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The benefits of nanotechnology in surveillance will vastly outweigh the dangers to privacy. The Collingridge Dilemma is quite a dilemma, but with more and more experience with new technology, the privacy concerns such as data processing, information-based harm, inequality, and identity, will probabilistically decrease in likelihood with more well thought out arguments, such as is contained in this article. As seems to be the trend, the medical industry has done things right regarding the consideration of the *individual*, which can be a model for how to implement strategic policy on behalf of new technologies. *Informed Consent* being the ideal requirement for surveillance is a great starting point.

Radio Frequency Identification Definition (RFID) is the technology made up of a tiny “integrated circuit attached to a tiny radio antenna, which can receive and transmit” a digital signal, identifying an object, you, and the movements of the thing being tracked. Also called, “spy chips”, this technology is becoming ubiquitous as some companies have received scrutiny. For example, the implementation of the RFID tags in clothing, as was the case by Benetton and Philips. The use of real-time location tracking systems has commercialized and exhibit such precision, they’re using Ultra Wide Band communication which locate objects in buildings down to 30 cm. The CEO of Digital Applications even announced on national television that these chips could be used to “track immigrants and monitor their movements.” Japan has already been using this tech to monitor children in their travels to and from school, where the children themselves are subcutaneously chipped, as just one example. So, there’s clearly good and bad components with this ability, but I view this technology as predominantly useful once we, as a society, identify the first dozen instances we agree are *unacceptable*. Primarily with regards to our *privacy*.

Privacy is most often used as a marketing strategy. When I speak of privacy with my close friends, I usually say things like, “privacy is a scam” and things like this. I say this, because the truth is, with the exponential increase in global population, and the consistent adoption of ever innovative technologies, it’s simply not practical to expect to not be observed in every way imaginable. Yet, this reading really helped me think about the nuanced relationship between privacy and agency. Privacy isn’t just important in this way, the exercise of maintaining individual’s privacy itself is of paramount importance. *Moral autonomy*, as the author calls it, should be one of the view fundamental rights that each human just possesses, as quality of life seems proportional to the degree in which we feel *ownership* in our efforts, aspirations, and reward functions. With invisible surveillance, our agency is no longer valid since we’re unaware of being observed. Our outputs cannot be genuine, and therefore our reward functions are not what we think they are, removing our agency. This is what is unacceptable. Data protection laws explicitly define constraints on how your data is processed, and revisions are being written all the time. These laws help ensure that whatever data is being processed, it’s as accurate as can be and that it’s use is for benign purposes only. Informational injustice will soon be the primary form of violence.

Michael Walzer provides a compelling view of “goods” with respect to data protection. “Goods have no natural meaning; their meaning is the result of socio-cultural construction and interpretation. In order to determine what a just distribution of the good is, we have to determine what it means to those for whom it is a good.” Aside from the fact that I couldn’t have thought of that on my own, I also couldn’t have put that any better. This is brilliant because it’s a solid argument to prevent the exploitation of the average consumer via RFID or any other privacy-threatening nanotech. Walzer’s explanation of “dominant” goods and monopolies also provides further clarity of his incredibly valid concern. The ‘art of separation’ of said spheres reminds me the debates over the various developing internet protocols back in the day when the internet was in its infancy. This logic-based argument Walzer provides further solidifies by optimism of the future of technology. Not only will more intelligent people have to be pollical offices due to policies based not technology with roots in advanced mathematics, but this logic-based argument, since it is *logic-based*, can algorithmically implemented, even if to a limited degree. That’s promising!

The benefits of nanotechnology in surveillance will vastly outweigh the dangers to privacy. From data protection laws to moral autonomy, the author provides potent arguments from clearly potent figures in these philosophical debates. Preventing the accumulation of “dominating” goods and information inequality, is the first step to ensuring that future human existence can suffer less self-inflicted wounds than we have in the current and as we have in the past. The future is bright, with sacrifices and with preventions, the future is bright.