

THE LONG ROAD FROM SECURITY TO INTELLIGENCE. CULTURE, NEW CONCEPTS AND PERSPECTIVES

Alexandra POPESCU*

Abstract

All the new risks and threats to the national security have caused each society to reconsider the general human values, values that represent a bridge between states and nations. Following the threat of the Sovietic bloc, the Western world, and beyond, has defined its main risks, dangers and threats to the national and international security taking into consideration both the major changes in the security environment – increased international terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction – and the political, economic and social development of Western countries.

Thus, the project aims to determine the role and importance of the existence of a security culture within any society, and to show, at the same time, how this culture has transformed under the influence of globalization and not only, from the concept of security to the concept of Intelligence. Furthermore, I will emphasize the role of Intelligence within society and to point out how society as a whole, and Intelligence organizations in particular, had to adapt to the changes that have shaped the world in the past 20 years.

Keywords: security culture, intelligence, globalization, concepts, risks, dangers, threats.

Introduction

The world is now in a new millenium, in which the new risks and threats to security triggered a reconsideration of the general human values that bind together states and nations. Following the threat of the Soviet block, the Western world, and beyond, has defined its main risks, dangers and threats to the national and international security, both in terms of changes in the security environment - increased international terrorism, proliferation of

* National Institute for Intelligence Studies, Junior Researcher.

weapons of mass destruction and decay of states – and in terms depending on the state of political, economic and social development of Western countries. In this context, the complexity of the concept of security has been particularly highlighted, whose representation is influenced by social change. Thus, not only does the concept apply to many dimensions - military, political, economic, social and environmental - but also in the study of security it is necessary to take into account the local, social, cultural and historical context of the reference object of an analysis. We can say that the security status of individuals should be the starting point of any study in this area, regardless of the level of analysis (national, zonal, regional or global), as the human kind represents the vital element of all forms of social organization, and the degree of achievement of their security is reflected in the security of the group to which they belong (Jean-Jacques Rousseau, 1984, book I, chapter 1).

The most important security threats, such as those mentioned above, have causes related to the individual's sense of insecurity caused by: the degradation of the human condition, disparities in economic development both between individuals and between countries and regions, the struggle for power, divergent interests manifested from the individual level to the level of alliances, etc. For these reasons, it is obvious that we can not talk about achieving the state of national/zonal/regional/global security within environments in which the individual does not feel protected. If an individual is threatened, then both the security of the group to which he or she belongs and the security of other related communities are threatened.

Security, security culture – conceptual limits

Security has its own development, a specific legislation, a stable target, stability and an adequate support. As an actional element, security is the ability of a system to preserve its functional characteristics under the action of destructive factors or factors that can cause such mutations, as to become dangerous to the environment or health of humans who are in the risk zone (Buzan, 2000, pp. 15-23).

Until the 1980s, in the field of international relations there was no coherent school of thought that could develop the concept of security, concept that had a subsidiary role in geopolitical analysis, being developed mainly in the military, in the strategic studies and related to the main concepts which are developed in schools of international relations (Buzan, 2000, pp. 23-25). The current context of the notion of security leads to the analysis of the quality of a phenomenon/ process/ product/ system in terms of their stability.

Security, thus, becomes the main determinant element of quality, leading at the same time to the recognition of the crucial role of risk, resulted from the dynamic of actions, risk that may be accepted (tolerated) or cleared (treated) judging by the cost that may be incurred (Buzan, 2000, pp. 25-37).

Security, in general, can be approached in a variety of perspectives. The theoretical analysis of the concept developed by representatives of the Copenhagen School (B. Buzan, Bob McKinlay) presents factors from five main sectors which affect human security, namely: military, political, economic, social and environmental. Another important factor contributing to security that should be taken into account in the analysis is represented by the performance of a state government, on which depends the degree of development of a country actually depends.

By culture, in general, one can understand a collection of beliefs, norms, habits, attitudes, rules and common practices for a particular organizational group. If we refer, however, to attitudes, rules and practices of an area, then we talk about culture within that particular area (Banks, J.A., Banks, & McGee, C. A, 1989, <http://www.carla.umn.edu/culture/definitions.html>).

In this context, it can be said that security culture is a sum of values, norms, attitudes and actions that determine the understanding and assimilation of the security concept and of other concepts related to it: national security, international security, collective security, insecurity, security policy etc.

In the process of developing ways to create and promote a culture of security at the level of individuals, it is important to take into account the values a society has developed in time. In a world characterized by conflicts and asymmetrical threats, it is very important to respect the values of a society, because they play an important role in the development of mankind. A viable security environment can only be obtained by respecting the values, all values in fact. We should also mention that we live in an informational society, a technologized era, which has different rules for manifestation from those we already know, and international security is no longer influenced by classical determinism (Schreier, 2010, pp. 37-40).

In order to conclude, we can say that security culture concerns the ways to approach things, concepts of organization members, attitudes, opinions, traditions, perceptions, ideals and ethical standards, in terms of security. Specifically, if we refer to the attitudes towards risk, to the rules and practices used to minimize its effects, then we will talk about security culture.

Trends in the development of security culture

The changing trend of the security culture in contemporary society is natural, since the climate that stimulates development, and the large scope of socialization, both are the result of scientific and technical progress and set new values and assumptions. As a consequence, the retention for a long time of some concepts/beliefs/rules which have had a beneficial effect can, in fact, turn into a hindrance for the development process, prejudices or rigidity.

In a highly competitive environment, resistance to change turns a beneficial condition into an unfavourable one, and positive culture into negative. Although changing the culture of security is generally unbearable for members of an organization, it is necessary and possible for the survival and development of the organization, because only a sustainable yet flexible culture ensures competitiveness and youth.

The main elements of a security culture

Risks, dangers and threats to global security and stability have diversified, although some of their forms of expression were more difficult to detect in a period of time which could enable effective counter actions. The current situation requires new techniques for monitoring and evaluating the sources of instability, while establishing and developing adequate capabilities of responding in time and space.

The effects of globalization began to be felt. After a considerable period of reflux, the world economy revived. The flow of goods and investment, technological development and progress of democracy have brought more freedom and prosperity to people. In this context, transnational threats (terrorism, drug and strategic materials trafficking and migration, organized crime), began taking advantage of the permeability of borders; for this reason they were more likely to spread on a global scale. The fight against them has become a new and unique component of globalization. In this context, state defence against risks, dangers and threats needs to be carried out both traditionally, by individual policies and strategies, and through collective forms of action, permanently adapted to the characteristics of the security environment in progress (Schreier, 2010, pp. 39-46).

Beside risk factors, security may be affected by domestic vulnerabilities, which can take different forms. The main weaknesses may consist of: lack of resources allocated to the public security and defense institutions, social inequities, proliferation of underground economy and increased corruption, economic crime, disturbing public order, the possibility

of producing an environmental disaster, natural disasters, hazards, maintaining a low level of information infrastructure and migration, all this can take a mass scale in case of socioeconomic phenomena and unruly processes (Schreier, 2010, pp. 39-46).

Due to the globalization process that has rapidly spread all over the world, the importance has shifted from the collective security to the individual, as a member of society, whether national, zonal or international. Globalization increasingly brings into discussion more problems whose solution refers to aspects of the human sphere of life.

The human dimension of contemporary society is becoming more and more important. All actors on the world stage are aware of the importance of achieving and maintaining a stable international security environment. Both states and national and international organizations realize that in order to be assured, security must be performed both ways - internal and external, given the fact that security is firstly built from the inside to the outside. A state can not be the guarantor/provider of regional security if it is not stable and secure inside, if it is not able to provide security for its citizens. In this case, a very important element is the communication and cooperation between the state and its institutions, on one hand, and the state and civil society, on the other. Most times, moral support and permission granted by the state society is vital (Schreier, 2010, pp. 55-63).

On this coordinate we can include the necessity of creating and promoting a security culture among the members of a society. In this type of culture are included elements related to the existing security environment, internal and external risks and ways of action to prevent/ mitigate them. In this context, we conclude that shaping a strong security culture is utterly necessary and this is, at the same time, an indicator of a healthy, prosperous and functional society. Taking into account the benefits of a strong security culture, the state must constantly engage, through its institutions, in informing society on relevant issues and developing a strengthened security culture of the population.

From security culture to Intelligence culture

Statistics show that at the dawn of the 3rd millennium the number of conflicts between states has considerably reduced, but the number of ethnic conflicts and asymmetric actions has increased. In addition, there have been numerous other outbreaks of conflict, such as the lack of water resources, states which have lost control of their national territory, borders between

countries that do not correspond to ethnic or historical boundaries, etc. No one can say that today's world is a safer world, a world where almost all events are directed towards the peace and welfare of all inhabitants of the planet.

Although traditional threats have been reduced, what happened on September 11, 2001 proved that the world is more unstable than we could imagine. In the globalization era, when the permeability of borders is growing, alongside with the development of new technologies arise more ways to put them to the wrong use. Especially after 2000, official statements do not always correspond with the true intentions of states. In many countries, even among those having a developed economy and consolidated democracies, the official power does not overlap totally with the real power. Large and powerful interest groups, transnational organizations are exercising de facto leadership, leadership which should belong to those elected bodies, apparently democratically voted (Treverton, 2003, pp. 11-13).

Amplification of threats, such as asymmetric threats, including terrorism which is the most relevant and the most common, implies taking preventive measures. A state needs information which can enable it to take justified decisions in order to maintain and improve its security. Informational activity (or intelligence, as it is being increasingly addressed in recent years) is vital to national security, and the above presented information supports the need for a sustained intelligence activity. Since the armed forces, in the classical meaning, have reduced their power, the role of intelligence is increasing significantly.

New features of the socio-political and economic crisis require a new approach in the intelligence activity, approach that may prevent political and professional shortcomings which have a negative influence. We speak of a need for change, for completing a journey towards a new ethic of the intelligence activity, in order to cope with the rigors of our modern world. A body of information serves a particular entity decision. In order to fulfil its tasks, the information entity, no matter the name, collects data to obtain the necessary information for decision-makers. So, the entity of information must handle a specific domain, which means knowledge. In order to know, one is supposed to take particular action to obtain information, and in order to act, a specific plan is required. From this description it appears that intelligence activity, in the broadest sense, requires knowledge (what, for whom, for what), action (how) and organization (who). Although it can be analyzed

separately, these three components are tightly linked (Barger, 2005, pp. 24-31).

For this reason, an integrating approach of the intelligence activity, in order to optimize this process, is essential. Starting from the definition of intelligence in a broader sense, as based on the aforementioned components – knowledge of what is significant, methods to obtain the necessary data and transform them into information, and organizational structure for accomplishing the first and second components – the development of a theory about intelligence activity will be based on a systemic approach of the activity itself, taking into account all the components mentioned above and the factors influencing them (Barger, 2005, pp. 24-31).

Revolution of the Intelligence concepts

Informational activity, or intelligence, plays a crucial role in achieving security. Intelligence helps maintain peace and order by reducing the risk of international conflict, being, at the same time, a support for diplomatic and military efforts to stop the spread of unconventional weapons. Also, intelligence plays a key role in the defense and protection against terrorist threats, transnational crime and other sources of violence.

Intelligence is necessary to detect the aggressive intentions of a foreign enemy and to define them, such as indirect aggression or preparation for the next step in intensifying the threat. In short, it takes intelligence to prevent threats before they escalate. Prevention requires decision makers to assess threats, decide the inevitability of conflict and make decisions for defense. Policy makers need to judge the level of risk to which the nation is ready and decide when an action will take place, taking into account both costs and consequences. It becomes imperative that intelligence services should anticipate the needs of those who will make the decision at the political level (Schreier, 2010, pp. 64-68).

The profound changes in the international security environment have had an impact on all areas of life, including intelligence activity. In this respect, in the next period the need for a revolution in the field will be felt. It is not a revolution in technology, cars, technic, software or speed. It is a revolution in concepts. So far, for 50 years, the information revolution focused on the letter "T" (technology) of the binomial IT field. The new revolution in information focus on "I" and considers the meaning and purpose of information. And this leads quickly to redefine the tasks at using information and to redefine

institutions fulfilling these tasks (Voicilă, <https://andreivocila.wordpress.com/2010/10/06/de-la-cultura-de-securitate-la-cultura-de-intelligence/>).

Conclusions

The models used in intelligence activity during the Cold War no longer meet the current requirements. It is necessary to develop a new model to obtain a leverage in the fight against both threats and non-traditional methods and sources. This is possible by identifying and developing new business concepts and new information ethics of intelligence.

The old model of threat, globally and especially within the great powers, highlights strategic nuclear forces and conventional ones, that were in connection with a government, that had hierarchical operational structure, that were linear in development. They were used according to the well-known and accepted rules of employment and doctrine, they were relatively easy to detect and track in the making and were supported by intelligence means generally recognized (Schreier, 2010, pp. 55-63).

In contrast, the new threat model is, in general, non-governmental, unconventional and nonlinear, random dynamic and nonlinear in incidence, with no constraints or rules of engagement. It does not have a known doctrine, it is almost impossible to predict and is supported by criminals, drug traders, terrorists, corrupt people, extremists and religious fanatics, xenophobic, mercenaries etc. Today, the model is defined by a single generic word, asymmetric (Schreier, 2010, pp. 55-63).

The old model of intelligence relied heavily on secret and technical and very expensive collection technique, given the so-called enemy states. The new model of intelligence must include and manage the information boom and, in particular, the boom in multilingual digital information, while managing the knowledge in the field by direct observation of reality.

The link between understanding threats and force structure is based on formulating and validating a new conceptual architecture that will integrate, when needed, classic elements, but that will march towards the development of new concepts, more suited to the security environment of the present and the future, which has an amazing dynamic.

Today, ethno-nationalist conflicts (state against nation) represent more than 50% of all confrontations, ethnic or tribal conflicts and anti-regime wars (state against insurrection) – over 15%. State against state conflicts represent less than 10 % and wars of decolonization and genocidal wars

complete the rest up to 100 % (Voicilă, <https://andreivocila.wordpress.com/2010/10/06/de-la-cultura-de-securitate-la-cultura-de-intelligence/>).

Therefore, a new approach to intelligence activity that should be a well-thought and balanced change in terms of opening the passage from secret to public, from the traditional military concern to non-traditional security factors including water, energy, food, diseases and sustainable development, from current monitoring to historical and cultural contextual analysis, from the fragmented community of secrecy to a network that is able to exploit information distributed. Above all, the new approach to intelligence activity is comprehensive, reliable and relevant to the challenges of all forms of threat, especially to non-traditional forms. The new approach to intelligence analysis can provide a decisive asymmetric advantage in local, national or regional non-traditional threats. The road to a new ethic of intelligence is a strategy to be followed.

Bibliography

1. Banks, J.A., Banks, & McGee, C. A. (1989). *Multicultural education*, Allyn & Bacon Press, Needham Heights, <http://www.carla.umn.edu/culture/definitions.html>.
2. Barger, Deborah G. (2005). *Toward a Revolution in Intelligence Affairs*, RAND National Security Research Division, Santa Monica.
3. Buzan, Barry. (2000). *Popoarele, statele și teama. O agendă pentru studii de securitate internațională în epoca de după Războiul Rece*, Ed. Cartier, Chișinău.
4. Chalk, P. (1985). *Non-Military Security and Global Order*, Palgrave Press, New York, 2000 Laqueur, Walter, *A World of Secrets: Uses & Limits of Intelligence*, Basic Press, New York.
5. David, Aurel V. (2005). *Sociologia națiunilor*, Ed. Tempus Dacoromânia, București.
6. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, (1984). *On the Social Contract*, trans. Judith R. Masters, New York: St. Martins Press, book I, chapter 1.
7. Tomlinson, John. (2002). *Globalizare și cultură*, Ed. Amarcord, București.
8. *National Doctrine of Security Intelligence*, approved in Country's Defense Supreme Council on 23.06.2004.
9. Schreier, Fred. (2010). *Transforming Intelligence Services. Making them smarter, more agile, more effective and more efficient*, Study Group Information, Reprocenter Vienna, Vienna.
10. Treverton, Gregory F. (2003). *Reshaping National Intelligence for an Age of Information*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
11. Warner, Michael. (2014). *The rise and fall of Intelligence. An international security history*, Georgetown University Press, Washington DC.

Internet resources

1. Băloi, Aurel, *Conceptul de securitate – Școli de gândire*, available at <http://www.studiidesecuritate.ro>
2. Voicilă, Andrei, *De la cultura de securitate la cultura de intelligence*, available at <https://andreivocila.wordpress.com/2010/10/06/de-la-cultura-de-securitate-la-cultura-de-intelligence/>
3. Voinov – Kohler, Juliette – *La sécurité globale: Une approche exhaustive de menaces envers la sécurité de l'individu*, available at <http://www.deza.admin.ch/ressources/deza.produit-f332.pdf>
4. <http://www.sri.ro>