

It appears that the call for individual privacy by various interests and institutions stems from a very human need to rest from the societal demands placed on one's public self – a product of continual negotiation between the individual and society.

In the most basic sense then, privacy is a lunch break from the obligations associated with one's socially determined public identity.

More complexly, privacy affords one the freedom to completely deviate from the persona they exhibit publicly to such an extent that if you were to invade this privacy you could potentially discover a person utterly inconsistent with the one you've trusted or known in their public capacity. Depending on the nature of the inconsistency discovered, one's public persona could be eroded to the point that the person may no longer be allowed to inhabit their previously held socially determined position.

Is the expectation that one behave in the same manner both publicly and privately totalitarian?

Is privacy mostly a refuge for our more prurient, animalistic, and unrefined impulses?

In what ways have data mining practices and the policing of virtual behaviors complicated the discussion?

Making the determination about what is acceptable human behavior is a strange sort of task where moral absolutes are imposed on the individual for the benefit of society. Certainly, this practice is necessary for the sake of societal stability. However, when one considers that this practice denies the fullness of the behavioral reality of humanity, it is apparent that the outcomes of such a practice are largely illusory.

Acceptable human behavior then is a product of continual negotiation between the societal self and individual selves.

Taken as a whole, society (in both its public and private capacities) is an exhibition of all behaviors.