



Noopolitical Aspect of Information Strategies of States

Sergey Borisovich Nikonov^{1*}, Anna Vitalievna Baichik², Anatoli Stepanovich Puiy³, Nikolai Sergeevich Labush⁴

¹Saint-Petersburg State University, Universitetskay Naberejnay 7/9, 199034, Saint Petersburg, Russia, ²Saint-Petersburg State University, Universitetskay Naberejnay 7/9, 199034, Saint-Petersburg, Russia, ³Saint-Petersburg State University, Universitetskay Naberejnay 7/9, 199034, Saint-Petersburg, Russia, ⁴Saint-Petersburg State University, Universitetskay Naberejnay 7/9, 199034, Saint-Petersburg, Russia. *Email: nikonovS@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

Modern political science assumes that states need a civilized strategy ensuring the progressive development of a society. The leading positions in the global policy have been typically held by the states, which had certain national strategies, including information strategies. In light of the ideas of the need to change Russia's information strategy, which are suggested in the scientific literature, the author proposes to adopt the concept of noopolitics. Noopolitic is an information strategy which involves manipulating international processes by forming, through the media, a positive or negative attitude of the public towards the internal and external policy of a state or a coalition of states, with the view of forming a positive or negative image of ideas and advocated moral values.

Keywords: Noopolitics, Information Strategy, Information War

JEL Classifications: H11, F51, Z13

1. INTRODUCTION

Experts in political science will hardly give a definite answer to the rhetorical question about whether we live in time of peace or in time of war. The media now and then reveal the contradictions in approaches to certain problems. It is obvious that there is a struggle for values. But these values are not always tangible. The main value is currently the ability to exert influence and to increase the possibilities of such influence in cooperation with the outside world. The space of influence is essentially the subject of the struggle. But if there is struggle, then there is confrontation. And any struggle involves the use of force. To extend one's zone of influence, one should use the force properly. It should be clearly understood that no one is going to give away the space over which the influence will be spread. In the space of common interests the way of interaction between the opposing forces in the struggle for the zones of influence is war. To win a war one should choose the proper strategy of action.

2. METHODOLOGY

In this paper, the following scientific methods were used: Statistical analysis, policy planning and forecasting, retrospective and comparative political analysis, content analysis, discursive method, the method of perception analysis.

The method of statistical analysis (cluster analysis, factor analysis, correlation analysis, regression analysis, analysis of trends, including using automated software systems) for the processing of the array of information appearing in the media on the political events and political decisions, which are adopted and implemented in practice.

The method of political planning and forecasting, providing for the building of reference scenarios of the development of international relations, depending on the information obtained through the media.

Retrospective and comparative political analysis, including the study of European, Russian and Asian experiences of using international information in the world history and politics.

Discursive analysis which makes it possible to delineate the conceptual framework of the research and to build the definition of the term “Noopolitics.”

Semiotic analysis - The study of the perception of valuable information by various political actors depending on their national, ethnic and cultural backgrounds.

3. THE MAIN PART

While conceiving the state as an entity involved in international activity, in which the processes of transformation of social relations shaping its foreign and domestic policy take place, we should determine the terminology used in this paper. If we define the state as a political organization of people living in a particular area and administratively managed by the government, it may be understood that such administrative organization exists in any state except for an anarchistic one. But this does not mean that goods and money will flow freely within such a state, making up the economic component of this state’s activity. In our opinion, viewing the government as equal to the state distorts the essence of the understanding of a state as an international entity. It is assumed that a state implements a policy of a dominant social group, while the public interest suggests that a state is a certain compromise between the interests of various social groups. To support the activity of a state, a certain political strategy is produced that defines the direction and controllability of the changes of the balance of power of social strata on certain stages of the historical development of the society. The strategic objectives which are produced by a state should include the maintenance of public order and the formation of certain moral guides in the society. Russian scientist Veduta concludes that “If a state’s strategy strengthens its positions in the world community, it can be considered a national strategy; otherwise it should be considered anti-national” (Veduta, 2014). This assertion is too categorical and not always suitable for the description of the modern real politics. Any activity involves a certain plan of action aimed at achieving one’s goals in space and time. This plan may be both short-term and long-term. Russian scientists put forward the idea that a society should pay more attention to the economic security of its state (Ignatov, 2005). The development of such awareness means, in fact, the recognition of the primacy of economics over politics in ensuring internal and external security of a state. Modern political science assumes that states need a civilized strategy ensuring the progressive development of a society. The leading positions in the global policy were held by the states which had certain national strategies, including information strategies. The underestimation of the strategic challenges posed by rival powers, lack of proactive preparation for the adverse development of international political situations, may lead to the deterioration of the geopolitical position of a state. The success of an international entity depends on the accuracy of the assessment of the actual political situation, the level of education of a society and its leader, the ability to perceive circumstances at the level of not subjective,

but scientific analysis, and the ability to simulate the situation. In case of ignoring the scientific analysis, the renunciation of the simulation of the development of a society and a situation, the choice of an information strategy will become subjective. As any strategy of a state involves stating the long-term tasks, historical approach is typically taken as a basis of the study of strategies. By using historical approach one can predict rather what will happen than when it happens. The history has shown that any strategy is formed on the basis of the understanding of the degree of the implementation of the principle of state intervention in the public management in a certain country. There are three widely known types of strategies, which are basically used for the development of a state’s strategy. They are applied in determining both an economical and a political strategy of a state. These are the liberal, control and mobilization strategies.

- The liberal strategy suggests that the political ideas advocated in a certain society, as well as culture and spiritual values, are freely distributed, and such distribution is not controlled by the state.
- If a state at any stage of its existence establishes control over moral values, which are advocated in its territory, the strategy of such a state becomes a control strategy.
- In case if there is understanding that the advocated cultural ideals and values, that are not in accordance with local customs, develop in the state-controlled territory, and there is direct formation of a negative image of this state in the eyes of the people inhabiting a specific territory, the strategy of a state should be formed according to the mobilization principle.

During different periods of the development of the society there existed different approaches to the understanding of the need to use information. Thus, in 2002 the Russian scientist Kubyshkin pointed out the thesis that “States should renounce the development and adoption of plans and doctrines envisaging the possibility of waging information wars” (Kubyshkin, 2002). This idea may have been popular at that time, but political realities have shown the opposite. The United States has for a long time promoted the idea of the unipolar world, especially after the collapse of the Soviet Union. After the disappearance of the Soviet Union as a political actor, the United States redirected its strategy to Europe. The main strategic objective of the United States, according to Friedman, the American analyst, founder and head of a private intelligence and consulting company “Stratfor,” is the prevention of the emergence of hegemonies in the territory of Europe. He believes that for the United States there is “one threat that has haunted it for a century. If Eurasia or the European Peninsula and a large part of the Eurasian mainland, particularly Russia, were to unite, they could threaten the United States. The combination of technology, capital, natural resources and manpower could construct a naval force that might challenge or overwhelm the United States” (Friedman, 2014). These ideas were expressed by Friedman at the meeting of the Valdai International Discussion Club in 2014. The American analyst’s opinion was broadcast by the media, which, in our view, was Friedman’s main task. Assessing the general message of the report, it was necessary to make the following conclusion: “There is no point in fighting against the hegemony of the United States. The global dominance of the United States will remain undisputed in the next 100 years, therefore, the foreign policy of the United

States is the main driving force of international processes” (Friedman, 2015). American analysts consider these assertions to be viable, although Friedman aptly noted in the same report, that building of modern strategies, including information strategies, should be based on the simulation of the proposed actions and their final effect. In fact, any hint, articulated in the media, can sometimes draw attention to the fundamental process. The global information space produces a vast amount of information, and it is becoming increasingly difficult to find the necessary material. Sometimes the emerging international process becomes visible, but it is sometimes hard to believe that this process will actually take place. This may be exemplified by the “Arab spring” or the events in Ukraine. How, for example, should we perceive Friedman’s report? Is it an articulated strategy of action of the political and economic elite of the United States, or is it directly presented disinformation? In any case, the media, by disseminating this report, had provided an opportunity for analytical services of other states to think, weigh, verify, and assess the view expressed by Friedman. The global politics is currently undergoing changes. With the access of China to the foreground as a power able to change the geopolitical game of other subjects of international communication, states are compelled to change their geopolitical strategies of coexistence in the modern world. The corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Natural Sciences Kozin, in evaluating the new National Security Strategy of the United States, articulated by the President of the United States B. Obama, notes that: “.claims against the Russian Federation and the People’s Republic of China, as well as distorting their foreign policy in the international arena, the new U.S. National Security Strategy 2015 carries an active anti-Russian and anti-Chinese charge and virtually calls for knocking together a new transatlantic and Trans-Asia-Pacific alliance against Moscow and Beijing” (Kozin, 2015). In one and the same historical period the high-ranking officials responsible for the development of the United States in the geopolitical arena articulated the following two theses. The first thesis is that the strategy of the United States is aimed at the prevention of the emergence of strong Europe, while the second thesis is that the United States is concerned about the possible strengthening of the Eurasian direction. Although both in the first and second theses there is a common element - Europe, the action strategies are completely different. One-way or another, both theses suggest that the United States is losing the control over the unipolar world, while recognizing the existence of other political actors, which are regulating international processes. The term “information warfare,” which is used in the media, remained a cliché.

Note that the complexity and uncertainty of the formation of the conceptual views of information war as a kind of social conflict, in which information is used as the primary weapon, are evidenced by the existence of a variety of approaches to its definition. Manojlo specifies three large groups of scientists exploring these social processes and phenomena (Manojlo, 2008). The representatives of the first group - Pocheptsov (2000), Rastorguev, (2003) - reduce the concept of information warfare to individual information activities and operations, information techniques and tools of corporate competition or armed struggle. The second group, which is dominated by the representatives of military departments

and military researchers, qualify information war as military confrontation (Kostarev et al., 2014). But if western views and attitudes regarding this type of confrontation are documented in directives, regulations and rules for the armed forces, in our country they are represented only in form of theoretical views of researchers, such as Grinyaev (2004), Pirumov and Rodionov (1997), Labush (1999). The third group includes authors who consider information war to be a phenomenon of the peaceful period of inter-state confrontation, which makes it possible to achieve foreign policy objectives in a non-coercive way (in contrast to coercive, military way). These views are shared by Belyaev (2014), Lisichkin and Shelepin (1999), Panarin (2014), etc. Unfortunately, the authors of works dedicated to the large-scale information warfare, while focusing on certain characteristics of the development of social and information processes, alternately use the categories of “information warfare,” “psychological warfare,” “cold war,” “moral and psychological warfare.” It should be noted that behind the specifics of these phenomena there was something common: Information and psychological impact, aimed at changing the system of values and the established norms of behavior. Through the intense impact of media the cultural and ideological expansion has been implemented by introducing foreign cultural values from outside. Information technology specialist’s note: “If there is a number of critical publications, it does not mean that the information war has begun. More often we use the concept of “strategic information operation”. States where there is one or more neutral publications per one negative publication, we consider to be neutral. If the number of negative publications per unit time is five times higher than the number of neutral publications, then we begin to view the situation as an information war” (Nikolaychuk, 2014). It remains to determine the audience of the negative information about another state. Nikolaychuk who headed the analytical departments at the All-Russian State Television and Radio Broadcasting Company and at RIA Novosti from 1997 to 2013, in an interview with the Russian Institute of Strategic Studies pointed out that Russian specialists were looking through about one and a half thousand publications in foreign mass media during a week. And at least half of these publications are negative. However, this is, in his view, a normal situation, rather than an information war.

4. DISCUSSION

Nikolaychuk believes that today “one can talk... only of the information pressure, attempts to influence the public opinion” (Nikolaychuk, 2014). At the same time, Nikolaychuk, who explores information operations against Russia, believes that it is impractical to form a positive image of Russia as a state. Despite the declared openness of journalism, “the system of political influence on the media, forming of the editorial policy, financial and institutional aspects of journalism groups are among the topics which receive the least coverage in any country” (Nikolaychuk, 2014). In our view, the currently adopted doctrine of the information security of Russia was formulated exactly from the perspective of defense and decency of foreign policy actors that form the global agenda of international relations. Nikolaychuk’s arguments come down to the fact that the purchase of foreign media that exert influence on the consciousness of readers,

viewers, users and listeners, is too expensive, while the purchase of regional media is impractical. However, this conclusion may be put into question. Naturally, the purchase and maintenance of media is expensive, but it all depends on the objectives of the strategic development. In terms of the long-term perspective, in light of the understanding of the fact that Russia and the United States will implement an information strategy aimed at the formation of the positive image of Russia abroad, the issue of funding should be considered with the participation of the foreign policy and military departments, the foreign intelligence service, analytical institutions and scientific community. In such a warfare the influence on the minds of people is exercised from both outside and inside the country, and it is the latter which, in our view, is of crucial importance. In this situation, a significant role in information battles is played by the so-called “fifth column.” The formal start of an information war should be seen as the adoption of the relevant official documents - concepts, doctrines, laws, directives, declarations, speeches by public officials. The speech of Friedman at the meeting of the Valdai International Discussion Club is commensurable with the speech of Churchill in Fulton, which is considered to have marked the beginning of the cold war (05.03.1946). In 2011 the English newspaper The Guardian reported that the Department of Defense of the United States had developed specialized software making it possible to secretly manipulate the moods of participants of social networks and disseminate pro-American propaganda using fake accounts. This software was called “Earnest Voice” (Operation Earnest Voice) (Fielding and Cobain, 2011). Its aim was the creation of a network of fake users geographically bound to the information space of a victim country. Thus, there was the impression of the presence of real people with well-developed cover stories, hobbies, temper and portfolio. This methodology has been successfully applied in Iraq, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Central Asia, the Middle East and in Ukraine. The spiritual component of the military force, as well as its material component, has undergone a profound transformation in the course of unceasing wars and armed conflicts which took place during the development of the mankind. According to Litvinenko (2012), Kurysheva and Potolokova (2013), it is associated with the development of social media, new media, Internet communications, new forms of political communication on the Internet, as well as Internet technologies. If initially the impact on an enemy’s consciousness, mind and will was for the most part exercised indirectly, through inflicting losses with touches of information impact - The dissemination of lies, misinformation, and later through propaganda and organized psychological impact, currently the information impact becomes independent and takes form of information support of hostilities, information operations.

5. CONCLUSION

As a result of the research, specialists have turned to noopolitics as a method of the implementation of foreign policy in the information age. In fact, there are scientific proposals regarding the formation of the direction of a new information strategy, which is called noopolitics. “Noopolitics is a form of political leadership, which is necessary for the interaction with the noosphere, the widest information space of consciousness, which combines

cyberspace (or “Network”) and infosphere (cyberspace plus media)” (Grinyaev, 2004). The term was coined by American scientists Arquilla and Ronfeldt: “Noopolitik is foreign-policy behavior for the information age that emphasizes the primacy of ideas, values, norms, laws, and ethics - it would work through “soft power” rather than “hard power.” (Arquilla and Ronfeldt, 1999). The mass media not only help to bring nations and peoples together by expanding possibilities for their joint peaceful coexistence, but also bring together and bring into confrontation those divergences and differences that were not previously included in the “agenda”. This paper proposes to use a different understanding of noopolitics. Noopolitics is an information strategy which involves manipulating international processes by forming, through the media, a positive or negative attitude of the public towards the internal and external policy of a state or a coalition of states, with the view of forming a positive or negative image of ideas and promoted moral values (Nikonov, 2013) By managing information flows one can develop in the society certain attitudes towards the events. This is openly declared by everyone who is engaged in this process (Holiday, 2013; Benton, 2013; Johnson, 2013).

REFERENCES

- Arquilla, J., Ronfeldt, D. (1999), The emergence of Noopolitik: Toward an American information strategy. *RAND*, 102, 46.
- Belyaev, D. (2014), Devastation in heads. Information war against Russia. Moscow: Piter.
- Benton, L. (2013), Manipulation – The Mind of a Con Man: The Psychology of Lying. 1st ed. New York: ePubWealth.com, LLC.
- Fielding, N., Cobain, I. (2011), 13.19 GMTR revealed: US spy operation that manipulates social media. Available from: <http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2011/mar/17/us-spy-operation-social-networks>. [Last retrieved on 2015 Apr].
- Friedman, G. (2014), Strategic forecasting: The impersonal dimension of intelligence. *Valdai Papers*, 6, 7.
- Friedman, G. (2015), Strategic forecasting: The impersonal dimension of intelligence. Available from: <http://www.oko-planet.ru/politik/politikmir/268662-dzhordzh-fridman-strategicheskoe-prognozirovaniye-obektivnoe-izmerenie-razvedyvatelnoy-deyatelnosti.html>. [Last retrieved on 2015 Apr].
- Grinyaev, S. (2004), The cyber-space as a battlefield: Theory, techniques, tools, methods and systems of information warfare. Minsk: Harvest.
- Holiday, R. (2013), Trust Me, I’m Lying: Confessions of a Media Manipulator. Penguin: Portfolio Trade.
- Ignatov, Y.U. (2005), The economic security of states and the problems of its international legal support in the modern context. PhD Thesis, Moscow.
- Johnson, O. (2013), The Art of Manipulation: How to Get Anybody to Do What You Want Create. Space Independent Publishing Platform.
- Kostarev, S., Efremov, O., Zverev, S. (2014), The concept of network-centric warfare in the light of the doctrine of “Shared vision 2020”. *Military Thought*, 1, 60.
- Kozin, V. (2015), The strategy of force. Red Star. Available from: <http://www.redstar.ru/index.php/component/k2/item/21815-strategiya-sily>. [Last retrieved on 2015 Apr].
- Kubyshekin, A. (2002), International and Legal Problems of Information Security of the State. PhD Thesis, Moscow.
- Kurysheva, Y.U., Potolokova, M. (2013), Internet-technology and marketing: Theoretical approach. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, (Education, Law, Economics, Language and Communication), 27, 266-269.

- Labush, N. (1999), *The Power Mechanism of the State and Society: The Politico-Sociological Analysis*. PhD Thesis, Saint Petersburg.
- Lisichkin, V., Shelepin, L. (1999), *The Third World Information and Psychological War*. Moscow: Institute of Socio-Political Research of the Academy of Social Sciences.
- Litvinenko, A. (2012), *Social media and perspectives of liquid democracy on the example of political communication of Pirate Party in Germany*. The Proceedings of the 12th European Conference on eGovernment in Barcelona. p403-408.
- Manojlo, A. (2008), *The Technologies of Non-Coercive Resolution of Modern Conflicts*. Moscow: Hotline-Telecom.
- Nikolaychuk, I. (2014), *A strategic information operation can be short-term or can last for years*. Russian Institute for Strategic Studies. Available from: <http://www.riss.ru/smi/6696/>. [Last retrieved on 2015 Apr].
- Nikonov, S. (2013), *Noopolitical aspect of international journalism*. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 17(1), 21-25.
- Panarin, I. (2014), *Information Warfare and Communication*. Moscow: Hotline-Telecom.
- Pirumov, V., Rodionov, M. (1997), *Some aspects of information warfare in armed conflicts*. *Military Thought*, 5, 44-47.
- Pocheptsov, G. (2000), *Information and Psychological Warfare*. Moscow: Sinteg.
- Rastorguev, S. (2003), *Philosophy of Information Warfare*. Moscow: Moscow Psychological and Social Institute.
- Veduta, E. (2014), *Strategy and Economic Policy of the State: Tutorial*. 2nd ed. Revised and Corrected. Moscow: INFRA-M.