

Are We Trading Freedom for Convenience? The Growing Debate Over Flock Cameras

Jay Dellinger, Publisher

By Jay Dellinger, Publisher

America has always wrestled with one difficult question: How much freedom are we willing to surrender in exchange for safety?

Today that question has taken the form of automated license plate reader cameras appearing on roads across our nation. One of the best known systems is operated by Flock Safety. These systems promise to help recover stolen vehicles, locate missing children, identify suspects and solve crimes. There is no question that automated license plate readers have provided law enforcement with another tool for accomplishing those goals. But there is another side to this story that deserves equal attention.

Our Founding Fathers did not write the Bill of Rights because they trusted

government without limitation. They wrote it because they understood the importance of placing limits on government power and protecting individual liberty. The Fourth Amendment protects the people against unreasonable government searches and seizures and places constitutional limits on government intrusion.

Supporters of automated license plate readers argue that these cameras simply photograph license plates and vehicles visible from public roadways. Critics argue that when information from large numbers of cameras is collected, stored and made searchable, the privacy implications become much greater.

When a single camera records a passing vehicle, it may not seem particularly intrusive. But when large numbers of cameras are connected through searchable systems that can allow information to be shared across jurisdictions, the picture changes dramatically.

Depending on data retention policies and the information available to an agency, historical plate detections can potentially reveal patterns about where a vehicle has traveled over time. Instead of simply investigating a particular crime after it occurs, technology can make it possible to search previously collected information involving vehicles whose owners may never have been suspected of wrongdoing.

That possibility should concern every citizen, regardless of political party.

The Fourth Amendment was not written to shield criminals. It protects **every American** against unreasonable government intrusion. Our constitutional rights matter most when they place boundaries on government power and protect people who have done nothing wrong.

Technology has advanced far faster than constitutional law. Our founders could never have imagined artificial intelligence, cloud databases, automated license plate readers or modern digital surveillance networks. Yet the underlying principle remains exactly the same.

Government should not know everywhere law abiding citizens travel simply because technology makes it possible.

History gives Americans good reason to carefully examine expanding government powers. A system designed for one legitimate public safety purpose today could potentially be expanded or repurposed tomorrow in ways the public never anticipated.

The question should never be whether today's officials can be trusted. The question should be whether we are comfortable giving the same capabilities to every future official and agency that may have access to them.

Some critics have expressed concerns about the potential for misuse of automated license plate reader systems. Questions have been raised about privacy, the collection and sharing of vehicle location information, data retention and whether these systems could eventually be used in ways that extend beyond their original purpose.

Privacy advocates and civil liberties organizations have called for oversight, transparency and safeguards surrounding automated license plate reader technology. As the use of these systems continues to expand, debates over privacy, public safety and constitutional protections are likely to continue.

There is another concern that receives far less attention.

Data has value.

Once location information exists, others may have an interest in obtaining it. Databases containing valuable information can become potential targets for unauthorized access, misuse or cyberattack. The more information society collects and stores, the more important the security and governance of that information become.

One argument commonly made in debates over surveillance is, **"If you've done nothing wrong, you have nothing to worry about."**

That argument completely misunderstands liberty.

Privacy is not about hiding wrongdoing. Privacy is about preserving freedom.

Americans close their bathroom doors. They lock their homes. They protect their financial records. They use passwords. None of those actions suggests criminal activity. They simply demonstrate something Americans have understood for generations: Privacy is an essential part of living in a free society.

The danger is not only where we are today. The greater question is where this technology could lead tomorrow.

Now consider a future in which automated license plate readers are combined with other technologies such as artificial intelligence, facial recognition, drones, cell phone location information, vehicle telemetry and government databases.

Individually, each technology may appear reasonable. Combined, they could create something previous generations could scarcely imagine: a surveillance infrastructure capable of revealing enormous portions of a person's daily life.

That should make every American pause.

This is not an argument against law enforcement.

Our police officers have difficult jobs and deserve effective tools to protect our communities. They solve crimes, recover stolen vehicles, locate endangered children and apprehend dangerous criminals. Those successes should not be dismissed.

But constitutional rights should never become casualties of convenience.

America has always been strongest when it protects both public safety and individual liberty. We should demand technology that helps solve crime while also demanding appropriate judicial oversight, limited data retention, transparency, meaningful independent audits and consequences for misuse.

Freedom is rarely lost all at once.

More often, it disappears one reasonable compromise at a time.

Benjamin Franklin famously wrote about the danger of trading essential liberty for temporary safety. The historical circumstances were very different from today's surveillance debate but the tension between liberty and security remains worth considering.

As automated license plate reader networks continue expanding across America, each community should ask an important question:

Are we building tools to protect a free society or slowly creating the infrastructure to monitor one?

The answer will define not only how crimes are solved but what kind of nation we leave for the next generation.