

In "The Googlization of Everything," Siva Vaidhyanathan examines the influence of Google on our society, showing concerns related to privacy and data collection. The author's main argument is the invention of Google Street View, a feature that enables users to explore any part of the world from the perspective of the street. Vaidhyanathan underlines the ethical implications of Google Street View regarding privacy invasion and the misuse of collected data. The technology's accessibility to the public shows inherent risks because anyone can access and potentially misuse the gathered data, leading to harms such as privacy violations and the potential for malicious intent. Google's implementation of Street View shows a consequentialist perspective, where the ethicality of an action is evaluated based on its outcomes. By applying a consequentialist ethical framework, Google should strengthen measures like informed consent, anonymity, and overall data protection. In this case analysis I will argue that consequentialism shows us that Google should take more precautions with the information gained by using Street View.

Luciano Floridi's concept of "Informational Friction" is about the difficulties people face in controlling and managing their personal information in the digital age. Floridi argues that the flow and accessibility of information create a complex environment where people experience challenges when trying to control their data. Friction arises from the difference between the speed and ease of information relaying and the ability of individuals to manage and protect their privacy effectively. When applying Floridi's concept of informational friction to the case of Google Street View, it is easy to see the challenges of privacy and data control. Street View, by capturing details of both public and private spaces, contributes to the spread of personal information in the online world. The technology's ability to display real-time views of streets, neighborhoods, and even the insides of businesses shows a scary level of informational friction. Some people may find it hard to control what aspects of their lives are exposed through Street View, leading to privacy concerns.

One aspect of informational friction in the context of Google Street View is the difficulty people face in knowing and controlling the visibility of their homes and personal spaces. The technology captures images without direct, explicit consent from anyone within its scope, contributing to a lack of control over the spreading of personal information. This lack of control aligns with Floridi's concept of informational friction, where many people have challenges in maintaining authority over their digital lives. By applying a consequentialist framework to Google Street View, we can show the results of the technology in terms of overall well-being and potential harm. From a consequentialist's perspective, the ethicality of an action depends on how balanced the good and bad outcomes are. In the case of Google Street View, the positive parts include the amazing navigation experience and the easily accessible visual information. However, the negative consequences, such as privacy invasion and the potential for misuse of data, cannot be ignored. The ease with which the technology allows access to detailed views of private areas without any consent contributes to the ethical challenges.

To address these concerns, Google should have implemented better measures to weaken the potential harm caused by Street View. This could include stricter privacy controls, more anonymity, and an opt-out option for individuals who do not want their properties or

images displayed on Street View. These measures would contribute to a more balanced test of positive and negative consequences, which directly aligns with a consequentialist approach where the idea is to maximize overall happiness. Luciano Floridi's concept of informational friction provides helpful ideas for the challenges people face in controlling their personal information, especially with Google Street View. The analysis reveals the existence of friction in individuals' ability to manage their privacy in the digital landscape. From a consequentialist perspective, Google's implementation of Street View could have been more ethically sound by prioritizing measures to reduce harm and ensure a happier community. Stricter privacy controls, increased transparency, and improved consent methods are recommended to address the ethical concerns associated with the lack of informational control and friction in the context of Street View.

In James Grimmelman's article, "Privacy as Product Safety," he proposes that any unethical or wrong use of personal information on social media platforms shows a design flaw in the product. His idea says that users, despite their privacy concerns, may struggle to secure it for themselves, and already existing privacy regulations may not fully address the social aspects of online services. Grimmelman suggests that online platforms, such as social media, should be treated as defective products if they direct app users' personal information in ways people do not expect. When applying the concept of privacy as a defective design to Google Street View, it is easy to see that the technology's capacity to capture and display detailed imagery of private spaces without consent could be considered an error in the design of the application. People may not know that their homes are being shown to anyone who looks at Google Street View, and the technology could be seen as defectively designed if it does not align with everyone's privacy expectations. This falsehood in user expectations and the actual capabilities of Street View shows a breach of privacy standards.

To add to this, the concept undermines the importance of transparency and user understanding. If people do not understand how their information is used, it helps see the perception of a defective design. In the case of Street View, the unintentional exposure of personal spaces may lead people to feel that the product does not meet their privacy expectations, making people believe it is a defective product. A consequentialist would want to weigh the overall outcomes of Google's implementation of Street View. Positive consequences may include better navigation and accessibility, but negative consequences, such as privacy violations and user distress, are just as crucial. If the negative consequences outweigh the benefits, then a consequentialist may say that there is a need for change or different actions. In the case of Street View, the possibility of privacy violations caused by the exposure of private spaces should be considered. The consequentialist perspective suggests that Google should take measures to minimize these negative outcomes, even if it means adjusting certain features of Street View to better align with user privacy expectations.

To address the concept of privacy as a defective design in Google Street View, ethical recommendations could involve the following when fixing the flaws in the design. This could include enhanced privacy controls, user education, ways to opt out of street view, and transparency measures. Better privacy controls would allow users greater control over what

parts of their homes and personal spaces are seen from Street View. Educating people on how Street View works may help them realize what kind of information people on the internet can get from Street View, and may make them want to opt out of certain features in the application. Opt-out features would make very clear ways for people to hide their property online, and remove the risk from people causing harm to their privacy. If Street View were more transparent with what data is shared on Street View, then people would feel better knowing what information of theirs is public to people on the internet. By taking these ideas, Google can align its actions with the ethics of addressing privacy concerns as defects in the design. This approach prioritizes user expectations and well-being, demonstrating a commitment to responsible and user-centric technology development.

Grimmelmann's concept of privacy as product safety offers a valuable framework for evaluating the ethics of Google Street View. The analysis suggests that addressing flaws in the design, prioritizing user consent, and minimizing negative consequences align with ethical principles

"The Googlization of Everything" by Siva Vaidhyanathan explores the social impact of Google Street View, with emphasis on concerns related to privacy and user data. Street View raises ethical questions surrounding privacy invasion due to its detailed images of public and private spaces. Luciano Floridi's article, "Informational Friction," adds distinction by showing the challenges people face in controlling personal information online, especially with social media. James Grimmelmann's article, "Privacy as Defective Design," suggests treating online platforms as defective products if they differ from user expectations. Analyzing Google Street View from these authors' perspectives shows many privacy concerns, presenting a case for ethical reflection. By analyzing these articles with the ethical tool of consequentialism, Google's actions in implementing Street View show the need for action to address misuse of data, such as privacy violations. Ethical recommendations include enhancing privacy controls, transparency, and user education.

In conclusion, with the combined perspectives of Vaidhyanathan, Floridi, and Grimmelmann show the ethical responsibility of technology developers, advocating for a user-centered approach that addresses privacy concerns as defects in design. While recognizing these challenges, this perspective aligns with changing ethical standards in the digital landscape. The call for ethical change reflects a need for the well-being of users and the responsible development of technology.