



Amazon's 'Halo' Is Dangerous To Customers?

By Seung June

Amazon's new wristwatch "Halo" judges you by how much you weigh. This wristband allows users to track their weight as well as how they sound to others. Though this new technology may be useful to certain people, it could still harm its customers both physically and mentally. I believe that Amazon's Halo is dangerous to customers because it can cause mental distress, it can cause physical pain, and it can use private information against other people.

Firstly, Halo can cause mental distress. It can easily judge its user as fat or overweight, or maybe even ugly or obese. Although this is meant to simply alert the person that they might need to exercise, the person could be emotionally affected by this negative comment, thus making them feel worse. Moreover, a robot might be able to measure what percentage of a person is fat, but what other people think of a person doesn't depend only on his/her physical appearance. Every single person is special in their own way, and they deserve to be treated with respect. People who are concerned with their appearance can easily try their best to lose weight through methods such as diet or exercise. They don't need a watch telling them that they're fat, obese, that their nose is too big, or that their ears are too small. A good example of students getting mental stress from other people's judgement is Facebook. When the "like" button was first invented, it was supposed to be a way for people to connect better and to spread positivity. However, the result was quite the opposite. "The idea that, fast-forward to today, teens would be getting depressed because they don't have enough likes or that it could lead to political polarization was way off our radar," said Justin Rosenstein, the creator of the Facebook like button. Similarly, the judgement of a computer can cause distress among people, especially children, who use Halo. Therefore, because Halo can cause mental distress, I believe that Amazon's new product is dangerous to buyers.

Secondly, Halo can cause physical pain. It is true that the Halo does have the benefit of encouraging us to do more exercise by showing us what we could look like if we lost weight.



However, this can pressure us to actually do more exercise than our body can handle, ultimately endangering our physical health. There is a “motivational” slider in the amazon Halo app. This supposedly lets customers know what they would look like if they gain or lose weight. However, the fear of losing weight and the desire to get thinner could affect the daily schedules of people. For example, they might spend too much time exercising when they should be doing work. A little exercise is necessary for health, but pushing yourself to the limit just because a slider tells you you’ll look terrible if you get fat isn’t good. According to Business Insider, one study found that women were less likely to have a heart attack if they were active at least once a week. However, it was also shown that the risks of a heart attack became much higher for women who exercised strenuously everyday. This demonstrates that, though exercising on a regular basis is good for your health, too much of anything is most likely harmful. But users might still not stop exercising due to the slider. It can show the person as extremely fat or even very obese, which can easily scare or worry users, causing them to devote too much of their time to exercise.

Finally, Amazon can use people’s private information. In order to enable the function that allows Halo to predict a customer’s fat percentage, Halo requires users to take several images of themselves. And in order to recognize how the user is feeling, Halo also listens to people’s conversations. This violates customers’ privacy, since Amazon could easily use these facts to their advantage. Amazon claims that it deletes the files after it analyzes them, but the private company could easily be lying. To prove this, let’s take a look at Amazon’s track record. According to CNN Business, Amazon confirmed that it hires people to analyse what people have been recorded saying to Amazon Alexa. And Amazon is also known for not telling people the exact truth how their company works. For example, Amazon could use Halo to determine when a user is happy or more gullible, and try to sell products to them during that time. Even if Amazon doesn’t use the information, hackers could steal the information and use it for their own purpose. These could include trying to make people make poor decisions or even just directly trying to sell products to them. Therefore, because Amazon or other people could use users’ information, I believe that Amazon’s Halo is dangerous to users.

Because it can cause mental distress, it can cause physical pain, and it can collect too much private information from users, I strongly believe that Amazon’s Halo is dangerous to its customers. Though technology itself is neither good or bad, we must always remember that they



are only a tool. We need to be aware of both the advantages and disadvantages of any new technologies, and make sure that we always control them, and they don't control us.

In the digital age, is face-to-face interaction still important?

By Ian Lam

Imagine a world that is so convenient that you can lie in bed and go to school at the same time. You never have to worry about time difference when calling your family living in other countries, and you can contact them whenever you want. What a life! I believe that face-to-face interaction is less important because social media and video calls are the same as face-to-face chatting, there are new ways to express things online, and online interaction is faster and more convenient.



First of all, video calling and meeting on social media have the same impact as meeting face-to-face. Video calling lets you chat and express feelings – the same things you can do during face-to-face interaction. For example, when online, you can look at other people's expressions or listen to their voice. You can chat privately and you can even send emojis to express feelings. This is important because face-to-face is time-consuming. Social media, which is much more convenient, makes this communication easier. Because face-to-face interaction is replicated and improved online, it can be replaced. Therefore, face-to-face interaction is less important.

Second of all, online chatting creates new ways to say and express things. You can express feelings differently, you can chat with lots of people, you can send photos which will express your feelings. It creates opportunities for new communication. For example, you can send a sad emoji when you are sad instead of saying you are sad. You can send pictures of your exciting trip to make people think you are happy. This is important because social media has created new ways of communication for us to understand each other better, and everyone can develop their own online communication style to see which fits them the most. That is why face-to-face interaction is less important.

Last but not least, meeting over social media is faster and more convenient. You can just chat on your phone or computer, write a few sentences, and the other person receives it instantly. It also helps with people who have relatives on the other side of the world, who you can just chat with through text or email without adjusting your time zone. For example, if your relatives live in Canada, it will not be convenient if you go there and meet them every time you want to talk. It would be much more convenient to go on social media and text them, or even to video call them. This is important because as humans move on, both technologically and socially, we need more convenient ways to communicate. Therefore, face-to-face interaction is less important.

On the other hand, people might not focus on other important tasks when they are on social media. However, this can be limited and fixed by different extensions, apps, and other tools to help people limit social media usage. Also, online communication teaches people to be responsible for their time and develop their time management skills. This is very important for both your work productivity and your learning. Because face-to-face interaction does not have these extra advantages, it is not important.



In conclusion, video calling and social media can replace face-to-face interaction because they can make your life easier and help you communicate in a different way. In the future, I would suggest that there could be less face-to-face interaction. We could even have one day of school each week online through video calls or Skype. This could change our whole way of life. It would be easier to work and attend school, as you can use the transportation time working and even getting a little bit more time to sleep. Although this requires everyone to stay focused and manage their time wisely, it would make our lives more productive.



Using the word 'fascist' to describe any government/world leader today is inappropriate.

By Joshua Chan

Did you know according to George Orwell, the writer of *Animal Farm* and *1984*, the closest synonym to the word fascist was bully? On this account, using the word 'fascist' to describe any government or world leader today is inappropriate. Since the current world leaders and government do not fulfill the criteria for what a fascist is, it is hard to describe fascism and it has a lot of meanings.

First of all, using the word 'fascist' to describe any government or world leader today is inappropriate because they do not fulfill the criteria of being a fascist. As an illustration, Donald Trump, people might say, is a fascist and he is promoting fascism. The reason is his crude slogans, racist remarks, and corruption. The historian Timothy Snyder said that the actions of Donald Trump are just the early stages of 'a confused sort of fascism'. This is because fascism was used to describe Nazi Germany, Mussolini's Italy and Francoist Spain. However, Donald Trump has not reached that level. This is important because fascism is defined as 'a system of government led by a dictator having complete power', whereas Donald Trump is not a dictator. Therefore, using the word 'fascist' to describe any government or world leader today is inappropriate because they simply do not meet the standards of being a fascist.

Moreover, using the word 'fascist' to describe any government or world leader today is inappropriate because it is hard to describe fascism. According to media outlet Vox, they asked 5 fascism experts whether Donald Trump is a fascist. This has something to do since a lot of people say that Donald Trump is a fascist, including the former secretary of labour Robert Reich and journalist Masha Gessen. Each fascism expert said different definitions about fascism, for example, Jason Stanley, a philosopher at Yale University, said that 'the word "fascist" has acquired a feeling of the extreme'. This means that the word 'fascist' is difficult to explain because we have become more unfamiliar with fascism as we experience less of it. Thus, using



the word 'fascist' to describe any government or world leader today is inappropriate because it is difficult to understand fascism.

Last but not least, using the word 'fascist' to describe any government or world leader today is inappropriate because the word 'fascism' has a lot of meanings. As stated by the New York Times, 'the term has been used and dismissed for being too extreme, alarmist, historically specific and vague. This is as a result of having different perspectives of the word. For example, one might say Donald Trump is a fascist because of his actions and another might say Donald Trump is not a fascist because he cannot be compared to the likes of Hitler and Mussolini. Hence, using the word 'fascist' to describe any government or world leader today is inappropriate because it has various meanings.

On the contrary, some may argue that using the word 'fascist' to describe any government or world leader today is inappropriate because of all the negative actions they have done. This argument is invalid because all negative actions have their own severity. For example, one might say that Donald Trump is a fascist because his actions are severe as he was faulted for his inactions in the current pandemic. Another might say that Adolf Hitler is a fascist because he discriminated against the Jews and other minority groups. Therefore, some may argue that using the word 'fascist' to describe any government or world leader today is appropriate because of all the negative actions they have done. This is wrong because it is based on the severity of the actions.

All in all, using the word 'fascist' to describe any government or world leader today is inappropriate because it does not fulfill the criteria for being a fascist, it is hard to describe fascism and it has a lot of meanings. On the other hand, some may argue that using the word 'fascist' to describe any government or world leader today is appropriate because of all the negative actions they have done. This is wrong because it is based on the severity of the action.

