

Information Society in its Function as an Object of Directed Influence of Noopolitics

Sergey Borisovich Nikonov

Saint-Petersburg State University, St-Petersburg, Russia

Submitted: Oct 30, 2013; **Accepted:** Dec 18, 2013; **Published:** Dec 20, 2013

Abstract: The article considers the environment, in which political forces develop their information strategy using mass media. The article also provides a definition of the noopolitics as an information strategy of manipulation of international processes by means of forming positive or negative attitude of the society to the external and internal policy of a state or a block of states with the purpose of creating a positive or negative image of ideas and advocated moral values. With the development of the global information space and new technology, the battlefield shifted to the created platform of the virtual world, in which it is almost impossible to separate enemies from friends. Currently, approbation of political actions initially takes place in the virtual world and in mass media and then, depending on the success, the results of these actions are applied or not applied in the real world and real policy.

Key words: Mass media • Noopolitics • Information strategy

INTRODUCTION

Formation of the contemporary information space takes place along with the construction of the new world order. The necessity of its construction is determined by the events of the last decades. This article does not target to prove the failure of the Westphalian system, which determined the sovereignty of a state as the main rule of the inviolability of this system. There occurred the necessity to distance ourselves from the concept that absolute sovereignty of a state is possible in the contemporary world. As we know, this concept was violated during last centuries and is violated nowadays. "The new world order must be based on clear rules of the political game, which would allow to regulate the issue of the limits of sovereignty restriction, to avoid handling this issue by a single state, though the dominating one currently" [1]. Now in the XXI century, we are evidencing the fact that the vast majority of states does not struggle for their sovereignty, but consciously passes it to either the USA (CEE countries, the Baltic states, Georgia, etc.), or to supranational structures, such as the EU (Germany, France, the Benelux countries, Portugal and Spain). As far back as in the beginning of this century, the famous American politician G. Kissinger said in his interview to

the German Die Welt newspaper: "The Westphalian order is in the state of systemic crisis. Non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries has been neglected in the name of the concept of overall humanitarian intervention. Or the overall jurisdiction. Not only the USA, but also many West European countries have made it... The principles of the Westphalian world, which were based on the sovereignty of states and treated violation of internationally recognized borders by international structures as an act of aggression, are passing" [2]. And the USA is considered to be the first country, which neglected the principles of the Westphalian world order. Manufacturing the American model of democracy in almost all continents of the world initially was accepted as a blessing, but as the understanding of the fact that the American democracy is not able to naturalize in an environment with a different culture, it started being rejected by the population of many states. The United States of America were proud to have brought the American model of democracy to Libya. This resulted in a tragic death of the US Ambassador in the city of Benghazi. Another success of the American democracy is Egypt. The Presidential elections in Egypt were won by a representative of the Moslem Brotherhood party. Despite the number of people who participated in the election, the

USA acknowledged the elections democratic. The problem was that the party, which led its representative to victory, was admitted (for example, in Russia) a terroristic organization. And the President was not elected by the majority of the population, but by the majority of those who visited the elections. Wherever American soldiers come to "maintain peace", they are facing not the population's love, but the chance to be destroyed. The attitude to common Americans is formed by the American politicians.

Body of the work. "Lately, there has been a tendency to blurring of distinction between the state of war and the state of peace. Wars are not declared anymore and the current wars are not going on according to the patterns we are used to. At that, the new-type conflicts are comparable to wars by their consequences", said V. Gerasimov, Chief of General Staff of the Russian Federation. As an example, the general mentioned so-called "color" revolutions, which demonstrated that even a "relatively trouble-free state can become a victim of foreign intervention and sink into chaos". Besides, current conflicts are accompanied by "taking the growing number of non-military measures (humanitarian, economic and politic); the remonstrative potential of the population is enacted; military actions of a latent nature are used" [3].

The XX century has formed such concepts as *Soft Power*, *Real Policy* and developed the theory of formation of an information society. Information society was to implement the idea of formation of a civil society, which was to be reached in a nonviolent way. Such terminological concepts were to replace the tough lexicon of threats used during the Cold War.

By definition, information society is a concept of a postindustrial society called the new historical stage of development, the main products of which are information and knowledge. And during the Cold War, all decisions and actions were based on the information and knowledge, but at a certain historical moment, it became inconvenient to use this term, as it set precise distinction of the opposing parties. There is a nuance here. The information was not produced by the society, but by the parties participating in the Cold War. And those were not only the USSR and the USA.

As the global information space and the new technology developed, the battlefield was shifted to the created virtual world platform, in which it is almost impossible to separate enemies from friends. Currently, approbation of political actions initially takes place in the virtual world and mass media and then, depending on the

success, the results of these actions are applied or not applied in the real world and real politics. These actions were named the *virtual diplomacy*. But where for the real diplomacy, political information remains information for service use, *virtual diplomacy* treats political information as a tangible asset, just like other resources.

For example, Julian Assange, the founder of the social Internet project Wikileaks, sold diplomatic information. The goal of his project was placement in the world network of non-traceable publications and analysis of documents that had been disclosed due to information leak.

All the above brings us to a conclusion that information society is the object of influence – an object of not occasional, but intended influence, which is the basis of noopolitics.

In order to reason the existence of noopolitics in its function as an information strategy, it is necessary to differentiate political information in its function as a commodity (economic factor) from political information in its function as an element of policy (political factor), which itself does not exclude their interdependence.

Noopolitics is understood as an information strategy for manipulation of international processes by means of forming a positive or negative attitude of the society to the external and internal policy of a state or a block of states in order to create a positive or negative image of ideas and advocated moral values [4].

The expression that mass media are the forth power, which has come into common use, receives another meaning, which is associated with government agencies – the force impact. This approach is not in line with the theory of *information society* described in the works by D. Bell [5], M. Castells[6] and J. Habermas who assumed that information force comes from the essence of the global information environment and is oriented to the development of information society without force impact. According to the communicative approach of J. Habermas [7], information power is an aggregate of communications and relations, which are formed around the preset information types related to solution of certain political tasks, including global problems.

The information force in international policy was mentioned in the works by K. Deutsch [8], R. Solomon [9], W. Riston [10], J. Shultz [11]. K. Deutsch described information force as an endless but controlled flow of information resources in the sphere of global policy and international relations. Through information force, according to these scientists, the society can become

closer to various mental cultures. Thus, information force is understood as a *soft power* - the power of conviction, but still they do not reveal the principle and methods of controlling this force.

The Russian scientist Y. Davydov assumed that information force needed to be considered in the following plane: *scientific and technical force - ideological force* [12]. The problem is that there are at least two political forces in any state: one force is the government and the other is those who intend to take over the government and, therefore, have different ideology. So, it is not reasonable to bring everything to the supremacy of scientific and technical force. Obviously, the scientific and technical potential of a state is one of the prevailing factors, but the example of Northern Korea shows that the ideological factor can also be prioritized.

Let us consider the example of using information force based on the scientific and technical superiority, which was described in the article by A.V. Zobnin. "According to the German secret service, the National Security Agency of the USA acquired access to the encoded information of the German Ministry of Defense using the complete set of keys to the Microsoft software, which they had. In order to protect their national secrets, the Ministry decided to place its stake on the domestic encryption equipment by Siemens. At that, the Microsoft software products have become a very affordable information weapon" [13]. According to the author, the owner of the information force if the subject capable of protecting the database or force other political actors to use his own database, at the same time keeping it under his control. However, this example could also have brought us to a conclusion that there was another problem, too. The problem of existence of disinformation. Information verification will become so difficult that instead of information (as we understand that any information from a subject, which in this case was represented by the German secret service, can be read by the manufacturer of the information equipment, which in this case was represented by the owner of the access keys to the Microsoft system), one can receive disinformation.

And again, at any researches, the issue of the information trustworthiness, sufficiency and selectivity arises. We can assume that the former President of Russia, currently the Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation, D.A. Medvedev can be accessed through Internet channels by the owner of the information

resource. And as we study the sequence of actions of the Russian top executives, which is their reaction to the information published in mass media or information sources, it seems sometimes that Medvedev believes himself independent from information technology.

The famous American political analyst Zbigniew Brzezinski, the councilor of Barack Obama for foreign policy, during the Presidential election campaign voted for creation of the Great Two, consisting of the USA and China. Russia, according to Mr. Brzezinski, does not influence the new world order. He believes that the leaders of the United States and China need to meet informally to discuss not only mutual relations, but also the issues of global policy [14].

It turns out so that the official rhetoric of the US Administration and the rhetoric of its military elite do not follow the same line, or they are probably addressed to different categories of persons who receive this information.

With various extents of objectivity, any methods of conviction can be brought to the concept of *soft power*, which exists and was introduced into the modern use. The terminology of *soft power* was formulated in the work by Joseph Nye *Soft Power. The Means to Success in World Politics*. [15].

Soft power is the ability to achieve the desired goal through voluntary participation of allies, rather than through enforcement or handouts. In this work, J. Nye provided the definition of *hard power* for a comparative analysis. He understood *hard power* as an ability to enforce conditioned by the military and economic power of the country. J. Nye believed that policy would most probably be attractive if based on values shared by others. For example, due to the farsighted course elaborated by the USA, which led to successful implementation of the Marshall plan, the Europeans happily accepted the American leadership. The Europeans could not even imagine that the policy of the USA would turn their back on Europe and that Europe itself would become the political subject, against which the *soft power* would be applied. The example of the Microsoft Company, which we have provided above, manifests this fact clearly.

Almost all scientists who study the political component of mass media determine such its element as *manipulation*. What is meant here is manipulation of the public consciousness by mass media and manipulation of mass media themselves. The most appropriate definition, to our opinion, belongs to the Russian scientist O. Pirushchy: "Manipulation of people's political views is

carried out through building the political reality using mass media" [16]. According to O. Pirushchy, in the Soviet Union, the research of the latent impact of mass media on the mass consciousness was carried out with account for the historical peculiarities typical of those times. The Soviet scientists V. Vilchek [17] and A. Vlasov [18] studied the latent impact of mass media on the mass consciousness within the theory of journalism. Y. Zasursky analyzed the role and the place of political propaganda in mass media [19]. The political manipulation subject was also concerned by A.R. Khabibullin [20] and L.G. Etimyan [21]. If manipulation is possible in a single country, we can assume it to be possible globally, either. And the globalization subject was approached by such scientists as Anderson [22], Berridge [23], Fortes [24], Spibyey [25] and others.

Politicians often use such word as *strategy*. But this term is not used in its peaceful meaning. Let us provide several definitions of the word *strategy* from different dictionaries. "The ultimate sphere of military art – the conduct of large military operations and warfare as a whole" [26]. "A military science, which studies everything that concerns military actions, i.e.: securing communications of field forces, assignment of campaigns, selection of places for battles, etc. aiming to achieve military goals as soon as possible" [27], "The science of war; the theory of better dislocation and application of all military forces and means. Stratagem, ruse of war, deception" [28].

The information society announced as the form of being of the contemporary civilization is now turning into a marionette of political forces struggling for the power. And information is turning into a weapon. The task of the holder of such a weapon is to give it to a marionette and govern its actions to make the information society to fulfill commands where and when it is necessary. This is why there are opinions that it is impossible to use the term *information society* for scientific analysis. For example, F. Webster ended his work *The Theory of an Information Society* with the chapter "Does the information society exist?" [29].

In this article, in order to make the current situation clear, we use the term *information society* as a society that is able to perceive and process information. In order to make the information society understand the current situation in the "right" way, the government needs strategic planning. This is one of the governing functions, which constitutes the process of selection of organization goals and methods of their achievement through the formation of political consciousness. Control of political

consciousness from the perspective of constructivism is nothing but control of group behavior of the group members. The contemporary sociology has studied group behavior rather well: it is the inclusion of an individual into a group or his joining the group that makes him to select a certain role for himself taking into account the roles of other members of the group and then play it.

CONCLUSION

Constructivists highlight with the provisions of their theory that there is no difference in the laws of social role behavior between the groups, which consist of individual members of the society and the groups, which consist of actors of international relations and world policy. The same relates to international conflicts: conflict-based interaction in them is based on the principle of an in-group social conflict. We can observe an obvious transfer of schemes, theories, laws and practice of social interaction into the sphere of international relations. Social technology of managing the behavior of world policy actors in a conflict environment clears the way to the future; their significance in the formation of tools of peaceful settlement of conflicts can be compared with at least the progress of technology of conflict perception management - the technology of political marketing [30].

Another important aspect of formation of international relations and geopolitical decisions is presence or absence of the image of a state outside it and in the minds of political actors who belong to an opposite ideology. It is not the reputation of a state, but a formed media image – an image of a territorial and state subject, which appeared as a result of perception of information about it provided by mass media. According to D.P. Gavra, media image is an element of indirect image, which appears as a result of perception of external information on a subject [31]. Scientists argue that currently, the external image of a state is not able to have a universal structure for all types of political audiences. Sociologists try to develop a sequence of actions, which will finally create an integrated model. This article does not consider the sociological basis of the state's image, but its final political image formed by the media image as determined by the definition of D. Gavra.

Summary: As a result of the development of information space, study of changes in sociological, military, political and metal communications, critical attitude to the nature of formation of a civil society through an information society and the probability of its existence, the necessity

to understand that the information society has become a battlefield for the right to manipulate the civil society has arisen. And states develop their own information strategies with this purpose through setting themselves the task determined by geopolitics.

REFERENCES

1. Kortunov, S.V., The collapse of the Westphalian system and the new world order M: "Golden Lion" 125: 15.
2. Henry Kissinger Interview. Die Welt. 05.05.2003.
3. Shoygu Declared a Military Threat. Date Views 27.01.2013 <http://news.mail.ru/politics/11752431>
4. Nikonov, S.B., 2013. Noopolitical Aspect of International Journalism. Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research, 17(1): 21-25.
5. Bell, D., 1999. The Coming Post-Industrial Society: the Experience of Social Forecasting. Moscow: Academia, pp: 578.
6. Castells, M. and V.L. Inozemtsev, 1999. "The formation of the society of networks", New post-industrial wave in the West: anthology ["Stanovlenie obshchestva setevykh struktur", Novaya postindustrial'naya volna na Zapade: antologiya], Moscow: Academia, pp: 505.
7. Habermas, J., 2000. Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action. Lane. with it. Eds. Sklyadneva, D.V.. Saint Petersburg: Nauka, pp: 379.
8. Deutsch, K., 1953. Nationalism and Social Communication: An Inquiry into the Foundations of Nationality. Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press, pp: 425.
9. Solomon, R.H., 1997. The Information Revolution and International Conflict Management. U.S. Institute of Peace Peacework, 18: 18-24.
10. Wriston, W.B., 1997. Bits, Bytes and Diplomacy. U.S. Institute of Peace Peacework, 18: 32- 41.
11. Shultz, G.P., 1997. Diplomacy in the Information. U.S. Institute of Peace Peacework, 18: 42- 46.
12. Davydov, Y., 2004. The Concept of Hard and Soft Power in the Theory of International Relations. International Processes, 2, 1(4): 74-76.
13. Zobnin, A.V., 2007. Information Force in the International Policy: Basic Concepts of Analysis. Space and Time in the World Policy and International Relations. In the Proceedings of the 4th Convent of RAMI (10 Volumes). Vol. 6. New Trends in the Word Policy. Eds. A.Y. Melvil. The Russian Association of International Research. Eds. Yagya, V.S. and V.S. Denisenko. Moscow: MGIMO-University, pp: 152.
14. Khranchikhin, A., 2009. Russia Can Get a "Great Two". Independent Military Review. Date Views 27.01.2013 http://nvo.ng.ru/wars/2009-01-30/1_bigtwo.html
15. Nye, J.S., 2004. Soft Power. The Means to Success in World Politics. New York: Public Affairs, pp: 192.
16. Pirushchy, O.N., 2009. Television and Internet in their Function as Means of Political Manipulation. Synopsis of the Thesis for the degree of Candidate of Political Sciences. Stavropol. Stavropol State University.
17. Vilchek, V.M., 1981. Under the Sign of TV. In the book.: "Television, vchvra, today and tomorrow". – M; "Arts", pp: 214.
18. Vlasov, A.I., 1982. Political Manipulations: The History and the Practice of Mass Media of the USA. Moscow: "Misl", pp: 295.
19. The System of Mass Media, 2003. Eds. Zasursky, Y.N. Moscow: Aspect Press, pp: 259.
20. Khabibullin, A.R., 2009. Peculiarities of Technology of Political Manipulation in Russia. Synopsis of the Thesis for the degree of Candidate of Political Sciences. Kazan. Kazan State University.
21. Etimyan, L.G., 1991. Advanced Technology of Political Manipulation in the Election Process in Post-Soviet Russia. Synopsis of the Thesis for the degree of Candidate of Political Sciences. Moscow. Peoples' Friendship University of Russia.
22. Anderson, B., 1991. Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. 2nd Edition, London: Verso, pp: 225.
23. Berridge, G.R., 1997. International Politics: States, Power and Conflict since 1945. Hemel Hempstead, Prentice Hall, pp: 244.
24. Fortes, M. and E.E. Evans-Pritchard, 1961. African Political Systems, 3 Vols. Oxford, Oxford University Press. pp: 272-296.
25. Spybey, T., 1996. Globalisation and World Society, Oxford: Policy Press, pp: 229.
26. Kuznetsov, S.A., 1998. The Big Dictionary of the Russian Language, Ed.1. Saint Petersburg: Norint, pp: 1536.
27. Chudinov, A.N., 1910. The Dictionary of Foreign Words Assimilated by the Russian Language. St. Petersburg V.I.Gubinskogo Edition, pp: 1580.
28. Dahl, V.I., 1866. The Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language in 4 Volumes. M: Publisher Society of Lovers of Russian Literature, uchrezhdennago the Imperial Moscow University, pp: 2800.

29. Webster, F., 2004. The Theories of an Information Society. Moscow: Aspect Press, pp: 360-373.
30. Karpovich, O.G., 2012. The Technology of Control of International Conflicts from the Perspectives of the American Constructivism. The World and the Policy, #09(72): <http://mir-politika.ru/1612-tehnologii-upravleniya-mezhdunarodnymi-konfliktami-s-poziciy-amerikanskogo-konstruktivizma.html>.
31. Gavra, D.P., 2009. The Outside Image of a State: The Understanding of the Category and Structural Models. The Image of a State / a Region: Modern Approaches: New Ideas in the Theory and Practice of Communication. Collection of Scientific Papers. Vol. 3. Saint Petersburg: Rosa Mira, pp: 264.