**Introduction**

Google Street View is a surveillance system created in 2007 that could be accessed through Google Maps. GSV allowed users to see other people, streets, cars, houses, animals, and so on. The big issue with it, is that it is an invasion to privacy. If people are not careful, their embarrassing moments will be caught on the internet. It could take hours to remove the images. Even if the images were to be removed, it might be too late as it will end up somewhere else on the internet. Because of all the complaints of being identified, GSV added a feature that blurred people’s face. But even with this, it still shows people’s bodies which raises a concern that if a criminal were on the run wearing the same clothing, there would most likely be a mix up which could ruin a person’s reputation. In this analysis I will argue that Kantianism shows us that Google should have asked people about the concerns about Street View before implementing it.

**Floridi**

A concept used by Floridi is information friction. Information friction is how hard it is to obtain information. To make information hard to obtain is by filtering, blocking, or using the environment to obscure vision. How this fit into the GSV case is that if there is low information friction, more information would be obtained from people. These surveillance systems are set in a variety of locations such as on streets, neighborhoods, power poles, streetlights, and even Google vehicles. Floridi’s example of information friction uses four students who live together. He states that the bigger the information gap they have between each other, the less they know about each other. For them to know more about each other, all they would have to do is make the information gap smaller. The same concept can be applied with the GSV. Since these cameras are placed in a variety of areas, everyone is being monitored with very little privacy. Floridi also mentions how easy it is to find out about someone just by looking through databases and various ICTs. Floridi continues that the person’s personal finance, house salary, mortgage, along with information of their partner can also be found out. If that is all it takes to find out information on a person, the GSV would be able to find out more such as a person’s interests and patterns. Finding out a person’s interests and patterns is good for marketing tactics. If they see what a person likes for example, they will try to sell or advertise their product more to this person.

With Kantianism, the correct way for Google to handle the issues of GSV is to ask people where cameras can be placed. This shows that they respect the opinions of where people feel the cameras are comfortably placed. What would be even better is to avoid private areas such as near homes and place them in public areas instead. Homes for example, is where a person should feel comfortable. They should not feel the need to be on guard or pressured to behave in a certain way. Home is supposed to be a place where privacy is expected. It is disrespectful to place cameras in a private area without consent. Osamu brings up a good point when he tries to inform Google of Japan’s daily life. He suggests that Google should remove cameras from highly residential roads of Japan. He says that it is impolite to photograph people in their living space. When these images are placed online without consent, it becomes an act of disrespect. People should be given the option to specify what is allowed and what is not allowed on the internet. One of the concerns that the GSV brings is the fear of a burglary. Because there are photos of homes, burglars get to study the layout of the land. Another thing that Google could have done is by using less cameras. If there were cameras around every corner, it would mean no privacy at all.

**Grimmelmann**

Grimmelmann uses Facebook to describe privacy. He talks about some of the instances where Facebook can be an invasion to privacy. Like how some photos can affect people’s reputations. Even if a person chooses to post something online, there will be instances where there is misinterpretation on what the post is about. How this relates to GSV is that if an image of a person were collected and posted on social media for example, they could potentially get fired from their job. Grimmelmann uses an example with a teacher who had a photo portraying them as a drunk pirate posted online. The teacher gets fired after the photo is discovered. What people do in their private time might be something they do not want others to find out. On Facebook, a person can choose not to post something on their profile, but they can still be tagged in one of their friend’s photos. With Facebook, a person is usually notified that an image with them included is posted online. With that in mind, it is faster and easier to take an image down if the user sees the post right away. The problem with GSV is that a person is not notified if there is an image of them online. It is even worse for those who do not use the internet often. It is just up there without their knowledge. Even if they find out their image is online, it would have been too late as their reputation is damaged. Google’s response time to remove images should also be considered as well. Removal is not guaranteed as well as the image can be found somewhere else online. As mentioned above with Floridi, seeing someone’s patterns is good for marketing tactics. This, however, can be dangerous to those who buy these advertised products. Some of the products could be cheap and faulty which would then result in potential harm to the buyer.

With Kantianism, the correct way for Google to handle unwanted photos is to at least notify the victims, perhaps through mail or the phone for example. If it is through mail, the photo itself should be included. Even though there is a delayed response time, it is better than not notifying the victims at all. Even though there is a delay, there is a chance that no one else has seen and downloaded the image yet. Before implementing GSV, Google should have mailed everyone a form that asks whether certain people want to opt out or not. This form should allow people to choose what to keep blurred out. Google should also go through the images themselves to see what they should blur out completely instead of waiting for a complaint as some images are sensitive or embarrassing. Another thing Google could have done relating to market tactics, is to ask if a person wants to opt out of those offers. If Google did all those things, then it would have meant they respected what people wanted instead of deciding and forcing something upon them without first getting their feedback. The way Google handled things was disrespectful as they did not consider how it could affect some people nor did they give people the opportunity to voice their opinions prior to implementation. Some of the opinions could have been used as ideas on how to make GSV run smoothly with less complaints from those who need their privacy.

**Conclusion**

The way Google handled implementing GSV was disrespectful to the people. Even though they listened to some complaints by blurring out faces. It did not solve the problem of identifying people. Even after adding the blur feature, some faces were not blurred out as intended. With that in mind, they did not fully think about their solution to the problem. What they are currently missing is a way to notify people that their photo is online. The problem with the cameras, is that people who are being monitored also do not know they are being monitored. So, what Google should add to the cameras is a light feature that lights up when the camera is being monitored through. This should give the people around the area an idea that they should be cautious of doing anything embarrassing. Another thing they need to work on is camera placement. They should consult with people before placing cameras in places people may not be comfortable with. For people who are all for using GSV without restrictions because in a way it makes them feel safe from criminals, they should also keep in mind that some of the things they do could be misinterpreted by someone looking through the cameras. What looks harmless to one person, might look harmful to another.