

Privacy

I think privacy is about the need and right to protect yourself. Some people like to think that if you have nothing to hide, you should have nothing to fear. This is absolutely not true.

My thinking is that, those that actually have nothing to hide, maybe also have nothing to prove, and don't necessarily feel the need to say so. Because it isn't the point of privacy.

People are dangerous. A lack of privacy is the very real threat of people, and the extent of their irrational actions. It is as dangerous as anything.

A lack of privacy is not about the truth, quite the opposite, people will never know the whole truth, you are always protecting yourself from the lie of the incomplete truth that someone else believes.

The problem with a lack of privacy is that it can remove the buffer of doubt in people's minds and position them to place false judgement upon you. Other people's actions affect us greatly. Their judgements affect us greatly because it is what they base their actions on. They can have an inability to even contemplate their total lack of understanding.

It is always about the lie, and our vulnerability to it.

Even something as simple as an embarrassing detail that will never be reconciled in someone's mind, that they will never unknit, or unsee, can loom large in every interaction. It can take a toll. There is a difference between what the "eye" can appreciate and reality. This effects us all, these are simple logistics of a practical reality. We don't live in a world of complete truth and understanding.

It is the constant danger of people who think they know enough to justify imposing themselves, their judgement, and their actions upon you, and removing privacy is like removing barriers for those people.

You also cannot "assume", without expecting that to be challenged, on principle. People are wrong all the time, and their ability to determine that they might be wrong can go hand in hand with the rest of their skill set.

This could result in being controlled by the inability of people, rather than the best of people, because power itself is a "senseless" form of determination, it tests boundaries, it is not itself "logical" or "human".

Ultimately, it is setting up the same system of power vs humanity, putting ourselves in a position of maximum opposition. It is not a great way to live. We build systems to move away from this dynamic like we build shelter, allowing privacy to be removed is like being exposed to the elements, we won't survive it if it becomes extreme.

As people, we don't necessarily want to “adapt” to being completely impervious to all threats to our existence. There is value in vulnerability and meaning, in fact to recognise value is to recognise that there is something to lose.

It is wrong to have the right to your own life forcibly controlled or violated by someone that has no right to do so. This includes the right to your body, to yourself, and the right to protect those things.

The value of the personal and the intimate can be stolen and degraded, and devalued, and there are very real consequences of a lack of privacy that can impact a person's life tangibly.

Privacy is a need, it gives room for value, and for function.

I'm not sure if physical reality as we know it can exist without privacy, or that we could survive a world without it, so a plan to limit or remove privacy from society would be very problematic.

People have always needed room to work within. It is not physically practical to need to explain yourself, or avoid being misinterpreted, constantly. Even the time it takes to do so is a practical metric.

Physical interaction is full of all the things we don't say, all the things we reserve judgement on, that we leave open and unknown. These are our physical restrictions, while our sense of “spirit” is soaring and expansive, full of possibility. Our ability to speak freely and with the ease of our true selves can be detracted from by practicalities, circumstances, and distractions. We are very limited in this way by our physicality, even though it is a great basis for our experiences.

A world without privacy might even place restrictions on reality that we don't understand. What is the cause and effect of an ever imposing mix of stark truths and crucial missing details? My impression is of something very tightly wound.

We must protect privacy rights, it is very dangerous to lose them. We should not allow ourselves to be controlled by raw power, it is a perpetual undercutting of what we are.

There may even be an eventual curse involved in seriously violating another person's privacy, as the only way to acclimatise might be either regression, or a sufficient amount of “truth” to reconcile the “lies” of inadequate understanding and judgement.

As a result, there is probably some blessed freedom in not knowing things that are not in your awareness through no fault, (or lack), of your own. And, a better method of growth toward understanding.

Extreme privacy violation in law

Watching illegal explicit material does more harm than just supporting the creation of that material and the criminals that make it.

Excerpt from 'The Political Manifesto of Ease: Haven't Left Yet' by Heather Leeves

Watching explicit illegal material, is a form of sexual assault on that person. You are violating that person's privacy by even watching it, you are adding to the harm inflicted on that person.

This includes any explicit material that you do not have the consent of that person to watch. As an individual, you have violated that person's rights and freedoms, degraded and devalued their privacy. You have threatened them. You have taken intimate knowledge of them that they do not want you to know of. And you have done it in the emotionally burdensome and consequential form of a sexual nature.

Putting this information into physical formats, including tangible "information" formats, is extreme additional harm. It is an extreme method of facilitating this harm by easily increasing the individual violations, and their real consequences. It allows people to violate privacy in extreme detail, in ways that are not even possible otherwise, or natural. And it poses a constant perpetual threat through it's material existence.

Abstractness is a form of privacy. A spider in the bathroom, as far as I know, doesn't pose the same threat to privacy because it doesn't understand or relate to what it's observing. A person thinking of another person in an explicit way, while potentially disrespectful to that person's image, is not the same level of harm, it has natural limitations. It does not expose anything true that can be used against someone. Although, the more that false information is confused for the "truth" the more likely it will pose a threat.

I do think some normal, decent people have been brainwashed and numbed to this reality, where the real extent of the crime has been removed from it's natural context. For example, people watching explicit material online might be grossly careless of the knowledge of the origin of that material, but the risk is high that you have committed a form of sexual assault on an innocent victim.

We must get very serious about it logically, because we are removed from our senses and better judgement in these situations. If our knowledge of the risk of real harm is high, then we cannot negate our own responsibility to it like we can in low risk situations.

We need to educate people, and we need to put systems in place to tidy up explicit content online. It is all very loose and this fosters criminal behaviour, and isn't healthy for anyone.

If decent people become aware, as they should, that if they are unreasonably careless online with explicit material that they could be held accountable for victimising that person, systems should naturally form to validify the origin of source material. Use some discretion at a bare minimum.

I would work to introduce serious sentences for extreme privacy abuses including deliberating watching, creating, and distributing non-consensual explicit material including "revenge porn", and "hidden camera" material. As well as any illegal abuse material. This is real harm.

Whether it would be appropriate to replace “extreme” material with verified “fake” or “generated” material as a possible alternative, that may also eradicate the market for real abuse, is a question of debate. It may perpetuate self destructive tendencies much like extreme drug addiction can hollow out a person of their self worth and self control.

Digital Rights and The Law

We must also deal with the impending privacy and control crisis. Facial recognition technology for general use must be made illegal immediately. Surveillance must be kept to the bare minimum. Requirements for digitalisation must be stopped. We must say no to all of it, and protect the rights of people to live without technology.

We must address the legality of “data” collection. Just because something is not “written” or “communicated” in law does not mean that wrong is right or up is down.

We don't know what is happening to our rights. We know that violating our rights is illegal, and should be illegal. These people should know that if it should be illegal, then it better damn well be, because they are accountable.

The only difference to accountability, is whether actual responsibility is changed through awareness and logical reasoning. It makes it hard to judge, it does not make it impossible. Societal law is a construct of communication and power, and is about the execution of the collective and individual will of people, in the name of what is “just”.

Who needs it to be a maze of overcomplicated logistics and administration except those abusing its power? You cannot do things in the name of power and call it justice. They have no respect for what the law actually is.

What is corruption? When everything that an establishment has stood for, or should stand for, can no longer maintain and direct its truest purposes, for the ignorance, and motives, of its moving parts.

It is all a matter of what is fair, what is right, who can judge it, and when.

How do we begin to do something about it if others think they can commandeer societal law for their own purposes? We would much prefer societal law to represent actual justice.

When someone clicks “I agree” on a computer screen, they have innately entrusted the law, with the correct belief that justice is its true purpose. You can not legally be coerced into giving consent, no one is agreeing to anything that they wouldn't agree to.

If you want explicit consent you must make it explicitly clear, and consent must be informed. Consent is a 1:1 ratio. You need awareness of what you are participating in.

Relying on deliberately doing unknown things in the shadows, with the idea that people can give away their rights without understanding them, without awareness, is not legal. It is just opportunistic delay and distraction.

Excerpt from 'The Political Manifesto of Ease: Haven't Left Yet' by Heather Leeves