

Google's Street View caused lots of controversy when it was initially making its way around the globe documenting landscapes and peoples' residences. The most common issue addressed with Street View was of individual privacy. People were worried about burglaries, blackmailing with shameful photos, stalking, and several other issues that could arise because of Google's Street View. While there was technology to blur faces, license plates, and other seriously private elements, this would take time and to many be far too little precaution. Google also failed in taking other nation's cultural values into account, so they were berated by countries like Japan, Greece, and the United Kingdom. In this Case Analysis, I will argue that the deontological tool and philosopher's theories show that Google should have waited to release Street View because it overlooks that the people in these pictures are real people with private lives and not just a means to an end, therefore the rolling out of this service breaks the golden rule of treating others as you wish to be treated and violates their privacy.

Floridi strongly believed that someone's personal information defined what they are and what they can become, which means an attack on a person's information is a violation of their very identity. He believed that this could impeded their sense of self identity and their further self-development. This means that protection the right to privacy is an act that should be performed out of respect for your fellow man.

The deontological tool and Superman's reasoning in story are very similar in this regard. Superman believed that a person, regardless of their background, past, or traits, should be treated as such and that no one person is greater or deserves more privileges than another. This boils down to the use of the golden rule, meaning treat others as you wish to be treated. When the fate of another person was in Superman's hands, he treated them with dignity and respect as he would anyone else.

Google seemed to not view the privacy of people being infringed as a disrespect, and they most likely believed that the convenience of Street View would win over the public. It is also important to remember that their goal as a company is to appease their stockholders and make a profit. They are not in the business of respecting or treating people with the dignity that they wished to be treated.

Since Floridi placed a lot of value and emphasis on people's identity, he too believes that people's right to privacy should be upheld for all because an attack on that would result in the fellow man's suffering. Floridi also mentions that the ICTs (Information and Communications Technology) are bringing the previous perceptions of privacy into question. Boundaries are constantly being moved around as humanity continues to creep into new ages of time. When this thinking is applied to Google's implementation of Street View across the globe, many problems arise. Since there were multiple images taken by Google's team that resulted in embarrassing photos or people simply requested to be taken down, they also thought it affected their identity, dignity, and personal growth. The fact that Google also swept through various countries with very little regard for their customs or practices relating to personal privacy shows that, in Floridi's eyes, they violated people's identities in mass.

Floridi mentioned the idea of information friction as well. This is the concept of how hard it is to obtain the information one is seeking to acquire. He stated that if there is no information friction for personal information then no identity can be formed. Street View can be easily used to go anywhere in the world in a couple of seconds and see all the things that are there. The informational friction is seemingly nonexistent. In summary, the use of the deontological tool, in conjunction with Floridi's paper, it is found that Superman's actions and Floridi's principles on

privacy are similar in their beliefs to protect the humanity of a person whether that deals with their privacy or their lives.

Grimmel had very strong views on what the privacy of people should be modeled after. He thought privacy should be viewed in the same way society views product safety. This thinking would make companies more accountable for leaking a user's personal information. Grimmelman argued that the user can do their best job to protect their information and go to the most trusted sites and services, and if something like Facebook, Google, Amazon, etc. becomes compromised, then they should be held accountable like when a product fails in other areas. The resulting punishment from the individuals that lost their personal information could be in the form of lawsuits to compensate for pain and damages. It is Grimmelman's thinking that this would deter this type of breach from occurring as frequently as it does because companies would more than likely place even more focusing on securing user information than they already do.

The reasons that product safety laws exist in the first place is for consumer protection. This is a useful perspective to have when applying it to Google's use and implementation of their Street View. In this instance, Google quickly rolled out a product that impacted many individuals' privacy. This product gradually stretched over the entire globe. As this happened, more and more privacy was impacted and people had to request to have things that they did not want out there to be taken down. The privacy as a product safety model can be used in this scenario to show how irresponsible the implementation of Street View truly was. People could sue Google for the embarrassing, shameful, invading, or cultural insensitive images because they are negatively impacting their lives and people may have seen these and harassed them over them. This a common practice when talking about product safety, and it exists as a safeguard to ensure product quality for the use of the consumer.

In the realm of comics and super heroics, this mindset of heavily emphasizing products would be more in line with Lex Luthor than Superman. There are still striking similarities to be found with Grimmelman's perspective. Grimmelman's way of thinking focuses on the individuals' right to privacy and granting them some means to protect that; therefore, it is more of a human rights perspective than a commercial one. This has much in common with Superman and his reasoning because he views his occupation as protecting the lives and rights of people from things that would harm them or take rights away. The added protection and civil agency that Grimmelman believes goes almost perfectly in hand with Superman's overall emphasis on justice and fairness for the everyman. Superman would also probably compare the production and distribution of a product and/or service that violates peoples' rights to the actions of a villain, such as Lex Luthor. The main summary and benefit of Grimmelman's views are that they would give citizens more options regarding to protecting their freedom, and given that Superman is very progressive, I am more than positive that he would be in favor of viewing privacy like product safety for more civil protection.

Whether privacy is viewed as a fundamental aspect of personal identity or as product safety, it remains vital to the human experience. Expert philosophers like Grimmelman and Floridi emphasize the importance of having the right to privacy in life. Superman, upholder of justice, fairness, and humanity, has views that parallel this assessment. Cultural differences and other factors, such as new emerging technology, may provide each area in society with their own definitions of privacy, but it remains important throughout. Objecting these perspectives to justify the encroachment on privacy and personal information because it may bring about convenience, order, a sense of community, or any other factor is wrong. Google's implementation of Street View and the way it violated privacy should never happened again with

a publicly release product or service. In conclusion, privacy is something that should be maintained, especially regarding personal information, for a person to retain their dignity and be able to have personal growth.