

REVIEWS AND NOTES

Company Man: Thirty Years of Controversy and Crisis in the CIA

John Rizzo, Scribner, New York, 2014, 320p.

Review by **Daniela BACHES**

A must-read according to former CIA director George J. Tenet, the *Company Man: Thirty Years of Controversy and Crisis in the CIA* is one of the many memoirs books that have been published within the last decade by former US Government officers having worked in the Intelligence field. However though, the value of this publication springs from the role its author had within the CIA throughout his 30-year long career as a lawyer and the agency's chief legal officer, which introduces the reader, whether that is neophyte, a professional or a scholar of Intelligence, to an organizational culture narrative.

Rizzo has been witnessing the evolution of the CIA and the American Intelligence community during the leadership of 11 directors and throughout key moments in the security and Intelligence modern history of the USA (from the Iran-contra scandal to waterboarding and enhanced interrogation techniques, the pre- and post-9/11 eras, and the decisions made by various presidents that marked the Intelligence-politics relationship).

His legal background provides an interesting testimony that can be used as a primary source for those who want to get a better insight into the organizational transformation of the CIA, especially with regards to the legal framework that shaped its public status. For "people are generally unaware of their own culture until they experience other cultures or are forced to make changes to their own"¹, Rizzo's insider perspective mirrors the CIA's self-awareness of its *raison d'être* and *modus operandi* within the national and international security community, and the calling into question of its praxis that led to various public controversies at home and abroad.

The CIA, as many other Intelligence organisations, is a bureaucracy, which follows and supports decision-making and the country's interests, however though, crafting its own ways among political changes and shifts.

The presentation of the CIA's transformation is made through the lenses on an individual's career evolution. Nevertheless, Rizzo's commitment

¹ A. Balogh, Z. Gaal, L. Szabo, "Relationship between organizational culture and cultural intelligence", *Management & Marketing Challenges for the Knowledge Society* (2011) Vol. 6, No. 1, p. 96

to the CIA is an important filter to the events, people and significations he recalls, many times his judgements being framed by an institutional perspective built up all along its career as the “Company Man”. The institutional relationships with the presidential administrations or the Congress inquiries, the public appreciations and the dialogue with national stakeholders, all are presented, explained and argued in favor of or against through the rather subjective lenses of a 30-year career lawyer in the service of a culture that has its own reasons and ways little accessible to outsiders.

Controversial and subjective, as well as revealing and instructive, the Company Man represents a guidebook in the Intelligence business and the culture of an Intelligence organization that negotiates its daily role, voice and actions both with itself and the many stakeholders it interacts with.

EU's Security Union Project

Daniela BACHEŞ

Since the 9/11 events, and especially starting with the 2004 attacks in Madrid, the European discourse on closer cooperation and intelligence sharing was present on the security agendas of EU leaders and MS policy makers. Yet, jihadists' movement(s) across Europe seemed to be one step ahead the national and European security and law enforcement agencies. For many theoreticians of security and Intelligence studies, explanations for limited cooperation reside, among others, in the traditional lack of confidence between states, the need of security services to protect their sources, or the competitive motivation of Intelligence organizations to preserve their informational competitive advantage.

However though, the last 2 years' terrorist attacks in Western Europe showed that the limits of coordinated fight against terrorism are also rooted in the institutional structure, as well as legal and regulatory framework that characterize national Intelligence communities. The EU security network relies on 28 national security communities, each of them being characterized by specific laws and practices that regulate the activity and interaction of Intelligence and law enforcement agencies within each country.

In March 2016, a day after the attacks in Brussels, but in the larger context of the threat that gained ground on Europe, European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker called for closer cooperation between member states to address and combat terrorism. His proposal residing in the creation of a "genuine security union" to address "the fragmentation that makes us vulnerable" was building on some keys ideas such as the shared responsibility to provide security, the need of joint use of security tools both between member states and with Europol, and the force of cooperation to protect and secure European borders².

A couple of weeks later, a press release of the European Commission was announcing that steps had been initiated towards "the achievement of an

² Discours du Président Jean-Claude Juncker à la session plénière du Parlement européen sur la lutte contre le terrorisme suite aux récents attentats. (2016, April 12). Retrieved from http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-16-1369_en.htm

effective and genuine EU Security Union – building on the *European Agenda on Security 2015-2020*.” A continuation of the former *Internal Security Strategy*, the new strategic document adopted on April 28th, 2015, represents a guiding framework to support EU MS’ better coordination in ensuring security in the global context of rising radicalization, violence and terrorism. Without affecting the States’ sovereign responsibility with regards to national security, increased coordination within a European framework becomes a need in the fight against transnational threats. As emphasized by First Vice-President Frans Timmermans, *Law enforcement authorities in all our Member States should both 'think European' and 'act European', as internal security is a shared responsibility*.³ Even more suggestive has been Migration, Home Affairs and Citizenship Commissioner Dimitris Avramopoulos, who expressed his conviction that “*The internal security of one Member State is the internal security of all Member States*”.⁴

The Security Union project has been imagined as a framework for the internal security of the community, gathering law enforcement authorities from member states in order to prevent and fight threats posed by radicalization, returning foreign terrorist fighters and their supporters by “achieving breakthroughs in information sharing, boosting resources for counter terrorism, creating a genuine digital strategy and stepping up action to prevent radicalization.”⁵

According to the “Towards a ‘Security Union’. Bolstering the EU’s Counter-Terrorism Response” EPSC Strategic Notes, the project of the Security Union is based on two key premises: “without security, there is no freedom” and “cooperation makes us stronger”. According to this manifesto explaining Junker’s design and role of the Security Union, “coordination between security services, police and judicial authorities, at the national and the European levels, is needed to reduce Europe’s vulnerability to such risks.”⁶ The operational strategy proposed by the project of the Security Union is based on three lines of action aimed at creating joint capabilities and strengthening interoperability at the EU level: (1) targeted assessment and information sharing, (2) bolstering capacity to respond, and (3) managing by anticipation.

Yet, in the aftermath of Junker’s announcement, reactions have been rather reticent about the new Commissariat, most voices considering it just another call for cooperation between MS to prevent similar deadly events

³ European Agenda on Security: Paving the way towards a Security Union. (2016, April 20). Retrieved from http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-16-1445_en.htm

⁴ *Idem*

⁵ Towards a ‘Security Union’ Bolstering the EU’s Counter-Terrorism Response. EPSC Strategic Notes, Issue 12, 2016, April 20. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/epsc/pdf/publications/strategic_note_issue_12.pdf

⁶ *Idem*

happening in the future, that lacks in adequate operational tools to effectively improve intelligence sharing or increase joint action.

Questioning about the Security Union increased at the beginning of August when Jean Claude Junker assigned the leadership of the newly created portfolio to Sir Julian King, UK's appointed commissioner after the Brexit vote. In a mission letter sent to King, Junker emphasized his future role in supporting the implementation of the European Agenda on Security, making him aware that "combatting cross-border crime and terrorism is a common European responsibility". The portfolio, and Julian King's work – if the European Parliament gives him a confirmation vote after the assessment that is planned to take place on September 12th – will be focused on the implementation of operational measures undertaken at EU level in accordance with the goals established by the 2015-2010 Agenda. Asked, during the hearing session, about his 2 priorities in the area of Security, King mentioned the strengthening of „our common fight against terrorism and organised crime, and the means that support them”, and of „our defences against terrorism and organised crime, and to build our resilience.”⁷

The Security Union's actional role in the fight against terrorism is shaped as a "contribution to national counter-terrorism efforts" residing in a coordination framework in accordance with the values of the European project, namely on cooperation grounds. Without having the force of a political establishment that moves security responsibility from national to supranational level, the Security Union is looking for greater integration and harmonization of best practices, capabilities and information that security agencies are working with, and are in need of to reduce the movement and actions of threatening factors to security within the EU borders.

⁷ Julian King, ANSWERS TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE COMMISSIONER – DESIGNATE, Retrieved from <https://polcms.secure.europarl.europa.eu/cmsdata/upload/c9fbef51-b1c6-4781-a8d9-f3cac635f800/FINAL%20written-answers-consolidated-King-07092016II.pdf>

