

Thomas Roeseler

PHIL 355E

Instructor Nathaniel Nicol

26 September 2023

Should the United States put in a place a data protection system similar to Europe's GDPR? Yes, I believe the United States should consider putting something into place for data protection similar to Europe's GDPR because then organizations can be held accountable for how much data they can collect and use. Using the GDPR would help protect people's data because they would have more control over it and they would have a better idea and understanding of what organizations are doing with their data because these organizations are forced to be transparent. In this case analysis, I will argue that the consequentialism ethical tool shows us that the United States should put in a data protection system similar to Europe's GDPR because people deserve to have more control over their data and so they know what organizations are doing with their data. It also should be put in place because that way organizations are held to privacy standards and must follow the regulations and if they don't, they will be held accountable.

The main concept from Zimmer's *But the Data is Already Public* is the concept of informed consent. Informed consent is where the consumer gives their consent to something after being informed of their options. In this case, informed consent is about how you would decide to let an organization use and collect your data. If a data protection system was in place in the United States like the one in Europe, then you would have informed consent where you can make your decision based on the information given to you that explains your options and that would make it better and easier for you to control your data and how it is collected and used.

With Zimmer's concept of informed consent, you can say that GDPR helps promote that, which is a good reason for the United States to put a similar data protection system in place because informed consent makes the organizations that are handling people's data be transparent with people's data and they would be held accountable if something were ever to happen to the data they collected, like a breach for example. If a breach happens, the organization would have to inform people of what happened, what was potentially taken, and possible outcomes from the breach.

Consequentialism can be tied into Zimmer's concept of informed consent because consequentialists and utilitarians want to have the maximum good for everyone and minimize suffering for all people, so using informed consent to everybody would be a good thing and considered a part of maximizing good for all people because they would have more control over their own data. Using informed consent when regarding data usage from organizations is an ethical way for organizations to be transparent and tell people what data is being collected and how their data is being used. The European Union (EU) had plans for data protection reform for a long time and started working on plans for GDPR in January of 2012. The GDPR is in place in the whole continent of Europe and all companies that do business with members of the EU are forced to follow the regulations and laws which makes it easier for the consumers of that company to have access to their personal data and know how it is processed. If the United States did this, it would take time to build the system, but once it is put in place, it would be a great thing for people in the US. This would be considered maximizing the good and minimizing the suffering for people in the United States because they would have easier access to their personal data and more control over it as well. In Europe, it is also considered maximizing the good because all citizens in Europe are protected by GDPR because all companies that do business

with European consumers have to follow GDPR's rules and regulations. A big focus of Zimmer was the ethics of research, primarily by social media companies like Facebook. Zimmer believed that researchers should use that data in a way that respects their privacy and not just throw ethics out the window even though that data is publicly available.

Buchanan dives into the ethics of big data research and focuses mainly on Twitter and the amount of support ISIS was getting on Twitter. There were extremist/terrorist groups with a social media presence on Twitter that were potentially going to be researched because it could give insights on that extremist group and their presence on social media. On the other side of things, you could say that it could potentially cause unintended problems, concerns related to privacy, and concerns with consent. Like Zimmer, Buchanan also has a concept of informed consent. Buchanan includes informed consent because he believes if the researchers had given informed consent to the Twitter users they were researching, then it would go with respecting privacy of individuals and be a more ethical way of researching. On the other hand with researching, using informed consent will delay the process or make it more complex because they would have to give their consent to the researchers and be informed of what the researchers would do with their data.

A big concern here between the ethics of researching these users with or without consent is "is it for the public good?" Because if these users can really give us insight on extremist groups then researching them might be the best for the majority of the people which ties this case into consequentialism. It can be tied into consequentialism because it can be considered maximizing the good or minimizing the suffering because of what harm these potential extremist group members can cause. If they were to research these users without consent, it could still be considered ethical, especially in the eyes of consequentialists and utilitarians because it would be

for the public good. Buchanan shows the challenges that researchers face when trying to balance ethical concerns regarding privacy, potential harmful outcomes from the research, and the benefits of actually doing the research.

With Buchanan's concepts covering big data research, with the ethics of research being very important, the United States putting something similar to the GDPR into place for a data protection system is a good idea. That way people have more control over their data and are informed about what organizations will be doing with their data. These organizations collect and analyze data from their users, so for users to be able to have more control over it is a good thing and ties into consequentialism because it would be considered maximizing the good for all people. A similar data protection system getting put into place in the United States would allow people to be more informed of what big organizations are doing with their data. It would also stop big companies from using your data in non ethical ways. These companies would have to follow laws that the data protections system would put in place and make clear that companies must be transparent with how they are handling data. If these companies were to not follow these and go around the laws, then they would be subject to fines and those fines will increase based on the number of times they break a rule or how big of a mistake that company made. If there are ever any breaches, those companies would have to inform who was affected with what happened, what was potentially stolen, and any possible outcomes from the breach.

In conclusion, the United States should definitely consider putting a data protection system in place similar to Europe's GDPR because it gives people more control over their data and makes companies handle data more ethically. Buchanan and Zimmer both show that informed consent is very important for people because if companies use that, then people are able to give their consent to companies using their data if they decide they'll opt-in after

receiving information on what the company will be doing. Consequentialism ties into this case because if a similar data protection system like Europe's GDPR is put into place in the United States, then that would be considered maximizing the good for many people because that way not everyone's data is getting used in ways they don't know and being used in non ethical ways. With a data protection system similar to GDPR, companies are forced to be transparent with how they use people's data and will have to follow laws that will hold them to it.