As we have discussed previously in class in the cases of John Wycliffe and Friedrich Wilhelm, transparency and the opportunity to gain or availability of knowledge are extremely important in systems. I believe that the information gained using McNutt's technology is too valuable not to use. Lives can be saved. Dangerous criminals can be taken off the streets before they hurt more people. In the right hands, this technology can be extremely beneficial. In the wrong hands, it is true that it could be slightly damaging, but can we justify letting our individual fears hold us back from the possibility of saving hundreds, or maybe thousands of lives? I believe that the persistent surveillance technology should not only be used in Baltimore, but in cities all over the United States and the world.

What happened in the case of Baltimore was very unfortunate. The people who were in control of this powerful technology engaged in criminal behavior themselves and in doing so, became the very people that the technology was trying to stop. Although most people would not think of the hands of the police as being the "wrong hands", many police departments are not squeaky clean, and nobody is perfect. In order to prevent this sort of abuse of power, the whole community being surveyed should be aware that the technology is in place and who is controlling it so that they are able to hold whoever that is accountable. Furthermore, I believe that an entity separate from the police should be created in order to oversee this technology. Perhaps another impartial branch of government, like the court, who would be able to observe without bias and alert either the police or if necessary the public (in cases of police brutality, etc) to any problems/injustices that they may see. No system will be perfect or entirely free

of corruption, but if everyone is aware of the presence and power of this technology, we can hold each other more accountable.

Even with a new branch/separate entity governing this technology, people will still be scared. People are fearful of what they do not know or understand and they also highly value their privacy. For these reasons, there should be strict rules placed on the use of the technology, like the rule about photo clarity that McNutt imposed upon himself. The technology serves its purpose very well with blurry pictures, and that way individuals going about their daily lives have nothing to be afraid of. There should also be a rule that specific dots or people can only be tracked through time if they are suspected in a crime. Not only would it be a waste of time to follow around every dot/person who was simply trying to go to school or work or live their life, but it would be an invasion of privacy. None of the information should be shared with the public unless it is to do with a crime, and the information should have an expiration date of a few days. Although I believe that this technology would be beneficial in every city, the citizens of the place that might be surveyed should all be given all of the information about it, and the power to decide through a vote whether or not it should be implemented.

In the age of the internet, the issue of privacy has become a very important question to many people. Does it exist? I am not sure but I believe there is a possibility that in the wrong hands, even a technology as common and taken-for-granted as your cell phone could reveal all of the intimate details about your life. Since this information is probably already out there, why not let McNutt's technology use it for good?