Krzysztof Kubiak

Professor, The Jan Kochanowski University of Kielce, Poland
kkubiak@ujk.edu.pl. ORCID: 0000-0002-9623-923X

Roman S. Czarny

PhD, The Jan Kochanowski University of Kielce, Poland
roman.czarny@ujk.edu.pl. ORCID: 0000-0002-1923-7660

War in the Era of the Sum of All Fears and the Monopolization of the Information Space

Introduction

Even on a general level, forecasting the nature of future armed conflicts is an ex-tremely complex task. Just like attempts to develop a comprehensive peace agree-ment for the Middle East for politicians, so intentions to capture key elements of the armed struggles of the future have become a graveyard of good intentions for forecasters and analysts. For the risk of making a mistake is great, and the infamy heaped on the author of a missed forecast is difficult to describe. Nonetheless, ef-forts aimed at even sketching the specific features of confrontations between states, coalitions, but also between states and societies[1] should be undertaken because

---

[1] This follows the apt notion introduced by General Rupert Smith. It should be noted, however, that Smith was writing at a time when the transregional effects of the US interventions and Iraq had yet to spread, and general assessments were built on the generally positive results of the involvement of external forces in the Balkans. Moreover, one of the most serious mistakes was considered to be the late commencement of combat operations aimed at forcing peace. Cf. R. Smith, *The Utility of Force: The Art of War in the Modern World*, TPB, Johanneshov 2012, pp. 382–385.

the density of the probabilistic fog shrouding the future events will turn out to be even greater, and our actions even less rational.

The environment for waging wars (including technical instrumentation) has been constantly evolving, but this process, starting from the first industrial revolution, has increased its dynamics. One can assume that the next acceleration will be brought by research on artificial intelligence, genetics and nanotechnologies, as well as on new energy sources. However, the authors of this text intend to focus on, treated in general terms, the relationship between the ability of society to act under conditions of threat and the phenomenon of information space, exemplified by the so-called social media (new media) managed by several supra-state decision-making centres.

Changing social environment of war – information space

In analysing the volatility of the war environment, the authors wish to draw attention to the factors that have already occurred after the end of the Cold War, yet were not associated with a simple change in the architecture of global and regional security systems. Perhaps the most significant changes in the war environment, which elude both recapitulation and forecasting efforts, are related to the phenomenon called the infosphere, virtual space, and the interpenetration between physical reality and virtual reality. It should be emphasized that the virtual space is not quite the expected child of the US projects to increase the resilience of the command system under conditions of nuclear war.[2] The result, judged from the perspective of three decades, generally exceeded the expectations of the creators. The HyperText Markup Language (HTML), developed and released to the public in the early 1990s, combined with an extremely dynamic multiplication of links, generated not only an extremely powerful communication tool, but in fact, a distinct dimension of modern civilization.[3] The defence implications of the digitalization of many aspects of reality and national security were recognized relatively early on, but attention focused primarily on the possibility of directly impacting the physical dimension using digital space. This was expressed in a very heated discussion, only a few years ago, about the so-called revolution in military affairs (RMA).[4]

---

[2] This issue has lived to see an abundance of literature covering it, to mention for example: J. Abbate, *Inventing the Internet*, MIT Press, Cambridge 1999; J. Gillies, R. Cailliau, *How the Web was Born: The Story of the World Wide Web*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2007; J. Ryan, *History of the Internet and the Digital Future*, Reaktion Books, London 2013. This is, of course, only the tip of the proverbial iceberg.

[3] Cf. J. Wasilewski, 'Zarys definicji cyberprzestrzeni', *Przegląd Bezpieczeństwa Wewnętrznego* 2013, no. 9, pp. 225–234. Terminological (and other) issues are more broadly addressed in: T. Aleksandrowicz, *Świat w sieci. Państwa, społeczeństwa, ludzie. W poszukiwaniu nowego paradygmatu bezpieczeństwa narodowego*, Difin, Warszawa 2018; *idem*, *Kluczowe megatrendy w bezpieczeństwie państwa w XXI wieku*, Difin, Warszawa 2020.

[4] In the Polish literature, this phenomenon, but also the consequences of uncritical submission to certain intellectual fashions and uncritical duplication of content generated in centers considered to be leading, was widely discussed by J. Maroń, *Wokół teorii rewolucji militarnej. Wybrane problemy*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, Wrocław 2011.

The next step was to implement scenarios of using the digital space to conduct intelligence activities or attacks on key elements of critical infrastructure (from the proliferation of widespread dysfunctions in banking networks, to the hostile take-over of control over energy transmission systems, air traffic, etc.). This is how the issue is attempted to be covered, among others, by the Tallinn Manual, which is, in fact, an attempt at taming fear or uncertainty by describing it rather than actually solving the problems.[5] In the shadow of the approach named the engineering one, which in essence just defined narrow areas of risk and counteraction by means of expansion of security systems, which was a rightly justifiable but also a simpler procedure, there remained a broad dimension of social changes generated by cyberspace in the feedback system.[6] The thesis can be put forward that, in principle, until the emergence of information about the impact of activities in the information space (specifically, in social media) on the results of the 2016 US presidential election, the topic was treated in strictly niche terms. This was largely due to a rift resulting from mutual misunderstanding between engineers and hard security specialists solving very specific problems, and representatives of social sciences (sociologists, media scholars, and social psychologists), active mainly at universities. As a result, the area of experience shared by both trends in the approach is quite modest.

Information and, through it, the psychological impact on the enemy since the dawn of wars has been an integral part of confrontation. So, what has changed with the emergence of the information space and, particularly, the phenomenon euphemistically called the new media or the social media? First of all, the density of information distribution networks has increased dramatically, and thanks to mobile devices, the impact on the recipients has become almost continuous. The time it takes for the distributor of information (or rather the message) to react to situation changes has also shortened. Finally, thanks to the systems of algorithmization, mass data processing, psychological profiling, and capacity of bandwidth, the recipient receives an individualized message that corresponds to their preferences, and thus is also capable of activating their fears, phobias, and strengthening resentments – in general, of reassuring them that there is a whole community of people who perceive the world in a very similar, if not identical, manner.

New or social media are an instrument of influence aimed primarily at civilian communities and it is less effective in relation to the armed forces, including soldiers on long-term or permanent duty. The personnel of the armed forces are necessarily much more socialized, motivated, and subjected to strong executive and formal discipline, which makes information infiltration more difficult and facilitates its counteraction by administrative methods. This does not mean, however, that soldiers,

---

[5]   *Tallin Manual 2.0 of the International Law Applicable to Cyber Operations*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2017.

[6]   The authors' diagnosis is confirmed by Lawrence Freedman's opinion. In 2017, he wrote that the term 'information warfare' entered circulation in the early 1990s. It had two meanings that were easily confused. The first referred to attempts to influence public opinion by manipulating the content of information, and the second – to measures designed to disrupt systems of communication and information transmission. The former fell within the competence of propagandists, while the latter – within that of engineers. Cf. L. Freedman, *The Future of War: A History*, Public Affairs, New York 2019, p. 306.

including those from formations regarded as select or elite, do not suffer from Facebook disease.[7] In their case, though, the treatment seems to be simpler and more effective. Looking at it from another angle – professional military personnel live in their own information bubble and are generally not interested in breaking its walls. The power of social media to influence conscripts and reservists is a separate issue, but it defies easy generalization and seems to need to be treated individually for each country using the aforementioned mechanisms to replenish the armed forces.

Therefore, the scale of threats generated by social media seems to be much greater in the case of civilian communities.[8] Given a strongly atomized society, which is gaining momentum, the psychological impact of animating and activating information bubbles is, as practice shows, highly effective and, most importantly, burdened with neither high financial costs nor political risk. Internet users no longer have to wait for a word of mouth, the grapevine, an inspired agitator, a leaflet distributor, or to laboriously track down a radio signal in a sea of background noise and intentional interference. For they receive the rumour, the created fact, the cheap sensation (generally post-truth) immediately after its generation; moreover, they receive it in the form they desire and expect. The message is professionally prepared, visualized and embedded in the language of emotions to such an extent that its falsification after being assimilated by the recipient is very difficult, if at all possible.[9] One more circumstance should be pointed out: post-truth is not subject to verification with the help of rational instruments, because these have been drained by mass culture for decades.

Fairy-tale, magical, fantastic universes were initially treated as an element of widely understood entertainment. Along with the blurring of the line between entertainment and information, there began slow but constant merging of the real world[10] with fantastic entities. In the case of socially and educationally neglected groups from the generation born with a smartphone, an almost amorphous image

---

[7] In general, however, in such a case social media are not so much used to infiltrate soldiers, but the careless use of them by military personnel leads to the publication of sensitive or potentially sensitive data. A particular form of fighting the 'Facebook disease' has been noted in the Russian Federation sub-units deployed in Syria. On the assembly square in Latakia, a box of transparent plastic filled with shot/executed, in the most literal sense of the word, cell phones was placed. Complementing the message are special plaques nailed with unauthorized mobile devices confiscated from soldiers.

[8] The role of social media in military operations has not, apart from the image dimension, become the subject of in-depth analysis. The issue was initially presented by Agnieszka Węglińska ('Nowe media w sytuacji zagrożenia i konfliktu', *Rocznik Bezpieczeństwa Międzynarodowego* 2007, vol. 2, pp. 202–210), but if only because of the date of publication, the text has a mainly historical dimension.

[9] The phenomenon of emotionalization and visualization of the message, of departure from the written word, is examined in a very broad context by Jacek Dukaj, *Po piśmie*, Wydawnictwo Literackie, Kraków 2020.

[10] Fantastic creation has for centuries been, for example in the form of satire, an element of political discourse. It seems that for the first time the convention of the fantastic was used consciously in order to arouse controversy over defense issues by George Tomkyns Chesney in a short story (of dubious literary value) published in 1871, *The Battle of Dorking: Reminiscences of a Volunteer or Reminiscences of a Volunteer by an Eye Witness in 1925* (Porter and Coates, Philadelphia, http://static.torontopubliclibrary.ca/da/pdfs/37131054487996d.pdf [accessed: 10.01.2021]).

of reality has developed, which is a combination of reality and fantastic creations. This needs to be complemented with a particular oversupply of dystopian, apocalyptic and post-apocalyptic visions, which can psychologically underpin the social conviction of the inevitability and imminence of the collapse of the 'known world'. The depth and importance of these interactions for society's overall immunity to change and challenges (especially unexpected and beyond the catalogue of typical, 'domesticated' threats) is the subject of detailed research by social psychologists, but it does not seem that in strictly defensive forecasts this element can be neglected.

Such actions can be long-term in nature, aimed at lowering the coherence of the community subjected to psychological and informational influence, destroying rudimentary social ties based on minimal trust between the rulers and the ruled.[11] They are conducted in a routine manner, not to achieve a clearly defined goal, but rather to create the desired state of social emotions, making it possible to move on to other projects if necessary. Well-planned and professionally conducted activities of this kind should blend in with other streams of activity that are absolutely natural for civil society, but in such a way as to expose opposites, increase polarization, and make agreement as difficult as possible. The subject of the activities should remain absolutely unaware, as long as it is possible, of the organiser's intentions. It seems that generating the situation sketched above is possible, and it cannot be ruled out that such projects are already underway. The main threat to the effectiveness of efforts aimed at exploding open societies from within is the desire to achieve the assumed goals in too short a time and the lack of in-depth knowledge of the object of influence. This results in adopting overly aggressive, identifiable rhetoric, committing cultural awkwardness and even linguistic errors.

It is possible to put forward a hypothesis that interaction in the information space is currently, in most cases, rather aimed at achieving a long-term effect: slowly breaking social bonds, perpetuating and widening divisions over all possible issues, widening the range of differences that are known to be socially important (and thus animating the creation of new information bubbles and strengthening existing ones). The problems generated by this kind of activity of both states and non-state organizations is currently the subject of active studies and exchange of ideas conducted from different positions,[12] but it does not seem to translate into an increased ability to conduct effective counteraction.

---

[11]   This mechanism, sometimes not obvious, illustrates the phenomenon of the anti-vaccine movements. Their final message boils down to the fact that the state is corrupt and in the name of the interests of pharmaceutical companies it risks our health and lives as well as those of our children. Thus, generalizing – the state is an institutionalized enemy of citizens, or actually not citizens, because this kind of narration is not present in the message, but it is an institutionalized enemy of people. A very similar logic appears in the message of other entities, for example, radical environmental and climate groups. Based on a similar message, there are information bans of leader-racist movements, whose basic thesis boils down to the belief that the state has been taken over by international plutocracy (or other equally dark forces).

[12]   A current overview of social media activities by states and organizations has been provided by P.W. Singer, E.T. Brooking, *LikeWar: The Weaponization of Social Media*, Mariner Books, Boston 2019. The book has the character of an emotional report and is burdened with a preconceived thesis. The authors, who come from ultraliberal backgrounds, fiercely follow content attributed to the far right, which flattens the narrative and brings them closer to the conspiracy theories

The question about possible effectiveness of planning and conducting in the information space a campaign aimed at causing mass panic, manifested, for example, by spontaneous and massive evacuation of large cities remains open. There is no experience in this matter on the one hand, or reliable research on the other. After all, the most comprehensively described case of causing socially dangerous results by a radio broadcast dates back to 1938.[13] It is worth noting, however, that a reflection on this event, including a possible repetition of the general mechanism used then, takes place on the level of science of cognition and communication, media studies, social psychology, and political science.[14] Security sciences also seem to notice this dimension of activities in the information space as it is even described as extremely dangerous and... this is basically all of it, followed by a rapid retreat to considerations on critical infrastructure, with a discussion of the Stuxnet example; although from the information systems development point of view it is already distant prehistory. However, it is hard not to see the opportunity presented by an attack on critical infrastructure conducted simultaneously with a social media panic campaign[15] and actions (such as diversions) in real space.

---

they seek to disavow. A much more balanced approach is presented by A. Jungherr, G. Rivero, D. Gayo-Avello, *Retooling Politics: How Digital Media Are Shaping Democracy*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK – New York, NY 2020. On the other hand, a highly professional, analytical approach to the issue is presented by publications produced at the NATO Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence: *Social Media as a Tool of Hybrid Warfare*, eds.: S. Svetoka and A. Reynolds, Riga: NATO Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence 2016; K. Giles, *The Next Phase of Russian Information Warfare*, Riga: NATO Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence 2016; *DAESH Information Campaign and its Influence*, ed. Z. Zgryziewicz, Riga 2016. They have retained the timeliness of the essential content. Particularly noteworthy are the centre's recent works such as K. Allen, *Communicating Threat in an Era of Speed and Fetishized Technology*, Riga 2020; *Falsification of History as a Tool of Influence*, ed. M. Varna, Riga 2021, as well as the periodical publication *Robotrolling*.

[13] Orson Wells' radio play aired in California on 30 October (based on George Herbert Wells' *The War of the Worlds*). Cf. M.K. Ntahonsigaye, *Fake News Hysteria: How an analysis of Orson Welles' War of the Worlds broadcast can inform the issue of 'fake news,'* University of Windsor, Windsor 2018, https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1062&context=major-papers [accessed: 22.03.2021]; J. Pooley, M. Socolow, 'War of the Words: The Invasion from Mars and Its Legacy for Mass Communication Scholarship', in: *War of the Worlds' to Social Media: Mediated Communication in Times of Crisis*, eds. J. E. Hayes, K. Battles, W. Hilton-Morrow, Peter Lang, New York 2013, pp. 35–56.

[14] Cf. *Słowa jak kamienie. Mowa nienawiści, kłamstwo, agresja w sieci. Kompendium wiedzy o języku w życiu publicznym*, eds. A. Kasińska-Metryka, R. Dudała, T. Gajewski, ToC, Kraków–Nowy Targ, 2019.

[15] An interesting and very recent example of an action that can be treated as a kind of testing safeguards and reactions is in the posting of information about the increase in radiation levels in Lithuania on the State Atomic Energy Agency website and the zdrovie.gov.pl website. Earlier, the the Lithuanian Nuclear Energy Safety Inspectorate website had been hacked. In order to make the disinformation credible, the Twitter account of Marek Budzisz, who is actively involved in Russian affairs, was taken over. The events took place on 17 March 2021.

Changing environment of war – custodians of the information space

The shutting down or termination of Donald Trump's accounts by the social media sites Twitter and Facebook, in conjunction with the incursion of his supporters into the Capitol, has been received by many circles with nearly ecstatic satisfaction. However, this is certainly not a singular case and such occurrences, with various degrees of importance, are probably found on a daily basis. A special English neologism 'de-platforming' has even been coined[16] which, however, due to its rather obvious political, connotations does not function in Poland.[17] A little later, a reflection came, although regrettably only a partial one. It turned out that the digital space, identified by many users as an area of unbridled expression and almost complete freedom, is subject to control, and that control is not only relatively restrictive, but also exercised arbitrarily. This was pointed out by Angela Merkel, the German Chancellor (who cannot be suspected of any sympathy for the former American president), who said that only the state, not the medium,[18] can interfere with the right of citizens to express their opinions. The opinion of the European Commissioner for the Internal Market, Thierry Breton, should be regarded as highly significant. Aware of the importance of the phrase and the significance of the comparison, he wrote: The unrest in Washington is proof that a powerful yet unregulated digital space – reminiscent of the Wild West – has a profound impact on the very foundations of our modern democracies. [...] Just as 9/11 marked a paradigm shift for global security, 20 years later we are witnessing a before-and-after in the role of digital platforms in our democracy.'[19]

The most powerful actors active in the digital space have grown to be monsters in three decades, taking the long road from innovative start-ups to global corporations, wrapping the globe in a web of visible and invisible connections. The remark above refers primarily to the so-called Big Five companies, namely: Google, Amazon, Facebook, Apple and sometimes Microsoft. It is primarily their services that have given the information space its current shape, while the possibilities they have created for widely understood consumption shape the basic content of the Internet. The domicile of all these entities is the United States, generally and formally understood, but their resources and means are dispersed all over the world. The level of independence of entities called, not without a reason, custodians of digital space,

---

16   'The action or practice of preventing someone holding views regarded as unacceptable or offensive from contributing to a forum or debate, especially by blocking them on a particular website;' Lexico.com (Dictionary.com/Oxford University Press).

17   Civic Platform (Polish: Platforma Obywatelska, PO) is a center to center-right political party in Poland. In November 2015, Civic Platform government stepped down after 8 years in power, defeated by the Law and Justice Party.

18   Cf. B. Jennen, A. Nussbaum, *Germany and France Oppose Trump's Twitter Exile*, 11 January 2021, Bloomberg, https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-01-11/merkel-sees-closing-trump-s-social-media-accounts-problematic [accessed: 23.03.2021].

19   T. Breton, *Thierry Breton: Capitol Hill–- the 9/11 moment of social media*, 10 January 2021, Politico, https://www.politico.eu/article/thierry-breton-social-media-capitol-hill-riot [accessed: 22.03.2021].

have for several years aroused growing concern of countries, initially for fiscal reasons, then also for security reasons, and related to the exponentially increasing dependence not only of economies, but also of the entire sphere related to administration, public security, and even defence against products provided by actual monopolists. Then came the realization of the importance of metadata obtained by information service providers and the potential impact of algorithms prepared on their basis on large social groups.[20] It should be emphasized that this results in the possibility of shaping the behaviour of populations (public opinion, Internet users) both in the non-kinetic, but characterized by a simultaneous impact of multidimensional confrontation phase (in journalism called 'hybrid warfare'), and during an open armed conflict.[21]

In view of the above circumstances, growing doubts are raised by the lack of coordinated control from any representative bodies (national or international) and the fact that the activities of the Big Five, to a limited extent, are subject to legal regulations of the countries in which they operate. The key issues here are not the security challenges exemplified directly, but fiscal and treasury problems, the issue of collection, processing and sharing of personal data, and the scope of influence of these entities on the flow of information.

From the point of view of states, especially non-power states threatened by entanglement in conflict, hybrid or kinetic, this is a factor that must be taken into account in both offensive and defensive planning. For in the information space, another player has emerged in the form of the Big Five, and it is a highly unpredictable player. The example of animating and dynamizing protests against ACTA regulations[22] has already shown that information corporations are guided by their specific understanding of reality, in which the key element is profit generation. The power of social media was then used to instil in millions of Internet users the conviction that the Web means freedom, and that any attempts to subject activities in the information space to any regulations (including those protecting the interests of such overlooked minority groups as, for example, creators) constitute a fascist threat to that freedom. The vast majority of those propagating this narrative fail to see its fundamental contradiction. In the real space, we perceive democratic representative systems as guarantees of freedom, while in the virtual space, which is becoming an increasingly important part of our reality, we are inclined to put it under the power of network giants. Therefore, are we to expect representative democracy in physical reality or rather enlightened absolutism in virtual reality?

---

[20] The impact of a message built on the basis of metadata obtained through the analysis of preferences revealed online was first practically exploited by the Cambridge Analytica company during the 2016 presidential election in the United States. The problem is interestingly presented, from the constitutional law point of view, by Kamil Stępniak, 'Algorytmy priorytezujące w świetle zasady wolnych wyborów', *Przegląd Prawa Konstytucyjnego* 2019, no. 4 (50), pp. 47–71.

[21] The issue is discussed at length by C. Castillo, *Big Crisis Data: Social Media and Time-Critical Situations*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2019. The problem with the literature on the issue is that developments in technology on the one hand, and the dynamics of events on the other, make significant portions of text quickly obsolete. This is true for both articles and monographic works. In turn, most of the publications written on an ad hoc basis do not address the analytical challenges, and they, too, rapidly become outdated.

[22] *Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement*, ACTA.

By taking action against Trump, the digital giants, or rather their undefined executive bodies, have made it clear that they are naturally guided by political preferences based on their worldview. Claiming that this was an objective decision is a bald attempt to usurp the wisdom of the Absolute. From the point of view of our considerations, it is significant that such motives would also undoubtedly work in the case of interstate conflicts. One can assume that the amalgam of the pursuit of profit (justifying, for example, the Big Five's far-reaching compromises with the authoritarian Chinese State), the conviction about one's own particular mission and ability to make things happen, but also the arrogance rooted in the American (and even earlier the British) imperial model can result in extremely surprising decisions. Should it come to reaching a compromise between the Big Five and the People's Republic of China, for example, banning Taiwan in cases of confrontation with the PRC is just one possibility.

Conclusion

The above text does not aspire to be exhaustive or even to tackle the subject in any depth. The authors outlined the title phenomena in a way that would allow for a broader discussion. It appears that, in most cases, interaction in the information space is currently aimed at achieving a long-term effect: slowly breaking social bonds, perpetuating and widening divisions over all possible issues, and widening the range of differences known to be socially important (and thus animating the creation of new information bubbles and strengthening existing ones). The problems generated by this kind of activity of both states and non-state organizations is currently the subject of lively studies and exchange of ideas conducted from different positions, but it does not seem to translate into an increased ability to conduct effective counteraction.

Further analyses should, on the one hand, exceed administrative and thus artificial boundaries of fields and disciplines;[23] on the other hand, they contain a quantum of practical recommendations. There is no doubt that the challenge of the media is not only a fascinating research area, but also a field of ongoing confrontation, with very high stakes. The issue of the Internet custodians has an even more dramatic dimension. The exchange of views, comments and, most importantly, suggestions between media researchers and representatives of security sciences and, above all, practitioners in this field, is not only desirable but absolutely necessary. Theory cannot keep up with the challenges of practice; as a result, the latter operates intuitively, if not completely in the dark, in many dimensions. Only a broad yet targeted exchange of views stands a chance for changing this state of affairs. Obviously, this holds true if we intend to build comprehensive[24] not segmented-departmental security.

---

[23] These findings, however, are only an exemplification of the way in which the administration and academia attempt to organize the enterprise called science and have little to do with the substance of the phenomenon itself. In many ways, this approach is useful and desirable, but it also carries the risk of generating grotesque divisions and micro-divisions which prevent an overall view of the essence of the phenomena and processes.

References

Abbate, J., *Inventing the Internet*, MIT Press, Cambridge 1999.

Aleksandrowicz, T., *Kluczowe megatrendy w bezpieczeństwie państwa w XXI wieku*, Difin, Warszawa 2020.

Aleksandrowicz, T., *Świat w sieci. Państwa, społeczeństwa, ludzie. W poszukiwaniu nowego paradygmatu bezpieczeństwa narodowego*, Difin, Warszawa 2018.

Allen, K., Communicating Threat in an Era of Speed and Fetishised Technology, *Defence Strategic Communications* 2020, vol. 8, pp. 203–215.

Breton, T., *Thierry Breton: Capitol Hill – the 9/11 moment of social media*, 10 January 2021, Politico, https://www.politico.eu/article/thierry-breton-social-media-capitol-hill-riot [accessed: 24.03.2021].

Castillo, C., *Big Crisis Data. Social Media and Time-Critical Situations*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2016.

Chesney, G.T., *The Battle of Dorking, or Reminiscences of a Volunteer by an Eye Witness, in 1925, Porter and Coates, Philadelphia,* http://static.torontopubliclibrary.ca/da/pdfs/37131054487996d.pdf [accessed: 10.01.2021].

DAESH information campaign and its influence, ed. Z. Zgryziewicz, NATO StratCom COE, Riga 2015.

Dukaj, J., *Po piśmie*, Wydawnictwo Literackie, Kraków 2020.

Falsification of History as a Tool of Influence, eds. I. Juurvee, V. Sazonov, K. Parppei, E. Engizers, I. Palasz, M. Zawadzka, NATO StratCom COE, Riga 2021.

Freedman, L., *The Future of War: A History*, Public Affairs, New York 2019.

Giles, K., *The Next Phase of Russian Information Warfare*, NATO StratCom COE, Riga 2016

Gillies, J., Cailliau, R., *How the Web was Born: The Story of the World Wide Web*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2007.

Jennen, B., Nussbaum, A., *Germany and France Oppose Trump's Twitter Exile*, 11 January 2021, Bloomberg, https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-01-11/merkel-sees-closing-trump-s-social-media-accounts-problematic [accessed: 23.03.2021].

Jungherr, A., Rivero, G., Gayo-Avello, D., *Retooling Politics. How Digital Media Are Shaping Democracy*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK – New York, NY: 2020.

Maroń, J., *Wokół teorii rewolucji militarnej. Wybrane problemy*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, Wrocław 2011.

Ntahonsigaye, N.T., *'Fake News Hysteria': How an analysis of Orson Welles' 'War of the Worlds' broadcast can inform the issue of 'fake news'*, University of Windsor, Windsor 2018, https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1062&context=major-papers [accessed: 22.03.2021].

Pooley, J., Socolow, M., 'War of the Words: The Invasion from Mars and Its Legacy for Mass Communication Scholarship', in: *War of the Worlds to Social Media: Mediated Communication in Times of Crisis*, eds. J.E. Hayes, K. Battles, W. Hilton-Morrow, Peter Lang, New York 2013.

Rieker, P., *From territorial defence to comprehensive security?*, NUPI, Oslo 2002.

Ryan, J., *History of the Internet and the Digital Future*, Reaktion Books, London 2013.

Singer, B.W., Brooking, E.T., *LikeWar: The Weaponization of Social Media*, Mariner Books, Boston 2019.

Słowa jak kamienie. Mowa nienawiści, kłamstwo, agresja w sieci. Kompendium wiedzy o języku w życiu publicznym, eds. A. Kasińska-Metryka, R. Dudała, T. Gajewski, ToC, Kraków – Nowy Targ, 2019.

Smith, R., *The Utility of Force: The Art of War in the Modern World*, TPB, Johanneshov 2012.

Social Media as a Tool of Hybrid Warfare, eds. S. Svetoka, A. Reynolds, NATO StratCom CEO, Riga 2016.

Stępniak, K., 'Algorytmy priorytezujące w świetle zasady wolnych wyborów', *Przegląd Prawa Konstytucyjnego* 2019, no. 4, pp. 47–71.

Szymański, P., *Nowe pomysły na obronę totalną. Bezpieczeństwo całościowe w Finlandii i Estonii*, OSW, Warszawa 2020.

Tallin Manual 2.0 of the International Law Appicable to Cyber Operations, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2017.

Wasilewski, J., 'Zarys definicji cyberprzestrzeni', *Przegląd Bezpieczeństwa Wewnętrznego* 2013, no. 9, pp. 225–234.

Węglińska, A., 'Nowe media w sytuacji zagrożenia i konfliktu', *Rocznik Bezpieczeństwa Międzynarodowego* 2007, vol. 2, pp. 202–210.

Wojna w epoce sumy wszystkich strachów i monopolizacji przestrzeni informacyjnej
Streszczenie

Artykuł zawiera rozważania dotyczące wpływu dwóch wymiarów rewolucji informacyjnej na przebieg konfliktów zbrojnych. Autorzy poddają refleksji teoretycznej dynamiczny rozwój mediów społecznościowych oraz dominującą pozycję kilku ponadnarodowych korporacji. Zwracają uwagę również na zacieranie się różnic między światem cyfrowym i rzeczywistym, co generuje interakcję wpływającą na gotowość obronną społeczeństw otwartych państw demokratycznych. Tekst nie aspiruje do wyczerpania tematu, ale zakończony jest apelem o budowę dialogu poświęconego szeroko rozumianemu bezpieczeństwu między specjalistami o kompetencjach inżynierskich, badaczami społecznego wymiaru rewolucji informacyjnej oraz osobami zajmującymi się problematyką bezpieczeństwa.
Słowa kluczowe: wojna, ewolucja, media społecznościowe, monopolizacja Internetu

War in the Era of the Sum of All Fears and the Monopolization of the Information Space
Abstract

The article attempts to consider the impact of two dimensions of the information revolution on the course of armed conflicts. The authors present a theoretical reflection on the dynamic development of social media and the dominant position of various transnational corporations. They also draw attention to the blurring of distinctions between the digital and the real world, which generates interaction affecting the defensive readiness of democratic states open societies. The text does not aspire to exhaust the topic; it is concluded with an appeal to build a dialogue dedicated to security in a broad sense between specialists with engineering competences, researchers of the social dimension of the information revolution and people working on security issues.
Key words: war, evolution, social media, Internet monopolization

Krzysztof Kubiak, Roman S. Czarny

Krieg in der Ära der Summe aller Ängste und die Monopolisierung des Informationsraums
Zusammenfassung

Der Text versucht, den Einfluss zweier Dimensionen der Informationsrevolution vor dem Hintergrund bewaffneter Konflikte aufzuzeigen. Die Autoren präsentieren eine theoretische Betrachtung der dynamischen Entwicklung der sozialen Medien und der dominierenden Rolle verschiedener transnationaler Großkonzerne. Sie weisen außerdem auf die verschwimmenden Grenzen zwischen der digitalen und der realen Welt hin, was zu Interaktionen führt, die die Verteidigungsfähigkeit demokratischer Staaten und offener Gesellschaften beeinflussen. Der Text beabsichtigt nicht, das Thema erschöpfend zu behandeln; er endet mit einem Aufruf, einen Sicherheitsdialog im weiteren Sinne zwischen Experten mit technischen Kompetenzen, Sozialforschern mit Interesse an der Informationsrevolution und Sicherheitsexperten zu initiieren.

Schlüsselwörter: Krieg, Entwicklung, soziale Medien, Monopolisierung des Internets

Война в эпоху суммы всех страхов и монополизации информационного пространства
Резюме

В статье рассматриваются вопросы влияния двух измерений информационной революции на ход вооруженных конфликтов. Авторы приводят теоретические размышления над динамическим развитием социальных сетей и доминирующим положением нескольких транснациональных корпораций. Они также обращают внимание на стирание различий между цифровым и реальным мирами, что порождает взаимодействие, влияющее на обороноспособность открытых обществ демократических государств. Статья не исчерпывает рассматриваемую тему и заканчивается призывом к построению диалога на тему широко понимаемой безопасности, между специалистами-инженерами, исследователями социального измерения информационной революции и специалистами, занимающимися вопросами безопасности.

Ключевые слова: война, эволюция, социальные сети, монополизация Интернета