

According would build
a society which
remains in

[Life](#), [Relationships](#)



According to the The Journal (Duffy, n. d.), the origin of the phrase is unclear but it is most famously associated with Nazi Minister of Propaganda Joseph Goebbels, who supposedly used it in 1933. Solove (2011), claims that privacy is too complex a concept that it is impossible to reduce it to one simple idea. Therefore "The nothing to hide" argument hailed by the government and the cooperate advocates, for me, is a naive attempt to appease people and turn down voices that have raised concerns about individual and mass privacy right issues. It violates the basic social right to choose what and with whom you want to share yourself and your life with. In doing so, both the government and cooperate sector has made people more paranoid about society. The question also arises whether "The nothing to hide" argument assumes that everyone is looked upon as a prospectus criminal or wrongdoer? If so, then it would build a society which remains in constant anxiety of being watched, assessed and analyzed.

We are already living in a society rich with conspiracy theories, this will further shape unhealthy relationships and associations which would presume an individual, a group or a cooperate of wrong doing and look upon it with distrust at the slightest hint of keeping something from the other. In other words the "nothing to hide" argument opposes itself, by making surveillance, whether government or cooperate, an indiscriminate tool to gather information and monitor without any reasonable suspicion. Thus agreeing with Emilio Mordini's view that the "nothing to hide" argument "is inherently paradoxical." Another important issue to ponder upon of such an argument is of the interpretation and analysis of the information, its processing

and storage and the use. It doesn't matter how harmless or innocuous, the data collected is, what matters is how it is used and who has access to it.

As to want privacy, doesn't not necessarily mean you want to hide something. It only asserts the notion of free will and freedom of speech. With "Nothing to hide" we will start to "hide" our true selves, opinions and would avoid saying or doing anything debatable, in fear it might get misconstrued. If the issue is of protection and security then shouldn't, "Nothing to hide" argument work both ways? Shouldn't there be transparency at both sides? The governments, the cooperates and the common public all have the right to enjoy this privilege.