

FALL 2006

International Journal of Intelligence and CounterIntelligence, 19: 519–537, 2006
Copyright © Taylor & Francis Group, LLC
ISSN: 0885-0607 print/1521-0561 online
DOI: 10.1080/08850600600656475



ROBERT DAVID STEELE

Peacekeeping Intelligence and Information Peacekeeping

The world remains in danger of slipping into complex global emergencies on several fronts. At the same time, the United Nations is rethinking its organization and mission; information technology is making many new forms of information-sharing possible; and collective intelligence—the “wisdom of the crowds”—is emerging as a force for world peace.

A review of how the Nobel Peace Prize has been awarded since its inception in 1901 can be a mirror of trends in international collaboration. That represents the single best “metric” for focusing humanity’s collective efforts. We must all strive to earn this prize each day of our lives.

Since 1901, the Norwegian Nobel Institute has made 113 awards in the 85 years in which an award has been made. In 19 of the 105 years (18 percent of the time) since the award was begun, the world has either been in a state of total war, or lacked a suitable candidate for recognition.

Since World War II, the tendency has been for the Nobel Peace Prize to be awarded to organizations rather than individuals. This is consistent with the growing global importance of non-state actors and networks, where the sum

Robert David Steele, a thirty-year veteran of the United States defense and intelligence communities, helped found the U.S. Marine Corps Intelligence Command, and went on to start two companies specializing in teaching governments how to gain access to and exploit the 90 percent of the relevant information that is legally and ethically obtainable at very low cost. Today, as Chief Executive Officer of OSS.Net, Inc., he provides commercial intelligence support to governments and corporations. Mr. Steele’s previous emphasis on the reform of secret intelligence and the role of open source intelligence has been supported by his focus on information-sharing and information peacekeeping through collective public intelligence.

of the parts is greater than any one individual, however inspiring. Among the organizational winners have been elements of the United Nations (5 awards, with peacekeeping forces recognized in 1988); the International Committee of the Red Cross (4 awards); Doctors Without Borders (1999); the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL, 1997); the Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs (1995); International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (1985); Amnesty International (1977); the International Labour Organization (ILO, 1969); the Quakers (2 awards, 1947); and the Nansen International Office for Refugees (1938).

The awards have tended to be given for peace organization (28), conflict resolution (19), human rights (15), relief enterprises (14), arbitration (9), disarmament efforts (6), refugee handling (4), nuclear reductions (4), pacifism (2), and land mine reductions (2). No awards have been given for creating a global information network dedicated to peacekeeping.

Within the existing awards, the information aspect in each case can be studied. By far the most common element was direct face-to-face contact, with 23 awards for direct engagements on the ground, and 22 for direct negotiations. Documentation of circumstances was the primary characteristic of 18 awards, followed by 12 being for personal examples, 7 for educational endeavors, 5 for authorship, 5 for global publicity campaigns, and 4 for media operations. Again, no awards have been given for establishing intelligent information architectures that empower collective groups of individuals, or enable the use of information to prevent, resolve, and recover from conflicts.

What then, should be the objectives in developing a focused discipline or practice of peacekeeping intelligence (PKI) and information peacekeeping? Although references are always plentiful, both definitions and distinctions are lacking. Both are here provided.

- **Peacekeeping Intelligence** develops and applies the proven process of intelligence¹ to the decision-support needs of the United Nations Secretary General (mandate and force structure), the field commanders (civilian, military, and police), and the tactical commanders and humanitarian assistance supervisors.
- **Information Peacekeeping** develops and applies the proven process of intelligence to define challenges, identify options, specify costs, and make the political, social, cultural, and economic cases for preventive and/or reconciliation actions by nations, organizations, and publics.

Whereas peacekeeping intelligence is largely reactive, seeking to field the right force with the right mandate to resolve an existing conflict, information peacekeeping is proactive, seeking to define courses of action that prevent conflicts from occurring, and/or address the many severe challenges that undermine stable governance and the social and economic prosperity stemming from stable governance and democratic participation.