

When looking at a case such as the persistent surveillance in Baltimore, it is true that systems thinking methodologies can reveal previously invisible relationships. While the surveillance appeared to work effectively in areas like Fallujah and Juarez, there was a lot of controversy regarding its usage in Baltimore since there were police brutality issues in the area. The surveillance used a time-series method to essentially go back in time, revealing pictures from past points in time to put together a more cohesive story of events. This method, however, has a lot of drawbacks as it can reveal previously invisible information such as protestors' actions and possibly their personal information. Thus, the surveillance perpetuates a debate regarding the invasion of privacy, and I argue that this methodology should not be used.

I personally take a lot of issue with the invasion of privacy. I think it is not ethical to have access to anyone and everyone's information, whether it be through the internet and data mining or through more physical means like the persistent surveillance. I understand that the surveillance is intended for good uses and was created to reduce crime and save lives, but will its usage reveal too much? Will the police use this technology to attempt to catch every crime that is revealed, or will they have to create some kind of boundary in terms of which crimes are "worst"? I think there is no way to equate a murder with smoking marijuana; the crimes are at completely different levels and should not be treated the same way. That being said, should the police just ignore misdemeanor crimes if they catch it with the surveillance? Even if the police did try to catch every crime, there is likely no way that they have the staff to act on every crime they see. There will always be some degree of illegal activity going on that will never be caught. Also, once people in the Baltimore area catch on that the police can see more crimes taking place, it probably won't lower crime since those people will just find more creative and secretive ways to carry out their crimes. The systems trap of rule beating is very difficult, if not impossible, to correct. It is a relationship in the system that is by nature invisible, and once it is revealed

it just changes form to become invisible once again. Overall, I don't think that surveillance use will have the desired impact and will cause more issues than it solves.

The issue of governance of the system is also a huge flaw. There is no good answer as to who governs the surveillance. First off, the obvious answer of police governing the use of surveillance is simply impractical. Assuming there are no restrictions as to which crimes they can act on, there is far too much room for bias. Police will begin picking and choosing which crimes they deem "bad enough," and police brutality and bias opposing minorities will only increase. Thus, the police alone cannot ethically hold the reigns on the system. Then again, the government is not a great alternative for a governing body. Given the uncertainty and bias in today's government system, I know I personally don't trust the upper level of government to use this technology effectively and ethically. I mean seriously, I would not feel comfortable putting an entire city's safety in the hands of the people who put Brett Kavanaugh on the Supreme Court. To me, that is a disaster waiting to happen. And yes, that might be a relationship I very much want to remain invisible because I don't even want to know what kinds of basic human rights would be violated if the government controls who gets punished for varying levels of crime. I would also take issue with a separate entity, such as a private outside company, governing the system. People tend to act selfishly and if there are no restrictions as to what a private company can do with the information the surveillance reveals, there is once again the potential for a huge bias that manipulates the system to accomplish the goals of the company alone. Generally, I think that the surveillance reveals too much previously invisible information. There is no one person or body that is responsible enough to properly handle the surveillance system, thus I don't think it should be put in place to begin with.

In the specific case of the surveillance use in Baltimore, I think it is clear that there is no way I would support its use given the vast information it would currently have access to. That being said, I do think there could be ways to create a different system that accomplishes the same purpose without the aforementioned concerns. For example, what if the surveillance system only looked at small areas

where crime is most common? What if there were preset conditions as to which criminal activities are recorded? What if some combination of the police, the government, and private entities had joint control over the governance of the system and the information gathered is somewhat transparent to regular citizens? I'm not 100% sure that even a system more like this would be effective, but I think it is important to discuss alternative ideas before scrapping the idea of surveillance usage altogether. If I had the answer to what a flawless system would look like, I would probably be running the operation, so clearly I am no expert. However, the system as is brings up too many concerns for me and thus needs to be changed and restructured several times over before I would consider its implementation.