

PHIL 314 01 Article Analysis #2

The argumentative conclusion being made by Grodzinsky and Tavani (2006) is that in the Verizon case individuals should presume in favor of privacy as the default position and that a presumption should be made in favor of sharing digital information. In this case, property rights are an important subject that has been discussed, especially from the RIAA's point of view, which is focused on protecting its proprietary information from being freely exchanged over the Internet via P2P networks (Grodzinsky & Tavani, 2006). Grodzinsky and Tavani (2006) stated because of this concern, "some might argue that the "presumption in favor of privacy" that we have defended can be counterbalanced by a presumption in favor of protecting intellectual property rights." (p. 249). The authors defended the principle "Information Wants to Be Shared," "which presumes against the "fencing off" or enclosing of information in favor of a view of information as something that should be communicated and shared." (Grodzinsky & Tavani, 2006, p. 249-250). They believed that this principle could "reverse the recent trend to turn all digitized information into a "commodity" that can be hoarded and thus more exclusive." (Grodzinsky & Tavani, 2006, p. 250).

A supporting argument that Grodzinsky and Tavani make to their conclusion is that with the combination of their principle with the interests of protecting privacy and anonymity, they can justify "a policy that tilts in favor of defending the position articulated by Verizon rather the one advanced by the RIAA." (Grodzinsky & Tavani, 2006, p. 250). To defend their principle, they briefly discussed Jessica Litman's distribution model, "which both rewards the creator of digital music and protects the interests of file sharers using P2P networks." (Grodzinsky & Tavani, 2006, p. 250). According to Grodzinsky and Tavani (2006), Litman's model "responds to her concern that as more and more people embrace P2P file sharing, more and more legislation that maintains the "asymmetrical power structure" of private interests over those of the consumers will be enacted." (p. 249). Litman believes that those who are engaged in P2P network sharing, a wide spectrum of music can be easily shared, either through blanket fees or by levies that would fairly compensate the composers of the music (Grodzinsky & Tavani, 2006). In addition,

composers can decide if they want to opt out of this system by withholding their music from distribution mechanisms designed to share music (Grodzinsky & Tavani, 2006). If models like Litman's were adopted, privacy conflicts could be easily resolved.

I object to the argument Grodzinsky and Tavani make because the sharing of information can still be dangerous and used in the wrong hands of individuals despite all these models trying to pave a solution for privacy conflicts. When the authors claim that their principle can make digitized information exclusive, does this really solve any privacy conflict? With any type of information being shared widespread online, there will not be any personal privacy anymore which is, in my opinion, not good. It is important to have privacy over certain types of information. Not everybody wants to know what people share and search online.