

The Rights of Man and State

Aksel Tjoenn

In this brief essay, the writer will share his thoughts on a quote by the philosopher Robert Nozick. The quote is found in one of his books, called "Anarchy, State and Utopia":

"Individuals have rights, and there are things no person or groups may do to them (without violating their rights). So strong and far-reaching are these rights that they raise the question of what, if anything, the state and its officials may do."

- Robert Nozick

This quote will be discussed on the premises that by rights the author is talking about certain God- or nature-given ideas about the human being, mainly being that all human beings are born equal, and thus can not be limited by any other man, no matter. By deducting this thesis, one argues that since all men are born the same, all men are, as described in the Declaration of Independence, endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The rights of man have yet to be precisely defined other than the 30 from the United Nations, and have been disputed and discussed by philosophers during the course of history. From the roman rights of men, to today, where every nation have different human rights. In some nations we have a right to firearms, others a property, and in most nations there are no human rights at all. Nozick's point, however, seems to be that we have unlimited rights, and his deduction from that is that governments thus are irrelevant, as only the individual can govern the individual, himself. But firstly, what is really the purpose of government? And secondly, what about the people unable to take care of themselves? And thirdly, how can we possibly have "complete freedom"? All this, and more, will be discussed in this short essay.

The first question imposed is perhaps the most important, as well as the main question of the political philosophical questions: what is the purpose of government? This question has been answered differently in different times of history, and has imposed various forms of governments i.e. technocracy, democracy or fascism. And most of the different forms of governments have changed from their original ideas as well, much due to the thoughts of men like Nozick, as we can see with democracy. The first forms of democracy were much like dictatorships, where 51% of the people could take away the rights of the remaining 49%. The Romans adopted and adapted this sort of democracy to the Republic, where majority rules, but all government and individual power is regulated by the Roman Tablets of Rights, where the rights of man were written down. The mentioned adaptation was indeed in the spirit of Nozick, but still people had to pay taxes, join the army, and other similar government duties. But if I am free and an individual, who can demand a split of my hard-earned money? Who can legally steal my profits and force me to work for them? The government. The reason the government can take your money, is that they use money for "the greater good" much better than the individual. If a baby is born with a mental retardation, who will take care of it? The obvious answer is the parents, but they will both lose their freedoms if they have to take care of a mentally handicapped baby for 30 years. And what if the parents do not want it, or can not have it? If they, i.e. pass away. This is where the role government comes in.

In the course of progress and development, money sometimes has to be spent without the hopes of a profit. If a road is needed, a fire station has to be built, or research has to be done to solve a large-scale problem like the climate-crisis, governments have to spend the money needed, as the goal is for the greater good. Laws are another example of government necessity; individuals can not possess such power, as individuals are corrupted by power. And thus, governments, neutral parties with no gain, are needed. Of course, Nozick would probably argue that all laws are opposed to human rights. Which is correct, and we fundamentally know so our self, as we, for example, usually think it is all

right if we are in a rush and "forget" to pick up after our dog, but are very much disgusted when other people are in the same position. Nevertheless, when asked the question, most people agree that laws are a necessary evil to keep a society stable. Not to mention, if you remove all laws, and all government, people usually wind up with very little freedom, as they have to constantly watch out for their property, possessions, family and work. Every time in history such conditions or anarchy were in effect, the people usually winded up hiring a sheriff, or some other branch of government to protect their possessions. So as the Oracle of Delphi said: "*Without law, there can be no freedom.*"

This essay has, so far, reached the point where it contradicts itself. With government we lose freedoms, and rights, and without governments we lose freedoms, and rights. So what are the human rights? It is said that we get them from our creator, but would a supposed God care if the individual has a right to a gun? Or would a supposed God not emphasize the right to food and water every day and a safe place to sleep at night? Keep in mind that no current official human rights contain these elements, the very foundations of human life. The writer of this essay personally believes that one of two things is true: we either have unlimited rights, or no rights at all.

Another mention worthy point when discussing human rights is where do you get them from? And who can possibly give them to you? The very existence of human rights contradicts the human rights, because if anyone has the ability to give you your rights, they also have the ability to take them away. An example of this is the 1943 Japanese-American containment camps. After the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, countless Japanese-Americans were stripped of all human rights, all property, job and family by the American government, solely due to their nationality. Keep in mind that the American Revolution gave new life to 2000 year old rights, and is the primary reason human rights are such a great value in our part of the world today. The American Revolution inspired the French Revolution, which inspired the freedoms and human rights in my own nation, the Norwegian Constitution.

As the existence of human rights are contradicting human rights themselves, and not having human rights have caused serious hierarchy and hegemony in history, where can we find human rights? Have they ever truly existed, other than as an illusion to control and please the masses? In this essay, the answer will surprisingly be yes. On the Internet. On the Internet, there are no actual laws, and absolutely no limitations. The Internet is perhaps the only place in the world where who you are actually have no influence on the way people perceive you. No one cares if you are Black or White on the Internet. Your social status, income, nationality or creed is absolutely irrelevant, and you can do whatever you please. And human rights do not exist, as they are oblivious. Who could possibly give you rights on the Internet? No one. And no one could take them away. Because no one governs you, you are truly free, and human rights actually exist. As the Internet is the only place social classes never existed, it is also the only thing close to Karl Marx' idea of Communism the human species have managed to create.

Karl Marx knew that Communism in present time was impossible, as current human nature contradicts every aspect of equality, especially in social circumstances. The Pygmalion-effect is always present, and the "workers revolution" is more of a agricultural revolution than an industrial, and will take hundreds of years. If the reader questions this, think only of what Communism was when it existed, and is, where it exists. China, North-Korea, Cuba, USSR, in no other time of history has so many people been governed by so few, and social classes been so disrupted as in the "Communitic" nations, as the state in reality is a very closed set of people, controlling everything in an Oligarchy.

The Internet, however, can never dictate to us how the "real" world should be politically, as issues of health and crime are nonexistent there. In the real world, governments are necessary, as individuals only respect their own rights, not the rights of their peers. For instance, ownership. Due to the monetary system of today, the right to your own inventions and innovation is highly profitable to all of mankind, and it makes hard work profitable. In Communism, and on the Internet, there is no monetary system, and due to this, everyone owns everything. And even if I am free, I should not be

able to violently abuse someone. Or to put it in another way, even if everyone around me is free, I do not think they should be able to violently abuse me. But that should also be the limit of government, to protect the rights of man. The government should exist only to take care of the weakest among us, take care of the non-profitable projects of the greater good and most important of all, protect the individual and his rights. The reader may think, truthfully enough, that this was the foundation of the Roman Republic, and it fell. But the Roman Empire fell due to many reasons, where the political was only one of them. And political, it fell due to politicians gaining unlimited power with the majority of the (voting) population behind them. Soon, government programs and projects started, and byrocracy increased, and as President Nixon, I understand that government programs never stop, as they increase the power of the politicians, the only ones able to stop them. This effect increased taxes, and soon government got too big. Government because the greatest enemy of its people, and as another American President said, "*When the people fears their government, there is tyranny, when the government fears its people, there is liberty.*", people were forced to trade freedom for security, and the Republic collapsed into Democracy, which collapsed into Anarchy, which, as Anarchy usually does, evolved into an Oligarchy, under the rule of the Caesar. But today, with the Internet as a firm base of information, we can actually maintain a state which is strongly controlled by the constitution, stating the clearly and in easily-understood language: the state exists for the people only, and its only purpose is to protect the rights of the people, as well as support the people unable to support themselves. That is the true purpose of government, and the true consequence of Human Rights.