Things for Chris to do : )

Need help finding evidence for this feedback loop argument:

<https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.09847> (there’s probably something in here, but I have yet to go through and read it)

Moreover, data suggests that predictive policing is a better predictor of police decisions than actual crimes. The disparity in crime rates between areas suggested by predictive policing models is thus the result of a feedback loop within the model itself, and is not tied to the actual likelihood of crime.

^ NEG could respond to this by saying that the feedback loop would end, as crime would eventually decrease as a result of more policing. <--how should AFF defend?

^ Yes and If this were true, then we should see this in places where PP is in use for an extended period of time. Additionally, the authors admit that the potential solutions are flawed.

“One of the most crucial assumptions we make (and one that in fact is sympathetic to current predictive policing models) is that reported and discovered incident rates track the true crime rates. There is considerable evidence that Once we remove that assumption, the analysis becomes more complicated, and while the problems of runaway feedback remain, the solutions might not continue to work. In this case, we would require better models to describe how crime rates manifest themselves in terms of reported and discovered incidents”

AT Neg Arguments:

Terrorism

PSN

Effective at reducing crime

Domestic Violence, human trafficking (NEG arguments that pp can identify potentially at-risk *victims*)

AT Aff Arguments

Police Brutality

^ This would have to have empirical data to be a good argument. We have been using PP for a long time. If there are legit empirics, you’d have to outweigh them. The increases would likely be fractional, so stopping terror would be better. Also, brutality can be addressed, so we should address it instead of losing the benefits of PP.

Support Aff Arguments:

Police Brutality

PP Violates the 4th amendment

<https://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/policing/spotlight/2016/12/02/predictive-policing-violates-more-than-protects-column/94569912/>

“The Fourth Amendment, largely prohibits unreasonable searches and seizures. Many prominent civil liberties groups such as the American Civil Liberties Union have argued that the growth of predictive policing will allow officers in the field to stop suspects under the guise of “Big Data” rather than more stringent legal standards**,** such as reasonable suspicion. An even more egregious violation of the Fourth Amendment could come through the use of social media by law enforcement to monitor the contacts of known criminals. That could easily open the door to an even larger network of people being monitored who have actually committed no crime, but are seen by law enforcement as guilty by association. How often do we "friend" or "follow" folks whose past is largely a mystery to us?”

You should be versed on Terry v Ohio

AT Sex/Human Trafficking on NEG

The StoptheTraffik app started in 2016. Is there any empirical data that this program has done anything substantive since its inception?

Compared to non PP methods is it better?

Traffic Jam (Marinus analytics) is not PP...it’s used to investigate and solve crimes that have already occured. Finding victims and criminals means that the crime has already occurred. If the topic was AI ought to be used to catch criminasl, then traffic jam would be relevant. This topic if explicitly focused on the predictive element of policing.

<https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2019/10/data-big-harness-good-human-trafficking-stop-the-traffic/>

“For example, if our findings identify a particular airline route with a high rate of child trafficking victims, the airline can respond along that specific route right away, and immediate measures can be taken to engage law enforcement before the victim reaches the designated destination.”

Again, catching the criminal and victim not predicting who the criminal would be.

This article gives you the proprietary / transparency warrant.

<https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/davlr51&div=19&id=&page=>

First, as with many significant innovations in law enforcement, predictive policing leads to concerns about transparency and oversight.27 In certain regards, transparency can be seen as a check on government. As police departments retain growing amounts of personal information and increasingly rely on tactics shaped around analysis of such data, transparency helps encourage a certain level of accountability and quality to the process.28 Additionally, transparency also creates opportunities for private sector involvement, facilitating input on improving practices or software. In general, proposals regarding public disclosure vary in reach, but largely emphasize the importance of (a) notice to individuals impacted by programs, (b) robust internal audit procedures, and (c) the opportunity for communities to be meaningfully heard, once informed of the scope of the automated program. But in order for disclosures to mean anything in practice, people need to be able to understand how this software actually works. An initial barrier here, discussed below, is the fact that private companies are reluctant to offer up their proprietary algorithms for the world (and competitors) to see.29 But even if courts or oversight bodies had access to a product’s source code or algorithmic assumptions, someone needs to be able to explain what they all mean.30 Are acceptable factors being considered? How are they being weighed? What metrics should be used to measure their efficacy? All of these open issues demonstrate the innate hurdles to oversight and the limits of transparency as a good in itself.

PP Software Companies

<https://oxfordre.com/criminology/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264079.001.0001/acrefore-9780190264079-e-508>

CompStat, PredPol, HunchLab, Strategic Subject List (SSL), Beware, Domain Awareness System (DAS), and Palantir.

These are listed as “assisting technologies” used by the programs above:

Some examples of these assisting technologies include Automatic License Plate Recognition (ALPR), Next-Generation Identification (NGI) System, the Global Positioning System (GPS), Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL), next-generation police body-worn cameras (BWC) with facial recognition and tracking functions, aerial cameras and unmanned aircraft systems, DeepFace, Persistent Surveillance Systems, Stingrays/D(i)RT-Box/International Mobile Subscriber Identity Catcher, SnapTrends that monitors and analyzes feeds on Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, Picasa, Flickr, and YouTube.

To me this kind of cuts both ways…...it is absolutely surveillance without probable cause. Any one of us might end up peripherally connected to someone and then would be surveilled without a warrant. That said, the more data points available the more accurate/effective the software becomes. So you would get security gains at the expense of privacy. Legal? End justify means?

In terms of separating PP from it’s implementation……

Water is good…...poisoned water is bad. We wouldn’t say “water” is bad just because there have been examples of water being polluted.