

Michael Johnson

Professor Hartl

Business Ethics

27 October 2020

Nothing To Hide By David J. Solove

In this article, Solove addressed one of the comments that I loathed hearing from adults my entire childhood and early teenagehood. “If you’re not doing anything wrong, then you should have nothing to hide”. This was normally an authoritative declaration and sound clearance for my mother and/or other guardian-esque adult figures (older siblings and teachers) to meander about through my personal belongings, internet interactions, credit card statements, and even illegally open my mail. For the sake of the paper and overall topic I’ll respectively digress. Solove, addressed this claim that gives the privacy of others a more invalidated countenance in the minds of others who either lack simple logic or have no problem being laid bare in front of everyone. Moreover, literarily speaking, The article is a syntactic masterpiece in the way that it juxtaposed a plethora of sides to take on privacy and the relevancy thereof, set them all next to one another arguing different perspectives to allow the reading audience to join a side and find a pathway to the concluding statements and from there decide on which stance better suit their opinion on the matter given what they know after the reading.

One of the major issues presented in the beginning of the article is: ;the premise on which the government advertises is commendatory grounds for snooping on citizens using new age technology. I don’t believe this should have been included in the nothing to hide argument as constitutionally; as US citizens, the 9th amendment grants us the

right of privacy which should include private conversations and important digital files as this is the freedom that so many people have taught and died for in war or battles for this country! This should never be something to be compromised even though systemic racism and the current state of judicial injustice in this country have found a plethora of ways of punishing and slandering people of color far more than wealthy, unmarginalized, or white citizens.

On the surface, it seems easy to dismiss the nothing-to-hide argument. Everybody probably has something to hide from somebody. As Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn declared, "Everyone is guilty of something or has something to conceal. All one has to do is look hard enough to find what it is." (Solove). In my analysis, I'm very biased on the topic at hand, I feel that everyone who has privacy, has a right to maintain that freedom; no matter what happens, everyone is innocent until proven guilty and are tried properly. While criminals, cyber hackers, and thieves may be subject to ideologies such as the nothing to hide impetus, this cannot be applied as a sound premise for everyone nor should it be. Solove put it best, if there is nothing to hide and this argument is sound that because there is no incriminating evidence in our personal affairs, it would be appropriate for nude photos of us all floating around the neighborhood, curtains would be a thing of the past, and our credit card history should be public domain. This is the toxicity of this argument and why fair right to trial and the protection of the freedom of privacy should be protected at all costs and upheld to the highest degree.