its approaches since the traditional models that emphasize the state as the dominant actor are less helpful in addressing the challenges of non-state and asymmetric threats. The rise of digital communication provides a more difficult context; it allows both the state and non-state actors to fight and make the fight more complicated, which seems to call for more knowledge of information warfare and cyber capabilities.

The increasing number of non-state actors and the proliferation of proxies<sup>15</sup>. Organizations, in particular, pose notable challenges to the intelligence community. It has raised the most serious doubts over the relevance of classical security paradigms to such new circumstances. Non-state actors and proxies are often organized along ethnic or social lines and operate independently of political boundaries. Due to their autonomy, the traditional security structures based on state-centered, hierarchical orders are successfully questioning whether such paradigms can help address today's challenges.

The evolution of the concept of information warfare<sup>16</sup> and its application in conflicts has revolutionized the operational framework of the intelligence community. Such synergies between intelligence operations and information warfare enhance the actor's situational awareness, making it possible to respond more effectively and gain advantages in the issue of conflict resolution. In today's world, adversaries also purposefully employ digital platforms and social networks to launch cyberattacks and conduct disinformation operations. It is underscored by hybrid and proxy warfare, all aimed at gaining a strategic edge while remaining under the threshold of war<sup>17</sup>. As a result, intelligence institutions face a significant problem distinguishing between accurate and false information as they deal with these evolving threats.

## **Contemporary Challenges for the Intelligence Community**

The recent changes in the methods of warfare and the global political confrontations have posed several problems for the world's intelligence, particularly concerning the asymmetric threats and the intricate ways of dealing with the civilian population.

Technology has transformed intelligence while introducing complex challenges involving state and non-state actors. The application of contemporary state tools to intelligence operations blurs the traditional lines. The intelligence community operates in a highly volatile, uncertain, and complex world order. Innovative changes in modern threats due to terrorist activities and espionage in the 21st century have made improving the intelligence community's diversity all the more critical.

### **The Influence of Political Polarization on Intelligence**

Political polarization targeting every individual's political, social, and cultural aspects has started to penetrate the architecture of systems prevailing in a state and, therefore, threatens not only the welfare of the society but also the development of various fields, including intelligence<sup>8</sup>. Political philosophies and conflicts have entered the intelligence community and become barriers to ensuring claims of impartiality and objectivity. Such factors degrade the quality of the analytical products prepared by the intelligence services structures and almost completely disarm the policy-makers who need timely and competent assessments of a neutral nature. Besides, creating a policing environment where partisan narratives dominate public discussion helps to obfuscate rational levels, in-depth dialogues, and policy among all actors of intelligence assessments.

### **Absence of National Intelligence Policy and Strategy for the Intelligence Organization**

The intricate nature of modern security environments has compelled the requirement for a national intelligence approach under a defined policy and strategy. Such an approach facilitates a focus on risks and an assessment of available tools, thereby necessitating the coordinated engagement of many stakeholders<sup>9</sup>. Without a coherent structure, intelligence bodies' effectiveness, capacities, and engagement within a complex security environment can be significantly compromised. The policies act as primary mechanisms whereby intelligence collection, analysis, and dissemination are organized and performed within the persistence of changing threats and interests of the nation. The absence of cohesive and systemic policy and strategy makes most intelligence organizations operate as silos which leads to inadequate coordination in the exchange of information and the analysis process. It may create large cracks in the necessary data exchange to protect the nation's security. Given the realities of the current technological age and shifting geopolitical factors, the existence of gaps between those states with established national policies and strategies on intelligence and other states that require formulating a policy approach is inarguable.

## **Inter-agency Collaboration and Cooperation**

The integrative nature of collaboration<sup>20</sup> and coordination among multiple agencies within intelligence communities has offered many benefits, but has posed a national security risk. Information from several contexts, including Nigeria's military campaigns, indicates that certain traits, such as severe superiority nuances and a lack of inter-agency cooperation, inhibit information exchange<sup>21</sup>. These challenges discourage optimal countermeasures to imminent threats and further stress the structural inadequacies in coordination with operations that can ultimately thwart the ultimate aim of national security. Moreover, the pattern of image building of intelligence agencies, which is rising in number, has not only created a demand for them to be more responsible and open but also presented room for risks.

## **Transparency and Accountability**

In a democracy, the operational activities of intelligence agencies must be accountable and transparent, guaranteeing responsible and accountable procedures for their operational activities<sup>22</sup>. The concepts of intelligence accountability extend to the performance of duty, the need for clarity and even-handedness, reporting and keeping records, and proper independent control that should never cease. The necessity of robust accountability mechanisms in the overall structure of democratic governance and the critical role they play become evident as the intelligence agencies navigate the complex trade-offs between national security and individual liberties. In today's environment, where the intelligence community faces intensified scrutiny, public accountability and acceptability concepts have emerged as substantial obstacles. There is a growing demand for the intelligence community to justify its actions or decisions since more people are now aware of and conscious of surveillance systems. Public distrust makes the agency's work effective, making it necessary to put more stringent accountability measures in place that align with the requirements of democracy.

## **Misinformation and Disinformation: A Dilemma**

Misinformation and disinformation are on the rise, and in turn, this becomes a huge concern for the intelligence community as it certifies challenging alterations in the conventional modes of verification and assessment of information. The use of social networking as a tool to source information and spread untrue information makes matters even worse. The advancement of social networking sites and the means to communicate digitally has sped up the rate at which information is spread throughout the globe; now, with just a click, one has access to a majority of information.

However, that very same environment also fostered the advancement of misinformation and disinformation, which hindered the ability of society to authenticate information found on the internet. Adversaries increasingly use the cyber manipulation of actors' disinformation to influence actors' thoughts and actions. The intelligence community comes face to face with many ethical dilemmas that arise from the duty to combat disinformation and misinformation. The Spread of Misinformation is a threat to democracy and public trust, which in turn showcases the risks of technological advancement.<sup>23</sup>

### **The Impact of Bureaucratic Culture on Collaboration**

The socio-political customs that nurture inter-agency relations among the intelligence community members also coexist with barriers that hinder joint efforts on the tasks. In particular, the type of interagency cooperation renders necessary the ability to withstand the bureaucratic traditions that support hierarchies rather than collaborative networks. The soiling tendency reinforced by bureaucratic culture infuses a sense of tunnel vision whereby intelligence agencies operate with minimal communication or cooperation<sup>24</sup>. Within the intelligence community, inter-agency efforts are endowed with significant risks due to deep-seated bureaucratic cultures. It creates barriers to the timely and efficient exchange of vital information and perception resources that catalyse interaction to realise set goals. Such insulations suppress creativity and flexibility as people now tend to become clannish and less willing to venture outside the agency's walls, which in turn abdicates the very essence of collaboration needed to address complex issues.

### **Preparing the Intelligence Community for Present-Day Challenges**

The intelligence community has witnessed tremendous transformation and structural adjustments due to the need to confront the constantly changing makeup of internal and foreign threats. The intelligence organizations were initially established to support conventional forces in any military conflicts. However, the intelligence community modified its base and design of operations to manage national security issues like evolving terrorism, hybrid threats coupled with cyber, and the expanding role of non-state actors. Given the rapidly changing technological landscape, the intelligence community must effectively adapt to address contemporary challenges.

## **Defining Policies that Reflect the 'Need to Share' and 'Cooperation'**

Policymaking for intelligence requires a new attitude towards information management that emphasizes a 'need to share' culture rather than a compartmentalized approach. In times when terrorism, insurgencies supported by proxies, information wars, and cyber warfare are global challenges, intelligence agencies must improve collaboration across governmental departments and with private organizations to bypass mass bureaucratic obstinacy. Appropriate policies should go hand in hand with the pledges to eliminate silo-minds that obstruct vital intelligence, which might spell disaster regarding time or comprehension. Those policies should not only enhance the degree of openness and accessibility of documentation but also highlight the imperative of the agencies to provide actionable intelligence within appropriate time frames. The intelligence community does have room to enhance efficiency in operations against various challenges if the principles of collaboration<sup>25</sup> and collective security are adopted. Still, the issues of the right to know must be carefully dealt with.

## **Transforming Skill-based Intelligence Community with Academic Uplift**

The increasing global interdependence and the emergence of unconventional adversaries have reshaped the dynamic and unpredictable global landscape<sup>26</sup>. In realigning its priorities, the intelligence community must interconnect academic growth and skill enhancement to counter emerging national security threats. The change requires a leap into advanced education and cross-disciplinary approaches to ensure critical thinking, structured analytical techniques, and flexibility among intelligence community members, which is the frontline defense against complex security threats. Following the 9/11 incident, the world realized the urgency of changing the intelligence workforce's demographics from skill-based to academic-based. As a result, degree programs designed to suit the diverse facets of the intelligence community were initiated as a key approach to responding to the multifaceted demands of the 21st century. However, the intelligence institutions in developing countries are yet to formulate a policy to enhance the intelligence community's capabilities with critical academic skills necessary to maneuver the intricate web of concepts within modern intelligence, especially the non-state actors and asymmetric warfare encompassing much more than mere strategizing. In Pakistan, the Federal Cabinet contemplated and approved the establishment of the National Institute of Intelligence and Security Studies (NISS) at Quaid-i-Azam University due to a deficiency in the academic growth of the National Intelligence Community and the needs of contemporary times.<sup>27</sup> The institute will impart knowledge at undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate levels, augmenting understanding of various facets of intelligence<sup>28</sup>.

## Enhancing Inter-Agency Collaboration

To achieve national security objectives, institutional reforms are needed for the complex inter-agency network and the interpersonal relations between the agencies involved in these endeavors. The challenges to working together effectively and efficiently are often found in the mediocre culture of being the best, which breeds more competition than collaboration. Furthermore, there is a severe lack of mutual comprehension of each other's roles and responsibilities.<sup>29</sup> Such organizational breakdowns can severely affect combined operations and restrict the smooth flow of fundamental intelligence required for effective prevention and response measures. In addition, the intelligence community needs to recognize the possibility of misuse of counter-propaganda measures, which calls for careful balance in public relations and accountability. Therefore, the need to promote a culture of trust through engagement, training, and setting common goals is essential. This approach improves inter-agency unity and enhances the level and quality of interaction and collaboration. In 2020, the government of Pakistan approved the formation of the National Intelligence Coordination Committee (NICC) to strengthen coordination and optimize intelligence agencies' capabilities. The committee aims to clarify agencies' roles in Pakistan and would give "the prime minister collated intelligence input".<sup>30</sup>

## From Intuitive to Structured Estimates: A Transformation

The establishment of analytical methods within the intelligence community has evolved from the older models to more systematic ones aimed at combating contemporary problems with increased precision. The term intuitive estimates appears to have been primarily descriptive of the use of personal instinctive judgment in informed decisions, which more often than not generated inconsistent results and fluctuating estimates that ought to be more invested in further making informed decisions. Consequently, there has emerged a culture of 'bias' where dependence on one's intuition becomes overwhelming because different analysts' understanding of a complex situation, given their various backgrounds and experiences, may distort the result and weaken the intelligence assessment provided. Structured analytics, on the other hand, offer some overarching frameworks that increase the trustworthiness and the accuracy of intelligence assessments, providing, in most cases, a richer understanding and actionable intelligence needed during critical times. The substitution of concomitant and heuristic strategies by systematic and structured estimates in quantitative intelligence analysis has led to significant technical progress in solving complex international relations problems.

The insertion of formal abstraction in the work processes of intelligence community members is connected with an estimation of their contribution to the comprehension of available data and making conclusions. Notably, post-9/11 changes highlight the use of estimative intelligence by emphasizing the application of structural analytic tradecraft standards to strengthen analytical rigor and better communicate ambiguity to decision-makers.<sup>31</sup>

### **Balancing Ethics and Legislation for Transparency**

The intricate interplay between ethics and law has a profound effect on the operations of the intelligence community. While the intelligence agencies of the developed world have various laws that guide their operations, these must balance the nation's security and the citizens' liberty. These frameworks define what sort of behavior is deemed appropriate and make the officer concerned responsible, thereby averting any possible abuse of that power. Similarly, ethics encases the intelligence community and its members and affects them and society. One of the vital issues regarding trust between intelligence agencies and the people they serve is transparency. It enables the determination of the appropriate standards of intelligence practices regarding ethical considerations. The lack of accountability and moral standards within the intelligence community is critical. Using this principle, it is possible to argue that every effort to widen access only enhances the credibility of governmental functions and makes the work of civilian society more effective. There will always be a low possibility for any abuse of power as there would be clear guidelines emphasizing ethical measures in decision-making, hence enabling a strong respect for civil liberties.

### **Dynamic Use of Strategic Communication for Narrative Building**

In modern times, the importance of the intersection of strategic communication and intelligence in solving the pervasive challenge of disinformation that states have to manage has greatly increased in the 21<sup>st</sup> century<sup>32</sup>. Strategic communication goes beyond just strengthening intelligence efforts to tell an understandable and more attractive story about a certain aspect of national security. A state's story should successfully educate both local and international audiences about such complicated issues and sources of conflict, as well as the measures to reduce them. It should also incite the audience to do a deep examination and evaluation of the materials provided to them. The existing framework for intelligence collection often remains siloed between domestic and foreign realms, making some democratic states vulnerable to insecurity due to a lack of information.<sup>33</sup>

Balancing between communications and confiding in intelligence organizations will be a hard challenge in the post-conflict period when numerous uncertainties and threats mutate the security landscape.

## **Conclusion**

The complex and diverse problems that the intelligence community has to cope with in the 21st century call for a complete reassessment of several approaches that have been adopted for a considerable time. The scope, objectives, and principles of our intelligence gathering and subsequent analysis must be altered to accommodate changing geopolitics and fast-developing technological aspects. In light of such cyber threats, disinformation, and globalization, a transition that nurtures the operationalization of modern technologies fused with accepted practices is required. Today, the intelligence community has addressed the problem of global interconnections' disintegration as an information explosion. Information saturation requires not only sophisticated analytical models but also staffing such a model with people with diverse skill sets that would help them simplify the chaos. Even so, such solutions have at most a single purpose or do it all – to ensure national security and balance of forces in the international arena. It is possible to claim that the intelligence communities of the developed world have focused on addressing the post-9/11 threat matrix and the changing dynamics they embraced. For this reason, developing country intelligence frameworks are still resolving and conceptualizing approaches to cope with the challenges of the 21st century.

## Endnotes

- <sup>1</sup> Svendsen, Adam D. M. 2012. "Intelligence and Globalization." In *Understanding the Globalization of Intelligence*, xix. Hampshire: Macmillan Publishers Limited. <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1057/9781137283313>.
- <sup>2</sup> Burch, James. 2008. "The Domestic Intelligence Gap: Progress Since 9/11?" *Homeland Security Affairs*, Proceedings of the 2008 Center for Homeland Defense and Security Annual Conference (April): 1. <https://www.hsaj.org/articles/129>.
- <sup>3</sup> Cepik, Marco, and Gustavo Möller. 2018. "National Intelligence Systems as Networks." *Air and Space Power Journal – Africa and Francophonie* 9, no. 4 (December): 3. [https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Portals/10/ASPJ\\_French/journals\\_E/Volume-09\\_Issue-4/cepik\\_e.pdf](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Portals/10/ASPJ_French/journals_E/Volume-09_Issue-4/cepik_e.pdf).
- <sup>4</sup> Schuett, Robert, and John Williams. 2024. "Intelligence in International Society: An English School Perspective on the 'Five Eyes'." *Global Policy* (March): 223. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.13362>.
- <sup>5</sup> George, Roger Z. 2022. "Intelligence and Strategy." In *Strategy in the Contemporary World*, 7th ed., edited by John Baylis, James J. Wirtz, and Jeannie L. Johnson, 146. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- <sup>6</sup> Stout, Mark. 2024. "Intelligence in the First World War." In *The Routledge History of the First World War*, 1st ed., edited by Paul R. Bartrop, 598. London: Routledge.
- <sup>7</sup> Shulsky, Abram N., and Gary James Schmitt. 2002. *Silent Warfare: Understanding the World of Intelligence*. 3rd ed. Washington, DC: Potomac Books.
- <sup>8</sup> Johnson, Loch K., and James J. Wirtz. 2023. *Intelligence: The Secret World of Spies, an Anthology*. 6th ed. New York: Oxford Press.
- <sup>9</sup> Ali, Fizza, Saqlain Haider, and Mohammad Nadeem. 2023. "Non-Traditional Security Threats in 21st Century and Its Socio-Political Impacts on Pakistan." *Journal of Social Sciences Review* 3, no. 1 (Winter): 975. <https://doi.org/10.54183/jssr.v3i1.360>.
- <sup>10</sup> Smith, Denis Fischbacher. 2016. "Framing the UK's Counter-Terrorism Policy within the Context of a Wicked Problem." *Public Money & Management* 36, no. 6 (July): 400. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2016.1200801>.
- <sup>11</sup> Miller, Seumas, Mitt Regan, and Patrick F. Walsh. 2022. *National Security Intelligence and Ethics*. Oxon: Routledge.
- <sup>12</sup> Riste, Olav. 2016. "The Intelligence-Policy Maker Relationship and the Politicization of Intelligence." In *National Intelligence Systems*, edited by Gregory F. Treverton and Wilhelm Agrell, 179. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/abs/national-intelligence-systems/intelligencepolicy-maker-relationship-and-the-politicization-of-intelligence/73FBiFE5DC59F73F791FC47EE0E5297B>.
- <sup>13</sup> Lundborg, Tom. 2023. "The Politics of Intelligence Failures: Power, Rationality, and the Intelligence Process." *Intelligence and National Security* 38, no. 5 (July): 726. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08850607.2020.1780084>.
- <sup>14</sup> Gomez, Gary. 2023. "Intelligence and Policymaking: The Opportunity for a More Collaborative Approach." *Foreign Policy* 21 (September): 29. [https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5e9f4b771eb1f4e079e6667/t/6508a1c5c4b1d2dc4b1ea4/1695064351183/fp21\\_intel\\_and\\_policymaking.pdf](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5e9f4b771eb1f4e079e6667/t/6508a1c5c4b1d2dc4b1ea4/1695064351183/fp21_intel_and_policymaking.pdf).
- <sup>15</sup> Ateş, Ahmet. 2020. "Current Challenges and Trends in Intelligence." *Güvenlik Bilimleri Dergisi* 9, no. 1 (May): 181. <https://doi.org/10.28956/gbd.736153>.
- <sup>16</sup> Clark, Mason. 2020. *Russian Hybrid Warfare*. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of War. <https://www.understandingwar.org/sites/default/files/Russian%20Hybrid%20Warfare%20ISW%20Report%202020.pdf>.
- <sup>17</sup> Bury, Patrick, and Michael Chertoff. 2020. "New Intelligence Strategies for a New Decade." *The RUSI Journal* 165, no. 4 (September): 48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03071847.2020.1802945>.
- <sup>18</sup> Nisar, Rana Danish. 2023. "Political Polarization and National Security: Challenges and Solutions." *World Geostrategic Insights* (April): 2. <https://www.wgi.world/political-polarization-and-national-security-challenges-and-solutions/>.
- <sup>19</sup> U.S. Department of State. 2021. *Office of the Director of National Intelligence: Intelligence Community Directive 204*. Washington, DC. [https://www.intelligence.gov/assets/documents/Intelligence%20Community%20Directives/ICD\\_204\\_JUL2021.pdf](https://www.intelligence.gov/assets/documents/Intelligence%20Community%20Directives/ICD_204_JUL2021.pdf).
- <sup>20</sup> Ball, Emma Jayne, Jessica Devon McElwee, and Michelle Ann McManus. 2024. "Multi-Agency Safeguarding: From Everyone's Responsibility to a Collective Responsibility." *Journal of Community Safety and Well-Being* 9, no. 2: 104. <https://doi.org/10.35502/jcswb.371>.
- <sup>21</sup> Gberinyer, Justine T., Ike Okoro, and Eric Adishi. 2024. "Criminal Intelligence Management and Joint Security Operations in Benue State: Taming the Interagency Collaboration Debacle." *Journal of Crime and Criminal Behavior* 4, no. 2 (May): 193. <https://doi.org/10.47509/JCCB.2024.v04i02.03>.

- <sup>22</sup> Constantino, Jorge, and Ben Wagner. 2024. "Accountability and Oversight in the Dutch Intelligence and Security Domains in the Digital Age." *Frontiers in Political Science* 6 (June): 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2024.1383026>.
- <sup>23</sup> Duyvesteyn, Isabelle, Ben de Jong, and Joop Reijn. 2014. *The Future of Intelligence: Challenges in the Twenty-First Century*. London and New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203071472>.
- <sup>24</sup> Cremades Guisado, Álvaro, and Henry Cancelado Franco. 2021. "Intelligence as a Bureaucratic Organization: Dysfunctions of the Weberian Model." *Colombian Journal of Military and Strategic Studies* 19, no. 34 (April): 482.
- <sup>25</sup> Chesterman, Simon. 2006. *Shared Secrets: Intelligence and Collective Security*. New South Wales: Lowy Institute for International Policy. <https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/87031/2006-03-31.pdf>.
- <sup>26</sup> Frerichs, Rebecca, and Stephen Rienzo. 2011. "Establishing a Framework for Intelligence Education and Training." *Joint Forces Quarterly* 62, no. 3: 70. [https://diwqtxtsixzle7.cloudfront.net/45358574/Establishing\\_a\\_Framework\\_for\\_Intelligenc20160504-26236-imn7c3p-libre.pdf?1462401028](https://diwqtxtsixzle7.cloudfront.net/45358574/Establishing_a_Framework_for_Intelligenc20160504-26236-imn7c3p-libre.pdf?1462401028).
- <sup>27</sup> Ministry of Planning, Development & Special Initiatives, Pakistan. 2024. *Public Sector Development Programme 2024-25*. [https://pc.gov.pk/uploads/archives/PSDP\\_2024-25\\_Final\(1100\).pdf](https://pc.gov.pk/uploads/archives/PSDP_2024-25_Final(1100).pdf).
- <sup>28</sup> Ghumman, Mushtaq. 2022. "Setting up of NIIS: Cabinet Directs QAU to Get Input from Key Stakeholders." *Business Recorder*, January 15. <https://www.brecorder.com/news/40348196/towards-boosting-foreign-investment-inflows-imf-told-how-corrupt-practices-can-be-eradicated>.
- <sup>29</sup> Gberinyer, Justine T., Ike Okoro, and Eric Adishi. 2024. "Criminal Intelligence." *Journal of Crime and Criminal Behavior* 4, no. 2: 202.
- <sup>30</sup> Mahmood, Aisha. 2020. "PM Approves Formation of National Intelligence Coordination Committee for Spy Agencies." *Business Recorder*, November 24. <https://www.brecorder.com/news/40034845>.
- <sup>31</sup> Borg, Lars C. 2022. "Reduced Analytic Uncertainty through Increased Analytic Rigour: Effects of Using Structured Analytic Techniques in Estimative Intelligence." PhD diss., Brunel University, London. <https://bura.brunel.ac.uk/bitstream/2438/24721/1/FulltextThesis.pdf>.
- <sup>32</sup> Hayward, Tim. 2023. "Intelligence Agencies' Communications with the Public." *Journal for the Critical Study of Society*, no. 2 (August): 106. <https://cdoi.org/1.2/066/000058>.
- <sup>33</sup> Burch, James. 2022. "Operationalizing Intelligence Collection in a Complex World: Bridging the Domestic & Foreign Intelligence Divide." *Global Security & Intelligence Studies* 5, no. 2: 123. <https://doi.org/10.18278/gsis.5.2.7>.