



## Abuse

Unless carefully controlled, CCTV will inevitably be abused.

### **Institutional Abuse:**

During times of political turmoil, surveillance systems can be used to oppress those who disagree with the agencies that control them.

Think back to the Red Scare, Joe McCarthy and the age of J. Edgar Hoover and imagine if the

Government had these surveillance systems in their hands.

### **Harassment and Discrimination:**

In England, San Francisco, Alabama, and New York City, camera systems have been used to improperly observe women.<sup>1</sup> In England, a study has shown that camera operators tend to focus on people of color.<sup>2</sup>

Cops, not cameras, fight crime.



### ***Displacing, not fighting crime:***

Studies from England and the U.S. determined that CCTV surveillance does not reduce the crime rate.<sup>3</sup> At most, what it will do is push criminals outside the range of the cameras, often into nearby residential areas.

### ***Cameras can't replace cops:***

What is worse is that these systems use money and resources that could be used on community policing. A cop, not a camera, makes far more sense.



### **Contact Us:**

**ACLU of Georgia**  
1900 The Exchange  
Suite 425

Atlanta, GA 30339  
Email: [info@acluga.org](mailto:info@acluga.org)

## Surveillance:



## Danger Without Benefits

### Video Surveillance in Public Spaces



# A chilling effect on Free Speech



## Cameras becoming more common.

Video Cameras, or closed-circuit television (CCTV), are becoming an increasingly familiar feature of American life. Fear of terrorism and the availability of ever-cheaper cameras have accelerated the trend.

## Danger to public discourse.

The use of surveillance systems by police and other public security officials is troubling in a democratic society. Blanketing our public spaces and streets with video surveillance is wrong because it will make us less free.

## Surveillance will expand.

Once the nation decides to go down the path of seeking security through video surveillance, the monitoring of citizens in public places will quickly become pervasive.

## Free speech is in danger.

The growing presence of camera systems in public spaces will bring subtle but profound changes to the character of our public spaces. Citizens become more self-conscious and less willing to freely express themselves when watched by the government. This is a legally recognized harm.<sup>4</sup>

## We need MORE than cameras.

If cameras are deployed, their performance should be measured for effectiveness in reducing crime. Camera systems also need to be subject to oversight and statutory regulation to protect privacy and prevent abuses. The ACLU of Illinois has developed a set of three proposals (Moratorium, Review, Regulation) that redresses the issues with Chicago's surveillance system.<sup>5</sup> This proposal can be easily adopted to Georgia as **MORE** (Moratorium, Oversight, Review, Effectiveness).

### Moratorium:

Until more is known about the positive and negative effects of CCTV surveillance by the government, creation of new systems and the expansion of existing ones should be halted.

### Oversight:

Regulations should be put into place requiring individualized reasonable suspicion or probable cause before utilizing capabilities such as tracking or facial recognition. Using cameras to record activities in private areas should be prohibited. There should be a time limit on the retention of images unrelated to ongoing criminal investigations.

### Review:

Systems should be subject to periodic audits of their effectiveness and negative community impact.

### Effectiveness:

Spend taxpayer dollars on programs proven to reduce crime, such as more police and better street lighting.<sup>6</sup>

## Resources

### CURRENT BILLS:

Georgia House of Representatives: HB 8

### REFERENCES:

- <sup>1</sup> Clive Norris & Gary Armstrong, *CCTV and the Social Structuring of Surveillance* (1999), in *CRIME PREVENTION STUDIES* 157, 161 [hereinafter "English Camera Study of 1999"], available at [http://popcenter.org/library/crimeprevention/volume\\_10/06-norrisarmstrong.pdf](http://popcenter.org/library/crimeprevention/volume_10/06-norrisarmstrong.pdf); *Spy cameras fail to focus on street crime*, *THE WASH. TIMES*, Aug. 13, 2006; Jaxon Van Derbeken, *9-month Suspension for Police Officer*, *S.F. Chron.*, Apr. 22, 2005; Jon Gargis, *Strip Traffic Camera Follows Pedestrians Home*, *THE CRIMSON WHITE*, Sept. 15, 2003; Sarah Wallace, *NYPD Housing Surveillance Staffed by Cops Under Investigation*, *ABC NEWS*, Apr. 23, 2004.
- <sup>2</sup> English Camera Study of 1999, at 162-64, 172.
- <sup>3</sup> Aundrea Cameron et al., *Measuring the Effects of Video Surveillance on Crime in Los Angeles*, at 14-16, 29-30 (University of Southern California, May 5, 2008); Jennifer King, et al., *An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of San Francisco's Community Safety Cameras*, at 11-12 (University of California, Berkeley, Dec. 17, 2008); Martin Gill & Angela Spriggs, *Assessing the impact of CCTV*, at 23-25 (Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate, Feb. 2005).
- <sup>4</sup> Michaelman, Scott, *Who Can Sue Over Government Surveillance?*, 57 *UCLA LAW REVIEW* 71 (2009) at 79, 89-93.
- <sup>5</sup> ACLU of Illinois, *Chicago's Video Surveillance Cameras: A pervasive and Unregulated Threat to Our Privacy*, Feb. 2011.
- <sup>6</sup> Ken Pease, *A Review of Street Lighting Evaluations: Crime Reduction Effects*, 10 *CRIME PREVENTION STUDIES*, 47-76 (1999).