

Patrick Hurley

PHIL 355E

10/27/24

Siva Vaidhyanathan introduced privacy concerns with the rollout of Google Street View (GSV) within the United States, Germany, Canada, United Kingdom, and Japan. Most countries felt there were very real privacy concerns such as showing sensitive items like license plate numbers or faces of people walking down a street or standing in front of their homes. Google expected everyone to be happy with this new application allowing you to see any street in any part of the world. No matter where you lived, you could spy on a street. There were other issues also in that how people view about public space outside their homes – in Japan it was an invasion since it was impolite to photograph others' living areas and the outdoor space around a home – even an alley is considered their living space. In Germany, there is a privacy law that says “prohibition against the publication of images of people or their property without their explicit consent.” (Vaidhyanathan p. 102). In this Case Analysis I will argue that Kantian Deontology shows us that Google should have created Google View with a moral imperative to respect others' privacy. Kantian theory states that, simply, we have a duty to respect others. In order to create this respect for others, Google Street View should have alerted people and communities when cameras would be on their street and allowed people to opt in or opt-out prior to a camera rolling down the street. Also, allowing people to put cars away, avoid standing in front of their homes, etc.

To further analyze what Google Street View should have done, I am going to use chapter five of Luciano Floridi's book *The 4th Revolution: How the Infosphere is Reshaping Human Reality*. This chapter focuses on ideas surrounding privacy. There are a couple of central concepts that Floridi talks about but the main concepts he discusses are called “informational friction” and “infosphere.” Informational Friction is when things stop the flow of information in the infosphere. The infosphere is the breakdown between online and offline. When they start becoming one. Floridi describes informational friction as “forces that oppose the flow of information within a region of the infosphere. It is connected with the amount of effort required for some agent to obtain, filter, or block information about other agents in a given environment, by decreasing, shaping, or increasing informational friction” (Floridi, p. 2). The Google case shows how less information friction led to more privacy concerns. Information about people's homes and neighborhoods shows up for the world to see, creating privacy concerns. According to Kant's Deontology, we would say that Google Street View is not ethical because they are not upholding their duty to respect others.

Google Street View created informational friction with people who wanted privacy. The lower the information friction, the more people in an area are known about. Thus, this relates to people's privacy. As Floridi states "Put simply and more generally, privacy is a function of the informational friction in the infosphere. Any factor decreasing or increasing informational friction will also affect privacy" (Floridi, p. 3). Meaning, if there is less informational friction, then more will be known about individuals and will affect their privacy. This is exactly what Google Street View did. Almost immediately, the informational friction of people's homes and neighborhoods was decreased drastically and they felt an invasion of privacy. People are now able to look at other people's houses from across the globe and now have an incredible insight into other people's lives.

Kant says you have to respect people, and one form of this respect can be notifying people of when the Google Street cars will be in a certain area. Sending out notices to neighborhoods towns and cities will allow people to prepare for the Google Street cars to come. People will have time to hide their license plate numbers, bring in pets, and hide any other personal information they do not want to show to the public. This will also give people a chance to not have to deal with some of the blurring errors. There are rare instances where people's faces are not completely blurred and even an instance where a completely naked toddler was shown in London. Respecting others will allow people to reduce the amount of their personal information that will then be public knowledge in the infosphere. Doing things like this will increase the informational friction too, because it will now be harder to obtain that information. With the way things are right now, Google doesn't show the Google Street View car schedules, so people don't even have a chance to increase the informational friction. A majority of the issues stemming from Google Street View can be mitigated by respecting people enough to give them a heads-up about what will happen, and by giving people time to increase the informational friction on their personal information.

Now I will use another work by James Grimmelman, titled *Privacy as Product Safety*, to further analyze what Google Street View should have done. This journal discussed four core myths about Facebook users, which could also translate to other social media sites and Google Street View. The second section of the journal discusses four myths about Facebook privacy. The first myth talked about is "Facebook users don't care about privacy." The second myth talks about how "Facebook users make rational privacy choices." The third myth is about, how "Facebook user's desire for privacy is unrealistic." the fourth and final myth is that "Database regulation will make Facebook privacy-safe." Another concept that is talked about by Grimmelman is in the third section titled "Privacy as Product Safety." This section introduced a concept around the idea that we could start to look at privacy safety like how we look at product safety. As stated on page 817 by the *Restatement*, "One engaged in the business of

selling or otherwise distributing products who sells or distributes a defective product is subject to liability for harm to persons or property caused by the defect." This is simply talking about how the seller of a product, Facebook in this instance, is still held liable for damage done to people.

James Grimmelman's selection deals with privacy on Facebook and how this can be worked to better protect users. He states that users do want privacy and expect privacy on social platforms such as Facebook or Instagram. Sometimes people are even unaware of what they are expecting with privacy. Grimmelman talks extensively about the case of Andrea who shared pictures of a vacation which had photos of Bono of the rock band U2. She was under the impression she was posting to her private Facebook page. When in reality, she was in a network and they had access to her photos. She thought it was controlled. Some say privacy is not feasible as Grimmelman states "If users want privacy and fail in their efforts at obtaining it, it is tempting to tell them to stop trying, to dismiss their desire as a pipe dream, a relic of the preinformation age. A decade ago, Sun's Scott McNeely said, " 'You have zero privacy anyway . . . Get over it.' "(Grimmleman, p. 804)

Because a duty to respect others is a core value of Kantian Deontology, Google also has a duty to respect its users. Google Street View also needs to show that it is respecting people's concerns about privacy and safety. They need to tell the public what is going to happen and what they are going to do so that they can respect their user's privacy. Not respecting people's privacy can have a lot of negative consequences, for a lot of people, and can also have some unsafe or legal consequences too. If someone accidentally left their window blinds open when they were changing, people can now see that person all over the internet. Even though it is possible for them to blur the images before they go up, Google Cars are still taking pictures of people without their permission. Because we also do not know everyone's circumstances, it could be dangerous for some people to be noticed out in public, like celebrities. Much like the story with Andrea, people can lose their livelihood because of disrespectful privacy rules.

Kantian theory states that "*goodwill*, or good intentions—this is the basis of morality"(Deontology Module). Thus, Google must show goodwill towards the communities and various countries. Though each is slightly different concerning laws, Google Street View cannot just do what it wants if you think about Kant. One solution could be to alert the residents of an area about a Google car coming by. This would show that Google does have a level of respect for its users. One issue with this implementation would be that the people would still have no choice in the matter. Google would still be saying "hey we are going to do this on x date," but they are not asking people if they are ok with it. Some people might not even be home depending on

when the notices go out, and when the actual picture would be taken, which can also be disrespectful for some people. If the notices come out too late, you are not respecting people's time. But, is it possible for Google to get everyone's perfect idea of how to implement this Street View? Is it possible? Sadly no. While it would be awesome to make sure that everyone is on board for something like Google Street View, It would require a lot of people to come together. This would require a lot of coordination between many parties.