

How far should a state have a right to monitor the actions of people within its b...

[People](#)



The state should monitor the actions of people within its borders if such actions pose a threat to the national security. A nation's security is of an utmost importance to a country as it ensures the survivability of a country. It is with this reason that the government should have a right to monitor the actions of the people within its borders. This refers to individuals who engage in terrorist activities with the aim of conducting terrorist attacks in the country to instill fear in others. E. g. In Singapore, the government monitored the actions of Mas Selamat when the police received tip off of his plan to bomb the Singapore Changi Airport in 2002, where he was eventually arrested. The state should have a right to monitor the actions of the people within its borders, especially during stressful times such as war; as long as its monitoring does not result in the violation of human rights. Possessing the highest power, the state has jurisdiction in virtually all areas that society has to deal with. Hence, it does have the right to monitor the actions of people.

In times of war, famine, disease and violent acts will arise. In such times, the general public is unable to control and detain the situation, thus requiring the intervention of a higher power. For example, the state should have the right to implement a curfew during a war. This helps keep the people safe and reduces the chance of a violent protest or riot that may result in more deaths. Eg: During the 2010 clash between the red shirts and the yellow shirts in Thailand, the state intervened and imposed a curfew to monitor the actions of the Thais.

This action has prevented more deaths and kept the people safe. Thus, the state should intervene in times of war to help control the situation.

Government should not have the right to monitor actions of people when it <https://assignbuster.com/how-far-should-a-state-have-a-right-to-monitor-the-actions-of-people-within-its-borders/>

comes to choosing one's life partner. Individuals should be given the freedom to decide with whom they would want to spend the rest of their lives with. If the government were to interfere in this issue, it would go against the basic human rights of freedom of choice. However, the state should not intervene when it violates human rights.

The purpose of the state monitoring is to benefit the people; however when the state crosses the line and invades the privacy of people, this right should be revoked. Eg: the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) in America has the authority to monitor anyone without the person legally consenting to it. This has resulted in the unhappiness of Americans and resulting in Americans losing faith in their legal system. Thus, the state should have a right to monitor the actions of people when in dire situations such as war but not at the expense of the privacy of people.