

Ziggy Sheynin

Mr. Ettlin

APCSP, Period 1

13 January 2020

HW 113 Article Response: Facial Recognition Technology

Article: <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/01/12/technology/facial-recognition-police.html>

- What are some of the implications of the subject of the article?

The article discusses facial recognition software used by police and other law enforcement officers. The software is fairly successful at matching clear images. It works to implicate and find people using fake IDs, or who have been captured on higher-quality cameras. However, the software falls short when it has to scan grainy security cameras or smaller portions of people's faces. Additionally, there are concerns that the software violates due process laws, which organize and regulate the process of arrests and convictions. The software is poorly regulated and can cause officers to make arrests without the proper proof. Moreover, this software has come into question with its integration into the iPhone and other supposedly secure methods of recognition. In 2016, a study determined that over half the population of the United States was in the police recognition software. This raised controversy over false positives and whether or not the software was actually accurate.

Facial recognition technology is not entirely a viable reason for conviction in court; however, most cases that have involved facial recognition technology have been convicted. The amount of scrutiny of a facial recognition match is much less than that of more precise forensic science. Facial Recognition and its backlash is largest in Florida where warrants were obtained by saying "investigative means" instead of stating that they used facial recognition software. The

number of arrests has increased due to the software and has angered many who do not wish to be discovered. Furthermore, while there have been about 400 successful convictions and recognitions with the software, the failed or misrepresented facial matches have not been recorded, so the public has no idea how accurate the software really is.

- Do you agree with the views presented?

I agree with some of the views presented. I agree with the fact that facial recognition technology needs to be refined and added to law regulation in order to maintain people's rights and due process. However, I disagree with the idea that facial recognition software is not enough probable cause for a search warrant. I think that while it may not be infallible it is relatively accurate and should give law enforcement probable cause to search someone's property as long as they have verified the images.

- What ideas would you be interested in exploring further?

I would be interested in further exploring the real accuracy or inaccuracy of facial recognition software. I would also be interested in exploring the cases where facial recognition was used to convict the accused and how, if any, the defendants tried to say the image was not them. I would also be interested in further exploring how technology has affected the world of crime and how it impacts prison overcrowding. I would be interested to see how advancements in computing innovations increase the accuracy of convictions and how it makes it more difficult for the defendants to evade conviction.

I would also be interested in exploring what images are used for facial recognition and how law enforcements receive the images that they use. Moreover, I would be interested in how facial recognition could be improved and how reliable it is on phones as security.