

This week's discussion on invisible relationships is certainly one of the cloudiest and challenging issues to date in this class. Unlike the other elements of systems we have been discussing, this week took an ethical approach. Not only did we have to think about systems from an operating standpoint, but we were personally faced with the thought-provoking question of what is right and what is wrong. The issue of governing these ways of revealing invisible relationships is a very opinionated one, but something I hope to expose myself to and elaborate on through this reflection.

To begin, I believe this question of invisibility and what should be revealed is dependent on the time setting the question takes place in. We have commonly in this class talked about perspective. For the purposes of this topic, the perspective is point in time. Our answers today are certainly different than they will be in the future, and extremely different than pre-9/11 era. Major events that undermine a society's sense of security have lasting impacts on the decision and opinions of those members moving forward. A common opinion for most of my childhood about what should be revealed would have included anything that for the betterment of society would make or keep Americans safe. Today, the narrative is changing slightly. There are certain things that ought to remain classified or invisible for that very reason as well. If by the general public knowing classified information, does the situation become less safe? If the answer is yes, it is probably a good idea to keep it classified.

The issue of how the information should be used, who gets to use it, and how that is decided is mostly a government issue as far as I'm concerned. As evident in class, there is some speculation among letting the government be able to use the data and the possible corruption that may occur. Having an honest and trustworthy government can alleviate these issues, but is often easier said than done. One may argue that through elections, citizens can put checks and balances on elected officials that may have governing rights over this topic. While that is ideal, our system often is not that straight forward. In addition, the delay between the government making a decision about this issue to the time the elections take place could be multiple years. Without having an immediate feedback system in the citizens, it is hard to insure the right thing will always be done.

In my opinion, I do believe this "eye in the sky" methodology should be allowed and used. In the podcast, they talk about the view point of, "I'm not doing anything wrong, so why should I be concerned". This is definitely the initial reaction I had to the scenario. I do understand that certain groups, often minorities, are targeted even when they are not really doing anything wrong. For this reason, I believe the use of this technology anywhere should be overseen by a civilian review committee. This committee would ultimately be who the elected officials and the police respond to. By adding a layer or boundary in the system, we can better insure for quality and desired results. Through this imposed hierarchy, the doubts of higher powers not doing what they should could be better regulated. The next area of concern one might have would be who would be on this review board. This would be similar to an elected representative position in that areas of the city would be designated representatives based on the population of the area. These representatives would meet with the constituents to insure the goals of the project were indeed inline with what the community wanted to see.

Like I mentioned at the beginning, this is definitely one of the toughest issues we have tackled so far. The results, in my opinion, speak for themselves. When used properly, this technology can help save lives and bring peace to many violent areas. We have a human right to use this technology, but to use it properly.