“We believe security shouldn’t come at the expense of individual privacy.” Apple(2014). Align with Moores argument that the trade is imbalanced.

Why did Apple do this? And why did the FBI react the way they did?

Stakeholder analysis of FBI, Apple, the people and the terrorists. Present the considered stakes.

**FBI**: National security, protection from terrorists. [SEE Comey’s letters, and FBI court order]. Taking people’s security against terrorists into consideration. They claim that encryption harms security.

**Apple**: Customers’ trust. Taking the people’s privacy into consideration. [See Apple’s letters]. [Comey says that encryption is a marketing trick – while that may be the case, there is a reason why Apple wants to sell it.]. They explain why it is important in their letters, but Rogaway has some of the same views. [Critiques of privacy]

“Parent's view, only when others acquire undocumented personal information about an individual”

Analyse

FBI claims that by trading some privacy, we can gain in national security. With the information gained by accessing the phone, future attacks may be prevented. Moore (2000) finds this problematic. Nissenbaum also has something to say about privacy. Etzioni and Marsh (2003) provides examples.

iPhones with cryptography is an IT artefact, which holds ethics of design independent of the user. It is a value of design placed by Apple. Their reasoning can be found in the security documentation, and open customer letter. Brey believes that technologies promote moral values, in this case Apple values costumer privacy.

Privacy and security dichotomy invalid.

Ethics. Cryptography as an expression of the privacy value in design to protect individuals from mass surveillance, and enable privacy by default. In order to protect this value, Apple has to deny FBI. Technical experts claim that weakening encryption is arguably a bad thing, and a master key ‘for FBI eyes only’ is impossible.

FBI asks for this because they feel they have a moral responsibility to the families of the victims. However, it could be argued that FBI had an ulterior motive for their “request”. They want access to phones by court order, whenever it is deemed necessary. However, is the security gained worth the loss in freedom and the potential exploitation by individuals with malicious intents. Privacy vs. safety.

FBI tries to say ‘give up a little privacy to gain security’, however this might not necessarily be the case.

It is argued that it would set a precedence for other companies, and force them to do the same. If FBI gets a backdoor, who else should get it? China etc.?

Ethical choice made by Apple. What thoughts lie behind the decision. Protection from a panoptical society. Protection of the privacy of the innocent (Snowden). Values in design (encryption). They value privacy and so they implement encryption (and updated the system further for compared to older systems).

Cryptograpy as an artefact of politics?

Idéer:  
Brug fremgangsmåden for at identificere values in design. Hvilke værdier ligger der I produktet og hvilke ligger I konflikt?

Is apple protecting the villains? – Actor-network-theory

Apple’s etik vs. FBI’s etik (se pårørende I øjnene, protect the country from terror)

Panoptikon, oligoptikon, synoptikon, Sousveillance, Participatory surveillance

Free will versus technological determinism

Science of technology : er det kryptering i sig selv (som artefatk) eller er det hvad folk bruger det til.

Har kryptering en ladning.

Værdier der ligger bag beslutningen af at lave det software fra apples side.

Since it turned out that they had an alternative way of breaking in to the phone, one may wonder why it was necessary to involve Apple in the first place.
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