Theoretical approach of territorial intelligence and communication.

Peter Acs

THEORETICAL APPROACH OF TERRITORIAL INTELLIGENCE AND COMMUNICATION

Peter Acs

Department of Communication and Media Studies
pite@maya.btk.pte.hu

Professional Address

6, Ifjúság Rd, 7624 Pécs
University of Pécs – Hungary

Summary: On the Flyer of the HUELVA 2007 conference there is a sentence: "Territorial intelligence implies the production of theories and instruments to understand the territory, but also the way a society jointly generates and apprehends the available knowledge and applies them to solve its problems." This paper is about to add one particular theoretical approach to this statement.

Keywords: territorial intelligence, communication theory, collective agent, territory.

Theoretical approach of territorial intelligence and communication

On the Flyer of the HUELVA 2007 conference there is a sentence: "Territorial intelligence implies the production of theories and instruments to understand the territory, but also the way a society jointly generates and apprehends the available knowledge and applies them to solve its problems." This paper is about to add one particular theoretical approach to this statement. This approach is different from the often mentioned socio-technical systems theory approach (Dumas et al. 2008)

1. THEORY USED

This paper using Participation Theory of Communication (PTC) (Horányi, 1999). From this aspect, the various forms of the phenomena described as communication can all be characterized as being rooted in the need of the agents to recognize and/or to solve problems. Communication is a way of understanding the agent's behaviour as a potential ability to recognize and/or solve problems with the help of symbols (or signs). The problem of the agents is a difference between the desired and therefore aimed state and the current state. (Ács 2007)

The basis of understanding patterns as symbols is common knowledge. The agents participate in this common knowledge, communio. Communio is not a factually existing phenomenon. It is strongly attached to an assumption of agents and to a concept which is about understanding some aspects of their behaviour. This kind of description titles their target as communication. The Participation Theory of Communication (PTC) (Horányi, 1999) is about describing a scale and topic and independent description of agents and their problem-solving capacity according to their preparedness. One possible "place" of problem-solving capacity is symbolic which results from the agents process of signification in a given place and time. The constituents of symbolic are the signifier and signified as it is discussed with various terms in the literature of semiotics.

Patterns are differences in time and/or space accessible via modalities of perceptions. The patterns or structures of it – understood as problem solvers – are agents, while other patterns are recognized as symbols (or signs) or raw-patterns. Human agents in everyday situations are, firstly, participants in a communication as agents that give a potential subject to be understood by someone and, secondly, the human agents are able to understand their own or others' behaviour as participants in the communication.

Communication is not something that can be recognized as a force, as a process, or as an architectural or structural phenomenon that is independent of the supposition of an agent with teleological goals and with abilities to step forward.

2. MIMETIC AND VIRTUAL AGENTS

There are two double agent-constellation aspects: mimetic and virtual. The mimetic double agent-constellation gives a model of the understanding of somebody who behaves like somebody else. We all know, in the theatre, actors play their lines, but we are concentrating on the character to appear. In the situation where we show an architecture (designed structure of physical elements), it seems to be or behaves like an agent, but this is virtual. Virtual and mimetic are not exclusive categories. We need a concept of agents in order to understand the surrounding patterns that are accessible via modalities of perceptions. The description of patterns is mostly about understanding agents that create a pattern or appear to do so.

3. THE REAL AND COLLECTIVE AGENTS

As Participation Theory of Communication agent means that the understanding of a certain situation entails a presupposition of problem solving drive and the solution appears to take place according to the supposition of common preparedness and patterns accessible. Presupposition of this model of understanding is required from the agent refers to its own aims and meaning of patterns. Davidson declares, that the man can be called an agent when the action of him can be described from an intentional aspect. (Davidson 1985, 46.) Agent is the concept of knowledge about understanding an agent. As Searle expressed about artificial intelligence: "Any mechanism capable of producing intentionality must have causal powers equal to those of the brain" (Searle 1980) Agent is the concept of causality of aims not just reasons.

There are fields of preparedness which are referential to other accessible preparedness. It is a referential knowledge. It extends the agents problem solving capacity with all of the potentially accessible knowledge. The transformation of the problem according to the aimed solution is a part of the referential knowledge. Not all the agents could really benefit from it, but – and that is here to express – we can suppose it. Agent is the concept of understanding the real word and not something which can be observed or discovered not considering the viewer. The real agents can suppose their own preparedness, and referentially extended potential of problem solving that is what Hofstadter called ability to "Jumping out of the system" (Hofstadter [1979], 36).

4. COLLECTIVE AGENTS

The agent is collective when the agent is built, or supposed as a common knowledge of its existence, aims, drives and its preparedness and identity exclusively by other agents.

The collective agent is not real. It never appears and acts on its own. All behavior of the collective agent appears as not less than one real agents behaviour. It never appears alone. The real agent acts regarding to the collective can be competent in a certain level according to its role and position concerning the common knowledge of collective. (Horányi 2004, 69) With other words the behavior and patterns created by of a collective agent can not be accessible independently from behavior and patterns created by real agents as well. The understanding strongly depends on common knowledge of collective and presupposition of the agent structure. The collective and real agent concepts are different levels of understanding. These concepts could be in conflict or concordant. The knowledge of collective the agent acts upon is a role. In real cases the agent behaviour often refers to roles connected to different concepts of collective.

5. COMMUNITY AND SOCIETY

The presupposition of agents ability to suppose this ability is about to understand each other in the society with regard to common knowledge about collectives and patterns. Mead distinguishes between the "I" and the "me." The "me" is the accumulated understanding of "the generalized other". (Mead 1934, 198) The knowledge about the roles and collective are created by the agents.

The culture is mostly about the knowledge of collectives and patterns in this sense. By Clifford Geertz the culture appear as structure of concepts the people communicate with each other. (Geertz, 1973, 89) Culture is not static, it is inherited, created, changed and learned. Gadamer handles it as with notion of tradition. (Gadamer, 1984, 201)

6. COMMUNICATION DEVICES / INSTRUMENTS OR TOOLS

"In the present knowledge society, territorial intelligence is extremely linked to the evolution of the information and communication sciences. The latter ones make the territorial intelligence development possible and then territorial intelligence creates new stakes for their design and use." (2007 Huelva flyer)

Understanding these patterns in many cases are based on the common knowledge about symbols (or signs) that are called communio. The patterns could be fixed for the future, transformed in space and amplified to overcome the limitations of perception. These architectures created for modification of accessibility of patterns are communication tools or instruments. They range from a simple amplifying-glass to complex television systems, or complex abstract instruments. Abstract instruments can be called method. In CAENTI project methods and computer based applications creates a chain of tools (Girardot et al., 2008, 81) to support the process of territorial problem solving efforts in different fields. The knowledge about the structure of the device or instrument: how the patterns are transformed, fixed or amplified via gives the potential of use for actors. Complex tools and their role in problem solving raises a lot of interesting questions to discuss, but it would extend the objectives of this short paper.

7. TERRITORY, ABSTRACTION OF SPACE

Communication devices/instruments are used and integrated very deeply in everyday life. Society and culture are strongly influenced and built by the way communication takes place. The use of computers and their networks give functional dynamics to communication devices. These changes make the information age. It creates a space of flowing information (Castells–Ince [2003], 60) as a new virtual platform of economical and social relevancies. The crossways of "real" space flows of raw-material, energy and people leads to the large and important cities of the today world. (Bell, 1979)

Appadurai shows some cultural aspects of locality in his well quoted essay "The production of locality." (1996) The relationship between cultural realty of locality and the real spatial location is not identical. Appadurai's argument about locality is constructed and suggests the notion "neighbourhood" which melts away the necessity of border declaration and expresses the possibility of access and communication. Some aspects of localization of global technology of information society can be described as e-neighborhood. (Acs et al. 2003)

CONCLUSION

The dynamics of understanding territory is an everyday experience in the field. The CAENTI project is not only about recognising and understanding the problems in several fields of "territory" but it has ambitious aims to influence them. "Their common link consists, on the one hand, of the confidence the researchers and actors have in research as the driving force for social change, and on the other hand, of their defence of the multidimensional and territorial approach due to their conviction that socio-economic problems are due to multiple, entwined factors and dynamics and that the arena where they are to be tackled is the territory where these factors and dynamics take shape (where they fall)." (Amiotte-Suchet – Miedes Ugarte – Redondo Toronjo 2008, 61) "A territory is a system that can only be defined with respect to the point of view of the inquirer, whether it is the observer or the designer" (Dumas - Gardere - Bertacchini 2008,147) The notion of territory is closely connected to the common knowledge of agents. In most cases agents do not behave independently from collectives. The knowledge of problems considered as problems of collective leads to responsiveness and seems to be the first step forward to solution. The effectiveness of organisation and institutions based upon the cultural phenomena of linking the collective aims to real agents, citizens aims. The problem solving capacity of the collective agents strongly depends on the knowledge gathered and shared.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

2007 Huelva (Spain) Octobre, 24th -27th "*Conference flyer"*
<URL: http://www.eusw.unipr.it/documenti/huelva_2007_flyer.pdf > (2008.09.11)

Ács P. – Béres Cs. – Filó Cs (2003) "E-neighbourhood, azaz a hipertér lokális perspektívái" ["e-neighbourhood, as local perspectives of hyperspace"] in: *"Kultúra és Közösség"* 2003/1

Ács P., (2008) "Theoretical Approach of Network Communication and Collaboration in Research". in: *Acts of International Conference of Territorial Intelligence*, HUELVA (Spain), 24-27 October 2007.
<URL: http://www.territorial-intelligence.eu/index.php/huelva07/Acs>

Amiotte-Suchet L., Miedes Ugarte B., Redondo Toronjo D., (2008) "Work Package 5: Proposal of an European Letter of Quality on Action-Research Favoring Territorial Governance of Sustainable Development". in: *Acts of International Conference of Territorial Intelligence*, HUELVA (Spain), 24-27 October 2007.
<URL: http://www.territorial-intelligence.eu/index.php/huelva07/Amiotte-Suchet>

Appadurai, Arjun (1996) "The production of locality." In "*Modernity at Large: Cultura! Dimensions of Globalization"* Miniapolis, Universty of Minnesota Press (Hungarian: Appadurai, Arjun (2001): "A lokalitás teremtése." In: "*Regio*." 2001/3. 3-31.)

Bell, Daniel (1979). "The Social Framework of Information Society" Pp. 163-311 in "*The Computer Age: A Twenty-Year View"*, (ed.) Michael L. Dertouzos – Joel Moses, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Béres, Cs.Z., Ács, P. (2008), "The 5th Level of CLBPS as a New Way of Network Communication in eGovernment", in "*SEFBIS Journal"*. 2008. No. 3. p 58-64.

Castells, M. (1996)*." The Rise of the Network Society."* "The Information Age. Economy, Society and Culture". Volume II. Oxford, Blackwell Publishers.

Castells, Manuel - Ince, Martin 2006 [2003] "*A tudás világa. Manuel Castells*." ["*Conversations with Castells"*] Budapest, Napvilág Kiadó.

Davidson, D., (1985) “Agency.” In “*Essays on Actions and Events.”* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Dumas P., Gardere J.-P., Bertacchini Y., (2008) “Contribution of socio-technical systems theory concepts to a framework of Territorial Intelligence”. in: *Acts of International Conference of Territorial Intelligence*, HUELVA (Spain), 24-27 October 2007.
<URL: http://www.territorial-intelligence.eu/index.php/huelva07/Dumas>

Gadamer (1984[1960]) “Igazság és módszer. Egy filozófiai hermeneutika vázlata.”[„Wahrheit und Methode”] Budapest, Gondolat.

Geertz, Clifford (1973) „Interpretation of Cultures.” Basic Books 2000 paperback: ISBN 0-465-09719-7 (Hungarian: Geertz, (2001) „*Az értelmezés hatalma. Antropológiai írások*.” II. kiadás. Budapest, Osiris)

Girardot J.-J.- Masselot C.- Damy S.- Herrmann B.- Jacques I.- Sanchez C.- Asensio M. J., (2008): “Progress and prospects of the wp6 "tools for actors”. in: *Acts of International Conference of Territorial Intelligence,* HUELVA (Spain), 24-27 October 2007.
<URL: http://www.territorial-intelligence.eu/index.php/huelva07/Girardot2>

Habermas, J. (1981). „*Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns*.“ Frankfurt a/M.: Suhrkamp. In English: (1984) “*The Theory of Communicative Action”*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Polity; (1987) “*The Theory of Communicative Action.”* Vol. 2. Cambridge: Polity.

Hofstadter, D. R (2002 [1979]) „*Gödel, Escher, Bach. Egybefont gondolatok birodalma*.“ „Metaforikus fúga tudatra és gépekre. Lewis Carroll szellemében.“ [„*Gödel, Escher, Bach: an Eternal Golden Braid*.“] Budapest, Typotex.

Horányi Özséb (2004) „A társadalmi kommunikáció ágenséről“ in Ivaskó Lívia (szerk.) 2004 „*A kommunikáció útjai.“* Budapest, Gondolat Kiadó – MTA- ELTE Kommunikációelméleti Kutatócsoport

Horányi, Özséb (1999). „A kommunikációról“ [„On Communication“]. In I. Béres & Ö. Horányi (Eds.), „*Társadalmi kommunikáció“ [„Social Communication“]*. (Pp. 22–35.) Budapest: Osiris. (In Hungarian.)

Mead, G.H. (1973 [1934]) “*A pszichikum, az én és a társadalom.”* Budapest, Gondolat. 1934. [1934 “*Mind, Self, and Society.”* Ed. by Charles W. Morris. University of Chicago Press.]

Searle, John R. (1980) “Minds, brains, and programs.” “*Behavioral and Brain Sciences”*, 1980, 3, 417-424.