

November 2016

The Tension Between Privacy and Security

Susan Maret
San Jose State University

Antoon De Baets
University of Groningen

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/secrecyandsociety>

 Part of the [History Commons](#), [Law Commons](#), [Political Science Commons](#), and the [Public Affairs, Public Policy and Public Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Maret, Susan and Antoon De Baets. 2016. "The Tension Between Privacy and Security." *Secrecy and Society* 1(1). <http://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/secrecyandsociety/vol1/iss1/9>

This Documents is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Information at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Secrecy and Society by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

The Tension Between Privacy and Security

Keywords

human rights, national security, privacy, public policy, secrecy

DOCUMENTS

The Tension Between Privacy and Security: A Review of

President's Review Group on Intelligence and Communications Technologies, *Liberty and Security in a Changing World*, 2013.

United Nations Office of the High Commissioner, *Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Privacy, Joseph A. Cannataci*, 2016.

**Susan Maret
Antoon De Baets**

The two documents discussed in this section might be considered bookends.

The 2016 *Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Privacy*, written by Special Rapporteur Joseph A. Cannataci, and the 2013 President's Review Group on Intelligence and Communications Technologies' *Liberty and Security in a Changing World*, have in common their discussion of the right to privacy, government surveillance, security, and secrecy. Citing the European Court of Human Rights Grand Chamber Judgment in *Roman Zakharov v Russia* (2015), the Special Rapporteur notes in his *Report* the "mere existence of a secret surveillance measure is a violation of the right to private life" (Office of the High Commissioner 2016, para 37). *Liberty and Security in a Changing World* states that "excessive surveillance and unjustified secrecy can threaten civil liberties, public trust, and the core processes of democratic self-government" (President's Review Group on Intelligence and Communications Technologies 2013, 12).

The *Report of the Special Rapporteur*, written by Joseph Cannataci, who was appointed in 2015 by the U.N. Human Rights Council as the first Special Rapporteur on the right to privacy (United Nations Office of the High

Commissioner 2016). *Liberty and Security* is drafted by “five outside” experts that comprise the President’s Review Group on Intelligence and Communications Technologies. These experts, who each in their own way was connected to the U.S. national security policy establishment, are Richard A. Clarke, Michael J. Morell, Geoffrey R. Stone, Cass R. Sunstein, and Peter Swire. The Group was appointed in August 2013 with a deadline of December 2013 to complete their task of reviewing National Security Agency data collection policies, both domestic and foreign. The Group called itself “the five guys,” after the Five Guys Burger and Fries chain, and for the “big book they'd soon be writing as 'The Five Guys Report'”(Kaplan 2016, 255). The 308 page unclassified report *Liberty and Security in a Changing World* is their final work product.

Neither the Special Rapporteur or the “five guys” reports formally acknowledges Edward Snowden's June 2013 disclosure of the National Security Agency's (NSA) covert activities pertaining to bulk collection of domestic and foreign emails, phone calls, and telephone metadata. The Snowden revelations – as a symptom of secret profiling, surveillance, and intelligence sharing by many governments - is central to understanding the policy recommendations of both reports. In particular, the *Report* is a conversation in that it opens dialogue with those official bodies active in carrying out profiling and spying. To this end, the Special Rapporteur

“Has continued a programme of continuous engagement with law enforcement agencies and security and intelligence services world-wide in an effort to better understand their legitimate concerns and recognise best practices which could be usefully shared as well as to identify policies, practices and legislation of doubtful usefulness or which present an unacceptable level of risk to privacy nationally and world-wide.” (United

Nations Office of the High Commissioner 2016, para 11)

Both reports, at a distance of roughly two years apart, are concerned with the essential elements of human rights, civil liberties, and their deep connection to autonomy, expression, trust, citizenship, rule of law, and the “adequacy” of official oversight. Both reports are also concerned with the intersection of security-rooted measures (surveillance) and the right to privacy. *Liberty and Security in a Changing World* goes so far to identify “two different forms of security: national security and personal privacy” the U.S. government must protect (President’s Review Group on Intelligence and Communications Technologies 2013, 14). The Special Rapporteur's *Report* notes that “the ordinary citizen may often get caught in the cross-fire and his or her personal data and online activities may end up being monitored in the name of national security in a way which is unnecessary, disproportionate and excessive” (United Nations Office of the High Commissioner 2016, para 11); *Liberty and Security in a Changing World* suggests that “when government is engaged in surveillance, it can undermine public trust, and in that sense render its own citizens insecure. Privacy is a central aspect of liberty, and it must be safeguarded” (President’s Review Group on Intelligence and Communications Technologies 2013, 47). In this way, the two reports are a plea to broaden the concept of security so as to encompass the human dimension.

Both reports are also concerned with risk, not only of having one's information gobbled up into a cloud of Big Data, but risks to privacy by targeted

and mass surveillance measures in the protection of state security. Of the President's Review Group of forty-six recommendations, the most connected to the Special Rapporteur's *Report* are:

- The U.S. government “should not be permitted to collect and store all mass, undigested, non-public personal information about individuals to enable future queries and data-mining for foreign intelligence purposes” (Recommendation 4)
- The “government should publicly disclose on a regular basis general data about National Security Letters, section 215 orders, pen register and trap-and-trace orders, section 702 orders, and similar orders in programs whose existence is unclassified, unless the government makes a compelling demonstration that such disclosures would endanger the national security” (Recommendation 10).

The President's Review Group recommends adopting a risk management approach that would serve to reduce risks to national security, as well as those “risks to privacy, risks to freedom and civil liberties, on the Internet and elsewhere” (President’s Review Group on Intelligence and Communications Technologies 2013, 15). In applying risk management, “the question is not whether granting the government authority makes us incrementally safer, but whether the additional safety is worth the sacrifice in terms of individual privacy, personal liberty, and public trust” (President’s Review Group on Intelligence and Communications Technologies 2013, 114).

The last word is with the Special Rapporteur's report, which suggests that protection of privacy is a basic element of the Cyberpeace movement, thus linking espionage, cyberwarfare, and state surveillance to the invasion of the right to privacy¹:

¹ *Cyberpeace, cyber peace, or cyber peacekeeping*, is a security-centered concept discussed by the U.N., U.S. military, and NATO. For example, the 2009 *Tallinn Manual on the International*

“Cyberspace can truly become a digital space where the citizen can expect both privacy and security, a peaceful space which is not constantly being put in jeopardy by the activities of some States over and above the threats posed by terrorists and organised crime.” (United Nations Office of the High Commissioner 2016, para 11)

References

Kaplan, Fred. 2016. *Dark Territory: The Secret History of Cyber War*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

McAskill, Ewen. 2013, June 12. “Edward Snowden: How the Spy Story of the Century Leaked Out.” *The Guardian*. Accessed June 11, 2016.
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/jun/11/edward-snowden-nsa-whistleblower-profile>

President’s Review Group on Intelligence and Communications Technologies. 2013. *Liberty and Security in a Changing World*. December 12. Accessed June 8, 2016.
<https://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2013/12/18/liberty-and-security-changing-world>

United Nations Office of the High Commissioner. 2016. *Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Privacy, Joseph A. Cannataci*. A/HRC/31/64 Human Rights Council, Thirty-first session, March 8. Accessed June 8, 2016.
<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/HRC/RegularSessions/Session31/Pages/ListReports.aspx>

United Nations Office of the High Commissioner. n.d. *Special Rapporteur on the Right to Privacy*. Accessed June 9, 2016.
<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Privacy/SR/Pages/SRPrivacyIndex.aspx>

Law Applicable to Cyber Warfare (Tallinn Manual Process) developed an extensive set of rules regarding “aggression,” cyberwar, and peace in the cyberenvironment. The U.N is central to the Tallinn Process, which includes provisions for privacy as laid out in international law. See the Manual, <http://csef.ru/media/articles/3990/3990.pdf>, NATO Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence (NATO CCD COE) Tallinn Web site, <https://ccdcoe.org/research.html>, and Anna-Maria Talihärm “Toward Cyperpeace: Managing Cyberwar Through International Cooperation,” *UN Chronicle* 50, no. 2 (2013): 7-9, <http://unchronicle.un.org/article/towards-cyberpeace-managing-cyberwar-through-international-cooperation/>

