

Jayden Dawson
Professor Hartl
BUS428

Nothing to Hide

When the government gathers or analyzes personal information, many people say they're not worried. "I've got nothing to hide," they declare. "Only if you're doing something wrong should you worry, and then you don't deserve to keep it private." Stated by Daniel J. Solove. The Nothing to hide argument focuses on discussions about privacy. The phrase "I have nothing to hide" and "If you didn't have anything to hide, then you wouldn't be worried" are frequently used by those who believe they have nothing to hide. Daniel refutes these claims by posing inquiries like, "Do you have curtains?" Everyone feels as though this kind of right to privacy should be given, but the people who support the nothing to hide argument actually do have something to conceal. Overall, it is impossible to condense privacy into a more straightforward concept or term. The problem with the nothing-to-hide argument is the underlying assumption that privacy is about hiding bad things. When sharing people's personal information, this becomes much more complicated. Many governments' national-security measures involve maintaining a huge database of information that individuals cannot access. This is how the nothing-to-hide argument works, it denies the existence of a problem. When the "nothing to hide" argument is dissected, its assumptions are looked at, and they are challenged. There is an obvious unfair advantage, and beyond the surveillance and disclosure, the nothing to hide argument isn't arguable.