

Forum:[Hack Forums](#)

Thread: [Are law enforcement cameras an invasion of privacy?](#)

eGod - December 25, 2019, 12:41 pm

As the title says,
Are law enforcement cameras an invasion of privacy? ?

What do you think?

rsx - December 25, 2019, 12:43 pm

I don't think so. It's like a cops 3rd eye in my opinion. Everything the camera sees and hears, the cop can also see and hear so I don't see it being invading when it's used in accordance with regular police work.

eGod - December 25, 2019, 12:47 pm

(Dec 25, 2019 01:43 PM)Nuzi Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I don't think so. It's like a cops 3rd eye in my opinion. Everything the camera sees and hears, the cop can also see and hear so I don't see it being invading when it's used in accordance with regular police work.

Well.

They're are all in public places.

Part of being in a public place is knowing people are allowed to film you. Law enforcement included.

On the other side.

Many many many people are abusing those cameras.

It would take me five minutes finding cameras by using google dorks, it's way to easy and the security are often way to low.

DNA - December 25, 2019, 12:50 pm

Public domain, so it's legal, just like how you can take photograph.

Here's what I don't understand:

You're required to ask the permission of parents in the area where you are taking photo's if children get in the shot.

But as long as a group of elites pay a bunch of idiots to run for office, they can record anyone and anything without consequence.

Gotta love every single hypocritical standard the government creates

eGod - December 25, 2019, 12:52 pm

(Dec 25, 2019 01:50 PM)Jelly Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Public domain, so it's legal, just like how you can take photograph.

Here's what I don't understand:

You're required to ask the permission of parents in the area where you are taking photo's if children get in the shot.

But as long as a group of elites pay a bunch of idiots to run for office, they can record anyone and anything without consequence.

Gotta love every single hypocritical standard the government creates
I think it should be a legal requirement that all police officers carry a camera that shoots 24/7.
So sick & tired of people getting tazed and killed without reasons.
The police are way to often abusing their power in my opinion.

I am also happy we have police, so we don't have serial killers running around everywhere.

Rally the Bulls - December 25, 2019, 1:04 pm

Thought you meant bodycams at first lol..

DrDoof - December 25, 2019, 1:06 pm

Yeah, since we can't know for sure how it's used. Sooner or later (if not already) western governments will follow China in building an AI network for profiling and tracking people.

eGod - December 25, 2019, 1:08 pm

(Dec 25, 2019 02:04 PM)Rally the Bulls Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Thought you meant bodycams at first lol..
Sorry.

My English can be confusing at times as it is not my first language.

(Dec 25, 2019 02:06 PM)DrDoof Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Yeah, since we can't know for sure how it's used.
Sooner or later (if not already) western governments will follow China in building an AI network for profiling and tracking people.

You are absolutely right.

Rally the Bulls - December 25, 2019, 1:11 pm

(Dec 25, 2019 02:08 PM)NealCaffrey Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Sorry.

My English can be confusing at times as it is not my first language.

Nah, not your fault. As I started reading more of the OP it became fairly apparent. I see nothing wrong with these cams, with the exception of the lack of security.

eGod - December 25, 2019, 1:13 pm

(Dec 25, 2019 02:11 PM)Rally the Bulls Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Nah, not your fault. As I started reading more of the OP it became fairly apparent. I see nothing wrong with these cams, with the exception of the lack of security.

Just look at - > <https://www.insecam.org/>

This is so much a lack of security.

? Soufian ? - December 25, 2019, 1:15 pm

No.

You wish they'd be there if you needed them.

Stork - December 25, 2019, 1:21 pm

Yeah idk I think that they are really useful and make crimes really hard to get away with. You basically cannot leave a city without being seen on a traffic cam and cops use them all the time. We also live in a welfare/police state and I would rather have the money that has been stolen from me go towards tangible items at the least LOL

Fish - December 25, 2019, 1:27 pm

(Dec 25, 2019 02:04 PM)Rally the Bulls Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Thought you meant bodycams at first lol..
I'm still confused, if he's not talking about body cams what is he talking about?

Mind explaining?

eGod - December 25, 2019, 1:30 pm

(Dec 25, 2019 02:27 PM)Fish Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I'm still confused, if he's not talking about body cams what is he talking about?

Mind explaining?

Let's just say body cams and surveillance cams traffic cams, whatever cams

Fish - December 25, 2019, 1:32 pm

(Dec 25, 2019 02:30 PM)NealCaffrey Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Let's just say body cams and surveillance cams traffic cams, whatever cams

Ahh, just in general ones that they use.

I believe that their good, gets everything on file for reference. Doesn't really effect me, for the most part

Lorem Ipsum - December 25, 2019, 1:35 pm

Yes, I do think so.

If you hang them in the bank or at 'important' locations, which is often related to governmental money related buildings or classified stuff. But to hang them around every corner, building, tunnel, etc. seems more of a privacy invasion to me than security.

You can't say it isn't and you can't say it is without risking your safety. But it's like should I wear a helmet in case I fall? Yes. But do I do it? No. Because I rather take the risk than to 'hurt' my ego, appearance or whatever it is that people care about. Same with camera's. Do I want to get robbed in a subway tunnel? No.. but do I want camera's at every footstep that I place on the public area in order to keep me safe? No, not at all. Just my thoughts.

Aeowulf - December 25, 2019, 1:42 pm

They've become to prevalent. Definitely an invasion of any potential privacy you may want. It's just too much now.

Silent Uprising - December 25, 2019, 5:19 pm

I think it is an invasion of privacy. Look at China everything is tracked it's insane. Like they have AI that knows peoples faces everywhere and tracks patterns, gives them toilet paper etc...

I bet if I went around and put cameras all over the United States to watch people there would be court cases for me to take them down.

shankfisherxd - December 25, 2019, 5:45 pm

Finally something I have first hand experience in!

So, Body Cameras are a tool used my modern day law enforcement (primarily US and Canadian LE) to help keep both police accountable and also keep everything truthful and accurate for both sides of the isle. Body cams have two primary challenges:

- 1) Body cameras violate the privacy of victims, such as domestic violence and rape victims.
- 2) Officers also have their privacy violated while wearing cameras (The AXON records constantly, but only saves 30 sec - 2 minutes prior to action button being pressed - depends on department.) -- officers using restroom, on phone with SO, etc are all recorded.

So lets break this down. In my previous experience and by reviewing thousands of hours of camera footage, i can tell you that cameras are essential to the mission of law enforcement, especially in 2019 America. For example, it is no news that officers have to use deadly force often, sometimes more often than necessary. In many of these instances, it is 1 officer against the perp, with no other witnesses. How would we know if everything occurred to standards and appropriate use of force was used if we didn't have cameras. Other instances, like the case of domestic assault victims being filmed. This is not a valid excuse. These cameras record usually constantly like I stated (department discretion) which helps have the whole situation able to be reviewed in-case an allegation occurs. i have witnessed first hand several instances in which a body cam was activated due to allegations flying and it came out the accusing was lying. There's no argument that can justify that body cams are an invasion of privacy, because if we didn't have them, victims and offenders could potentially be in more danger without them.

I will attach a video of a very very good case study of why body cams are 100% essential, regardless of any potential 'privacy invasions' that may occur. Video below is very graphpic and NSFW.

[Video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tUmMMA9LtJs>]

Grey - December 25, 2019, 5:47 pm

(Dec 25, 2019 06:45 PM)shankfisherxd Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) 2) Officers also have their privacy violated while wearing cameras (The AXON records constantly, but only saves 30 sec - 2 minutes prior to action button being pressed - depends on department.) -- officers using restroom, on phone with SO, etc are all recorded.

They're public officials. Their entire salary comes from tax dollars. If they're tasked with enforcing the law and have a common occurrence of killing people, putting a camera on their chest seems like the logical and only thing to do. I'm down to drop the body camera if we take their guns away.

shankfisherxd - December 25, 2019, 5:53 pm

(Dec 25, 2019 06:47 PM)Grey Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) They're public officials. Their entire salary comes from tax dollars. If they're tasked with enforcing the law and have a common occurrence of killing people, putting a camera on their chest seems like the logical and only thing to do. I'm down to drop the body camera if we take their guns away.

I see this post was about other LE cameras (surveillance/red light cameras) but i'll keep my original post up.

It's not that officers often kill people to kill them. With the climate of the United States (guns being accessible and a constitutional right), it is evident firearms will be used at some point. No doubt additional training can be implemented in about 50% of shootings that could of potentially stopped it. De-escalation training is big and needs to be taught more often. Unfortunately, LE in the United States (and Canada to an extent) need firearms to effectively do their jobs. The general public is less likely to respect the authority of an unarmed officer (see Community Service Officers). I was simply highlighting two different arguments people have on why cameras are potential violations of privacy. I am 100% for body cameras.

Now to address the issue of other surveillance systems. The most common used surveillance system in the US besides body cameras are red-light cameras which are cameras that take a photo of your vehicle if it is caught running a red-light. While there is some constitutional issues around this system, this is also a vital system in law enforcement.

However, systems like facial recognition and other surveillance systems used in China for example are not favorites of mine and I would say systems like these need to be under extreme scrutiny if they are going to exist. If proper safeguards and auditing is in place, then I suppose they are beneficial for law enforcement work, not political work. There would need to a structure in place that

would ensure these systems are being used to fight crime instead of being used as political leverage and weapons.

CHUZI - December 25, 2019, 5:56 pm

As long as they don't keep the footage for long enough, don't trace us, I would say I'm okay with. Cameras are everywhere, on every road, in every shop, restaurant -- at least here.

Yes it's violation of privacy to a point but there are ways to avoid and bypass these CCTVs cameras.

I don't think it's too Critical here, In china, it probably is:)

Dhoroty - December 26, 2019, 5:56 am

Where I live, public cameras improve security. There was a lot of bad people in the streets, and now there are significantly less.

(Still there are, but less).

If the security of the cameras would be better, and couldn't anyone hack it, that would be great.

spiral - December 26, 2019, 5:58 am

(Dec 25, 2019 06:47 PM)Grey Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) They're public officials. Their entire salary comes from tax dollars. If they're tasked with enforcing the law and have a common occurrence of killing people, putting a camera on their chest seems like the logical and only thing to do. I'm down to drop the body camera if we take their guns away.

even without guns, body cams should still be worn

passCODE - December 26, 2019, 6:13 am

Quote:No Federal Guidelines

The first thing that you need to know about surveillance laws is that they might vary from state to state, but there is a total lack of federal restriction. What exactly does this mean? This means that there are no federal laws that prohibit video surveillance in public place, workplaces, or elsewhere.

However, there are some exceptions to this. This usually involves areas where individuals have a reasonable expectation of complete privacy. Most of the time these locations include changing rooms, hotel rooms, bathrooms, bedrooms, and other places where individuals might disrobe.

Once again, there are even some exceptions to this rule. For instance, in Delaware and Connecticut businesses are allowed to place cameras in such area, but they have to notify their employees and customers ahead of time that there is surveillance in such places.

In my country, all public cameras places by the country/police, are there legally and it's normal to have cameras. All the cameras put by private business/people, you need to put a sign/sticker that the place is under surveillance, without the sticker or notice, it's illegal. That's why when you're entering banks, stores and other places, you can see the sticker on the door that say "Place is under surveillance".

In my opinion it's not invasion of privacy.

If you're talking about cameras that cops wear on themselves, why would that be an invasion of privacy? They need to film the contact between you and police officer, in case it escalates to court, they need to have proof of your conversation and everything else. For me it's not invasion of privacy, why would it be? Don't get yourself into the situation that you have to be arrested or whatever and you won't need to post shit like this.

Vyrkfrir - December 26, 2019, 8:20 am

One would argue yes, but I'd rather they're on to show clarity in the situation, and hopefully bring accountability to either concerned parties.

Brutality from police is unacceptable, but provocative and disrespectful behaviour towards police is abhorrent. Rarely justified, and when so - the aggression gives the cops ammo for arrest. Body cameras prevent abuse but also false claims against police.

Bossk - December 26, 2019, 8:52 am

Yes it is an invasion of privacy, but that's not a problem by itself. You gotta be pragmatic and drop the principles sometimes, public cameras have done more good than bad, eg provided useful evidence in criminal cases etc.

Vyrkfrir - December 26, 2019, 8:56 am

(Dec 26, 2019 09:52 AM)Bossk Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Yes it is an invasion of privacy, but that's not a problem by itself. You gotta be pragmatic and drop the principles sometimes, public cameras have done more good than bad, eg provided useful evidence in criminal cases etc.

I agree entirely. It's only in the rare circumstances the cameras aren't switched on (when the proof and clarity isn't produced), that cameras fail, but almost every single time the camera saves someone's ass from jail or proves misconduct of an officer, I'm sure the invasion of privacy wouldn't be brought up at all.

201497 - December 26, 2019, 9:19 am

They protect the public too.