

I think there are many connections to be had between the persistent surveillance system and the systems associated with identity and race. Both systems have a very strong and controversial ethical and component, yet there are many differences in how each of these systems are to be implemented. There is a strong connection between the two types of systems in terms of boundaries, as both have rather unclear and loose boundaries that must be made clearer to function and achieve the desired purpose. With the surveillance system, the lack of boundary as to who governs the system and maintains the influx of information is a huge flaw. If the police were to have complete control over all of the photographic information of crimes in Baltimore, it would lead to further distrust of the police and further room for personal bias in deciding which crimes police take action on. Similarly, with the system of structural racialization, it is difficult to draw boundaries on the spheres of internalized, interpersonal, institutional, and structural elements to create real change on a societal level.

There are many examples of flaws in boundary creation with the structural racialization system. As discussed in the systems thinking section of this week's reading, when looking at one particular area such as the National Domestic Workers Alliance, the web of connections grows very quickly, and it becomes more ambiguous as to what areas would be most beneficial for intervention. There are many factors, or parts of the system, that could be altered, from health care access to labor laws to the housing situation of immigrants. There are also many groups that have the potential to influence such factors (ie governments, unions, individuals). How does a government intervene without disrupting the entire system? If unions, for example, push for bettered labor laws, will this component alone in turn improve the other parts of the system as well? It is extremely unclear as to where the boundaries of this system are drawn, and the lack of current government intervention to begin with poses a threat to the outcomes of the immigrant labor system, as conditions will continue to worsen until action is taken in one or more areas.

The case study I found most interesting from the reading was the Berkley Unified School District example in California. Redlining is a historic and complex system that over time has forced segregation in communities due to differences in mortgage and loan opportunity for people of different races. In this example, the government clearly saw the impact that redlining has had on the segregation of school systems and acted on the issue by redrawing school catchment area boundaries. While this seems like an easy, institutional fix to an internalized problem, the school district faced much controversy over the use of race as a factor in assigning students to schools. Both lawsuits against the school district were unsuccessful, however the fact that controversy still exists showcases the flaws in the system. As with the persistent surveillance system and the continuing distrust of police, racism and restriction of opportunity for people of color are systemic issues that an institutional amendment cannot fix. Should governments then be looking more closely at methods of reversing internalized beliefs? Or should they continue creating institutional changes in the hopes that it trickles down to internalized changes in belief over time? On the other hand, is it actually the job of individuals to create that internalized change themselves, or should they rely on governments to change institutions and thus society to reflect discouragement of internalized racism and mistrust of authority? I think it *should* be the job of both entities, however the current structure of the larger government system is not at a place where it can be fully trusted or relied on to create the necessary changes. Every institutional change by a government is a step in the right direction, but individuals should be held accountable for their own internalized beliefs; unfortunately I don't think there will ever be a way to set boundaries on how that can be monitored and governed, but if the overwhelming majority expresses their discontent with structural racialization, it can be a strong enough force for governments to follow suit.

Overall, my previous assessment of the persistent surveillance system has remained largely unchanged with the understanding of structural racialization. Both systems are controversial and require tighter boundaries to function. There is a strong connection between internalized beliefs (distrust of

authority and racism) and the lack of government and supervisory entities (control of information and institutional changes), yet there is a huge disconnect in how the two can be amended to best achieve results. There are limited ways the police can control information in a way that will change people's distrust of government. There are also limited ways the government can create institutional changes to fix people's internalized racist characteristics. The systems themselves are flawed in this way, however the more governments see the internalized issues and try to implement policy change related to such issues, perhaps societal internalized beliefs will begin to fade and real change can be made.