

*When I use a word [...] it means just what I choose it to mean — neither more nor less.
(Humpty Dumpty, by Lewis Carroll. Through the Looking Glass)*

ENGLISH INTELLIGENCE TERMINOLOGY

INTERVIEW PROF. DR. JAN GOLDMAN

Author: Ana-Maria SURUGIU*

* PhD student within the Doctoral School for Languages and Cultural Identities, Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literatures, University of Bucharest, and of the Doctoral School Intelligence and Security, "Mihai Viteazul" National Intelligence Academy, graduate of the Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literatures, University of Bucharest and the Faculty of International Relations and European Studies, Spiru Haret University, advanced intelligence instructor within ANIMV. This article is part of the PhD research paper *The Terminology of Intelligence: Lexicographic and Translation Issues*.

ABSTRACT

The present paper is an interview with Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman, a renowned professor of intelligence and security studies and author and co-author of English intelligence dictionaries. The discussion revolves around the idea that language can frame both people and concepts, considering the importance and challenges of terminology and definitions within the intelligence community. We will also explore the misunderstandings and misinterpretations of terms and the extent of their potential implications, bearing in mind the importance of clear and accurate language in the intelligence field. Given the lexicographic interest of the interviewer, Prof. Dr. Goldman will touch upon his methodology while compiling the dictionaries, highlighting the added value a glossary of intelligence terminology would bring to the Romanian intelligence community.

Keywords: terminology, intelligence, information, lexicography, dictionary, intelligence community.

Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman is a former United States Intelligence Community analyst, he is a highly experienced professional in the field of *intelligence* and security studies. Currently, he is a professor of *intelligence* at The Citadel, the Military College of South Carolina, USA. With over 35 years of experience in the US *intelligence* community, he has taught at institutions like the National Intelligence University and the FBI Academy. He is also a professor at the Faculty of Business Administration in Foreign Languages (FABIZ), at the Master of Business Intelligence, program endorsed by the Bucharest University of Economic Studies and “Mihai Viteazul” National Intelligence Academy. He specializes in various research areas such as ethics in intelligence operations, secrecy, intelligence analysis, psychological operations, intelligence in civil society, and intelligence education. Prof. Dr. Goldman is also known for organizing international intelligence conferences and holding significant editorial roles, which include, but are not limited to, editor-in-chief of the *International Journal of Intelligence and CounterIntelligence*, the founding editor for professional textbooks – *Security Professionals Intelligence Education Series* (S.P.I.E.S. at Rowman & Littlefield Publishers), and author or co-author of four *intelligence* terminology guides, namely *Intelligence Warning Terminology* (2001), *Words of Intelligence* (2006, 2011), and *Intelligence and Information Policy for National Security* (2016) (FABIZ, 2023). His new books are *Ethical Espionage: Ethics and the Intelligence Cycle* (2024), and *Ethics of Spying: A reader for the intelligence professional, volume 3* (2024).

Interview Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman March 28, 2023, Bucharest

◆ **Ana-Maria Surugiu:** Dr. Goldman, thank you for having accepted the interview! We are very honored to have you here with us today!

◆ **Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman:** Thank you for inviting me to speak for this research that you are working on!

◆ **Ana-Maria Surugiu:** Our first question would be about your four terminology guides, *Intelligence Warning Terminology* (2001), *Words of Intelligence* (2006, 2011), and *Intelligence and Information Policy for National Security* (2016) are the intelligence terminology guides that you have developed so far. Alongside other professional glossaries of intelligence terminology and similar lexicographic databases (such as NATO Standard 2-A-7, UNTerm, DOD Dictionary of Military and

Associated Terms, etc.), these lexicographic products are invaluable tools for intelligence and national security specialists. Thus far, you have given us not one, but four terminology guides that all build on each other. In your opinion, what was the most difficult challenge you faced while compiling these intelligence terminology guides?

◆ **Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman:** The first of the four guides that I have developed began on a napkin, when someone had asked me about a word I had not heard before. The word was *hugger-mugger*. I had not heard about what *hugger-mugger* was, but I was working in the intel community, and someone mentioned *hugger-mugger* and I did not know what it was. I went to the dictionary, it was not in the dictionary, so I wrote it on a napkin, and I said *I am going to look to see what this word is*. Actually, the term *hugger-mugger* is an old spy term, which means that when one agency is doing something and another intel agency is unaware of what the other intel agency is doing and, by doing this, one agency is testing the limit. So, if American intelligence was pushing Russia and so we set up false information, Russia would then see this false information thinking it was real and then suddenly alert its forces. Another intel agency would watch Russia and see that they had alerted their forces and suddenly write reports and analysis on why they are standing to be activated when, in fact, the only reason they are being activated is because we have lit the match. This is called *hugger-mugger*. So, I wrote this down, I found the information and after that there were some other words and solely, I put together this information terminology, which is free and you can download, and then I came out with *Words of Intelligence*. In the US intelligence community, we have 18 agencies that make up the US intelligence community and probably 12 of the 18 agencies have unique words to their agency. You would think in the US Intelligence community everyone would agree what intelligence is, but no. In my last book, you will see there are 5 or 6 definitions for *intelligence* and then I cite where I get them from. So, for example, the CIA would have a different definition for *intelligence* than the FBI, and the military. Everyone looks at *intelligence* differently. *Intelligence* can be a process, like: *I am doing intelligence*. Some people look at intelligence as a product: *I have received intelligence*. And so, you have either a product or a process and it gets kind of tricky. My goal was to develop one definition for one word, instead I have got one word and five definitions. That was not what I set out to do.

◆ **Ana-Maria Surugiu:** So, the most difficult challenge was to identify, to define those words so that all the intelligence agencies would relate to it and understand it, to agree on their meaning.

◆ **Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman:** That is not the case. It is obvious. This is what I take away, overall, trying to come to one meaning. In some words, this is possible, in other words this is not.

◆ **Ana-Maria Surugiu:** You said that they do not even agree on the definitions of *intelligence*. What about the distinction between *information* and *intelligence*? At least do they all agree that there are different meanings?

◆ **Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman:** When you look at the term, *information* and *intelligence* are two different words. We are surrounded by *information*, we are not surrounded by *intelligence*. But you can garner *intelligence* from *information*. For example, when you have some intel agencies, they may be part of the intelligence community, but they look at *intelligence* differently, not as *information*, but they look at it as evidence. Now the term *evidence*. *Evidence* means something has occurred which means it has occurred in the past and when you commit a crime, you collect evidence. So, you kill someone, they collect evidence and the goal here is to put you on trial so that you may go to jail. This is called *evidence*. *Evidence* looks in the past and it is based on history. To me, from someone who has been in the intelligence community for 40 years, I always look at *intelligence* as the future, to prevent something from happening. If it happens, then it is *evidence* and quite frankly there is not much we can do. But when I went to law enforcement, the FBI, when they recruited me to teach their analysts, I noticed that they were interested in evidence, the past. I am not a cop, I am not a policeman, I am an intel analyst and I look towards the future. The future is a lot harder than the past. But that is how they viewed *intelligence*. And why did they view *intelligence*? It is because the FBI is really the only agency of the 18 agencies in the US intelligence community that puts people in jail. Also, the FBI is concerned about *intelligence* because we have the Constitution and we have civil liberties, and everyone has a right for unwarranted search and seizure, so you cannot just break someone's door, this is not the Soviet Union anymore, or Russia, everyone has rights, and they are concerned about that. They are concerned about the law, and this affects how they view *intelligence* as we can see from *evidence*.

◆ **Ana-Maria Surugiu:** The editor of the second edition of *Words of Intelligence* mentioned that “this book is the culmination of five years of research and extensive interviews with intelligence analysts, collectors, and managers in the law enforcement and foreign intelligence communities” (Goldman, 2011, p.ix). On the other hand, for *Intelligence and Information Policy for National Security*, you observe not only the rational language, institutional texts, but also the culture language and

the culture clash caused by multiple meanings of the same concepts. Could you please develop a little bit the research methodology you used and in case you also employed other techniques in the creation of these two terminology guides, could you give us some examples?

◆ **Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman:** First, my background is in journalism, so I was a reporter. When I was very, very young, I got to college and I became a reporter, because I liked to write, and I liked to report. Intelligence requires communication, so journalism is extremely part of intelligence. And I tell people that if you do not like to write, you do not like words, words are pictures that you develop for your consumer who is your policy maker, then you really should not be in this business. Intelligence is all words, it is all information, it is breaking down, deconstructing this information. So, as far as the culture language clashing of rational language, I can give you an example. When we talk about *intelligence analysis*, what does the word *analysis* mean? Any ideas?

◆ **Ana-Maria Surugiu:** *Analysis* is what you *know*, as opposed to *assessment*, which is what you *think you know*. I have read it in your book.

◆ **Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman:** Good for you! Because I would say over 90% of the people do not know that. But that is a term that in some agencies, they do not make the distinction, they think *analysis* and *assessment* are the same thing. And this is why the United States went into Iraq looking for weapons of mass destruction when we did an assessment without analysis and so, looking for weapons of mass destruction that did not exist and that is because intelligence failed in their analysis. And then you look deeper, and, if you see, US intelligence did not do analysis, they did assessment. But for the administration, what they have done is that they have put those two words together and they have politicized analysis and assessment, so now they say the intelligence community failed in its assessment or its analysis of finding weapons of mass destruction when, in fact, there was no analysis. The analysis was based on one person who said: *Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction*, which was not credible, and you can say: *But what is credibility, right?* This fellow had no credibility because he had never been a source, he had never been a human intelligence source, so the fact that he had never worked for us, that we knew nothing about him and now he is telling us suddenly that Saddam Hussein has weapons of mass destruction, we are not ready to do an assessment yet, because we have satellites, we take pictures, we listen to hear what Saddam Hussein was talking about and none of that came open, none of that was available. And yet we relied on this one person who clearly was lying to us, and we quickly skipped the analysis and went straight

to assessment. And this is the problem! But 90% of the people in the intel community, I would say the agencies, they do not know the difference. I will give you another term that is confusing—the terms: *clandestine* and *covert*. *Clandestine* is something that is done secretly, and *covert* is something that is done secretly but if it is found out, there is deniability, which means you do not know who is responsible. *Clandestine* means if it is found out, you will know who is responsible. But how many times have you seen a movie where they interchanged the word *clandestine* in *covert* when it is very obvious who is responsible? They say: *we are doing a covert operation*, which means there is deniability, which means you can say we are not responsible, even though you are. That is the difference between *covert* and *clandestine*. But I watch movies all the time and they are doing clandestine action, and they are calling it covert, so you know where the public gets its meaning from.

✦ **Ana-Maria Surugiu:** The third question would be about the most important criteria you took into consideration when you compiled these dictionaries, and by criteria, I mean whether you took into consideration size, relevance, reliability, type of the dictionary, the specialists' needs maybe? Have you thought of what their needs are with respect to these dictionaries?

✦ **Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman:** Actually, I was not concerned about their needs. My need was to collect words that are relatable to intelligence professionals. What would a professional do? When I talk about professionals, I am talking about people who see themselves as in a profession, that this is their career and they want as much knowledge as possible, knowing that there are many different words and many different terms that are used in different situations so that they are at least aware. So, when you write something, you should have a sense that there may be some ambiguity, some confusion about what you are writing. Because writing wants to be clear, you do not want the policy maker, the leader, or the consumer of your products to have doubts or to misinterpret the information. So, when we started compiling the information of the last book, with Susan and myself, we would ask ourselves: where is the definition, if there is a definition, in the US Government, what documents exist and let us get that information. And what we found out was that in the US Government there were several documents that may have had several different definitions for the same word. And instead of choosing, we have put in all the information and said: this is where it is coming from. Because we cannot choose. It is very similar to, I also teach ethics and I can pose the problem, but I really cannot give you the answer. But then we would also go and see if there were any very small population of words that are being

used online, in chat rooms and so forth, that are related to intelligence, but have some meaning, but they are not official words. Those were not too much because I am not a social media, so I left that for Susan, but that was something that we have considered. Anything that an intel analyst or intel professional would come in contact with, this is what we have considered.

✦ **Ana-Maria Surugiu:** During the interviews you had with the intelligence analysts, did you ask them about how they would work with the dictionary?

✦ **Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman:** Yes. When I was at some of the institutions in the government, we would give each new employee a copy of the book, so the book that you have there, *Words of Intelligence*, when I was at the FBI Academy, since it was geared towards law enforcement, every intel analyst for the FBI received a copy of that book. And that was to help them understand that the intelligence that they are working on, evidence, is different from the rest of the community. So that is why I wrote that book. It was really for law enforcement, and as you can see in the subhead lining, it is for the domestic threat. Interesting story though, when this book was published and I was talking about developing a program for domestic intelligence that I was chastised and said *do not use that word*, because domestic intelligence means to them, the senior officials, that we spy on Americans in the US, and we do not. So, *you must stop using that term: domestic intelligence*. Really? Cause we do, cause of course, if we see that there is a crime that may be committed or could be committed, we get a warrant, we do it all legally and they say yes, and then we gather evidence to put them in jail, but that is not to be considered *domestic intelligence*, that is a no-no word. You also have to understand that, in 1947, when President Truman signed the National Security Act of 1947, he said: *I am going to sign this act*, which created the CIA, *but I have some concern, I do not want to develop a Gestapo, I am not here to create a domestic intelligence, neighbors spying on neighbors, turning them into the government, this is what it happened in Nazi Germany, we do not do that*. So, when the CIA was created, the goal was the CIA can spy all they want, but they can do foreign intelligence, but they are not allowed to do domestic. We do not do domestic intelligence, which means we do not collect on Americans, which is certainly not true, because you must collect if we are going to collect evidence, but it is called investigation, evidence, not domestic intelligence. And so, senior officials came to me and said: *Doctor Goldman, you need to take that word out, we do not use domestic intelligence*.

✦ **Ana-Maria Surugiu:** And is it still up to the present, this distinction between foreign intelligence and domestic

investigations?

✦ **Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman:** It is a big concern. Domestic intelligence wreaks of Nazism, the Soviet Union, Ceaușescu, this is domestic intelligence, we do not do that.

✦ **Ana-Maria Surugiu:** Now getting back to our questions, starting with the premise that dictionaries are utility tools (see Wiegand, 1998, 2001, Bergenholtz & Tarp, 2003), instruments that users consult in order to learn or use a word in one specific situation, we know that for the entries in *Words of Intelligence* you conducted interviews with intelligence specialists. For sure, your own professional expertise in the intelligence field carried a lot of weight in the process. How did you mix the techniques employed in the compilation of the dictionary? Would you say that it was “introspection” (based on your mental lexicon and subjective experience in the field, see Atkins & Rundell, 2008) or rather “informant-testing”, the technique that you used the most often for the selection and definition of dictionary entries and informant-testing would be a technique by which speakers of a language are questioned about their use of words?

✦ **Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman:** This is a very good question, and it shows to me that this is the weakness of my publication! So, thank you! It is mostly mental lexicon and subjective expertise, and if I had to do this again, I would look at the other techniques. Clearly this is not done from a lexicon expertise, and I would say Susan Maret is probably much more qualified in that. Just as a background note, Susan's expertise as a librarian PhD doctorate is conspiracy theories. What is a *conspiracy*? And she looks at how to deconstruct conspiracy theories. I am the complete opposite, I do not look at conspiracy theories, but I thought I had from my experience to pull something together as only as a reference and as I started it on a napkin, it was only for my own use and then slowly it just grew and grew. But here is what I did do though! Because I was in the intelligence community, I did go to every agency, and I asked them: *Do you have a reference book? A lot of them said: No, we do not use a reference book, we think it is common knowledge*. But those that did have a reference book, I asked them, and I got it. And I would say that 90% of the time, even the reference books, they were unclassified, but there were 10% that were classified. I said: *These are just words, why, how can you classify?* This is where it became difficult, because even in this research of doing words you get overclassification, and the overclassification is information that you do not want the public to know when, in fact, there is no reason to classify. There are only two reasons that you classify information: sources, which is like where are you getting

this information, then you must protect your sources, and the second is called methods – how did you get this information, not who did you get the information or what satellite you used, but the means to collect it. So, sources and methods. Those are the only reasons you deal with classified information, then you have the classification series: top secret, secret, confidential. Damage, it is all based on the damage inflicted on US National Security at least for the US classification. But I would say in other countries like Romania, it is the same thing. How badly will this damage our security? So, given all that, and given classified, trying to find the common and then looking at the official, it would have been way too much for me to try to come up with and I just said no, I am going to just, based on my experience, based on the words I see, this is what I am going to. I think *Words of Intelligence* is a very good book because it is very succinct, it is to the point. The other book that you got is much broader and I think there are some words, they are definitely Susan's words, but the reason I do not relate to them is because they are from the public. I am looking at them from an intelligence perspective. Except for that, there is no real methodology to my madness except to write this down.

✦ **Ana-Maria Surugiu:** How did your previous expertise in the intelligence field help you in your lexicographic work? Is it preferable for a lexicographer to also have, in addition to linguistic competences, professional expertise and knowledge in the intelligence field? Does this professional expertise help with the lexicographer's observation of the language in use or not (Atkins & Rundell, 2008)?

✦ **Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman:** For me, having professional expertise was a hindrance. It prevented me from seeing outside of the intel community. So, this points out to how we look at words. There are words that are used inside the intel community that are perceived differently from outside the intel community. Probably one of the terms that comes rarely to my mind is the term *torture*. How do you view *torture*? There are some, who are in human intelligence collection, who view torture different than the public would see. What is *torture*? I use it as an example: the administration and the intel who works for the administration, they can change the definition of *torture*. This is all just an example. When World War 2 ended, the US put on criminal charges, charges against humanity, human rights violations, individuals, the Japanese particularly, for torturing American soldiers. What did they do? They did this where they put someone on a board and they slowly poured water over their face until they felt like they were suffocating and this is a term which we use - *waterboarding* - and they were crimes against humanity and they were held accountable, the

Japanese. Fast forward, 65 years, US is doing the same technique, but we do not call that *torture*, because US will never torture. But it was *torture* in 1949 when we did for the Japanese, we held them, it was right after the war, 47, but now here we are after 9/11, and we are doing the same thing and it is not *torture*, no. And why is it not *torture*? Because we have a legal document, and the legal document says: *this is not torture*. Oh, so now the law defines the words. So, this is what we see, where the law's interpretation of what a word is and that is outside the public and it was a great debate. Should we be torturing? People have said to me: *What do you think?* And I said: *It has already been decided 60 years ago. So why are we having this question?*

✦ **Ana-Maria Surugiu:** That is why it is very important how you define words.

✦ **Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman:** And how you change the definition. Ultimately, a memorandum came out from the administration that said: *You know, we are going to redefine torture, waterboarding is not torture*. Instead, the Gonzales Memorandum has some absurd where it is said: for torture to occur you must lose a certain amount of blood and you must have a certain number of bones broken and this would be torture. But if you do not lose blood and you do not break bones, waterboarding and you just think you are going to die and suffocate... the water is not going to break your bones, but you may drown, but that is different. That is why it is not torture. And you think: this is crazy. But the definitions, the terms, this is why it is so important.

✦ **Ana-Maria Surugiu:** Indeed. Now a little about our Romanian specialists. The Romanian specialists' need to align themselves to the NATO and EU intelligence terminology, as well as the need for smoother communication with their counterparts, has led to a process of extensive borrowing from English and code-switching. How would you see this process in terms of both advantages and drawbacks to the development of the intelligence terminology? Is intervention within language, as I have seen it in your recent dictionary, an anticipatory indicator of languages' evolution, speaking of our national intelligence?

✦ **Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman:** As far as the Romanian intelligence specialists, there is no reason to reinvent the wheel, as we say. The British certainly have a lexicon of terms, which is in some ways very different from the US. I know their spelling is different. So, the fact that they spell words differently, this is where probably in your study would probably come in most handy. For example, in developing a lexicon, I do not know, and I have to be honest, for my weakness, do you use British spelling, or do you use American spelling?

✦ **Ana-Maria Surugiu:** I personally use American spelling; we do not have a national standard in respect to using British or US spelling.

✦ **Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman:** Now we have found a weakness. So, if you are going to do something in intelligence, you need to decide if you want to go with British or American spelling. It is probably 75% overlap and 25% unique. But even in that respect, taking a word like a *biscuit*. I am leaving the intel, I am just looking at the word *biscuit*. *Biscuit* in British vocabulary, vernacular, a *biscuit* is a cookie, right, they have biscuits. In the United States, *biscuits* are not cookies, *biscuits* are square pieces of bread, dough that is piled high, usually with butter and eaten for breakfast. For them, this is called the *biscuit*. Sometimes you put gravy over your biscuit. Biscuits and gravy. The British say it is a *cookie*. So, when you write the word *biscuit*, what do you mean? Because you are developing your Service and I know you are at your 30th anniversary [ANIMV's 30th anniversary], maybe it is time you should be focusing on establishing your own language and decide if you want to go with *cookie* or *biscuit*, in what you mean. You can look at the Americans, you can look at the history, you can look at the British. Even more important is awareness since you do not have a standardized lexicon. You should establish like where you are getting this information and how it is being used even though you have said to me just now that you like the American. But if another of your colleagues says British and then, ultimately, a good profession has to have its own terminology regardless of where it is located. We are not there yet, but if Romania is to be a professional, you need to develop a professional language. Like everyone should know the difference between *analysis* and *assessment*. But I have no doubt, 90% of the students who graduate here, like in the US, think those two terms are the same. The fact you are dealing with NATO and EU, you are now talking about an international organization, so you are dealing not just with the Brits, but the French, and you know everyone else involved in NATO. And the EU, which are countries that are not in NATO. We have tried to maybe establish an international lexicon for use at the United Nations, because we give them information, we do not give them classified information, but we give them information. And I have tried to define what kind of information we can give them and what kind of words we should use that are understandable by 192 countries because that is how many make up the UN, 192 countries. Can you make a standard that includes 192 countries? I do not think so. So, you are asking me: Doctor Goldman, can we do a standard with NATO? Which has 22 countries? And then add another 30 countries to the EU and have a standard

lexicon. And I would say: why do not you just develop a standard for yourself? And not worry about those.

✦ **Ana-Maria Surugiu:** Because our specialists mostly borrow the words, such as *intelligence* and *tradecraft*, for example, and they use them as such in Romanian and, we also have some inflection morphemes attached to *intelligence* and that is why they are borrowed, but they have not been yet lexicographically attested anywhere because our intelligence literature has not reached that point so far.

✦ **Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman:** But that should not stop you because the thing is that any time that you develop a word, the word is going to have much more distribution. Like you will always be following the word. You are not going to lead the word; you will follow the word. Every year *The Oxford English Dictionary* comes out with words that we are adding to our dictionary. And they have used words which were mostly slang, words that have appeared with no permanent definition, but people knew what they meant. And so, someone collected all the terms and said: *Here is what we believe is the definition for this word, because everyone is using it*. And it would be silly for us to ignore this word when everyone is using it. So, my response to you is: if you want to develop a Romanian one, I think it would be great, because if you wait to test it and people think about it, the word is already out there, the horse has already left the barn, as we say, and now you have to go get the horse and put a saddle on it and drive it back to the barn. That is why I would have loved to have put one definition for all the words.

✦ **Ana-Maria Surugiu:** What would you do differently about the compilation?

✦ **Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman:** There are some definitions that I have given too much credence to, I have said that this is the definition when, in fact, it was very technical that very few people used it and maybe that could have been eliminated. So, I could have been more selective. I will give you an example. I am teaching a class online, back in the United States, and I had the students develop threats scenario to anticipate fighting China-Taiwan and I told them how to develop a scenario, but the thing is I talked about what are key drivers, and when you go to my book and you look under *key drivers*, it is a very technical definition and then underneath it says *see critical indicators* and you go to *critical indicators* and basically what it says is something that tells you that the scenario is occurring and it is unambiguous, which means that there is no doubt that it goes right to the scenario. I should have just written *key drivers, see critical indicators*. Instead, I had this long information and I tried to make it readable, so I talked about *key drivers* and *weapons of mass destruction* and like what was pushing

that because I could not really find a good definition, so I gave an example, which is not really very good and then it says *see critical indicators*. I should have just written *see critical indicators*. So, the bottom line is I would do it simpler.

✦ **Ana-Maria Surugiu:** Our last question would be about bilingual glossaries, to get back to our Romanian terminology. In your opinion, what is the added value a bilingual glossary of terminology in the intelligence field would bring to Romanian intelligence and national security specialists?

✦ **Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman:** I think it would be very helpful. It is helpful when you are learning words about a profession that appears in your native language. Because if you have to learn about a lexicon, and you need to learn the words and then you have to translate the words and then it loses its meaning. And I use Google translate. So, whenever I get something from Romania, sometimes my friends, they write in Romanian, I will translate it into English and then sometimes I will type it in English and translate it into Romanian for them. But sometimes it is silly. You are not getting the real information, because you are doing a transliteration, not a translation. And a transliteration is you are going word for word. When you are dealing with intelligence, and you want to be accurate, you want to be clear, you cannot do transliteration because it is a concern that if you transliterate it versus actually translate it, anyway it is going to lose its meaning and intelligence is all about meaning. So, having a properly translated, not transliterated, but a translation of what it means and to adapt it and note that it is from the British and not the US or vice-versa, it would be very helpful for the intelligence professional. If we are to become a professional and the Academy is now 30 years old, you develop your own language and your own words and there are probably things that do not need to be translated that apply directly to Romania. For example, if you come to my country, where I live in South Carolina, we have a term that is *called the low country*. I do not know what *the low country* is, but where we are located in *the low country* means where all the plantations were, this is where all of the slaves were located, where all the cotton was picked, and this is known as *the low country*. I did not know, I just knew it was called South Carolina. But if you talk to someone in law enforcement and they are looking for a criminal, they will say: *We believe the criminal is in the low country as opposed to the high country*. Well, you have just eliminated half of the state. And now I know what that means. That is the same thing I would say with a country like Romania or any country. What do your terms mean? That is not only when we talk about translation or transliteration, but we are also

talking about dialect, what words mean in a dialect. In the United States, where I come from, in New York city, you go to the store and people would call it a *grocery store*, somebody will just say a *shopping store*, some people call it a *food market*, this is all on and off. And then in the south, where do you put your groceries? They put their groceries in a *bag*. But in the south, you go to the same stores that I have mentioned, given different names, and they will put your groceries in a *sack*. So, if you are looking for someone that may have robbed the bank and they put the money in a *bag*, grocery bag or did they put it in a *sack*? So, it would be nice to differentiate or just say *grocery bag and sack are two enclosures that people put stuff in, normally food stuff, which carries in it by one foot, by two feet and it is usually made out of paper*. There is your grocery bag and there is your sack.

✦ **Ana-Maria Surugiu:** And culture knowledge, besides linguistic competence, is very important, as you gave us this example, and dialect.

✦ **Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman:** And then they get into dialect. They will tell you that that is how they are using the words. And you need to collect on that because that is how that people talk. And yet, they mean the same thing. So, if we stretch that further now and look at the United States and say *what is intelligence* and I go to Romania, and they say: *What is intelligence? Is that a process or is it a product?*

✦ **Ana-Maria Surugiu:** And is it *information* or *intelligence* into Romanian? Because we also have this discussion whether to translate it with *information*?

✦ **Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman:** Does it become *intelligence* after you translate it, because no one understands it when it is not being translated?

✦ **Ana-Maria Surugiu:** They use it as *intelligence*, most of them, they do not translate this word. They know the difference, at least most of them, because we also have some situations where we have seen that our specialists cannot tell the difference between *information* and *intelligence*, and whether to translate *intelligence* with *information* or leave it as such: as *intelligence*. It is a clear difference of meaning, but with respect to the translation we still have some discussions.

✦ **Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman:** Are you familiar with the *intelligence cycle*?

✦ **Ana-Maria Surugiu:** Yes.

✦ **Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman:** I typically ask when I teach intelligence what is the most important part of the *intelligence cycle*? If you look in my book, you will see the *intelligence cycle*, some of the US intelligence

agencies have 5 steps into the process and some have 6. Why do they have different things? When we are talking about the Intel Cycle, the FBI has 5 and the CIA has 6. It is important to know how many steps. The other thing is when we talk about the intel cycle, I always ask my students: *what is the most important part of the intelligence cycle?* And everyone looks and then people say: analysis or assessment, some will say collection, exploitation, which is when you translate. I would say: *You are all right to say that, but I will tell you the answer. The answer is number one: plans and requirements.* What does that mean? That means what are we looking for, what are the questions, besides what platforms we are going to use, what do we want answered? Because this will determine our answers, which is going to drive the words that we accumulate for our analysis and our assessment. And we have a saying in the US Intelligence Community: *garbage in, garbage out*. If you do not know what you want, and you are unclear, and you give me many words, which mean nothing, then you will get garbage out, which means you get many words that mean nothing, and you are done. And this will drive your production, your collection, your exploitation, and you will find out that this is all meaningless and now you have got to do it all over again and hopefully you will be better, you will be clearer, you will understand the words better and then you can proceed. I will give you an example. When people are gathering for a demonstration, if it is a big demonstration, we need to collect on it because this tells us that the government is in trouble. So, we fly over, we take pictures, and we give it to an imagery interpreter, and the imagery interpreter looks at it and says *there are 175 people at this gathering*, ok. So, then you write the report, and you say *there was a huge gathering of individuals, demonstration* and you can even say 175. Well, let us just leave the number out. When it goes to the policy maker, he sees *huge*, what are we talking about like 75,000, I mean how big is it? Well, knowing this country and knowing the restrictions, knowing the limitations of the liberty they have, 175 is huge. It is not 75,000, it is not 175,000, it is 175, which we think it is very large. Ok, but you have to convey that and tell the policy maker 175 is huge. For this country it is huge. And that is all you can do. And that is why having a single lexicon unclassified not just for the professional, but also for the consumer.

✦ **Ana-Maria Surugiu:** Thank you very much, Doctor Goldman!

✦ **Prof. Dr. Jan Goldman:** It was my pleasure! Thank you for inviting me!

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING:

Atkins, B. T., & Rundell, M. (2008). *The Oxford Guide to Practical Lexicography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bergholtz, H., & Tarp, S. (2003). Two opposing theories: On H.E. Wiegand's recent discovery of lexicographic functions. *Hermes, Journal of Linguistics* (31), 171-196.

FABIZ (2023). Retrieved on June 26, 2023, from <https://intell.fabiz.ase.ro/jan-goldman/>

Goldman, J. (2001). *Intelligence Warning Terminology*. Washington: Joint Military Intelligence College.

Goldman, J. (2006). *Words of Intelligence: A Dictionary*. Scarecrow Press.

Goldman, J. (2011). *Words of Intelligence. An Intelligence Professional's Lexicon for Domestic and Foreign Threats* (ed. Second Edition). Scarecrow Press.

Goldman, J., & Maret, S. (2016). *Intelligence and Information Policy for National Security: Key Terms and Concepts*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Goldman, J. (2024). *Ethical Espionage: Ethics and the Intelligence Cycle*, Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Goldman, J. (ed. 2024). *Ethics of Spying: A reader for the intelligence professional, volume 3*, Rowman and Littlefield Publishing.

International Journal of Intelligence and CounterIntelligence, available at <https://www.tandfonline.com/toc/ujic20/current>

Security Professionals Intelligence Education Series (S.P.I.E.S. at Rowman & Littlefield Publishers) available at https://rowman.com/Action/SERIES/_/SPIES/Security-and-Professional-Intelligence-Education-Series