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In “The End of Privacy as We Know It?” on *The Daily* podcast, host Michael Barbaro introduces an interview of reporter Kashmir Hill regarding Clearview AI’s facial recognition technology. Hill argues that though Clearview’s technology is beneficial for law enforcement, the lack of transparency and federal regulation risks society’s privacy. Hill begins with background information on facial recognition, warning that public access to the technology would be privacy nightmare. She illustrates how the technology can identify suspects even if their face is covered, helping agencies solve tough cases. However, Hill claims that the results can be manipulated. She summarizes that though the technology is beneficial for law enforcement, there is a lack of transparency. She raises the concern that due to the lack of federal regulation the technology could be sold to anyone.

The points raised by Hill in the podcast can go beyond Clearview AI and apply to governments around the world. Specifically, the application of the technology can vary wildly from government to government based on the ideologies the countries are based upon. Hill raises point that there is a lack of transparency regarding facial recognition technology. More restrictive governments could take advantage of this and be more invasive in their citizens’ privacy. Though most companies probably are somewhere in line with Hoan Ton-That’s perspective on avoiding “bad” governments, Hill’s argument of the technology being uncontrollable after a point is valid. Even if these companies somehow manage to avoid having their technology get into the hands of more restrictive governments, these countries could end up developing their own version. In general, authoritarian governments are more likely to use facial recognition technology as a tool to monitor their citizens for any unwanted activities (such as protests) while democratic governments are more likely to allow more personal privacy. There is the possibility, however, that the increased power democratic governments get from being able to constantly monitor their citizens may (slightly) turn them more authoritarian, whether it may be more monitoring/censoring or even the limitation of rights they had previously defended. Some countries, however, may ban the use of facial recognition technology to protect their citizens’ privacy. Overall, the rise of facial recognition technology gives countries the opportunity to have more power in monitoring and/or controlling their citizens. This is to the advantage of authoritarian governments who can use the technology to invade their citizens’ privacy and have a more restrictive approach to how they run their country. Democratic countries, however, may lean away from this technology to protect citizens’ rights to privacy, possibly even going as far as banning the technology. There is the distinct possibility, however, that the technology may make democratic governments slightly more authoritarian in some respects, showcasing the power of the technology to shift governmental ideologies.
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