I see connections between the lecture on persistent surveillance systems and the lecture on race and identity in systems thinking in terms of how your race/identity would determine your reaction to McNutt's technology. I also see a connection of problem solving using transparency, as well as a theme of unintended consequences.

The way that you view and react to the idea of persistent surveillance systems could be connected to the way that you view identity and race, or which identity and race you choose to identify. Your background and identity inform your perception on almost everything. Your experiences are affected by these things, and from prior experiences, opinions are formed. When the idea of persistent surveillance systems was presented, the reaction of the civilians in the city depended on a multitude of things: the way it was presented to them, the reaction of others around them, and their prior experience with technology like this/their specific biases/opinions/attitudes revolving around surveillance technology. Currently, I believe that McNutt's technology is a great, hugely beneficial idea, and we should implement it anywhere we can. However, if I were an African American man living in Baltimore, I would likely be completely against the technology, considering the reputation of the police. I would be afraid of the technology because, despite never doing anything wrong, I would fear being falsely accused because of my gender and race. If I were an undocumented immigrant, or frankly, just an immigrant, in Texas or California, I would also likely fear the technology. I would fear being profiled for my race and being arrested and questioned simply for existing. Same situation if I were a transgender or a gender non-conforming individual. If I were not white, I would have asked the question of whether or not you can see the color of the individual blurs in the video. Don't get me wrong, if I were a different race or identity, I believe I would still see the benefit of McNutt's technology, and individually, would probably still believe that it could be good and beneficial. Unfortunately though, my original opinion would not matter as much in determining the stance I would take regarding the use of persistent surveillance systems. I would have to worry about violence and discrimination against me not only by specific, horrible individuals who may have a problem with my existence and be able to track me down, but also by institutions that might be able to see where I come from or what I do and use it to further harmful stereotypes, or even just harm me. These worries would outweigh my original viewpoint, because I would have to think about all aspects of our racialized social system.

Transparency is an important aspect of systems, and one that McNutt's technology utilizes in order to lower the crime rate in cities in which it is used. Transparency can also be used to try to fight against racism in systems, because when people see how racist ideologies and biases are embedded into every level of our society, they may be better able and motivated to combat it. In the first case of McNutt's technology, many people fear transparency because privacy is one of the things that has inherent value in our society. In the second case, most people view transparency as

a good thing because racism truly benefits no one, seeing how it denies people opportunity and prevents them from contributing their full potential to society (or even worse things, such as denying people their basic human rights). I believe transparency is a good thing in all systems, but the reason why it might be feared/viewed in a negative light is because the perpetrators of or believers in violence or wrongdoing are often, unfortunately, in a position of power, or simply the loudest voices in the room. Additionally, both systems, combating violence in cities and racism in America, intend to use transparency for good, but unintended consequences cannot always be avoided, or even planned for.

As we saw in the case of Baltimore, the efforts to get the civilians to place more trust in the police and allow the persistent surveillance to be put into place backfired when police brutality occurred and the technology was used to protect the violent person(s). McNutt and his team never wanted their information to be shared with the whole public, per say, since they at least to some extent share our value of privacy and since there are some bad eggs out there, but they surely never meant for it to be used against the public. These unintended consequences were devastating for the technology in the case of Baltimore, as any chance it had at gaining public approval went down the drain after this incident and the subsequent riots (during which this technology was used to arrest more protestors than would have otherwise been possible, making worse an already bad situation). Unintended consequences have also been devastating to people of color and minorities in America throughout recent history. After the end of slavery and the election of Barack Obama, our first black president, many people were quick to claim that racism in America had "ended". It is true that America as a whole may not be actively trying to be racist anymore, although specific groups and individuals certainly still are, but in a system that has already been racialized, even a small micro biases can lead to huge macro biases and continue to perpetrate racist systems and ideas. Similarly, people who may not think they are being racist could still act in a way that is harmful to minorities because of our racialized culture and because of they say they have grown up and their behaviors have been reinforced by society. We ourselves may be unintentionally contributing to racism, if only by failing to actively combat it. Most of the time, unintended consequences are unavoidable because they are unforeseen. However, in the case of racialized america, deconstructing the system and the construct/idea of race or in other words, redrawing the boundaries would be a good place to start.