

sive openness, when any secrets, whether they are personal and state secrets, become available to absolutely any person that have certain technical skills?

Yes, there are solutions such as DLP (Data Loss Prevention), a standard that not by chance began to be improved after the LGT scandal (the Liechtenstein Bank). On the other hand, **it is also true that no technology may ever completely stop an information leak**, especially when we are speaking about insiders who have intentionally leaked out such information.

■ *A new elite is emerging in the modern world, which justifies its status by possessing new communication technologies. Does the new 'netocracy' change the nature of elites and their configuration?*

I guess the answer to that question is yes. Let me give you a very simple example. Until several years ago, computer geeks were named 'nerds'. Today they are named geeks, hackers, and so on. This is happening because the world's concept of 'power' has changed. **Today, the power is represented in terms of information:** information is essentially power. Ultimately, geeks know how to gain access to and manipulate information. Then, the network itself – the Internet – as well as social groups and so on, has made things different. Today, for instance, I have noticed that many girls are now being attracted by hackers, who were nerds not so long ago, because the balance and all our views have changed. Also, the fact is that hacking used on the wrong side, meaning cybercrime, brings money. There already exist economic elites, who have made their money based on cybercrime. Thus, the standard and 'old-school' status are changing as well, bringing to light such profiles and backgrounds that were not there just a few years ago.

■ *New communication technologies bring forth two opposite processes: on the one hand, new technologies contribute to a better informational openness and they can serve as the means for emancipating masses. On the other hand, it is a wonderful tool for manipulating the masses and democratic procedures. In your opinion, which of these two processes prevails nowadays?*

In my opinion, the first tendency is dominating. But, the risk that all of this technology may set the stage for mass manipulation is also high: that is another reason why I am 'pro-Assange'. Governments have manipulated information for centuries, haven't they? Then, Gutenberg invented the concept of the 'free press', removing that special power from a restricted elite and effectively bringing culture to the masses. Culture has allowed those masses to evolve, to grow up, and to enhance their background and their lives. **Wikileaks is the 21st century's Gutenberg revolution.** In any case, that is what I hope. ■

Raoul Chiesa was speaking with Yulia Netesova

CYBER CRIMINALS



JOHN BOLTON

is an American statesman and a diplomat. He served as the US Ambassador to the United Nations in 2005-2006. At present, John Bolton is a Senior Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute

Exclusively for Yaroslavl initiative

It is clearly a crime under US law to divulge classified information. Thus, certainly anyone serving in the US government who has participated in leaking such information should be persecuted. Now, whether or not someone like Julian Assange or Wikileaks falls within the US jurisdiction, I think that is something that needs to be studied and I think that it is being studied. However, I have no doubts that this entails criminal activity.

It is very detrimental to the conduct of US diplomacy, and it would be detrimental to the conduct of the diplomacy of any country that has had its diplomatic and military communications made public. If Wikileaks is not subject to legal proceeding against it, **it will appear that they are operating with impunity, and there will be risk of other leakers also trying to make public the state secrets that are known to them.**

The founders of Wikileaks, as well as the people funding and supporting it, have been profoundly anti-American. The US has been the target of all of the documents disclosed thus far, and I think it is entirely consistent with what we

know about the people who have been involved in Wikileaks. Therefore, I see this as basically an anti-American enterprise.

I think that the consequence will be that foreign government officials, opposition party leaders, dissidents in authoritarian societies, as well as church, religious, civic, business leaders, will now be reluctant to talk to US diplomats due to the fact that they will want their confidential communications to be held in confidence. Of course, they don't want to read about them in the newspapers. The consequence will be that **US diplomats working abroad will be able to learn or obtain less valuable and truthful information.** I think that this situation may be corrected over time but I think that, in the short term, and maybe even in the medium term, it will make interlocutors with US diplomats much more likely to follow only their approved talking point for fear that the State Department cannot ensure that conversations that are intended to be private and in confidence will remain that way – that is, that they are kept private and confidential. ■