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Technological innovations have always allowed people to view the old with an eye for what could be. This is certainly true in with the case of the computer and the refrigerator. The first smart fridge started out 20 years ago and manufactures have never really let go of the idea despite low consumer demand. I found this article interesting because it made me wonder about the various ethical concerns which have transpired and continue to immerge.

The article nicely divided ethical concerns into two camps. The first was privacy. With cameras, sensors and microphones, they offer vulnerable targets for hackers. Collecting information about buy habits and consumption, they also open up the potential for the sale of such information to outside as insurance companies and or food manufacturers.

The article also talked about how technology may actually decrease the life cycle of the typical fridge from 15 years to the that of the software or hardware or hardware running it which is typically much shorter. This raises the ethical concern of should we continue to push for convenience which directly encourages the “disposable society” mentality.

As an alternative to an expensive fridge, the article suggests that companies could dramatically reduce the cost thorough, “…shoveling ads, data-mining algorithms, and crapware into their smart fridges.”

This appears to set up the classic situation where those who could afford to protect their privacy could buy the more expensive fridge and those who could not would be subject to an invasion of their privacy.

Google Duplex:

From an article referenced by Jack McCoy

https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-switch/wp/2018/05/08/a-google-program-can-pass-as-a-human-on-the-phone-should-it-be-required-to-tell-people-its-a-machine/

Update:

<https://www.androidauthority.com/what-is-google-duplex-869476/>

With it’s limited scope of intended use, and with the arrogant attitude that I’d not likely be at the receiving end, but rather the user, of the technology, the ethical implications seemed almost non existent. It would be like using any other machine to carry out a transaction which I would otherwise perform with a human : getting money from an ATM or using a self checkout at the grocery store. The reality however is there are implications, however small, which have the potential of expanding as the technology proliferates to other areas as it most likely will. When we speak to people, there is a certain level of courtesy which we adopt. While that level is different for each person, and may be adjusted based on our level of acquaintance, there is a level. Most often when we speak to someone for the first time we may exhibit more patience, understanding and time listening. If that courtesy was taken advantage of by AI systems such as Duplex which have been modified for telemarketers then I feel like there may be a sort of breach of social contract. I’d like to be able to ask if this is a robot and then hang up before I spent more time listening to a possible argument which may influence me to purchase something.

Voice Synthesis:

From an article referenced by Margaret MonteLeon

Glover, D., & Gobir, N. (2020, July 16). On to the Next One: Jay-Z Beefs with A.I....Are Other Artists Next? Retrieved September 01, 2020, from [https://yr.media/tech/on- to-the-next-one-jay-z-beefs-with-a-i-are-other-artists-next/](https://yr.media/tech/on-%20to-the-next-one-jay-z-beefs-with-a-i-are-other-artists-next/)

This topic has intrigued me ever since 1987 when Ben Richards, a character in the movie Running Man, is the victim of CGI and voice replication technology. Over the years this technology has not only been created but is now becoming more readily accessible as we see in the article. The danger of course comes from using the technology to create things which are then passed on as actual occurrences, with the intent of misleading or hurting someone. The implications for it’s misuse are enormous as we have already seen through attempts to mislead and pursued elections in various countries. This would be just another tool in the belt of those willing to lie and misrepresent. Of course the overly simplistic solution would be to state that such material was created through artificial means, a sort of GMO label so to speak. This of course fails if someone whishes to intentionally mislead and leaves the label off.

While it may be argued that the technology is already out of the box, and that it is too late to prevent some of it’s more nefarious uses, this specific case is an example of where something can be done, but what? By duplicating some ones voice there is already an implication that it is the real person themselves and that they have thus indirectly given their consent to not only the release of the material but to it’s authenticity. When a comedian impersonates a famous person, is that copyright infringement? More likely we do not even consider that question because we know that the they are not trying to persuade us that they are the other person – we can see that it is clearly not or we know the source of the material we are listening. For this reason, a label indicating that the material was synthesized may help. There is of course the question of who is benefiting from the creation. In the case of the comedian impersonator, they receive all the profit and admiration. Should the same be done in the case of the article. There are a number of issues, what is the benefit and does the who has rights to the product or image? reward to the creator of the synthesis