THE CULTURAL EFFORT OF *INFORMATION SHARING* IN THE *KNOWLEDGE-BASED SOCIETY*

Oana-Andreea PIRNUTA*, Mircea BOSCOIANU**

*Faculty of Letters, *TRANSILVANIA* University of Brasov, Romania,
** Faculty of Aeronautic Management, *HENRI COANDA* Air Force Academy, Brasov, Romania

Abstract: *Knowledge is the most precious power of human society and the fundamental unit of knowledge is information. The knowledge-based society is shaped by information. It develops systems of values consolidating its basis, the information culture. The culture of the knowledge-based society consists of knowledge values accumulated in systems of value giving consistency to this type of society. Information plays an important part both in shaping the architecture of the knowledge systems and marring it. The information-based power is, in fact, knowledge-based power having as main characteristics stability and security. Within the framework of the information age, technology can influence and change the future rapidly. Information sharing is more than technology, being based on the responsibility culture of delivering information. It stands for the information exchange among information collectors, analysts and end users. Its main aim is the national security. The Information Sharing New Model offers a new vision interweaving the Shared Information, the Deeper Knowledge and the Improved Security. The 21st century war is also known as the information war. The new face of the modern war is highlighted under the impact of modern technology without diminishing the role of the human factor as an interface between technology and battlefield. In the context of the information warfare, information security represents the protection of data against unauthorized access and alteration of the information content. The knowledge-based society is founded on the information society. It represents more than the information society due to the major role played by the knowledge-information within society.*

Keywords: *cultural effort, information sharing, knowledge-based society, power, stability, security.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Knowledge is man's most precious capacity as well as the most important power of human society. The basic unit of knowledge is information.

Information stands for the reason to be of the communicative act. There is no information in itself, only information about something, related to something.

It is very important to measure the quantity of information of a certain event. Information is often identified with the novelty brought in the communicative act which supposes an interaction. The receiver stands for the information consumer and the sender is the information generator.

The concern for the study of *intelligence* has never been as significant as in the early 21st century.

The terrorist attacks of 9/11, the media scandals regarding the Gulf War, the military interventions of Afghanistan and Iraq as well as the change of the security paradigms in the

field of national and international security have produced major transformations in approaching *intelligence.*

Information, under all its aspects, is part of the arsenal of the new asymmetric conflicts.

2. INFORMATION CULTURE

The main feature of human society is knowledge. According to Alvin Toffler [11], knowledge is one of the traditional elements of power, besides power and money. Within the framework of this type of society, information represents the essential force as it assures the process of knowledge. This type of society is based on the knowledge culture, that is, on knowledge as process and system of values and on knowledge science, that is, epistemology.

The knowledge-based society is modelled and patterned by information due to the fact that it receives, consumes and generates information, thus developing systems of values and consolidating the information culture.

The fundamental concept of civilization is culture and the basic concept of culture is value. The role of information is very important in shaping the systems of value, of knowledge. Information gives substance to the act of communication. It represents an essential condition of the decision.

3. INFORMATION AND *INTELLIGENCE*

A correct decision can be taken only according to precise and complete information. Information must be interrelated with other data and introduced in an information system. The utility of information is very important in adopting the political line of the decision factors, in conflicts, treaties, in the fight against all the actions targeting at the national security.

Intelligence represents the way to know information, to turn it to good account, to give it value.

According to Herbert E. Mayer, *intelligence* represents the set of operations of collecting, filtering, analyzing the data and disseminating the intelligence products having value and satisfying the needs of a specific consumer [5].

Intelligence aims at operating with information, at assessing the connections and effects of the information process. The *intelligence* product stands for the *summum* of the information activity, which can be found in the philosophy of power. It stands for a strategic product, for the art of operating with information.

According to Stephen Marrin [4], knowledge does not mean power. Knowledge, by itself, lacks power. But power facilitates the ability to change the behaviour of a certain person.

The scientific knowledge of information is the first condition of an information architecture based on effects. The information-based power is, in fact, knowledge-based power being constructive, sustainable and beneficial for knowledge. Stability and security are the main characteristics of the knowledge-based power.

4. COMMUNICATION IN THE FIELD OF *INTELLIGENCE*

The most frequently used forms of communication within the framework of the process of communication among the specialists and researchers in the field of *intelligence* are direct and indirect communication.

Direct communication approaches issues of great interest for the field of *intelligence* from an interpersonal perspective within the framework of certain common activities, such as: conferences, symposia, workshops, research grants, etc. This type of communication has certain advantages. It offers both mutual information as it is consistent including updated information and explicit information regarding the models, norms, values, policies, binding together different specialists and researchers belonging to various institutions having common interests in the field of *intelligence.*

Indirect communication covers the needs of information concerning the research studies without maintaining a real relation with the research environment. It is conducted by

"HENRI COANDA"
AIR FORCE ACADEMY
ROMANIA

GERMANY

"GENERAL M.R. STEFANIK"
ARMED FORCES ACADEMY
SLOVAK REPUBLIC

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE of SCIENTIFIC PAPER
AFASES 2011
Brasov, 26-28 May 2011

written means, such as: newspaper articles, reports, etc. and by electronic means, such as: television, radio, Internet, videoconferences, etc.

Communication, among the *intelligence* specialists and researchers, aims at developing contacts, elaborating professional standards, encouraging social communication.

5. *INFORMATION SHARING CULTURE*

The present-day threats to security impose reunited formulas of response. Concerning *information sharing*, the relation cause-effect can be summarized as follows: the new threats require that the action of security, through intelligence, should be that of a complex of continuously improving information networks possessing proactive and reactive sources of information, having an accelerated flow and a high level of precision. In keeping with the changing rhythm of present-day threats, it is recommended for us to accelerate these types of actions within the information community.

In the information age in which we live, technology can influence and change the future rapidly. *Information sharing* is more than technology, being based on the responsibility culture of delivering information in *intelligence.*

Within the framework of the US *Intelligence* Community, information sharing can be defined as the act of information exchange among information collectors, analysts and end users in order to strengthen national security.

The promotion of *information sharing* has been increased after the terrorist attacks of 9/11. Thus, the information sharing, as a means of adapting to the contemporary security challenges, has represented one of the main recommendations of the 9/11

Commission turning into the landmark of the American strategy to reshape *intelligence.*

According to Jones Calvert, those who collect information should achieve a synthesized and multidimensional *intelligence* [1].

The role of *information sharing* in the *intelligence* American community can be compared with the role played by the nervous system in a human body.

6. A NEW PERSPECTIVE ON *INFORMATION SHARING*

In 2008, DNI elaborated the *Information Sharing Strategy* [13], the first strategy of information sharing among the intelligence communities, issued in order to strengthen the US national security.

The previously mentioned document highlights the ways of removing the institutional and technical barriers so that the federal government should have the authority to take decisions of vital importance for the national security.

The strategy offers a new perspective on *information sharing* rendering a model of applying this vision. It supposes an interconnection within the framework of the intelligence community between the information exchange, achieving an in-depth knowledge and an improved security by interweaving the *Shared Information,* the *Deeper Knowledge* and the *Improved Security.*

The new model of *information sharing* is completely different from the period prior to the 9/11 attacks and it supposes the adoption of a dominant behaviour in *information sharing* which should characterize the entities involved, being based on the responsibility to offer necessary information. Thus, there is a clear-cut distinction between the *responsibility to provide* and the *need to know*.

The agencies should belong to an extended institutional complex of the *enterprise* type and the information sharing should take place in this large context: between agencies with various partners and along the international borders. Thus, there should be made the distinction between *enterprise-centric* and *agency-centric*.

The cooperation should be a dynamic one, based on a rapid adaptation to the needs, which are continuously changing, taking into account the possibility of including new partners in the process of information sharing.

Security should be shaped within the data bases, that is, *security-in-depth*. The access should be based on attributes beyond the classification levels according to missions, environment or affiliation.

7. REASSESSING THE *INTELLIGENCE CYCLE* PARADIGM

The *intelligence cycle* is one of the few theoretical paradigms concerning *intelligence*. Theoreticians have tried to suggest new formulas corresponding to the changes that have taken place lately. The concept of *intelligence cycle* is one of the few paradigms, which has survived after the end of the Cold War.

The Occidental countries have passed through different stages, from *containment*, through *détente* towards *globalization* whereas the US army has shifted from the active defense to the *Airland Battle* doctrine and the network doctrine.

In the new context, the political and military decision factors need sophisticated *intelligence* products supporting the modern doctrines of fighting the war.

According to Kristan J. Wheaton [12], as long as an information agency does not theorize a new model, adapted to the present-day requirements of fighting the war, it is unlikely to eliminate the old paradigm.

8. INFORMATION WAR AND INFORMATION SECURITY

The 21st century war is also known as the information war. The new face of the modern war is highlighted under the impact of modern technology without diminishing the role of the human factor as an interface between technology and battlefield.

The information technologies are coupled with the energy components of war. The decisive energy actions, the mobility and precision will be interwoven with the information war techniques and methods in an extremely intelligent dynamic configuration.

According to W. Schwartau [10], the information war consists in those actions carried out in order to protect, corrupt, reject or mar information or information resources, which aims at obtaining an advantage, reaching a certain goal or gaining an important victory against the enemy.

Dumitru Oprea [6] considers that both information security and the defensive information war are included in the concept of *information assurance*.

The information wars do not involve only computer networks, but also information under any form as well as the way in which the information is conveyed.

In the context of the information warfare, information security represents the protection of data against unauthorized access and alteration of the information content.

9. CONCLUSIONS

The knowledge-based society is founded on the information society. It represents more than the information society due to the major role played by the knowledge-information within society.

Under the conditions in which the world moves towards the service-oriented system, everything is changing, thus new action areas are generated.

It is estimated that new opportunities will be developed, thus rendering new services which allow a rapid *information sharing*.

The *intelligence* services have been repatterned according to the new characteristics of the information society. They must redefine their objectives, policies and doctrines in order to identify the new threats and the means to fight against them.

"HENRI COANDA"
AIR FORCE ACADEMY
ROMANIA

GERMANY

"GENERAL M.R. STEFANIK"
ARMED FORCES ACADEMY
SLOVAK REPUBLIC

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE of SCIENTIFIC PAPER
AFASES 2011
Brasov, 26-28 May 2011

The immediate effect of the security paradigm shift at both internal and international level has consisted in transforming the role of *intelligence* in the decisional process, the political action being more and more based on the quantity and quality of the *intelligence* products.

According to Alan Collins, *'from time immemorial, tribes, clans, empires, and nations have collected information about other groups in order to make more informed decisions when dealing with them. This information is called intelligence and its collection may well be the "second oldest profession" in the world. As from the beginning, modern nations believe that the collection, analysis, and use of good intelligence will enhance their security in an anarchic world'* [2].

Since the early 20th century, most global powers have had military and civilian *intelligence* agencies which have operated during peacetime as well as wartime.

According to John Keegan, a well-known British military historian, *intelligence* does not win wars [3], but it uses the courage and skills of certain persons to achieve this thing.

The modern security environment, marked by terrorism, proliferation of mass destruction weapons, drug trafficking, generated against the background of globalization, has imposed more intense intelligence activities as well as concerns regarding the consequences of the intelligence activities.

When the *intelligence* process is conducted appropriately, the *intelligence* services contribute to the national security of each state. When this process does not function normally, national security can be weakened and the *intelligence* activities of the foreign reactions generate a type of sophisticated diplomacy increasing the international tensions.

Future work should be focused on the impact of globalization on security, the influence of culture on *information sharing* as well as the mechanisms of recovery after the recent global crisis.

For a better understanding of the impact of globalization on the states' security, a transvaluation is needed, a repatterning, a redimensioning, a new approach according to which the actors of international relations should adapt the political instruments of the integration of present-day and future relations.

REFERENCES

1. Calvert, Jones, 'Intelligence Reform: The Logic of Information Sharing', in *Intelligence and National Security*. Volume 22, Number 3, June 2007, pp. 384-385, (2007).

2. Collins, Alan, *Contemporary Security Studies*. New York: Oxford University Press, p. 265, (2007).

3. Keegan, John, *Intelligence in War: Knowledge of the Enemy from Napoleon to Al-Quaeda.* London: Hutchinson, p. 28, (2003).

4. Marrin, Stephen, 'Intelligence Analysis Theory: Explaining and Predicting Analytic Responses', in *Intelligence and National Security*, Volume 22, December 2007, p. 821, (2007).

5. Mayer, Herbert E., *Adevarata lume a intelligence-ului*. New York, p. 21, (1987).

6. Oprea, Dumitru, *Protectia si securitatea informatiilor.* Iasi: Polirom, p. 20, (2003).

7. Pirnuta, O.-A., Arseni, A. A., Boscoianu, Mircea, 'Transnational Organised Crime. International and Domestic Legal Framework', in *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Crisis Management: World and Homeland*

Security held on 16th-17th June 2010, University of Defence, Brno, Czech Republic, pp. 447-456, ISBN 978-80-7231-728-8 (2010).

8. Pirnuta, O.-A., Moisescu, F.-G., Draghici, C.-O., Arseni, A. A., 'Romanian and EU Institutions Involved in the Fight against Terrorism', *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference The Knowledge-Based Organization*: Management & Military Sciences, Sibiu, 25th-27th November 2010, organized by "Nicolae Bălcescu" Land Forces Academy & The National Authority for Scientific Research, pp. 365-371, ISBN 1843-682X (2010).

9. Pirnuta, O.-A., Draghici, C.-O., Boscoianu, M., Zota, A.-C., 'Terrorist Risks and Threats to the International Security Environment', *Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference Management – Theory, Education and Practice* 2010 organized by the Academy of the Armed Forces of general M. R. Štefánik, 29th September – 1st October 2010, Liptovský Mikuláš, Slovak Republic, pp. 248-255, ISBN 978-80-8040-404-8 (2010).

10. Schwartau, W., *Information Warfare*. 2nd Edition, New York: Thunder's Mouth Press (1996).

11. Toffler, Alvin, *Puterea in miscare*. Bucuresti: Antet (1998).

12. Wheaton, Kristan J., *Revolution in intelligence*. Center for Security Studies, ETH Zurich (2009).

13. *** *United States Intelligence Community. Information Sharing Strategy*. February 22 (2008) DNI [online] Available: www.dni.gov (February, 2008).