Global Governance and Control: A Trade-Off Between Freedom and Security

Rosario Parise

Rosario Parise, 21, is a Political Science student at LUISS University of Rome. He is concluding his Bachelor Degree with a thesis concerning the trade-off between freedom and security in the digital era. In 2012, he took part as Student Diplomat in a Listening Summit between LUISS University and Pepperdine University (CA) concerning the confrontation between EU-US political systems, exposing a thesis about the different conceptions of scholar system between European Union and United States. He is currently at his 3rd year in LUISS Political Science undergraduate programme. His interests include political philosophy, global studies, security studies and European affairs.

Keywords: Power, Internet, Security, Limit, Democracy

Introduction

The digital era deeply influences the social and political features of the entire human community: it is related to the phenomenon of Global Governance, affecting the way of communicating, associating, getting and sharing information. It is a new period, and thus far, it needs important rules in several aspects. In this paper, we will talk about how this significant revolution influences, perhaps implements freedom and security and the consequent trade-off between the latter. We will start with some preliminary considerations about the formation of the State and how Global Governance compromises the ancient equilibrium, trying to establish a more open and internationalized worldwide community. In the first chapter, we will talk about how international mechanisms of management of violence call into question the national monopoly of physical force, with the example of NATO and Europol. Moreover, in the same chapter, the discussion will turn to another monopoly, that is no more an exclusive prerogative of the State: economy and the faculty to print money. In this case, we will take the example of the WTO and European System of Central Banks as a clear illustration of this important international economic development. In the third chapter, we will focus on national identity and social media, explaining how the global system is becoming more and more interdependent and symbiotic. The importance of web 2.0 lets us turn to another consideration about the potential asset that this revolutionary instrument could be for both citizens and governments and, on the other hand, the potential risk that it could represent. We will talk about the latter in chapter three, where we will describe with a current scandal one of the possible dangers given by the internet and the social networks. With a description of various cases of espionage programmes we would like to demonstrate that without an international regulation there could be an abuse of the web, which could create serious problems to our society and our democracies. After this analysis, there will be an elucidation about the effects of the internet in terms of freedom and security, particularly focusing on the deteriorations that a non-regulated digital system could create; this will be discussed in chapter four. At the end of this paper, we will propose two possible solutions to avoid the potential degenerations of our system, which could push the trade-off between freedom and security to inauspicious levels. In my opinion, there are two main keys to circumvent these potential consequences: shared rules and digital education. If they are combined in the name of respect for people, plurality of identities and transparency, the unprecedented revolution given by the Internet 2.0 will be extremely useful and positive for the global society.

Preliminary considerations

Before beginning the discussion concerning Global Governance and its limits, we should fix some important concepts about the State, its creation and its possible overcoming. To understand what actually a so discussed phenomenon is, it is important to free up our mind from the idea that conceives Nations as spontaneously created entities that are all along the unique base for our society. This mental work is useful for a more precise and coherent historical analysis as well as an easier examination of the events characterising our time, in which the State will play more and more exiguous role. Two main characteristics shown below that, even foreseeable, are fundamental to go on with our line of reasoning:

- 1) The State is a **human** -precisely European- **invention**: officially born with the peace of Westfalia, in 1648, when we can establish for the first time the mutual recognition of sovereignty by the modern state following the principle of *cuius regio, eius religio*. From this moment on a rudimental form of our international system begins to take shape. Behind this conventional there is a process lasted for centuries in which a double monopoly takes place:
 - The monopoly of physical violence
 - The economic monopoly (faculty to print money as the only official currency for a State)
- 2) The “State Builders” or “Framers” accompanied this double monopoly with the construction of a **common identity** with the concept of Nation-State. A stable building has to be manufactured by solid foundation, so to realize a unitary well-structured State it is necessary that people, the human foundation for this public structure, identify themselves in common principles, professing them as part of their personal identity.

Starting from these basic concepts, we can now develop a more careful treatment of the phenomena that characterize our time, in a political social and cultural outlook, explaining how the state is trying not to lose its importance on the domestic and international scene.

All the powers listed above and previously held almost exclusively by the state are now more than ever in deep crisis and subject to significant changes, flowing in the complex system that takes the name of Global Governance. Therefore, I will analyze the

phenomenon starting from the institutional changes and then focus more specifically on identity aspect that will be the center of our discussion.

1) Violence and Economy: still State monopoly?

1.1 International monopoly of violence

The years of the immediate second postwar period saw an unprecedented proliferation of international and supranational organizations with the task of handling the most diverse sectors of civil life. Especially for what concerns the monopoly of legitimate physical violence in the European case, it is important to mention the progress made in the field of Justice and the cooperation among different police forces (Europol) operating with more and more relevant and differentiated tasks. Another important example of internationally combined use of the violence for foreign affairs is undoubtedly the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It was conceived as opposed to the Soviet bloc during the Cold War, even though this organization has continued to live after the dissolution of Soviet Union. Consequently, NATO changed the meaning of his existence, becoming a military alliance organism that nowadays manages an even more significant role, not only for the Western powers. To demonstrate this, we should look at the emblematic actions operated by NATO during its first military operation in Kosovo in 1999, when it crossed even the power of the UN Security Council, which gave the authorization to operate only after the initiation of the armed interventions. The early years of the twentieth century also saw a complete doctrinal and organizational restructuring of NATO, through the establishment ACO (Allied Command for Operations), responsible for ongoing operations and ACT (Allied Command for Transformation), responsible for the definition of future strategies. It is expected, therefore, a radical and further processing of this organization, that is including a growing number of member countries and at the same time is claiming more and more autonomy in operations. Decisions remain intergovernmental; however, it is undeniable that the international system is beginning to think of NATO as an advanced functional effective and self-sufficient entity.

1.2 Supranational economic monopoly and the European example

It is known that the State is not the only agent that affects the macroeconomic aspects of the various societies. It is moreover well known that in some cases it is not, nowadays, even the principal regulator of trade policy, taxes and monetary union of its own markets. The enduring rise of multinational companies demonstrates the ability to

transcend, more or less easily, the boundaries of the State in unthinkable ways regarding the organization of the immediate post-war international market. This is also due to the policies of the GATT (first) and WTO (since 1995), which have given rise to an increasingly interdependent world. Leaving aside the global economic collaboration and taxes break policies on the road of free trade, the progresses made by the European Union in this regard are exceptional. This supranational organization, in fact, has created a system of exclusive powers belonging merely to the Union, which include front-line customs union, competition rules necessary for the functioning of the internal market, the common commercial policy and monetary policy to Member States whose currency is the euro. This last point, in essence, allows a common system of price regulation or the ESCB European System of Central Banks. This last has the task to define and implement the Union's monetary policy, conduct foreign exchange operations. It holds and manages the official foreign reserves in foreign currencies of the Member States, as well as the creation of a European Central Bank that pursuant to Article 128 TFEU "has the exclusive right to authorize the issue of euro banknotes within the Union [...]." This set of skills has always returned to the ranks of the prerogatives of the State, is now more than ever the object of important steps to witness. Even the power to print money, always the prerogative of the State, in this case escaped this entity on behalf of another organization.

Can we therefore say that today, centuries later by the process of State formation, those qualities that contributed to Nation States creation are still in force?

2) National identity and new technologies

The economic globalization, through the relocation of increasingly internationalized firms and dissemination of the same objects of common use in every corner of the world is radically changing our habits and our daily lives. At first sight, it would seem strange to think about the identity of an individual observing just what is commonly used; however, they are just tools to define us on daily bases and frame us according to the specific characteristics of our identity. Let us think about smartphones: a search held by the University of Bonn affirms that they are controlled by us, on average, 80 times a day, once every 12 minutes. Are we confident that such a small gesture cannot affect our day? This is the revolution of the web 3.0, so defined because it represents a change of paradigm compared to the web 2.0. It is expected that by 2015 there will be about 25 billion objects that will be connected to the Internet, creating an environment where machines will

automatically collect, exchange, develop and retain all types of information⁶¹. However, this “revolution of globalized things” does not concern only the new technologies: there are several elements, first symbols of national identity and culture, which have been exported and have began part of the identity rooted in other traditions, torn from their homeland and have arrived to become “intellectual heritage” of the global world. Up to seventy years ago, it was unthinkable to find a pizzeria on the outskirts of Taipei, as well as a Japanese restaurant in Pamplona. Today, in contrast, this is less far-fetched than ever.

Despite that the advent of web 3.0 would lead to important insights, we will focus on the revolution created by the Web 2.0 because it is the first example of concrete opportunity of social aggregation inside the net, based not only on individual collection of information, but also on a more rapid and effective exchange of them. Information, in fact, is a far more important element for the educational and cultural individual development. It strongly affects our identity. To describe the changes in this field, the Orientalist and anthropologist Arjun Appadurai speaks of *mediascapes*, or directories of images and information flows that are manufactured and distributed by the mass media at the transnational level⁶². Today’s media, especially for the new generation, moves very quickly and seems to know no limits or boundaries abstract from the States. Internet, in particular, is the most complete and revolutionary source of information: it is fast, cheap, easy to use and is not subject to particular types of limits. The network is a vehicle information never conceived before: we can have immediate information from opposite corners of the planet. The most significant example of the advantages given by this use is without a doubt one of the social networks in the uprisings in the Maghreb. Social networks, playing a key role in the communication of a modern society and altering the way in which people relate , converse and exchange information , ideas and news, have been suggested as a possible new factors that have led simple popular protests to overthrow regimes over decades . Through these media, citizens of countries where freedom of expression has been suppressed for too long have found new channels to be able to get in touch and try to undermine the power system. The network of internet has been fundamental for the sharing of content (text, photos, and videos) that otherwise would not pass the censorship of the institutional bodies of these countries. Nevertheless, because of the uncontrollable nature of the net, governments have failed to curb this “threat” despite various interventions to bring the network under control.

⁶¹S.Rodotà, *Il Diritto di avere Diritti*, Editori Laterza, Bari, 2012, pp.322-323

⁶² A.Appadurai, *Disjuncture and difference in Global Cultural Economy*, University of Minnesota Press, 1990.

To sum up, internet and especially social networks are an immense resource and a vehicle information than ever before. They have consolidated their role in the world, becoming a daily reality for the civil society, including citizens, activists, NGOs, telecommunications companies, software providers, and ultimately governments themselves and their machinery and officials. In a global system in which individuals are increasingly culturally close, where national identity thins in favour of a more complex global knowledge and in a world in which daily habits tend to homologate between diametrically opposite sides of the planet, having control over this informations can be crucial for the survival of entities that fail to keep pace with these profound changes.

3) The counterattack comes from governments

The media "without borders", complicit in this singular metamorphosis of identity, is not only a threat: on the contrary, it could become -if controlled- an unprecedented asset. States, therefore, in a desperate attempt to piece together the human foundation under which lays theirs political and administrative structure, try to seek a roundabout way to get to the beating heart of its citizens. The web gave to some important security agencies the possibility to create an enormous espionage programs that have no precedents. This could be a problem for the health of our democracies because it is difficult to know if these programs were created just to protect the Nation. It could be one of the so called "all-purpose means", by which the governments have "sought to dissemble their purposes, bury their mistakes, manipulate their citizens and maximize their power"⁶³. The striking example of the Datagate scandal, in this regard, is not so surprising if analysed with the perspective of control examined until now.

3.1 Datagate: chronicle

Edward Snowden, former NSA technician and former employee of Booz Allen Hamilton (business information technology consultant to the NSA), assisted by a journalist for the British newspaper *The Guardian*, has revealed several details about secret intelligence programs, including the program of wiretapping between the United States and the European Union on the metadata of communications, PRISM, and Tempora Internet surveillance programs. The news that the communications in many countries of the world would be under control immediately created worries around the world's public opinion, requesting a comment by President Obama. He claimed the highest legality of the program,

⁶³ A.M. Schlesiger, *Imperial Presidency*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1973, p.317.

calling it "private, not secret." According to documents published by the Guardian about the scandal Datagate, the authorization for the FBI to monitor communications would be given in secret by a federal judge April 25, 2013, an order that would grant the government the ability to have unlimited access to data for three months. While checking the phone records would be recent, since 2007, the data related to communications made via the internet by millions of users would be available to American intelligence agencies using the PRISM program, which aims to collect and use data communications via Internet. The initiative to control the communications would be taken by the National Security Agency (NSA), the U.S. intelligence agency, which generally keeps an eye on specific persons considered potential terrorists, although the scope of the interception is unquestionably huge. However, the White House has defended the actions of the NSA, sustaining that this agency was critical to protect the United States from the danger of terrorism. The range of the scandal Datagate was then greatly enlarged with the news that the PRISM program would be associated with several companies, not just Verizon, and under control of the NSA there may also be "unconventional" data, such as photos, videos and information stored on computers, social network profiles and mobile devices. In a first analysis, it would seem that this spying program relates only to the United States and has considerable weight only within the U.S. socio-political context. Instead, there is a further revelation that came to light on COMINT (Communications Intelligence), which is the collection of intelligence from the communications between people, which once covered only radio and telephone traffic and today everything that passes through the internet. The *Guardian* wrote that there would be formal agreements between the United States and various European countries, providing for the exchange of this type of communication data. Another interesting fact comes from Apple, the international giant of new technologies, which published a list containing the states that have requested personal data from this U.S. Company.

Although some European governments have described themselves as the injured part unknowingly involved in this scandal, as supported by major newspapers in some countries of the old continent, according to the NSA Director Keith Alexander revelations of the French newspaper ' *Le Monde* ' and the Spanish ' *El Mundo* ' are *completely false*. In support of this argument arises Dianne Feinstein, chair of the Commission on Intelligence of the Senate, who, while calling for a review of the strategies of the NSA, said that U.S. did not collect autonomously the data, but that they were put together by France and Germany. According to the *Wall Street Journal*, in addition, U.S. intelligence sources say that

the intercepted telephone conversations in France (70 million) and Spain (60 million), *"would be controlled by the NSA with approval of the intelligence services in Madrid and Paris"*. French intelligence services have an agreement to share data with the National Security Agency (NSA) since 2011. France, in fact, enjoys a strategic position with respect to the transport of electronic data: the submarine cable, which passes much of the data from Africa and Afghanistan, arrive in Marseille and Penmarc, in Brittany. *"It's a barter between the direction of the NSA and the DGSE"*, said a source in French intelligence agency. *"They give us whole blocks of these areas and we, in return, we give them parts of the world where they are absent, but the negotiation has not happened once, it widens the scope of sharing in discussions which are still ongoing today."*

The range of this scandal does not extend only to the transatlantic allies: in India, for example, there is a centre of mass control that relies on the monitoring of text messages, phone calls, websites, applications and social media. This system, called CMS (Central Monitoring System), is owned by the Government of India and was described by the newspaper *The Times of India* as *"the single window from where government arms : such as the National Investigation Agency or the Tax Authorities will be Able to monitor every byte of communication"*.

In this scenario of general disorder, the White House is trying to maintain stable diplomatic relations with European nations with a reform of the National Security Agency that starts from the top; German Chancellor Angela Merkel, also spied by U.S. intelligence, has plans to set up a European anti-espionage agency against any similar case in the future. We do not know where the author of Datagate case is, even though some South American nations offered him political asylum.

3.2 PRISM and Tempora

PRISM is a top-secret surveillance program that the National Security Agency has put in place to collect and use information from service providers and Internet communications.

This program became public in conjunction with the revelations about the scandal Datagate issued by Snowden, who has decided to disclose information relating to the PRISM to inform the population about the possibility that sensitive information about communications are monitored by the U.S. government. Despite the fact that news has spread only in June 2013, the program PRISM was born in 2007. At first, the surveillance was called upon individuals identified as potential terrorists, but it would have been extended to millions of American citizens by monitoring communications within the United States or from the United States to foreign countries. The information that the

NSA would have been able to get through PRISM project could include email, voice and video communications, photo, file transfers, and information on social networking profiles. The program uses companies like Microsoft, Yahoo, Facebook, Paltalk, YouTube, Skype, AOL and last in order of time, Apple. They have offered Prism their servers, through which the majority of the global internet traffic passes via "packets" of information, including from foreign countries, which necessarily go to the United States. Without crossing any border, then, PRISM intercept and capture this information when they are in U.S. territory.

Tempora is the name of a surveillance program run by the British intelligence (GCHQ, Government Communications Headquarters, equivalent to the American NSA) and it emerged with documents on Datagate. The program, among other things, browses 600 million "telephony events" per day. How does it work? By directly filtering the data stream that passes from over 200 optical fibre cables. What kind of content it gets its hands on? Telephone conversations, email content, messages on Facebook and all online activities (such as websites visited, etc.) from any kind of user.

3.3 Metadata

It is one of the keywords of Datagate. Literally, metadata are informations obtainable by other information. In the specific case, with regard to the phone calls, they do not indicate the content of the conversation in itself. They disclose the data related to those calls: callers to whom (in the sense of number), for how long and also the geographical location of the phone, although the NSA has declared that it does not preserve this last kind of information. In the case of Internet communications, metadata differ depending on the channel used: for an email, it is the address of the sender and recipient, the IP address, the size of the file, the subject of the letter, to name just a few. Just a post posted on Twitter, regardless of its 140 characters that can be read by everyone, is associated with 33 different pieces of information, including language, geographical location, software used to tweet. Most of the experts of Network and privacy point out that the ability to access en masse to these data and analyse them allows deriving a lot of personal information on the targets. In short, to paraphrase McLuhan, metadata are the message. Because they reveal the context in which we move and our relationships.

Considerations

A so impressive espionage program, developed in almost every corner of the planet, reveals to citizens a famished aspiration to total control by the governments of our

time. At this point, Viktor Mayer Schonberger, a professor at the University of Oxford and Kenneth Neil Cukier, Data Editor at The Economist have written a book titled Big Data. In this volume, the authors reflect on how the internet and technology innovations influence modern society and our daily lives. For example, how can we monitor the status of the development of a virus? How can we stem the crime and prevent it, improving the safety of a city? In addition, is it possible to know the mood of the population of an entire nation? Of course it is, through Big Data, an enormous amount of information that, in spite of privacy, collects information on each individual, acting on the totality of the information and overcoming the concept of statistical analysis. Everything we need to know becomes extraordinarily precise and fast. Yet, there is a downside. On one side, big data may be used for the safety of the population; while on the other hand, the information related to our life, often stored in our total knowledge, can be used for many different reasons. Just log on to a social network, use a smart phone and surf the web. You will provide an impressive amount of information about yourself, your interests, what you think and what you like. These informations are private and intimate, and then if they were poorly managed, they may generate a form of reduction of our rights and our privacy policy, as confirmed by several recent scandals. It is a trade-off between freedom and security in which it is difficult to find a meeting point: through access to this large amount of information we can improve a number of important social variables. If it exacerbates, this attitude ends up creating a global police state where control becomes more important than individual freedom and in which, in order to obtain information that sociology and statistics reveal only partially, we reduce the individual capabilities in the exercise of free will.

4) Freedom and security

“Au citoyen appartient la propriété, au souverain l’empire”. This is one of the most common quote from the Napoleonic Civil Code, took as an example in the civil law of all times. Paraphrasing this sentence, the State has the duty to guarantee to citizens the fundamental liberties, in particular the propriety of themselves; on the other hand, it must ensure stability to its government, with the aim to protect its human community. However, an excessive *empire* reduces *propriety*, as well as the latter, if maximized, could destabilize a strong government. In other words, there is a trade-off between freedom and security in which the executive power, acting on one of these aspects, affects the other and vice versa. It is difficult to find a meeting point between freedom and security, because it also has to

adapt itself to the historical events. As Eric A. Posner and Adrian Vermeule write in the introduction of their paper “*Terror in the balance*”, “when national emergencies strike, the executive acts, Congress acquiesces, and courts defer”⁶⁴. This means that governments, in particular historical moments, can act using some powers and faculties that do not belong to them. As we can see thinking about the Datagate case, the Internet represents an important resource for citizens as well as for governments, because it strongly affects both freedom and security. In the paragraph below we can notice the effects of the 2.0 on these aspects and, consequently, on the entire trade-off.

4.1 Internet and Freedom

The internet considerably affects the concept of freedom and privacy, which is no more conceived as an exclusionary “right to be left alone”⁶⁵. It is nowadays best defined as the “right to freely choose their way of life”⁶⁶. The influence of network communications, information and any kind of social relationship extends the range of the human freedoms in the name of simplicity, effectiveness and immediacy. This would seem to imply a significant enlargement of *property*, both personal and intellectual: the power of the web is unprecedented, there are no stringent constraints imposed by television and other mass media that somehow can convey the thought of the citizens through a more rigid selection of information. The digital world, considered by Yochai Benkler as a meritocratic space⁶⁷, looks like a plural world where it is not possible to stem the inevitable variety of voices, opinions, considerations. This suggests that the impact of this feature on individual and collective freedom is immeasurable. However, a closer analysis shows that what may appear as the biggest selling point for the web hides contraindications that may cause serious risks to the democratic culture of a country. The feeble controls, in fact, are not only a guarantee of greater empowerment, but they represent a danger to the public because the information may be distorted and unreliable; this may adversely affect the thinking of an entire community. If we apply this concept to politics, the ideas conveyed through the network cannot be easily made responses to a public figure or a political party, which, on the contrary, should always take charge of what says in terms of responsibility and accountability. This radicalization of freedom without rules inevitably moves the axis of the

⁶⁴ E.A.Posner A. Vermeule, *Terror in the Balance. Security liberty and the courts*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007.

⁶⁵ S.Warren e L.D.Brandeis, *The Right to Privacy*, in Harvard Law Review no. 5, Boston, 1890, pp.4 e sgg

⁶⁶ F.Rigaux, *La protection de la vie privée et des autres biens de la personnalité*, Bruylant, Bruxelles-Paris 1990, p.167.

⁶⁷ Y.Benkler, *The Wealth of Networks: How Social Production Transforms Markets and Freedom*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 2007.

trade-off to a level that tapers on the side of safety up to alarming levels. If, on the one hand, it gains what we argued so far, on the other hand there is a loss in terms of protection and then defence of the community. It is therefore important to look for the mechanisms by which we can create effective safeguards to ensure that this does not occur.

4.2 Internet and Security

As for safety, it is necessary to analyse the variation in the management of the latter by the democratic nations and their governments. In fact, as we already mentioned in this paper, security is not always administered evenly over time. It has to take account of the historical changes that inevitably influence the policies in this matter. A regime of war or of strong domestic and international tensions cause changes in government decisions in the field of security, which may be more or less a temporary sacrifice of some liberties in the name of protecting the integrity of people. There are various mechanisms to determine if the intent of the government is to ensure the safety or justify misconduct. We can rely on the balance of power, which must be ensured by other constitutional bodies (primarily the Parliament and the Judiciary) or we can create a mechanism in which there is a number of physiological *whistleblowers*, elements within agencies safety data that reveal secrets related to government programs which have the sole purpose of giving the executive authority what does not belong to it. Regarding the latter case, the Internet is once again a very effective expedient because of the range of its communication system and the ability to publish news without barriers and forms of mediation that would be located outside of the digital world. Another form of protection for *whistleblowers* is the anonymity, which allows some protection from the possible sanctions by the agencies in which they work. We have to protect *whistleblowers* if they are acting in the interests of the citizens, since they are the guarantors of freedom and transparency. At this point, an important question arises: who are the legitimate *whistleblowers*? What are their intentions? Are their actions always performed for the collective good? These questions are difficult to answer to. Despite this difficulty, the evaluation of the incisiveness of the network in this not easy mechanism remains fundamental. If, on the one hand, the Internet provides for whistleblowers, on the other hand it may be a risk because it makes it even more difficult to answer the questions we posed. The anonymity can be a fundamental form of guarantee, while on the other side it can also prove to be the other face of irresponsibility: a whistleblower armed with bad intentions can thus undermine the foundations of a security system for personal interests and trigger panic on an entire Nation.

Conclusions

To avoid the extreme consequences given by the arbitrary use of this revolutionary political mean, regulatory actions are required to be more precise, especially in a collective sense. The need for regulation is given by the unique peculiarity, which belongs only to the web, in which the network is used in the dissemination and exchange of information: it knows no territorial boundaries, or if in some isolated case knows, these are not easily traceable. The method of action in this field is twofold and can only be effective if practiced in combination. On one hand, a fundamental legislative action that gives a number of internationally recognized safeguards is needed; on the other hand, it cannot be fully adequate if not accompanied by a concerted intervention on the educational level, which gives people, enterprises or anyone who uses the web a full awareness of this tool and its effects. In this regard important national and global initiatives, which aim to promote and ensure a change in this direction, have been developed. After the Datagate scandal, for example, in its final report "Liberty and security in a changing world", the Committee appointed by Barack Obama to investigate this sensitive issue asks the President of the United States for an urgent and drastic reform, in terms of processing the data of U.S. citizens and of those that concern the data of citizens of other countries⁶⁸. A further step forward was made in the Human Rights Committee of the United Nations, through the approval of the text "Right to privacy in the digital age", which could give a strong international slant to what is hoped to be a collective regulation on digital rights. Concerning the plan of education about the use of the network, a key resolution in this regard was approved during the 35th International Conference on Privacy, which was attended in Warsaw by the authorities that ensure the protection of data around the world. The resolution, strongly supported by the Italian Guarantor, has the implementation of a joint program of digital education involving all citizens with varying degrees of protection and participation. Ultimately, although it is difficult to find a meeting point between freedom and security in the digital space, we should support the fundamental definition of a frame within which the trade-off can take place in a socially acceptable manner and with the utmost self-respect, which is the ultimate and fundamental safeguard in a civil society.

⁶⁸ R.A. Clarke, M.J. Morell, G.R. Stone, C.R. Sunstein, P.Swire, *Liberty and Security in a Changing World*, Report and Recommendations of. The President's Review Group on Intelligence, 2012.

References

1. S.Rodotà, *Il Diritto di avere Diritti*, Editori Laterza, Bari, 2012
2. A.Appadurai, *Disjuncture and difference in Global Cultural Economy*, University of Minnesota Press, 1990.
3. A.M. Schlesiger, *Imperial Presidency*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1973
4. E.A.Posner A. Vermeule, *Terror in the Balance. Security liberty and the courts*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007.
5. S.Warren e L.D.Brandeis, *The Right to Privacy*, in Harvard Law Review no. 5, Boston, 1890
6. F.Rigaux, *La protection de la vie privée et des autres biens de la personnalité*, Bruylant, Bruxelles-Paris 1990,
7. Y.Benkler, *The Wealth of Networks: How Social Production Transforms Markets and Freedom*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 2007.
8. R.A. Clarke, M.J. Morell, G.R. Stone, C.R. Sunstein, P.Swire, *Liberty and Security in a Changing World*, Report and Recommendations of The President's Review Group on Intelligence, 2012.