

## 1: Library Resource Finder: Table of Contents for: Technology and society : opposing viewpo

*The internet threatens privacy -- Jeffrey Rothfeder Technology may not threaten privacy -- Travis Charbeneau Workplace monitoring violates employee privacy -- Dana Hawkins.*

While the rest of the auto industry increasingly uses robots in manufacturing, Toyota has taken a contrarian stance by accentuating human craftsmanship. For instance, normally in auto plants installing a gas tank is a tedious, relatively complicated procedure. Because the tank is so heavy, a crane usually positions and holds it against the skeletal frame while employees tighten its straps and bolts from under the chassis, a strained and time-consuming maneuver that requires keeping arms up in the air for long periods of time. The process is fast, seamless, and ergonomically safe. Freed from securing the bolts, the workers the designers of this new device would seem to be superfluous. Indeed, the same number of employees as before are still at that assembly station. But instead of turning bolts in cramped crannies, they are doing the types of less obviously essential human tasks that manufacturers tend to eliminate when automation is introduced; namely, painstaking tactile and visual inspections to check and double-check for flaws on the tank and its connections and for holes or weaknesses in the critical fuel line. Even as the automaker unveils an updated version of its vaunted production system, called the Toyota New Global Architecture TNGA , the company has resisted the very modern allure of automation—a particularly contrarian stance to take in the car industry, which is estimated to be responsible for over half of commercial robot purchases in North America. And that ratio was low to begin with: Despite its dry subject, this book had a radical impact inside and outside of the business community—for the first time, unveiling the mysteries of Japanese industrial expertise and popularizing terms like lean production, continuous improvement, andon assembly lines, seven wastes or mudas and product flow. Today, that idea seems quaint. In the industrial world now manufacturing prowess is measured more by robotic agility than human ingenuity. As an aspiration, lean is taking a back seat to lights-out—a manufacturing concept Elon Musk is championing for his Model 3 Tesla plant in which illumination will ultimately not be needed because the factory will be devoid of people. Some plants have more than 1, robots—and less than a thousand people—on an assembly line. Dozens of articles, white papers, and books, written by respected thought leaders, executives, and consultants, depict an industrial future inevitably overrun by robots able to do the most sophisticated tasks at inhuman levels of efficiency. Some of the Pollyannaish views about the onslaught of robots foresee a period of unprecedented free time for individuals to cater to the whims of their imagination, turning us all into freelance artisans and entrepreneurs. Other, more sober forecasts worry about what people will do without the satisfaction of a job and the stability of a paycheck. Either way, a revolution awaits us, so goes the conventional wisdom. In China and India, that figure is even higher: To maintain this performance, Toyota has eschewed seeking growth primarily through cost-cutting read automation , but rather has focused on automobile improvements offered at aggressively competitive prices. Unexpectedly, the automaker named Mitsuru Kawai, a year veteran of the firm he was hired at 15 , to head up global manufacturing, the highest position ever held by a former blue-collar worker. Kawai is one of the last remaining links at Toyota to Taiichi Ohno, the godfather of lean manufacturing and the Toyota production system. Ohno, who died in , idealized the importance of seasoned and practiced individual workers to the success of the organization. When he first started at the company, experienced factory employees were called gods because they were masters that could make anything by hand. Soft-spoken and unassuming, Kawai described the manufacturing philosophy he uses to achieve this as uncomplicated: Then when the process is thoroughly simplified, machines can take over. But rather than gigantic multi-function robots, we should use equipment that is adept at single simple purposes. The imprints of Kawai and Ohno are already evident in large and small ways in the Kentucky facility. For instance, the outsized overhead conveyer belts that used to carry a steady stream of engines to the assembly line have been swapped out for moving pedestals that skate across the factory guided by electronic sensors in the floor. This new engine delivery system which is, after all, merely a machine replacing a machine accomplishes a series of manufacturing goals. By eliminating the complex web of conveyer belts, Toyota is able to downsize its plants considerably, essentially to one story

from as many as three. That, in turn, results in substantial savings on construction, real estate, cooling, heating, and maintenance, some of the highest costs in managing a factory network. Which means that Toyota can theoretically make three SUVs for every sedan one hour and do the opposite the next, depending on market orders. Such flexible, one-by-one production is the elusive Holy Grail of the auto industry. As a result, assemblers can spend their limited amount of time with the automobile—usually less than a minute—completing their tasks and checking for defects while not wasting seconds navigating inelegantly around it. A more rudimentary innovation in Georgetown that dovetails perfectly with TNGA tenets is the floating chair, or raku seat raku roughly means easy in Japanese. This assembly aid glides along rails in and out of the vehicle and then front to back inside the car, giving installers unimpeded access to difficult-to-reach spots like the dashboard console without having to bend or squeeze into awkward positions. The Toyota employee that designed this device patterned it after the moving swivel chair in his bass fishing rig—and used a seat from his boat to beta test the concept. Repeated across the assembly line, trimming small slices of time adds up to meaningful productivity benefits. If we gain back 55 seconds throughout the factory, we can ultimately eliminate a job and move that worker to another slot where they can begin the innovation process over again. Humans are amazing at finding those stray seconds to remove. To this end, assemblers were given a karakuri assignment—a lean management drill that requires workers to build a Rube Goldberg-inspired contraption that operates under its own force to improve a workspace activity. One team is reengineering the flow rack, the ubiquitous stand next to each assembly station that holds the parts needed for the local task. Currently, as shelves are emptied, workers have to manually set them aside and then replace them with a full bin of parts. When this decidedly low-tech device is perfected, Toyota plans to use the prototype as the blueprint for a robot to emulate the process. Toyota has admitted that by juicing production growth too rapidly at that time, quality, manufacturing controls and factory productivity were allowed to lag. So much so that in Toyota had its first loss in 59 years in part due to the global financial depression and during the next two years recalled more than 10 million vehicles after a spate of sudden acceleration accidents. Justice Department into its alleged attempts to mislead the public and hide the true facts about the dangerous problems with its vehicles. Kawai believes that without this body of knowledge assemblers become myopic, focused solely on their small part of the operation and blinded to their responsibility to design improvements for the larger team effort that are required to consistently produce high-quality vehicles. Worse yet, in this narrow outlook, workers often mistakenly see robots as replacements for people rather than basic tools that can be used to enhance factory performance. Some of the results of this experiment are unexpected. Do robots kill jobs or create them? Toyota, of course, would argue that while some manufacturers eagerly embrace automation and more will in the future, on a larger scale and ironically in the more innovative and pioneering factories robots are best used to precipitate more human plant activity rather than reduce it. Recent analyses of employment data support this somewhat contrarian point of view. In one bit of research, James Bessen, a Boston College law professor, found that although automation has been increasingly prevalent in all types of services and manufacturing industries since, in that time only one of occupations categorized by the Census Bureau was eliminated by technology; namely, the elevator operator. Other jobs were partially automated and in many cases, automation led to more jobs, often higher-skilled positions at companies that used technology to design and develop new products and new ways to reach customers. For instance, ATMs have radically altered consumer-banking habits, yet the number of branch employees has grown since money machines were first installed during the late s. In theory, companies able to manufacture products more quickly and efficiently will reinvest the money from higher sales in assets and innovation and, in turn, additional workers. Or they may lower prices, which drives more consumer spending, higher GDP, and an improved employment outlook. A trenchant study on this topic by the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation illustrated the relationship between productivity and employment by examining economic data of the post World War II era. ITIF found that in the s, when U. From to, productivity gains had ticked downward once more to only 1. These productivity statistics lead to a few significant conclusions about automation today. Moreover, the effect that automation has had on employment has been muted. Another bit of data is worth mentioning in this regard: He asserts that the productivity slump reflects a slowdown in innovation recently. Technology waves

lasting as long years have traditionally transformed society and revitalized economies but IT has stalled out, at the bottom of the S curve, Atkinson argues. Same thing with how much chips progressed in capabilities in the s, but no more. And annual productivity could increase to as much as 3. That, anyway, is what Toyota is counting on—or, better yet, cutting its own curve to make sure it happens.

## 2: Technology and society ( edition) | Open Library

*Table of Contents for: Technology and society: opposing viewpoints The internet threatens privacy / Jeffrey Rothfeder -- Technology may not threaten privacy / Travis.*

Many state DMVs sell their databases of personal information, complete with names, addresses, phone numbers, and personal characteristics, to direct marketing companies. This is completely legal, and often the citizens are not even notified that their personal information is being bought and sold on the open market by the government. These incidents are not at all out of the ordinary. Invasions of privacy similar to these incidents happen all the time, and the privacy laws currently in place in the US are simply not equipped to adequately protect citizens. Recent advances in technology have created even more opportunities for the government and private corporations to collect and take advantage of personal information. Innovations such as cellular telephones, personal computers, and online shopping have improved on the convenience of our daily lives, but they also carry inherent threats to personal privacy. Other methods of protecting privacy, including voluntary industry self-regulation and independent consumer watchdog groups, have historically proven to be ineffective. The current system of privacy law has not been effective in preventing invasions of privacy either. In many areas, the US has no legislation at all concerning the collection and use of personal information. Widely enforced privacy law in the US is long overdue. Any discussion of legislation and public policy requires unambiguous definitions of the concepts involved. The word privacy itself has many different connotations. Most people in the field of privacy identify three distinct areas that have been contested in legislation and court cases. This includes strip searches and body cavity searches at customs, which have come under fire recently because of incidents of customs officials abusing their power. Finally, privacy can refer to records about a specific person and who has access to them. This includes identifying information such as address, phone number, and Social Security Number, but also includes other information such as credit card statements, criminal records, medical history, financial records, and credit reports. Worse, it is fairly easy to obtain almost any of these records about almost anyone in the US. In this paper, the term "privacy" will be used to refer only to the this area of privacy, personal information and access to it. Thousands of cases of "identity theft" are reported each year, and in most cases the perpetrator is never caught. Disclosure of personal information can reveal home addresses to would-be stalkers, phone and criminal records to future employers, and religious and political beliefs to a federal prosecutor. The effects of this kind of disclosure can be much worse than cases of physical intrusion or even violent crimes. For a constructive discussion of privacy law, other concepts need clear definitions as well. Security is a critical concept for discussing privacy. If access to some information must be controlled, there must be safeguards on the facilities holding that information and measures to prevent unauthorized people from accessing it. Ware defines security as "the totality of safeguards in an information system that protects both it and its information against some defined threat, and limits access to the system and its data to authorized users in accordance with an established policy. Ware, an expert on privacy and public policy and a member of the RAND group, defines confidentiality as "a status accorded to information that indicates that it is sensitive for stated reasons, that it must be protected and that access to it must be controlled. Should access to personal information be tightly restricted once it has been collected, or are there some types of personal information that should not be collected at all? The question runs through almost all aspects of the privacy debate, but the answer is not immediately clear. The current state of privacy law in the US is haphazard and sorely inadequate. Unlike most European countries, there are very few strong omnibus laws concerning privacy. The courts have also set precedents concerning privacy and the law. Connecticut, the court found that there is an implied not explicit right to privacy in the constitution, but this right was later severely limited in scope. There is no federal legislation concerning a general right to privacy. There have been almost no landmark cases or legislation affecting private institutions, companies, or individuals. There are many reasons for this — our country was founded as a reaction against tyrannical, authoritarian government. A constitutional right to privacy protected by the government would have been antithetical to the fundamental freedoms America was built upon, as enumerated in the Constitution and the

Bill of Rights. These laws and court cases are even less designed to address many recent threats to privacy. Recent technological advances have enabled almost anyone to collect and store large databases of personal information, where the same process would have taken prohibitively large resources only 20 or 30 years ago. Personal information has become big business. This kind of personal information is valuable to almost any company. Consumer advocate groups do not have enough clout to lobby against companies in Washington, much less to set privacy standards in industry and try to enforce them. Only broad, widely enforced legislation in favor of privacy can prevent this. In the field of public policy, many scholars and lawyers alike consider the principle of privacy an extension of both property rights and civil rights. Information about a specific person should not be public property and available to anyone, but should instead be the property of that person. They should have the right to reveal it or hide it as they see fit, and this fundamental right should be protected by the government. Confidentiality requires a concept of privacy as property to determine if personal information can be collected at all, instead of only asking who should have access to it. However, property rights alone do not adequately address privacy rights. The concept of ownership is inherent in property, and if privacy is treated solely as property, a person could relinquish all ownership of their personal information and thus any claim to privacy they might otherwise have had. Privacy rights must also be considered in terms of civil rights that are fundamental and accorded to all human beings. Unlike property rights, a civil right can never be surrendered, bought, or otherwise separated from a person. Most current laws treat privacy more as a civil right than as a property right. Many foreign countries focus on privacy as simply an extension of civil rights, especially those countries that specify a right to privacy in their constitutions. The primary issue in the US is not as much the focus of existing privacy law as the necessity for new law. However, new legislation cannot be proposed without considering the origin of privacy law in the US. In Boston, Samuel D. A reporter from the Saturday Evening Gazette attended the reception and, to the dismay of Mrs. A series of Mrs. Brandeis, advocating a legally protected right to privacy. Warren and Brandeis outlined a right to privacy as "the right to be let alone. Warren and Brandeis further proposed that personal thoughts and information should be protected "owned" by the person "whether or not they are recorded or written down. This implies a relationship to civil rights as essential as the explicit relationship to property rights. Ever since this article was published in the Dec. Miller, a law professor at Harvard, described the article as "a model of how effectively presented legal scholarship can lead to a change in the law. Congress has passed legislature and courts have made decisions, but the whole of privacy law in the US remains largely fragmented and without clear direction. A turning point came with *Griswold v. The Supreme Court* found that married couples could use contraceptives and overturned the Connecticut law by defending a stronger right to privacy. The Freedom of Information Act of required that all government records must be available to the public, except certain records such as law enforcement and issues of national security. The Privacy Act of , a companion to the FOIA, allows citizens to see and correct any government records about them and places limits on what kind of information can be collected. The question of whether it should be collected at all is not addressed. For better or worse, these acts lay the foundation of US privacy law with regard to the government. Legislation with regard to private individuals, companies, and organizations is even more haphazard and narrow. Laws and court cases have made strides in specific areas. The FCRA allowed people to see and correct their credit reports and placed restrictions on their disclosure, the RFPA allowed people to see and correct their financial records and challenge them before they were sent to any other agency, and the EFTA required funds agencies to inform customers of the terms of any transfer. There are also state and community laws protecting various information from video rental records [12] to library records. Unfortunately, general privacy law is still nonexistent. Many laws and court decisions have done as more harm than good to the privacy cause. Miller [13] , the Supreme Court found that records held by banks and other financial institutions are not confidential and may be disclosed to third parties without notifying the subject of the records. This case set a precedent for many similar decisions, including that abortion clinics *Planned Parenthood v. Danforth* and telephone companies *US v. New York Telephone Co.* Miller illustrates the weakness in most current privacy laws aimed at the private sector. There are almost no limits set on what information can be collected, for what purpose, or to whom it may be disclosed. This is where strong legislation is most needed. There is no single reason why

privacy law in the US has developed this way. One of the most visible failures of current law is its focus on the government. Until recently, collection and storage of significant amounts of personal information required an immense investment of capital, equipment, and people. The government was the only institution with enough resources to do this successfully. Only recently have advances in technology and communications made collecting personal information more accessible and effective to private companies and individuals. Historically, the government has always been slow to respond with appropriate legislation to current issues, even when it is clearly necessary. In the last five years or so, the both the Clinton administration and the largely conservative Congress has finally begun to address issues of privacy. This is at least partly because computers and the Internet have thrust privacy back into the public eye. Companies, lobbying groups, and the general public have placed increasing pressure on the government to address these issues. For example, a year ago Clinton finally lifted the ban on exporting strong encryption, a move considered long overdue by both industry experts and political analysts. It is possible that given enough time, the US government will address general privacy issues in a manner acceptable to even the toughest watchdog groups. Unfortunately, this is a highly optimistic stance, and not an especially realistic one. The checks and balances inherent in the three branches of the government contribute to this, as do the fundamental, inalienable rights enumerated in the Bill of Rights. A fundamental right to privacy, protected by an omnibus law and enforced by the government, does not fit easily into this ideal. Legislation and court decisions have also taken into account the legitimate need of organizations and companies to collect and use certain personal information. This is not currently a valid argument against stronger privacy law, though. Almost uniformly, companies and organizations collect more personal information than they need solely for business purposes.

## 3: Jeffrey Rothfeder | Open Library

*The Internet threatens privacy / Jeffrey Rothfeder; Technology may not threaten privacy / Travis Charbeneau; Workplace monitoring violates employee privacy / Dana Hawkins; Workplace monitoring can be ethical / Laura Pincus Hartman -- How will technology affect society in the future?.*

July 17, , 1: Nobody seemed to care much. We had an early warning from Jeffrey Rothfeder, Privacy for Sale: This was before the Internet was born in its current GUI format. To prove how we were losing privacy even 26 years ago he was interviewed on a major show. The interviewer asked him just how fast he could find information on anybody. Give me a name. She said give me some information on Dan Rather. At that time was well known that Dan Rather was a very private individual offscreen. Rothfeder was able to find very detailed personal information about Dan within five minutes. As we grow older there are more secrets to hide. Whether it be personal secrets, wealth or private information. Now the problem with Facebook is a shared responsibility. You all give up so much information to Facebook without actually considering how this can be used or weaponized against you. All the information you provide can be shared even secondarily through friends. None of it is private. None of this information is private. Remember, their goal is to sell information. That is how the accumulate wealth. I have often seen various websites where the log-in offers you the possibility of a personal email with a password or alternatively, as a courtesy, just sign in with your Facebook or your Google account. More information is now being gathered. Every time you sign in using Facebook incredible information is being gathered. Safeway Even Safeway has been a master of information gathering. You know your Safeway discount card. The one that you swipe every time you go to the supermarket? That is another portal of information gathering. They know exactly when you are buying. What you are buying. Profiling your buying habits to the cent. Incredible amount of information has been gathered that can be shared. So all of you who are using gmail or hotmail or yahoo email are not sending private mail. All this email is probably being surveyed, stored and sold. So Facebook becomes a shared responsibility. No doubt, Cambridge Analytica was harvesting this stolen information from Facebook in Machiavellian and sinister ways. If you care, my suggestion is never use gmail or hotmail or Yahoo mail. Your own personalized email address is very simple. You can purchase your own vanity email address from GoDaddy dirt cheap. And you can use Go Daddy as your portal. Personally, I have gone to the trouble of programming my own personal email server. Not something that I recommend for casual use. It took 2 to 3 months to perfect. But once perfected it is entirely private and nearly hack proof. Because the safeguards are so intensely strong. So the overriding question remains, how much do you value your own privacy? How much are you concerned about the selling of your personal information? I can tell you that even valid email addresses are being widely spoofed. Everyone says nothing can be done. Not enough people care. Spoofing is another form of identity theft. Where hackers are using your email address. To be honest, even I have never been able to understand how this is done. I only know through surveillance, it is very widespread and unknown to most of you. Credit cards You know that credit cards are being stolen at an increasing rate. The new embedded chips are an improvement. It is designed to thoroughly protect your health information. But this one has the opposite effect. But it actually hinders normal and timely communication between healthcare providers. And it does not protect against sharing information outside of the country. All demonstrating that protection of privacy is an extremely complex issue. But it is a vital topic that needs constant vigilance. Dr Miller has been in medical practice for over 45 years and is a recognized leader in anti aging and integrative medicine. Dr Miller has been in medical practice for over

## 4: Facebook and privacy

*by Jeffrey Rothfeder (IDG) -- Early one morning in April, a scam operation took just a couple of hours to swindle dozens of investors out of tens of thousands of dollars.*

## 5: US Privacy Law | [www.enganchecubano.com](http://www.enganchecubano.com)

*This was before the Internet was born in its current GUI format. To prove how we were losing privacy even 26 years ago he was interviewed on a major show. The interviewer asked him just how fast.*

## 6: At Toyota, The Automation Is Human-Powered

*Open Library is an initiative of the Internet Archive, a (c)(3) non-profit, building a digital library of Internet sites and other cultural artifacts in digital form.*

## 7: Library Resource Finder: Staff View for: Technology and society : opposing viewpo

*Jeffrey has 9 jobs listed on their profile. See the complete profile on LinkedIn and discover Jeffrey's connections and jobs at similar companies. View Jeffrey Rothfeder's profile on LinkedIn.*

## 8: Rothfeder Family Trees, Crests, Genealogy, DNA, More

*The "privacy gap" between Europe and the U.S. " and the E.U. directive that turned a spotlight on it " threatens to stymie the success of U.S. companies across the Atlantic. It also endangers Europe's participation in e-commerce.*

*How To Make One Hell Of A Profit and Still Get In To Heaven Tukaram maharaj gatha English glosses from British Library Additional Manuscript 37075 The trend of modern poetry. Estrogens, the storm breaks : a struggle of medicine, law, and politics Blues driver keeley mod Introduction to the study of national music Political Thought of Joseph Stalin Selections Westaway John Hatfield, the imposter. Western Europe 2001 Latest interview questions and answers for desktop support engineer Rolling in the deep score piano The finite element method 2nd solution PREPARATION FOR BAPTISM OF FIRE Puttagunta suresh kumar books Firefight brandon sanderson bud Sinbads guide to life Using bioluminescence resonance energy transfer to measure ion channel assembly Gina M. Whitaker and Eric Dissolving wedlock Information processing in motor skills Mat Res Eng Noyan et al The The The A A An History of the College of California. Bookkeeping 101 : from shoeboxes to computers Wild talents rpg Unlocking the Mystery of Foreclosures Experimental animals used in pharmacology Russia and the North Korean nuclear crisis Seung-Ho Joo Evolutionary causality, theory of games, and evolution of intelligence Werner Leinfellner Oil Sketches by Frederic Edwin Church Exchange theory definition education learning journal Creator from jpeg Foxit editor 3.0 5.0 full crack Parallel symbolic languages and systems Nash by jay crownover bud Divided Loyalties (Byte-Me Teen Read) Selected problems and questions in strength of materials Animals that store food McLachlan the cartoons of Edward McLachlan.*