

NOOPOLITIC AS AN INFORMATION STRATEGY: GENESIS OF THE CONCEPTUAL APPARATUS AND DEFINITION

Sergey Borisovich Nikonov*, Vera Alekseevna Achkasova,
Nikolai Sergeevich Labush, Anna Vitalievna Baichik and
Anatoli Stepanovich Puiy

This article is devoted to noopolitic, an information strategy used in modern world. Up till now scientists have not come to a single definition of noopolitic, but from this work we can see that scientists are trying to do it and looking for arguments. The term “noopolitic” proposed by American political scientists, is defined by this way: Noopolitic is an information strategy of manipulating world processes through forming a positive or negative attention of the public to the inner or foreign politic of a state or a union of states in order to create a positive or negative image of ideas and moral values, advocated by it.

Keywords: Noopolitic, media, political processes, mediocracy.

INTRODUCTION

The modern stage of science development updates existing concepts and definitions. “The complexity and contradictions of social knowledge do not let it elaborate a single paradigm and a stable theory. Social dynamic demands constant updating of both separate concepts and categories” (Savin 2013). Mass media are becoming mediators of political knowledge. A scientist draws knowledge from the sources that have already reflected political processes, as new information carries a verbal (sense, textual) modality. According to E.Y. Leontyeva and A.V. Bounin, “ a modern political scientist has not only to use the information that he draws from various sources, but also to select facts, events and opinions” (Leontyeva and Bounin 2014). As scientists note, using mediators is a specific quality of modern politic science. Mediators give researches (subjects of political knowledge) information of political and social processes that is defined as “real politics” (Leontyeva and Bounin 2014). E.K. Obrinskaya writes that development of new approaches to instruments of foreign policy and appearance of a new foreign-police strategy, noopolitic, have been observed in the last 15-20 years. The process of understanding this new tendency made it possible to conclude, that the appearing term “noopolitic” is going to replace geopolitics (Obrinskaya 2014).

* Saint Petersburg State University, 199034, Russia, Saint Petersburg, Universitetskaya Naberezhnaya, 7/9

METHODOLOGY

Any research is based on certain research methods that help to define the nature of the object. In this case, keeping in mind that a certain definition is being examined, we use the following methods:

- The method of analysis, that is, breaking the object of research into parts;
- The method of synthesis, that is, uniting the elements under research into one entity;
- The method of generalization, that is, the cogitative process of passing from the whole to the general;
- The method of abstraction, that is, idealizing the object under research and separating component parts of the qualities of the object under research till the results are clearly perceived.

Besides these methods, historic and logical methods are used, as the topic of the research passes certain stages of development.

This work is a continuation of another research, and it has been presented at international conferences in China, Great Britain, the USA and Russia. Articles on this topic have been written and published in scientific journals.

This article is based on the working hypothesis, that demands an answer to the question: do scientists agree to define processes of manipulation as noopolitic? Is it really necessary for states to develop information strategies? We can suggest that the existing opinion about “the agenda” being formulated by a small circle of people, due to information strategy.

RESULTS

The definition of “noopolitic” has not yet become widely used in the scientific world, this is why we see different understanding of it by different scholars. In their report to RAND Corporation, J. Arquilla and D. Ronfeld suggest the following terminology: “Noopolitic is a world-wide political strategy in the conditions of information society, that accentuates the prevalence moral ideas, interests norms and laws; in its work it prefers “soft power”: to “hard power” (Arquilla and Ronfeldt 1999). For a long time the concept of noopolitic had not drawn attention of scientists. Only military experts monitoring information noticed this concept and presented it to the public in 1999 (Grinyayev 1999). At the same time they proposed a new understanding of noopolitic. “Noopolitic is a form of political management necessary for dealing with the noosphere, the widest informational space of human consciousness, in which cyberspace (or the”net”) and infosphere (the cyberspace plus mass media) are united. (Grinyayev 2004. P. 14). Here it is appropriate to mention such a concept as noosphere (the sphere of reason), proposed by E. LeRoy, professor of mathematics in the Sorbonne. I. Vernadsky, an outstanding Russian thinker, who developed the theory of the biosphere gradually turning into the

noosphere, thought that it had been the influence of scientific thought, together with human labor, that had conditioned the biosphere turning into a new condition, noosphere. As humankind used bigger and bigger territories of the planet for its needs, people's activity was becoming a factor of planetary importance, a guiding power of all subsequent evolution. The term "noopolitic", used by modern political scientists, is a derivative from "noosphere". «Noos» is an ancient Greek word for human reason, and politics is "the art of managing" a state, a community, or international relations. According to E.K. Obrinskaya, the interest to noopolitic as a foreign-policy strategy is limited because in international relations traditional methods of influence are practiced, and the potential of noopolitic is not yet understood. Obrinskaya has given the following definition of noopolitic: "A strategy of managing political processes, based on a mass extensive influence on individual minds in order to form personalities of a certain type" (Obrinskaya, 2014). However, some scientists, such as P.N. Plougatarenko and O. Zollner see an informational component in noopolitics. So, Plougatarenko writes, that noopolitic is a system of global management, based on active interaction of information technology on people's minds (Plougatarenko, 2011). O. Zollner, Düsseldorf University professor, thinks that noopolitic is a set of net mechanisms of a civil society, that generates knowledge, management problems and conflict solving, that involves new approaches to informational policy, public diplomacy, and communicational "soft power" in general (Zollner 2009). In his article "A Simple Paradigm for Noopolitics: The Geopolitics of Knowledge" Idriss Aberkane writes that, to his mind, noopolitic is a Trojan Horse, brought to the territory of real politics (Idriss 2015).

According to Robert Gehl, noopolitic is a socialized attention to information, strengthened by economic knowledge (Gehl, 2015). In his work he mentions Maurizio Lazzarato, who states, that all of us live "at the moment of noopolitic" (Lazzarato, 2006).

Having declared the terminology used by them, J. Arquilla and D. Ronfeld have given us the opportunity to use this term and finish its elaboration, and then use the product that has been approbated.

However, in 2007 Arquilla and Ronfeld consider noopolitic again. They state, that our informational age influences the character of strategy and diplomacy more and more. Traditional Realpolitik, that is, after all, based on tough power (mainly that of war) is going to yield the palm to noopolitic (noöpolitik, noopolitics or noöspolitik), that is based on soft power, mainly that of thinking (Arquilla and Ronfeldt, 2007). This article repeats what the authors wrote in 1999, and then adds some new material that they are going to use in a manual in public diplomacy. One of the key conclusions is that some subjects, that do not belong to states (especially Al Qaeda and affiliated organizations) use the Internet and other mass media to practice noopolitic more effectively, than state subjects, for example, US Government. In their work Arquilla and Ronfeld come to the conclusion, that "the

next great revolution of an information age must take place in the sphere of diplomacy. The USA has been experiencing a business revolution since 1960, it has had revolutionary changes in the military sphere (RMA) since the beginning of the 80-s. Now it is time for an analogue, a revolution in diplomacy (RDA). Diplomats will have to review what is called “information”; and we see that a new sphere appears, a global “kingdom of reason”; which can have a profound influence on the government of a state.

The information age will still break the conditions, necessary for the classic diplomacy, based on Realpolitik and hard power, and this will make for the appearance of a new diplomacy, based on what we call noopolitic, and its preferred “soft power” (Arquilla and Ronfeldt, 2007).

In the same year (1007), when the next article of these famous scientists was published, the former USA undersecretary of state Richard Armitage, and Hillary Clinton, when she was a co-chairperson of the two-party commission in the center for strategic and international studies, tried to make a new concept of “smart power” popular. That period influenced the power elite, but the war department insisted that the concept of “smart power” could not oppose the concept of military prevalence of the USA, so it did not seem adaptive to pass something to a political department.

Hillary Clinton thought that there had to be limits of what hard power alone could achieve, and that it was not right to address the Pentagon, because it could not achieve the goal with its usual hard methods, and it will lead to a change of attention of foreign states to the USA. It is necessary to remember, that the term “smart power” had been formulated by Joseph Nye in 2003 (Nye, 2003), as he thought that the existing term “soft power” did not describe the non-military actions, directed at pursuing an effective foreign policy. Joseph Nye thought that any state needed “smart strategies” that would unite the instruments of the hard and soft power.

All the development of social relations can be reduced to discussing problems of world order. Thomas Hobbes (Hobbes, 1991) note that the logic of constructing international relations includes the state of uncertainty. States do not have complete information about the potential and intentions of other states. Consequently, they will take into consideration the variant of undesirable actions of another state, and it must be ready for “the worst scenario”.

DISCUSSION

I. N. Timofeev, a Russian scientist, notes that we “discuss hierarchy, power balance, crises, wars, sanctions and international law, not touching upon conceptual bases of these concepts. However, in the framework of the normative political theory the corresponding concepts have been long ago formulated as instruments of legitimizing the concepts of the must-be world order and the organization of

international relations” (Timofeev 2014). It is all about the three approaches to forming interpersonal relations that help to preserve peace. They are the liberal, Marxist and conservative approaches. In different states these approaches are used (not equally successful) as concepts of their development. Western countries, that consider themselves the most developed ones, are carrying out the ideas of liberalism. The main postulate of liberalism is the idea of the human mind and rationality as a powerful transforming forces. It is supposed that if a country is capable of developing a civil state, it can rationally develop international relations. The development of the society is democratic. People have the right to take part in the state policy and influence it. The main argument in favor of democracy is that citizens, as liberals presume, are not interested in war. So the citizens prevent the state from beginning it. This is why all the world should become a democratic place, where governments depend on the will of their citizens. This is a component of liberal relations.

Economic relations imply the following syllogism. States actively trading with each other are not interested in war, as it breaks the settled order. Ruined trade means damage. Legal relations suppose creation of legal norms and international institutions, common to all states, that suggest sanctions in case some states do not share the liberal views.

The Marxist approach to the forming of the world order is that the human mind just takes part in transforming the world. They think a war is waged only where there are flaws in the social order. Liberals propose a change of social order to get rid of such flaws (democracies do not wage wars); Marxists think that the state itself is a violation of the world order.

We can see neomarxist criticism of the liberal approach in the works of Antonio Gramsci (Gramsci, 1997) and Nicos Poulantzas (Poulantzas, 1997). They claim that sooner or later even democratic institutions become bureaucratic, which corresponds to R. Michels' theory of “oligarchization”. First open systems become more and more closed and oligarchic, though they keep the rotation, then they become independent from the citizens, then they develop their own interests. “Among them are the educational system and the mass media, that make it possible to form the image of an enemy in the public opinion and influence the support of certain decisions. Even in the most democratic society nationalism becomes a powerful instrument of mobilization making for the solving of international tasks” (Timofeev, 2014).

It is important to note that both approaches agree that the world order can be built through creating a special type of a just society.

The conservative political theory considers international relations from the viewpoint of the realism of its derivatives. Common sense and political wisdom, pragmatism and traditions, openness to everything that is new and interest to history are considered to be the main factors of conservatism. From the viewpoint of

conservatism both liberals and Marxists are mistaken when they think that the political organization of the state and its inner policy influence its foreign policy. “The only means to tame anarchy and keep the world order is powerful restriction of those who aspire to dominate” (Morgenthau, 2002).

The change of socio-economic formations, the development of states and state institutions does not happen spontaneously. Everything has its preconditions. Information about the state of the economy, the political organization, the challenges and expectations makes it possible for a political actor to preview political events.

A forecast of political events is important for any state, and it is possible only where there is not only some work on the information, but also the possibility of its spreading. Such spreading, in its turn, must not be chaotic. It must be built on the basis of some information strategy. If Obrinskaya defined noopolitic as a strategy of managing political processes, Plougatarenko defined it as a system of global management, Zollner as net mechanisms of civil society, and Abercane, Ronfeldt and Arquilla as an informational strategy, in our opinion all these definitions can be summarized. We can say the following: noopolitic is an information strategy of manipulating international processes by forming people’s positive or negative attitude to the foreign or inner policy of a state or a bloc of states with the aim of creating a positive or negative image of ideas or moral values advocated by it (Nikonov *et al.*, 2015).

One of the reasons for it is admitting that “information” and “power” are interwoven more and more often. In all political, economic and military spheres, the informational “soft power” becomes more important than traditional means. This tendency can take decades, and “soft power” can coexist with the “hard power”. But after all, according to universal human principles, the society, in our opinion, must become disappointed in the “hard power”.

At the present period of the existence of human society, traditional methods of exercising power can stay in the central position of international politics. However, the growth of “soft power” gives the power one more reason to participate in the formation of informational strategy. It is because of the necessity to understand the interrelation of power and information, that scientists look at what is happening in a new way and consider this connection. N. Labush (Labush *et al.*, 2015), Y. Danilova (Danilova *et al.*, 2015) and S.N. Bolshakov (Bolshakov *et al.* 2015) pointed it out in their work to this or that degree.

In the works of researches much attention is paid to the concept of mediocracy. This concept is equally important for noopolitic. When we speak about mediocracy transforming into noopolitic, we take the position of externalism. It states that the appearance of scientific terminology is due to completely external circumstances, including political factors, so the main task of examining events is reduced to reconstruction of social conditions of research activity at certain stages of its development. As Russian scientists A.S. Puiy and S.S. Bodrunova think, the concept

of mediacracy was first introduced in 1975 by Kevin Phillips in his work "Mediacracy: American Parties and Politics in the Communications Age" (Puiy and Bodrunova, 2013). Analyzing the definition, we can make a conclusion that the term defined not the essence of mediacracy, but rather a decoding of the term, that consists of two roots: "media" (understood here as "mass media") and "cracy" ("a regime of power"). To their mind, mediacracy is a qualitative characteristic of a political regime, and it can be perceived as kind of fatality, the result of the process of blending of journalism and politics.

We speak about the interconnection of information and power. Learning mediacracy and the formation of noopolitic were going on practically at the same time. The attention to the term "mediacracy" was forming in the process of development of science. Its meaning can be found in dictionaries, available to the users of the Internet. For example, the dictionary of «Unwords.com» suggests the following definition: "Government, usually indirectly, by the popular media; often a result of democracy going awry. A system in which politicians stop thinking and begin listening exclusively to the media regarding what the important issues are and what they should do about them" (Mediacracy, 2014). Modern researches, and among them, no doubt, Hallin and Mancini, consider the interaction of mass media and politics viewing mass media just as exercising instrumental control over what the power is doing.

Noopolitic as an information strategy of mass media also suggests that media is just used as an instrument. The formed models of mass media development state that mass media are connected with the political system and its development. According to Hallin and Mancini, to analyze political communication we need comparative analysis, and institutes of media that have developed in the West, cannot be analyzed without their political and historical context (Hallin and Mancini P., 2004).

To our mind, there is a problem, which these scientists do not want to see. Their research ignores using mass media for manipulation and propaganda; they think that it is characteristic of non-democratic regimes, for example, socialist (that existed in the USSR and in Cuba). However, content analysis shows that manipulation and political propaganda takes not just a significant, but the leading place in modern democracies (European countries and the USA). Dealing with the term of mediacracy we should find out who forms the contents of mass media information. The existing stereotype of the equal meanings of "journalism" and "mass media" distorts the understanding and definition of mediacracy and its place in the models and practices of modern politics. Speaking at the conference "Mas Media in the Modern World. St Petersburg Readings" in April 2013, P. Mancini, as usual, touched on the topic of media systems as a set of fixed characteristics. In the political context of media systems Mancini notes the different roles that the different roles the state can play, being an owner, regulator and founder of the media, is rooted in the different roles of the state in the society.

Scientists try to describe media systems as mediacracy, that is separated from the state and plays the role of a political subject. The actuality of the given topic is defined by the modern condition of world politics and interrelations of political actors. Informational operations carried out in connection with the events in Ukraine in 2015 – 2016, that were dealt with in mass media, became a litmus paper, showing that treating the topic of mediacracy is necessary. If we speak about media systems, that are, according to Mancini, different in different legal systems, those events showed the inconsistency of the definition. Freedom of speech in democratic states is questionable. In the period of the preparation for the referendum in the Crimea, when the political elite of Europe could not decide what position to take concerning Russia, the time of mediacracy should have come. But, just as it was during the events in South Ossetia and Georgia in 2008, mass media did not form the position of political elites. To be more exact, mass media translated a certain character of information.

Here it becomes clear, that the activity of a journalist and the activity of mass media are far from being the same. For example, in Great Britain and Germany attachments of the “Russian Newspaper” to the leading newspapers of these countries were not published, though there were contracts on those attachments. Conflicts between journalists who did not agree with the position of the editorial board, and the media were described and available to the public in the Internet. So we can make a conclusion that media systems in the Roman and Germanic legal system, in the traditional legal system and in the legal system of socialism are much the same. But this demands diversified studies, as there can exist nuances in the organization of control over media systems.

CONCLUSION

As we have stressed earlier, P. Mancini, D. Hallin, A.S. Puiy, and S.S. Bodrunova view mediacracy in isolation from propaganda and manipulation of mass media. Of course we can study a separate topic, but placing it in vacuum with no connection with real politics, will, in our opinion, lead to an incorrect result. Modern theories of journalism define the place of mass media as that of a link between the state and the society. It is supposed, that through mass media the state receives a feedback from the people. However cynical it may seem, we can agree, that in a democratic society people are the same as electors, who are to take part in elections and vote for either a person who is in the hierarchic power system or another one who is going to be in it. Mediacracy, which we suggest studying, is a part of the structure “state – society”. In our opinion, mass media and mediacracy are not a part of interrelations of the state and the people. Mass media are an instrument of the state, like the army. When it is necessary, the state uses mass media in its interests. Interests of the state do not appear right on the spot.

Everything is done according to a plan and an earlier developed strategy. According to our opinion, it is an information strategy. A state that can form its strategy acts according to it. In such an information strategy there is a place for mediocracy that can be used by the state at an appropriate moment, to substantiate why it is acting this way. It is necessary to take into consideration that the concept of power is still a philosophic category. Taking into consideration the realities of our days, we can say, that mass media have functions of propaganda.

References

- Arquilla J. and Ronfeldt D. (1999). The Emergence of Noopolitik: Toward an American information strategy. Santa Monica: RAND. Retrieved September 24, 2016 from http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/Mr1033.html.
- Arquilla J., Ronfeldt D. (2007). The promise of noöpolitik by David Ronfeldt and John Arquilla First Monday, 12 (8). Retrieved September 24, 2016, from http://firstmonday.org/issues/issue12_8/ronfeldt/index.html
- Bolshakov, S. N., Puiy, Y. V., Bolchakova, Y. M., Nikonov, S. B. (2015). Cloud Technologies in the Promotion strategy of Integrated Communications. Asian Social Science, 11 (19): 8-14.
- Danilova, Y. S., Puiy, A. S., Nikonov, S. B., Bekurov, R. V. and Litvinenko, A. A. (2015). Problems of Ethno-social Representation in Media: Review of Theoretical Approach in XX-XXI Century. International Review of Management and Marketing, 5(Special Issue): 148-153.
- Gramsci, A. (1997). Tyuremnye tetradi [Quaderni del Carcere]. Antologia mirovoy politicheskoy mysl. [Anthology of world political thought]. In 5 volumes. Foreign political thought of XX century. Moscow: Mysl.
- Gehl Robert W. (2015). Server Farms: Disciplined Machines Behind Noopower Media Fields Journal, 6. Retrieved April 01, 2015 from <http://www.mediafieldsjournal.org/server-farms/> (date of access: 01.04.2015).
- Grinyayev, S. N. (1999). Intellektualnoye protivodeystvie informatsionnomu orouzhuyu. [Intellectual Resistance to the Use of Information Warfare.]. Moscow: SINTEG, pp. 232.
- Grinyayev, S.N. (2004). Polye bitvy, kiberprostranstvo. Teoriya, priyomy, sredstva, metody i sistemy vedenia informatsionnoy voyny. [Cyberspace as a Battlefield. Theory, Techniques, Means, Methods and Systems of Information Warfare.] Series: Professional. Kharvest publishing house. Retrieved September 24, 2016 from <http://psyfactor.org/sgreen.htm>
- Hallin D. C. and Mancini P. (2004). Comparing Media Systems. Three Models of Media and Politics. Cambridge, p. 343.
- Hobbes, Th. (1991). Leviathan, ili materiya, forma i vlast gosudarstva tserkovnogo i grazhdanskogo. [Leviathan or the matter, form and power of common-wealth, ecclesiastical and civil.]. Selections in 2 vol. Moscow: Mysl.
- Idriss J. A. (2015). A Simple Paradigm for Noopolitics: The Geopolitics of Knowledge, Oct 15 2015, Articles. E-international relations. Retrieved September 24, 2016 from <http://www.e-ir.info/2015/10/15/a-simple-paradigm-for-noopolitics-the-geopolitics-of-knowledge/>
- Labush, N. S., Nikonov, S. B., Puiy, A. S., Georgieva, E. S. and Bekurov, R. V. (2015) War and Armed Conflict in the Information Space. International Review of Management and Marketing, 5 (1S), pp. 30-35.

- Lazzarato Maurizio (2006). "The Concepts of Life and the Living in the Societies of Control," in Deleuze and the Social. Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 171–190.
- Leontyeva, E.Y., Bounin, A.V. (2014). Metodologiya politicheskikh issledovaniy: traditsii i innovatsii. [Methodology of Political Research: Traditions and Innovations.]. National Association of scientists, 5: 170.
- Mediocracy. Retrieved September 24, 2016 from <http://www.unwords.com/alpha/M/1.html> (access 11.06.2014).
- Morgenthau, H. (n. d.) Politicheskiye otnosheniya mezhdru natsiami: borba za vlast i mir. [Politics Among Nations. The Struggle for Power and Peace.].44 International relations theory. Anthology. Moscow: Gardariki, pp. 74.
- Nikonov, S. B., Baichik, A. V., Puiy, A. S. and Labush, N. S. (2015). Noopolitical aspect of political defamation. European Journal of Science and Theology, 11(5), pp. 265-275.
- Nye J. S. (2003) Get Smart Combining Hard and Soft Power. Retrieved September 24, 2016 from <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/65163/joseph-s-nye-jr/get-smart>
- Obrinskaya, E.K. (2014). Noopolitika kak vneshnepoliticheskaya strategiya. [Noopolitic as a foreign-policy strategy.]. National Association of scientists, 5: 170.
- Obrinskaya, E.K. (2014). Noopolitika kak vneshnepoliticheskaya strategiya: problema definititsii. [Noopolitic as a Foreign-Policy Strategy: Problem of Definition.]. National Association of scientists, 5: 170.
- Plougatarenko, P. N. (2011). Problema issledovaniya poliyicheskogo prostranstva v usloviakh globalizatsii. [Problem of Political Space Research in the Conditions of Globalization]. Vestnik MGOU. History and Political Science, 1: 135–137.
- Poulantzas, N. (1997). Politicheskaya vlast i sotsialnyye klassy kapitalisticheskogo gosudarstva. [Political Power and Social Classes of a Capitalist State] [Anthology of world political thought]. In 5 volumes. Foreign political thought of XX century. Moscow: Mysl.
- Puyu, A.S. and Bodrounova, S.S. (2013). Mediakratia: sovremennyye teorii i praktiki. [Mediocracy; modern theories and practice.]. St Petersburg: St Petersburg University publishing house, pp. 352.
- Savin, V.V. (2013). Spetsifika sovremennogo sotsialnogo poznaniya [Specificity of Modern Social Cognition: thesis of a Candidate of Science in Philosophy]. Volgograd State Technical University. Volgograd, pp. 154.
- Timofeev, I.N. (2014). Mirovoy poryadok ili mirivaya anarchia. Vzglyad na sovremennuyu sistemu mezhdunarodnykh otnosheniy. [World Order or World Anarchy. Considering the Modern System of International Relations.] Russian Council for international cases (RCIC). Moscow: Spetskniga, pp. 48.
- Zollner, O. (2009). Heinrich Heine University of Dusseldorf, winter 2009/2010 Prof. Dr. Oliver Zollner. Course title: «Noopolitik»: Soft power and international communication. Heinrich Heine University of Dusseldorf. Retrieved September 24, 2016 from http://www.public.rz.uni-duesseldorf.de/~olzoe001/uni-ddorf_ws2009.html.