NIJ Award Detail: Chicago Public Schools's Connect and Redirect to Respect (CRR) Program to use social media monitoring to identify and connect youth to behavioral interventions.

Award Data and Description
Number: 2014-CK-BX-0002  Status: Open
Total Funding: $2,197,178  Fiscal Year: 2014

Description of original award: Chicago Public Schools (CPS) Check and Redirect to Respect (CRR) Program Project Abstract CPS is aware of the increasingly violent link between gangs and social media applications. Using social media, gangs can coordinate illicit activities and carry out threats leading to youth violence and unsafe schools. The district currently does not have the capacity to monitor these threats, instead relying on traditional methods of detection including observation and word of mouth referrals. Current research suggests a lack of policy knowledge and development related to social media and gangs. In order to dismantle gangs, provide intervention opportunities to redirect problem behavior, and improve school climate, the district proposes the Check and Redirect to Respect (CRR) program. Using the PathAR software, CPS will track social media posts to identify influential students who may either take part in gang activities or may be at risk for joining gangs. The district will dispatch the Chicago Police Department's Gang School Safety Team (GSST) to perform interventions drawing upon the knowledge gained of the student through monitoring. After GSST interventions, the students will either receive group or individual interventions from their school's behavioral health team. At the conclusion of the services, participating students will be equipped with the life skills to resist gang activity and reengage with their school. The CRR will take place at a total of 16 schools during Year 1, 20 schools in Year 2, and 24 schools in Year 3. The project will compare treatment schools receiving the CRR with control schools continuing to use traditional service models. The project will utilize the University of Chicago's Crime Lab, which will compare outcomes between school groupings and against baseline indicators. Armed with this knowledge, CPS will produce high quality research to identify strategies to reduce the influence of gangs and social media, establish best-practice intervention strategies, and better understand the process between initial interest in gang life and full participation. Through the CRR, CPS proposes to achieve the following outcomes: 1) decrease the incidence of high level infractions (Level 4-6 which also include violence related misconducts) by 10%, 2) decrease the incidence of out of school suspensions by 10%, 3) decrease the number of student expulsions by 10%, 4) increase the number of GSST interventions by 20%, 5) reduce student arrests by 5%, and 6) increase school climate ratings as measured by the My Voice, My School survey tool by 10%. ca/ncf
Big Paper: Building a Silent Conversation

Source: Facing History
Available at: https://www.facinghistory.org/resource-library/teaching-strategies/big-paper-silent-conversation

Rationale
This discussion strategy uses writing and silence as tools to help students explore a topic in depth. In a Big Paper discussion, students write out their responses to a stimulus, such as a quotation or historical document. This process slows down students’ thinking and gives them an opportunity to focus on the views of others. It also creates a visual record of students’ thoughts and questions that you can refer to later in a course. You can use this strategy both to engage students who are not as likely to participate in a verbal discussion and to help make sure that students who are eager to talk and listen carefully to the ideas of their classmates. After they participate in this activity several times, students’ comfort, confidence, and skill in using this method increases.

Procedure

1. Select a Stimulus for Discussion
   First, you will need to select the “stimulus”—the material that students will respond to. A stimulus might consist of questions, quotations, historical documents, excerpts from novels, poetry, or images. Groups can all be given the same stimulus for discussion, but more often they are each given a different text related to the same theme. This activity works best when students are working in pairs or triads. Each group also needs a sheet of big poster paper that can fit a written conversation and added comments. In the middle of each of these, tape or write the “stimulus” (image, quotation, excerpt, etc.) that will be used to spark the students’ discussion.

2. Prepare Students
   Inform the class that this activity will be completed in silence. All communication is done in writing. Students should be told that they will have time to speak in pairs and in the large groups later. Go over all of the instructions at the beginning so that they do not ask questions during the activity. Also, before the activity starts, the teacher should ask students if they have questions, to minimize the chance that students will interrupt the silence once it has begun. You can also remind students of their task as they begin each new step.

3. Students Comment on Their Group’s Big Paper
   Each group receives a Big Paper and each student gets a marker or pen. Some teachers have each student use a different color to make it easier to see the back-and-forth flow of a conversation. The groups read the text (or look at the image) in silence. After students have read, they are to comment on the text and ask questions of each other in writing on the Big Paper. The written conversation must start on the topic of the text but can stray wherever the students take it. If someone in the group writes a question, another member of the group should address the question by writing on the Big Paper. Students can draw lines connecting a comment to a particular question. Make sure students know that more than one of them can write on the Big Paper at the same time. The teacher can determine the length of this step, but it should be at least 15 minutes.
4. **Students Comment on Other Groups’ Big Papers**
   Still working in silence, students leave their groups and walk around reading the other Big Papers. Students bring their marker or pen with them and can write comments or further questions for thought on other Big Papers. Again, you can determine the length of time for this step based on the number of Big Papers and your knowledge of the students.

5. **Students Return to Their Group’s Big Paper Silence is broken.**
   The groups reassemble back at their own Big Paper. They should look at any new comments written by others. Now they can have a free verbal conversation about the text, their own comments, what they read on other papers, and the comments their fellow students wrote for them. At this point, you might ask students to take out their journals and identify a question or comment that stands out to them.

6. **Discuss as a Class**
   Finally, debrief the process with the large group. The conversation can begin with a simple prompt such as, “What did you learn from doing this activity?” This is the time to delve deeper into the content and use ideas on the Big Papers to draw out students’ thoughts. The discussion can also touch upon the importance and difficulty of staying silent and students’ level of comfort with this activity.

**Variations**

- **Little Paper:** With a Little Paper activity, the “stimulus” (question, excerpt, quotation, etc.) is placed in the center of a regular-sized piece of paper. Often, teachers select four to five different “stimuli” and create groups of the same size. Each student begins by commenting on the “stimulus” on his/her Little Paper. After a few minutes, each paper is passed to the student on the left (or right). This process is repeated until all students have had the opportunity to comment on every paper. All of this is done in silence, just like the Big Paper activity. Then students review the Little Paper they had first, noticing comments made by their peers. Finally, small groups have a discussion about the questions and ideas that stand out to them from this exercise.

- **Gallery Walk:** The Big Paper activity can also be structured as a [Gallery Walk](#). In this arrangement, Big Papers are taped to the walls or placed on tables, and students comment on the Big Papers in silence, at their own pace. Sometimes teachers assign students, often in pairs or triads, to a particular Big Paper and then have them switch to the next one after five or ten minutes.
Section 213 of the 2001 US PATRIOT Act
“(4) to a governmental entity, if the provider reasonably believes that an emergency involving immediate danger of death or serious physical injury to any person justifies disclosure of the information; or
“(5) to any person other than a governmental entity.”.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 121 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 2702 and inserting the following:

“2702. Voluntary disclosure of customer communications or records.”.

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR GOVERNMENT ACCESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2703 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking the section heading and inserting the following:

“§ 2703. Required disclosure of customer communications or records”; 

(B) in subsection (c) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); 

(C) in subsection (c)(1)—

(i) by striking “(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service may” and inserting “A governmental entity may require a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service to”;

(ii) by striking “covered by subsection (a) or (b) of this section) to any person other than a governmental entity.

(B) A provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service shall disclose a record or other information pertaining to a subscriber to or customer of such service (not including the contents of communications covered by subsection (a) or (b) of this section) to a governmental entity” and inserting “);”;

(iii) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as paragraph (2);

(iv) by redesigning clauses (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv) as subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D), respectively;

(v) in subparagraph (D) (as redesignated) by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(vi) by inserting after subparagraph (D) (as redesignated) the following:

“(E) seeks information under paragraph (2).”; and

(D) in paragraph (2) (as redesignated) by striking “subparagraph (B)” and insert “paragraph (1)”.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 121 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 2703 and inserting the following:

“2703. Required disclosure of customer communications or records.”.

SEC. 213. AUTHORITY FOR DELAYING NOTICE OF THE EXECUTION OF A WARRANT.

Section 3103a of title 18, United States Code, is amended—
(1) by inserting “(a) In general.—” before “In addition”; and
(2) by adding at the end the following:
“(b) Delay.—With respect to the issuance of any warrant or court order under this section, or any other rule of law, to search for and seize any property or material that constitutes evidence of a criminal offense in violation of the laws of the United States, any notice required, or that may be required, to be given may be delayed if—
“(1) the court finds reasonable cause to believe that providing immediate notification of the execution of the warrant may have an adverse result (as defined in section 2705);
“(2) the warrant prohibits the seizure of any tangible property, any wire or electronic communication (as defined in section 2510), or, except as expressly provided in chapter 121, any stored wire or electronic information, except where the court finds reasonable necessity for the seizure; and
“(3) the warrant provides for the giving of such notice within a reasonable period of its execution, which period may thereafter be extended by the court for good cause shown.”.

SEC. 214. PEN REGISTER AND TRAP AND TRACE AUTHORITY UNDER FISA.

(a) Applications and Orders.—Section 402 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1842) is amended—
(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “for any investigation to gather foreign intelligence information or information concerning international terrorism” and inserting “for any investigation to obtain foreign intelligence information not concerning a United States person or to protect against international terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities, provided that such investigation of a United States person is not conducted solely upon the basis of activities protected by the first amendment to the Constitution”; 
(2) by amending subsection (c)(2) to read as follows:
“(2) a certification by the applicant that the information likely to be obtained is foreign intelligence information not concerning a United States person or is relevant to an ongoing investigation to protect against international terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities, provided that such investigation of a United States person is not conducted solely upon the basis of activities protected by the first amendment to the Constitution.”;
(3) by striking subsection (c)(3); and
(4) by amending subsection (d)(2)(A) to read as follows:
“(A) shall specify—
“(i) the identity, if known, of the person who is the subject of the investigation;
“(ii) the identity, if known, of the person to whom is leased or in whose name is listed the telephone line or other facility to which the pen register or trap and trace device is to be attached or applied;
“(iii) the attributes of the communications to which the order applies, such as the number or other identifier, and, if known, the location of the telephone line or other facility to which the pen register or trap and trace device is to be attached or applied and,
Section 215 of the 2001 US PATRIOT Act
in the case of a trap and trace device, the geographic
limits of the trap and trace order.”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION DURING EMERGENCIES.—Section 403 of the
Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1843) is
amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “foreign intelligence
information or information concerning international terrorism”
and inserting “foreign intelligence information not concerning
a United States person or information to protect against inter-
national terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities, pro-
vided that such investigation of a United States person is
not conducted solely upon the basis of activities protected by
the first amendment to the Constitution”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “foreign intelligence
information or information concerning international terrorism”
and inserting “foreign intelligence information not concerning
a United States person or information to protect against inter-
national terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities, pro-
vided that such investigation of a United States person is
not conducted solely upon the basis of activities protected by
the first amendment to the Constitution”.

SEC. 215. ACCESS TO RECORDS AND OTHER ITEMS UNDER THE FOR-
EIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT.

Title V of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978
(50 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.) is amended by striking sections 501 through
503 and inserting the following:

“SEC. 501. ACCESS TO CERTAIN BUSINESS RECORDS FOR FOREIGN
INTELLIGENCE AND INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM INVE-
STIGATIONS.

“(a)(1) The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation
or a designee of the Director (whose rank shall be no lower than
Assistant Special Agent in Charge) may make an application for
an order requiring the production of any tangible things (including
books, records, papers, documents, and other items) for an investiga-
tion to protect against international terrorism or clandestine intel-
ligence activities, provided that such investigation of a United
States person is not conducted solely upon the basis of activities protected by
the first amendment to the Constitution.

“(2) An investigation conducted under this section shall—

“(A) be conducted under guidelines approved by the
Attorney General under Executive Order 12333 (or a successor
order); and

“(B) not be conducted of a United States person solely
upon the basis of activities protected by the first amendment
to the Constitution of the United States.

“(b) Each application under this section—

“(1) shall be made to—

“(A) a judge of the court established by section 103(a); or

“(B) a United States Magistrate Judge under chapter
43 of title 28, United States Code, who is publicly des-
ignated by the Chief Justice of the United States to have
the power to hear applications and grant orders for the
production of tangible things under this section on behalf
of a judge of that court; and
“(2) shall specify that the records concerned are sought for an authorized investigation conducted in accordance with subsection (a)(2) to obtain foreign intelligence information not concerning a United States person or to protect against international terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities.

“(c)(1) Upon an application made pursuant to this section, the judge shall enter an ex parte order as requested, or as modified, approving the release of records if the judge finds that the application meets the requirements of this section.

“(2) An order under this subsection shall not disclose that it is issued for purposes of an investigation described in subsection (a).

“(d) No person shall disclose to any other person (other than those persons necessary to produce the tangible things under this section) that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has sought or obtained tangible things under this section.

“(e) A person who, in good faith, produces tangible things under an order pursuant to this section shall not be liable to any other person for such production. Such production shall not be deemed to constitute a waiver of any privilege in any other proceeding or context.

“SEC. 502. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT.

“(a) On a semiannual basis, the Attorney General shall fully inform the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate concerning all requests for the production of tangible things under section 402.

“(b) On a semiannual basis, the Attorney General shall provide to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report setting forth with respect to the preceding 6-month period—

“(1) the total number of applications made for orders approving requests for the production of tangible things under section 402; and

“(2) the total number of such orders either granted, modified, or denied.”.

“SEC. 216. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITIES RELATING TO USE OF PEN REGISTERS AND TRAP AND TRACE DEVICES.

(a) General Limitations.—Section 3121(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “or trap and trace device” after “pen register”;
(2) by inserting “, routing, addressing,” after “dialing”; and
(3) by striking “call processing” and inserting “the processing and transmitting of wire or electronic communications so as not to include the contents of any wire or electronic communications”.

(b) Issuance of Orders.—

(1) In General.—Section 3123(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(a) In General.—

“(1) Attorney for the Government.—Upon an application made under section 3122(a)(1), the court shall enter an ex parte order authorizing the installation and use of a pen register or trap and trace device anywhere within the United States, if the court finds that the attorney for the Government
PREVENTING VIOLENT EXTREMISM IN SCHOOLS

JANUARY 2016

High school students are ideal targets for recruitment by violent extremists seeking support for their radical ideologies, foreign fighter networks, or conducting acts of targeted violence within our borders. High schools must remain vigilant in educating their students about catalysts that drive violent extremism and the potential consequences of embracing extremist beliefs.
THE ISSUE

Framing the Threat

Despite efforts to counter violent extremism, the threat continues to evolve within our borders. Extremism and acts of targeted violence continue to impact our local communities and online violent propaganda has permeated social media. Countering these prevailing dynamics requires a fresh approach that focuses on education and enhancing public safety—protecting our citizens from becoming radicalized by identifying the catalysts driving extremism.

Emerging Trends

Youth are embracing many forms of violent extremism; those perpetrated by terrorist organizations or other domestic violent extremist movements, to those maintaining biases towards others due to their race, religion, or sexual orientation. Youth aged 13 – 18 are actively engaged in extremist activities including online communication with known extremists, traveling to conflict zones, conducting recruitment activities, or supporting plotting against U.S. targets. These factors signify the potential for increased risk within our schools and local communities.

Although violent extremists are predominantly male, there are noted increases in the number of females embracing violent radical ideologies due in part to their roles becoming more defined. Extremist organizations actively seek females to fill operational roles, including carrying out attacks in the Homeland or traveling to fight—in addition to historic supportive activities such as fundraising or traveling to marry foreign fighters.

Impact on Schools

As this threat evolves and more youth embrace extremist ideologies, it places a growing burden on our educational system to provide appropriate services to students who view hatred or targeted violence as acceptable outlets for their grievances. To complicate matters, youth possess inherent risk factors making them susceptible to violent extremist ideologies or possible recruitment. A current body of research on developmental behaviors, which is discussed later in this guide, suggests that a youth’s risk factors and stressors, if not properly addressed through personal actions or third-party intervention, can lead to negative outcomes in the form of suicide or violence against others.

Our educators are in a unique position to affect change, impart affirmative messaging, or facilitate intervention activities due to their daily interactions with students. These interactions allow for observing and assessing concerning behaviors and communications—students embracing extremist ideologies and progressing on a trajectory toward violence.
Executive Order Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States

Issued on: January 27, 2017

Section 1. Purpose. The visa-issuance process plays a crucial role in detecting individuals with terrorist ties and stopping them from entering the United States. Perhaps in no instance was that more apparent than the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, when State Department policy prevented consular officers from properly scrutinizing the visa applications of several of the 19 foreign nationals who went on to murder nearly 3,000 Americans. And while the visa-issuance process was reviewed and amended after the September 11 attacks to better detect would-be terrorists from receiving visas, these measures did not stop attacks by foreign nationals who were admitted to the United States.

Numerous foreign-born individuals have been convicted or implicated in terrorism-related crimes since September 11, 2001, including foreign nationals who entered the United States after receiving visitor, student, or employment visas, or who entered through the United States refugee resettlement program. Deteriorating conditions in certain countries due to war, strife, disaster, and civil unrest increase the likelihood that terrorists will use any means possible to enter the United States. The United States must be vigilant during the visa-issuance process to ensure that those approved for admission do not intend to harm Americans and that they have no ties to terrorism.

In order to protect Americans, the United States must ensure that those admitted to this country do not bear hostile attitudes toward it and its founding principles. The United States cannot, and should not, admit those who do not support the Constitution, or those who would place violent ideologies over American law. In addition, the United States should not admit those who engage in acts of bigotry or hatred (including “honor” killings, other forms of violence against women, or the persecution of those who practice religions different from their own) or those who would oppress Americans of any race, gender, or sexual orientation.
Anti-Sharia Law Bills in the United States

**Source:** Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC)

**Available at:** [https://www.splcenter.org/hatewatch/2018/02/05/anti-sharia-law-bills-united-states](https://www.splcenter.org/hatewatch/2018/02/05/anti-sharia-law-bills-united-states)

Since 2010, 201 anti-Sharia law bills have been introduced in 43 states. In 2017 alone, 14 states introduced an anti-Sharia law bill, with Texas and Arkansas enacting the legislation.

![Anti-Sharia Law Bills in the United States](chart)

One of the most successful far-right conspiracies to achieve mainstream viability, the mass hysteria surrounding a so-called threat of “Sharia law” in the United States is largely the work of anti-Muslim groups such as the American Freedom Law Center and ACT for America (ACT), an SPLC-designated hate group. In June, so-called “anti-Sharia” rallies organized by ACT were held across the country and attracted white nationalists, armed right-wing militias and even neo-Nazis.

David Yerushalmi, the father of the anti-Sharia movement, serves as co-founder of the American Freedom Law Center (AFLC) and General Counsel of the Center for Security Policy. AFLC has pushed its initiative, American Laws for American Courts (ALAC, principally authored by Yerushalmi, since 2010. Politicians in just eight states have not joined this concerted project of stoking fear of Islam. Guy Rodgers, the former executive director of ACT for America, the largest grassroots anti-Muslim group in the country, concedes that there is no real influence of Islam in courts but says, “Before the train gets too far down the tracks it’s time to put up the block.”

The majority of anti-Sharia legislation introduced across the country incorporates the American Laws for American Courts model legislation published on the American Public Policy Alliance’s (APPA) website. This sort of language typically includes a clause
prohibiting foreign law in American courts where it would result in a conflict with rights guaranteed by the constitution of the state or the United States. This legislation is totally useless — the U.S. Constitution already expressly denies authority to any foreign law. In fact, Yerushalmi himself admits:

*If this thing passed in every state without any friction, it would have not served its purpose. The purpose was heuristic — to get people asking this question, ‘What is Sharia?’*

**What is “Sharia law”?**
The term “Sharia law” is a misnomer because sharia is not actually a law or a universally-defined legal code, but a set of guiding principles to living a moral life set out in the Quran. Many representatives, in their introduction of anti-“Sharia law” bills, mention the “invasion” of ‘sharia law’ and the urgent need to stop it from entering American courts.

Upon further inspection of Yerushalmi’s campaign to create a fear of Sharia, it is not so far fetched that the general public is falling for it. The SPLC has previously documented the problematic findings of simple Google searches such as, “what is sharia,” and “sharia and the us constitution.” Anti-Muslim propaganda represent the majority of the findings.

Similar to other religious scriptures, sharia may be considered in court matters (although rarely and infrequently), including family disputes and torts with foreign countries, but federal and state laws always take precedence. Still, Yerushalmi has drafted several iterations of anti-Sharia bills. In 2006, he drafted anti-Sharia legislation with his organization, Society of Americans for National Existence (SANE), which stated:

*“It shall be a felony punishable by 20 years in prison to knowingly act in furtherance of, or to support the, adherence to Shari’a.”*

Speaking on the topic of Muslims, he added:

*The Mythical ‘moderate’ Muslim ... the Muslim who embraces traditional Islam but wants a peaceful coexistence with the West, is effectively non-existent.*

However, in 2010, a judge in New Jersey made an error in his interpretation of this diverse religious legal tradition, and Yerushalmi has exploited this to serve his larger anti-Muslim movement ever since.

In 2010, a Moroccan Muslim woman, who entered into an arranged marriage with her Moroccan Muslim husband just two months before, asked for a restraining order against him, alleging he had been raping her. The husband allegedly said he didn’t believe he was doing anything wrong because they were married and “this is according to our religion.” The New Jersey judge did not grant the restraining order, citing lack of criminal intent.
The New Jersey Appellate Court reversed the decision shortly after, recognizing that the consideration of religious beliefs is not applicable without the authorization of American law. In other words, the U.S. Constitution prevents any foreign law from primarily being used in the United States.

Nevertheless, the anti-Sharia movement led by Yerushalmi, AFLC, APPA and other anti-Muslim organizations have taken advantage of this overruled decision in their *American Laws for American Courts* initiative instead of learning from the short-lived mistake of one New Jersey judge.

**The harm of anti-Sharia legislation**

“Anti-Sharia” bills are rarely explicitly labeled as such. Most legislators include the phrase ‘foreign law,’ and present bills as the solution to a larger influence of all foreign countries and religions. However, APPA explicitly says this legislation was created, “to protect American citizens’ constitutional rights against the infiltration and incursion of foreign laws and foreign legal doctrines, especially Islamic Sharia Law.”

It is not just the drafting of this legislation that is problematic, but also that anti-Muslim organizations are working directly with legislators to pass this sort of bill. With entities like ACT and Center for Security Policy on the frontlines of this movement, they are also heavily increasing anti-Muslim rhetoric.

The rise in legislation and anti-Muslim rhetoric within state legislatures is not without consequence for Muslim communities. In fact, hate crimes against Muslims increased by 67 percent according to FBI statistics released in 2015. In March, three Muslim students attempted to visit Rep. John Bennett in the State Capitol in Oklahoma City. Before meeting with them, Bennett insisted they fill out a questionnaire about Islam which included questions like, “The Koran, the sunna of Mohammed and Sharia Law of all schools say that the husband can beat his wife. Do you agree with him?”

Experts including professors, attorneys, politicians, and the American Bar Association (ABA) have been quick to denounce anti-Sharia law bills. In response to an uptick in anti-“Sharia law” bills introduced in 2010 and 2011, the ABA published a formal letter of dissent, saying in part:

"*The American Bar Association opposes federal or state laws that impose blanket prohibitions on consideration or use by courts or arbitral tribunals of the entire body of law or doctrine of a particular religion,*” adding, “...*American courts will not apply Sharia or other rules (real or perceived) that are contrary to our public policy, including, for instance, rules that are incompatible with our notions of gender equality.*"

The ABA further discussed the concerns of highly publicizing this type of legislation. The mass hysteria created by these organizations and further perpetuated by politicians at state and federal levels, is alarming. The misconstrued understanding of both Sharia and the United States constitution by these groups has sought to create an actionable
goal of exterminating Islam. Some states, including Tennessee, have explicitly named ‘Sharia organizations’ and Muslims, the enemy.

“The threat from sharia-based jihad and terrorism presents a real and present danger to the lawful governance of this state and to the peaceful enjoyment of citizenship by the residents of this state;” adding, it further authorizes the attorney general to designate “Sharia organizations,” defined as “two (2) or more persons conspiring to support, or acting in concert in support of, sharia or in furtherance of the imposition of sharia within any state or territory of the United States. Anyone who provides material support or resources to a designated Sharia organization could be charged with a felony and face up to 15 years in jail.”

Driven by hate groups, the ALAC initiative has created unfounded fear, and has sought to demonize Islam and American Muslims across the nation through legislation and rhetoric.

This post was last updated in January 2018.
Politics
The Patriot Act: Key Controversies
by Larry Abramson and Maria Godoy

Feb. 14, 2006 -- The USA Patriot Act seems headed for long-term renewal. Key senators have reached a deal with the White House that allays the civil liberties concerns of some critics of the law.

Passed in the weeks after the Sept. 11 attacks, the law expanded the government's powers in anti-terrorism investigations. Controversial surveillance provisions were set to expire at the end of last year; attempts to re-authorize them long-term were filibustered last December. The compromise reached last week, which has the support of both House Speaker Dennis Hastert and Senate Minority Leader Harry Reid, makes three major changes to the law:

1 - Recipients of court-approved subpoenas for information in terrorism investigations now have the right to challenge a requirement that they refrain from telling anyone. However, recipients must wait a year before challenging the gag order.
2 - The second change concerns recipients of a so-called National Security Letter, which is an administrative subpoena issued by the FBI demanding records. Recipients will no longer be required to tell the FBI the name of any attorney consulted about the letter.
3 - Most libraries -- those that act in traditional roles, such as lending books and providing Internet access -- will not be subject to National Security Letters demanding information about suspected terrorists. However, libraries that act as an Internet Service Provider will still be subject to National Security Letters.

Below, NPR examines the act's most controversial provisions:

**Information Sharing**

Sec. 203(b) and (d): Allows information from criminal probes to be shared with intelligence agencies and other parts of the government. Expires Dec. 31.

Pro: Supporters say the provisions have greatly enhanced information sharing within the FBI, and with the intelligence community at large.

Con: Critics warn that unrestricted sharing could lead to the development of massive databases about citizens who are not the targets of criminal investigations.

**Roving Wiretaps**

Sec. 206: Allows one wiretap authorization to cover multiple devices, eliminating the need for separate court authorizations for a suspect's cell phone, PC and Blackberry, for example. Expires Dec. 31.

Pro: The government says roving wiretaps are needed to deal with technologically sophisticated terrorists.

Con: Critics say the language of the act could lead to privacy violations of anyone who comes into casual contact with a suspect.

**Access to Records**


Pro: The provision allows investigators to obtain books, records, papers, documents and other items sought "in connection with" a terror investigation.

Con: Critics attack the breadth of the provision, saying the law could be used to demand the reading records of library or bookstore patrons.

---

### Foreign Intelligence Wiretaps and Searches

**Sec. 218:** Lowers the bar for launching foreign intelligence wiretaps and searches. **Expire Dec. 31.**

**Pro:** Allows investigators to get a foreign intelligence wiretap or search order, even if they end up bringing criminal charges instead.

**Con:** Because foreign intelligence probes are conducted in secret, with little oversight, critics say abuses could be difficult to uncover.

[Read more »](https://www.npr.org/news/specials/patriotact/patriotactprovisions.html)

### “Sneak & Peek” Warrants

**Sec. 213:** Allows “Sneak and peek” search warrants, which let authorities search a home or business without immediately notifying the target of a probe. **Does not expire.**

**Pro:** Supporters say this provision has already allowed investigators to search the houses of drug dealers and other criminals without providing notice that might have jeopardized an investigation.

**Con:** Critics say the provision allows the use of “sneak and peek” warrants for even minor crimes, not just terror and espionage cases.

[Read more »](https://www.npr.org/news/specials/patriotact/patriotactprovisions.html)

### Material Support

**Sec. 805:** Expands the existing ban on giving “material support” to terrorists to include “expert advice or assistance.” **Does not expire.**

**Pro:** Supporters say it helps cut off the support networks that make terrorism possible.

**Con:** Critics say the provision could lead to guilt by association.

[Read more »](https://www.npr.org/news/specials/patriotact/patriotactprovisions.html)

### The ‘Lone Wolf’ Provision

Section 6001 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 allows intelligence investigations of lone terrorists not connected to a foreign nation or organization.

While not part of the Patriot Act, this provision also sunsets on Dec. 31 and is under review. Civil liberties groups say the provision could sweep in protesters and those suspected of involvement in domestic terrorism. Language passed by the Senate Intelligence Committee would make this section permanent.

### Information Sharing

Sections 203(b) and 203(d) of the Patriot Act are at the heart of the effort to break down the "wall" that used to separate criminal and intelligence investigations. The Justice Department has frequently blamed the wall for the failure to find and detain Sept. 11 hijackers Nawaf al-Hazmi and Khalid al-Midhar prior to the attacks. CIA agents had information that both men were in the United States and were suspected terrorists, but the FBI says it did not receive that information until August 2001.

U.S. officials also blame the wall for the failure to fully investigate Zacarias Moussaoui, who has since pleaded guilty in connection with the Sept. 11 plot. The government says that existing procedures made investigators afraid of sharing information between the intelligence and criminal sides of the probe.

Supporters say these provisions have greatly enhanced information sharing within the FBI, and with the intelligence community at large.

Civil libertarians say the failure to share information was largely a result of incompetence and misunderstanding of the law. They say investigators were always allowed to share grand jury information, which is specifically authorized by this section. They warn that the scope of the Patriot Act language is far too broad and encourages unlimited sharing of information, regardless of the need.

Critics say that investigators should have to explain why information is being shared, and that only information related to terrorism or espionage should be released. They warn that unrestricted sharing could lead to the development of massive databases about innocent citizens.

« Back to top

### Roving Wiretaps

The Justice Department has long complained about restrictions that required separate court authorizations for each device used by the target of an investigation, whether it’s a computer terminal, a cell phone or a Blackberry. This provision of the Patriot Act specifically allows "roving wiretaps" against

[Read more »](https://www.npr.org/news/specials/patriotact/patriotactprovisions.html)
suspected spies and terrorists. The government says it has long had this type of flexibility in criminal cases, and that such authority is needed in dealing with technologically sophisticated terrorists.

Surveillance experts point out, however, that criminal wiretaps must "ascertain" whether the person under investigation is going to be using the device before the tap takes place. Civil liberties groups say the language of the Patriot Act could lead to privacy violations of anyone who comes into casual contact with the suspect. They want Congress to require investigators to specify just which device is going to be tapped, or that the suspect be clearly identified, in order to protect the innocent from unwarranted snooping.

Access to Records

Probably the most hotly debated provision of the law, Section 215 has come to be known as the "libraries provision," even though it never mentions libraries or bookstores. Civil liberties groups attack the breadth of this section -- which allows investigators to obtain "any tangible thing (including books, records, papers, documents and other items)," as long as the records are sought "in connection with" a terror investigation.

Library groups said the law could be used to demand the reading records of patrons. But the government points out that the First Amendment activities of Americans are specifically protected by the law. The Justice Department has released previously classified statistics to show the law has never been used against libraries or bookstores. But the act's critics argue that there's no protection against future abuse.

Civil liberties groups have proposed numerous amendments: special protections for libraries and bookstores; a requirement that investigators explain the reason the records are sought; and an end to the "gag rule" that prohibits people who receive a 215 order from talking about it with anyone. The Justice Department has agreed that recipients can consult with an attorney and is open to an amendment that specifies this right. But the government says the controversy over this provision is an overreaction, and that this section merely expands longstanding access to certain business records.

Foreign Intelligence Wiretaps and Searches

Criminal investigators have a high bar to reach when asking for permission to wiretap or search a suspect's home. The bar is lower in counterterror or counterintelligence probes, where investigators must only prove the suspect is an "agent of a foreign power." Previously, investigators had to show that the "primary purpose" of the order was to gather foreign intelligence; the Patriot Act lowered that requirement to a "significant purpose." The government said this change takes away another brick in "the wall" separating criminal and intelligence probes: It allows investigators to get a foreign intelligence wiretap or search order, even though they might end up bringing criminal charges.

Civil liberties groups insist that "the wall" rose up through misunderstandings, and that there was no hard barrier against launching a criminal probe against someone being investigated as a spy or terrorist. They point to a 2002 ruling by the Foreign Intelligence Court of Review that buttresses this point.

But critics say the Patriot Act creates a new risk in Section 218 – that investigators will too easily use spying and terrorism as an excuse for launching foreign intelligence wiretaps and searches. They point to the fact that the number of intelligence wiretaps now exceeds the number of criminal taps. Since these probes are conducted in secret, with little oversight, abuses could be difficult to uncover. Civil liberties groups say one antidote would be to require that the Justice Department release more information about foreign intelligence investigations.

“Sneak & Peek” Warrants

This section allows for "delayed notice" of search warrants, which means the FBI can search a home or business without immediately notifying the target of the investigation. The Justice Department says this provision has already allowed investigators to search the houses of drug dealers and other criminals without providing notice that might have jeopardized an investigation. Investigators still have to explain why they want to delay notice, and must eventually tell the target about the search.

Critics say that investigators already had the power to conduct secret searches in counterterror and counterspaniong probes. The Patriot Act, they say, authorized the use of this technique for any crime, no matter how minor. They say that "sneak and peek" searches should be narrowly limited to cases in which an investigation would be seriously jeopardized by immediate notice. Legislation to cut off funding for such searches passed the House in 2003. However, this provision does not face a sunset as other controversial provisions do, so it may be harder for opponents to amend it.
Material Support

The antiterrorism law passed in 1996, in the aftermath of the Oklahoma City bombing, outlawed providing "material support" to foreign terrorist organizations, and expanded the definition of support to include "personnel" and "training." Section 805 of the Patriot Act extended that ban to "expert advice or assistance."

The Justice Department has said this expansion is critical to cutting off the networks of support that make terrorism possible. But many legal scholars -- and even some judges -- contend the provision is vague. They say it will lead to guilt by association and might criminalize unwitting contact with a terrorist group.

Opponents also argue that it stifles free speech, by raising fears that any charitable contribution could somehow be linked to a terrorist group by the Justice Department, and then construed as "material support." Courts have differed on the constitutionality of these efforts to cut off the "lifeblood" of terrorism. Some have ruled they are unconstitutionally vague, others have upheld these laws. In response, Congress tried to tighten the definitions in the 2004 Intelligence Reform and Terror Prevention Act. But the language in that law is also being challenged in court.

Full List of Patriot Act Provisions Expiring on Dec. 31, 2005
Rauner halts Syrian refugees in Illinois, joins wave of governors

Photo gallery: Terrorist attacks in Paris on Nov. 13, 2015, killed 129 people. The deadly assaults led to mourning, global displays of support and a military response from France.

By Monique Garcia, Tony Briscoe and Rick Pearson
Chicago Tribune

Gov. Rauner puts temporary halt to accepting new Syrian refugees in Illinois

Gov. Bruce Rauner on Monday joined a wave of mostly Republican governors in announcing that Illinois would temporarily stop accepting Syrian refugees following the Paris terrorist attacks, sparking sharp criticism from advocates who said the move amounted to fear-mongering and raising questions about whether states can refuse to take those fleeing the war-torn country.
The move by at least 21 governors marks a turn in public opinion on the crisis, which tugged at people's heartstrings in September when a photo of a drowned Syrian toddler surfaced, but has shifted somewhat after the Paris attacks. Authorities have suggested at least one of the attackers entered Europe amid the recent influx of migrants from Syria.

Rauner, who's in his first year as governor of the nation's fifth-largest state, said a pause was needed.

"Our nation and our state have a shared history of providing safe haven for those displaced by conflict, but the news surrounding the Paris terror attacks reminds us of the all-too-real security threats facing America," Rauner said in a statement. "We must find a way to balance our tradition as a state welcoming of refugees while ensuring the safety and security of our citizens."

Rauner said his office will "consider all of our legal options" and wants a review of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's acceptance and security processes. But refugee advocates questioned how governors would enforce bans after the federal government grants entry.

"How are they going to go about doing this? Are they going to send marshals to the airport and be on the lookout for anyone who looks Syrian?" asked Lavinia Limon, president and CEO of the U.S. Committee for Refugees and Immigration, which helps place refugees in their new homes. "They are really reacting emotionally, and talk about stereotyping."

Under the Refugee Act of 1980, the authority for admitting refugees is granted to the president, but states are relied upon to supply support in the form of housing, medical and other assistance. Advocates say the law does not give states the ability to turn away refugees, though Rauner's office argues federal law does provide the state an ability to "evaluate and revise the extent of their involvement in these programs at any time."

Rauner's office did not respond to questions about what specific services for refugees the state may discontinue, but cautioned "this is a review only."

It can take two or more years for U.S. officials to process Middle Eastern refugees' applications for resettlement. Most applicants are referred to the U.S. and other countries that have agreed to accept them by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Each applicant undergoes medical exams, a security check and an in-person interview with immigration officers at Homeland Security.

According to the State Department, 169 Syrian refugees have relocated to Illinois since 2010, including 105 living in Chicago. The majority — 131 — have moved within the last year.

RefugeeOne, a resettlement agency, is expected to welcome two refugee families from Syria after Thanksgiving weekend, according to Kim Snoddy, assistant director of development. The group, which provides refugee families a furnished apartment and cupboards filled with culturally appropriate food, already had gathered to look to their national partners for answers on the
"We had received notification of their arrival and were preparing an apartment for them," Snoddy said. "Now, we're not sure if we'll have to reschedule. It's all so new and surprising."

Homeland Security spokeswoman Marsha Catron said the Obama administration "remains steadfastly committed" to plans to admit 10,000 Syrian refugees. Catron said the administration will "continue to consult with states to allay any concerns" but that the focus was on admitting the most vulnerable, including survivors of violence and torture.

Obama addressed the issue Monday at the end of a global summit in Turkey, noting many refugees are victims of terrorism themselves.

"That's what they're fleeing," Obama said. "Our nations can welcome refugees who are desperately seeking safety and ensure our own security. We can and must do both."

In addition to Rauner, governors saying they won't accept Syrian refugees include those in Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, Florida, Indiana, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire and Texas. A dozen or so states with Democratic governors that stood by admitting Syrian refugees included California, Colorado, Missouri and Pennsylvania.

The issue is unfolding amid a presidential campaign in which Donald Trump, at or near the top in some polls, has fueled his bid for the Republican nomination by taking a hard — if controversial — line against illegal immigration based on fear of crime.

But U.S. Rep. Randy Hultgren, a Republican from St. Charles, warned that terrorists are not limited to people entering the country from Syria.

"There is well-documented evidence that the Islamic State is targeting religious minorities including Yazidis and Christians for extermination in the Middle East. We have not and cannot turn a blind eye to their plight," Hultgren said in a statement.

"Gov. Rauner has temporarily suspended Illinois accepting refugees from Syria out of a necessary abundance of caution. Unfortunately, terrorists come from all over — the diversity of prisoners at Guantanamo Bay is a testament to the breadth of countries from which they originate," Hultgren added.

Republican U.S. Sens. Mark Kirk of Illinois and Kelly Ayotte of New Hampshire took the lead on a letter from concerned senators to Obama urging that his administration "ensure that no members, supporters or sympathizers" of Islamic State infiltrate Syrian refugee movements to enter the U.S. Specifically, the letter asked the administration to detail what "special or enhanced measures" will be added to screen Syrian refugees.

Meanwhile, Democratic U.S. Senate hopeful Andrea Zopp criticized the move as an "another example of Gov.
Mayor Rahm Emanuel, who was Obama's first White House chief of staff, stopped short of directly criticizing Rauner. Instead, the mayor pointed out that the federal government performs background checks on refugees before they get here and said the U.S. has a history as a welcoming place for people fleeing trouble elsewhere in the world.

At the same time, Emanuel said he will go ahead with plans he already made to attend a Dec. 4 climate change summit in Paris. Standing alongside French Consul General Vincent Floreani, Emanuel said Paris Mayor Anne Hidalgo invited him to attend the summit when the two met during his trip there this summer.

"Given recent acts, I was going to announce it a week from now, but I wanted to announce it today to make sure those who thought you could weaken or somehow sow fear, that is not the result here," Emanuel said. "In fact, if anything, it strengthens our resolve to be a sense of fraternity and camaraderie with the people of Paris at this moment."

But while the world is coming to the support of Paris, Syrian refugees face the welcome mat being pulled from beneath their feet.

Suzanne Akhras Sahloul, who moved to the Chicago area from Syria about 30 years ago and founded the nonprofit Syrian Community Network to assist the anticipated surge in refugee families, recounted one conversation with a refugee.

"She asked, 'Why are they doing this? What did we do? We just want to live,'" Akhras Sahloul said. "It's difficult for them, this sense of being unwelcome."

_Chicago Tribune's John Byrne and the Los Angeles Times contributed._
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Justice Department and City of Des Plaines, Illinois Settle Lawsuit over Alleged RLUIPA Violations

June 6, 2017

Source: US Department of Justice
Available at: https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/justice-department-and-city-des-plaines-illinois-settle-lawsuit-over-alleged-rluipa

The Justice Department today announced an agreement with the City of Des Plaines, Illinois, to resolve allegations that the City violated the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act of 2000 (RLUIPA) when it denied a rezoning application to allow The Society of American Bosnians and Herzegovinans (SABAH), a Bosnian Muslim religious organization, to use a vacant building as a mosque.

The agreement resolves a lawsuit the Department filed in September 2015, after conducting an investigation into the City’s zoning and land use practices. A separate agreement resolving a similar lawsuit brought by SABAH has also been reached.

The United States’ complaint alleged that the City discriminated against SABAH on the basis of religion or religious denomination by treating land use applications by non-Muslim religious groups better than it treated SABAH’s on the basis of parking requirements and tax-exempt status, and that the City departed from its normal practices and procedures in the treatment and denial SAHAB’s request. The United States also alleged that the City’s denial imposed a substantial burden on SABAH’s religious exercise without serving a compelling governmental interest using the least restrictive means and that the City treated SAHAH on less than equal terms with similarly situated nonreligious groups, including a school and cultural center.

On February 26, 2017, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois ruled that the United States’ claims should proceed to trial, and found that the City misapplied its zoning laws by imposing higher parking standards on SABAH than on non-Muslim religious groups, and that the City did not use the least restrictive means to address purported concerns it had with SABAH’s request.

As part of the agreement, the City of Des Plaines will abide by RLUIPA in its determinations involving religious land use requests, and has agreed to provide training on the requirements of RLUIPA to its officials and employees, and to publicize its non-discrimination policies, among other remedial measures.

“Religious freedom is a fundamental right that belongs to all persons and religious groups in the United States,” said Acting Assistant Attorney General Tom Wheeler of the Justice Department’s Civil Rights Division. “The Department of Justice’s Civil Rights Division will remain vigilant in its enforcement of federal law protecting the rights of religious communities to build and use property for religious worship.”

“Religious freedom is a fundamental right, and we will not tolerate the unlawful use of zoning or land use restrictions to infringe on that right,” said Joel R. Levin, Acting U.S. Attorney of the Northern District of Illinois. “The U.S. Attorney’s Office will continue to safeguard the rights of religious groups to establish houses of worship without fear of discriminatory zoning or land use practices.

RLUIPA prohibits discrimination on the basis of religion in land use and zoning decisions. Persons who believe they have been subjected to such discrimination in land use or zoning decisions may contact the U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights Division at (800) 896-7743 and, in the Northern District of Illinois, they may also call the Unite States Attorney’s Office of Civil Rights Hotline at (855) 281-3339.
Even after the identification of the Boston bombing suspects through grainy security-camera images, officials say that blanketing a city in surveillance cameras can create as many problems as it solves.

A network of cameras on city streets and other public spaces increases the chances of capturing a criminal on video but can generate an overwhelming amount of evidence to sift through. The cameras make some people feel more secure, knowing that bad guys are being watched. But privacy advocates and other citizens are uneasy with the idea that Big Brother is monitoring their every public move.

Meanwhile, facial-recognition software and other technologies are making security-camera images more valuable to law enforcement. Now, software can automatically mine surveillance footage for information, such as a specific person’s face, and create a giant searchable database.

After last week’s bombings at the Boston Marathon, authorities had to sift through a mountain of footage from government surveillance cameras, private security cameras and imagery shot by bystanders on smartphones. It took the FBI only three days to release blurry shots of the two suspects, taken by a department store’s cameras.

Compare their quick turnaround with the 2005 London bombings, when it took thousands of investigators weeks to parse the city’s CCTV (closed-circuit television) footage after the attacks. The cameras, software and algorithms have come a long way in eight years.

Cities under surveillance
In major cities, in the age of terrorism, someone is almost always watching.

The cameras used in London are part of the city’s extensive and sophisticated "Ring of Steel" surveillance system that combines nearly a half million cameras, roadblocks and license plate readers to monitor the heart of the city. Set up in 1998, the system is one of the most advanced in the world and allows authorities to track anyone going into or out of central London.
Many residents question the effectiveness of London’s system, however. In 2008, only one crime was solved for every 1,000 cameras, according to the city’s police. CCTV cameras across Britain also cost authorities nearly $800 million over the past four years, according to civil liberties group Big Brother Watch.

Modeled after London’s system, New York’s Lower Manhattan Security Initiative monitors 4,000 security cameras and license plate readers south of Canal Street. The project uses feeds from both private and public security cameras, which are all monitored 24 hours a day by the NYPD.

Using face and object-detection technology, the police can track cars and people moving through 1.7 square miles in lower Manhattan and even detect unattended packages. The $150 million initiative also includes a number of radiation detectors and automatic roadblocks that can be used to stop traffic in an emergency.

Boston's camera network is smaller than those in London and New York, though that is likely to change soon. In 2007, Boston law enforcement had an estimated 55 CCTV cameras set up around the city. Since then, the city has expanded its surveillance system, though authorities there are not commenting on the exact scope of the current camera setup.

Boston's example has shown the power of these systems to help solve crimes, causing many to call for even more cameras. But it’s still not clear whether they are effective at preventing crimes. According to the Surveillance Studies Centre at Queen's University in Ontario, urban surveillance systems have not been proven to have any effect on deterring criminals.

Facial recognition
As the volume and quality of cameras and sensors are ramped up, cities are turning to more advanced face- and object-recognition software to makes sense of the data.

"We describe what's in the video, and we store that in a database," said Al Shipp, CEO of San Francisco-based 3VR, one of several companies that makes this type of facial-recognition technology.

The company's first investor was In-Q-Tel, the CIA's venture-capital arm, which finds and funds promising security-related technology. Now, 3VR works with federal and local law enforcement agencies, as well as private companies and banks.

Its software can identify objects by shape, size and color. It can read license plates and recognize cars. When it comes to people, it can detect their gender, approximate age, mood and other demographic information. Using multiple cameras, it can track their patterns and some behaviors. It automatically zooms in on any person's face and identifies them based on things like the distance between their eyes or the shape of their nose.
All that information is stored in a database. Big clues that would take a traditional investigator untold hours of watching video to uncover can be found with a 15-second search query.

For example, they could do a search for anyone who entered a 7-Eleven store between 8 and 11 p.m. on a specific night, pull up the times that certain cars have entered and left a parking lot, or ask for images of every person who has entered a certain building over the past year.

"It instantaneously gives you a picture of everybody who has walked in the door in the past based on the geometries of their face," Shipp said.

Privacy concerns
Civil-liberties activists are concerned about how this technology could be abused. With cameras in far-flung cities all connecting to the same database, a person's movements can be tracked across states or continents. For example, it could be used to single out a person attending multiple political protests.

"We like to think we have some privacy in our lives, that we can go places that we don't necessarily want the government to know about," said Jennifer Lynch, an attorney at the Electronic Frontier Foundation, an Internet civil-liberties group. "What concerns me is if all of those cameras get linked together at some point, and if we apply facial recognition on the back end, we'll be able to track people wherever they go."

For now, many of the biometrics databases in the United States are still separated. Some are scattered across various federal and local government agencies, and connecting them will take time and big budgets. The FBI is in the process of building out its own facial-recognition database and is working with state DMVs to access their photos.

It's less likely the government will be able to tap into private databases anytime soon, but it's still a cause for concern down the line, privacy advocates say. Facebook has the largest facial-recognition database in the world, a potentially rich vein of data for any government agency.

Another worry is the misidentification of suspects. Shipp acknowledges that these systems can make mistakes but says the computers aren't there to take over for humans but to assist investigators by weeding out useless information.

"The cameras themselves are not a panacea. They're not going to solve the problem. It's one of the steps," he said.

But at least one prominent tech blogger thinks the benefits of surveillance cameras outweigh our fears about privacy.

"The idea of submitting to constant monitoring feels wrong, nearly un-American, to most of us. Cameras in the sky are the ultimate manifestation of Big Brother -- way for
the government to watch you all the time, everywhere,” Farhad Manjoo wrote last week in Slate.

But Manjoo thinks we need to be thinking about ways to make cameras work for us, not reasons to abolish them.

"When you weigh cameras against other security measures, they emerge as the least costly and most effective choice. In the aftermath of 9/11, we've turned most public spaces into fortresses -- now, it's impossible for you to get into tall buildings, airports, many museums, concerts, and even public celebrations without being subjected to pat-downs and metal detectors. When combined with competent law enforcement, surveillance cameras are more effective, less intrusive, less psychologically draining, and much more pleasant than these alternatives."
Here are three topics much in the news these days: Prism, the surveillance program of the national security agency; the death of Trayvon Martin; and Google Glass and the rise of wearable computers that record everything.

Although these might not seem connected, they are part of a growing move for, or against, a surveillance society.

On one side of this issue we have people declaring that too much surveillance, especially in the form of wearable cameras and computers, is detrimental and leaves people without any privacy in public. On the other side there are people who argue that a society with cameras everywhere will make the world safer and hold criminals more accountable for their actions.

But it leaves us with this one very important question: Do we want to live in a surveillance society that might ensure justice for all, yet privacy for none?

In the case of Mr. Martin, an unarmed black teenager who was fatally shot by George Zimmerman, a neighborhood watch volunteer, the most crucial evidence about how an altercation between the two began — one that ultimately led to Mr. Martin’s death — came down to Mr. Zimmerman’s word.

As the trial showed, eyewitness accounts all differed. One neighbor who was closest to the altercation saw a “lighter-skinned” man on the bottom during a fight that ensued. Two other neighbors believed that Mr. Zimmerman was on top during the fight. One said she saw the man on top walk away after the fight.
Clearly the memory of one or all of those neighbors had been spoiled by time, confusion and adrenaline. But if one of those witnesses — including Mr. Martin or Mr. Zimmerman — had been wearing Google Glass or another type of personal recording device, the facts of that night might have been much clearer.

“Whenever something mysterious happens we ask: ‘Why can’t we hit rewind? Why can’t we go to the database?’” said Jay Stanley, a senior policy analyst with the American Civil Liberties Union in Washington. “We want to follow the data trail and know everything that we need to know. The big question is: Who is going to be in control of that recording and data?”

Prism, the highly secretive government program that was brought to light last month by a government whistleblower, is an example of a much larger scale of recording and data. President Obama has defended the government’s spying programs, saying they help in the fight against terrorists and ensure that Americans stay safe.

But critics say it goes too far. Representative James Sensenbrenner, the longtime Republican lawmaker from Wisconsin, compared today’s government surveillance to “Big Brother” from the George Orwell’s “Nineteen Eighty-Four.”

Michael Shelden, author of “Orwell: The Authorized Biography,” told NPR earlier this month that today’s surveillance society is just like the book.

Orwell, Mr. Shelden said, “could see that war and defeating an enemy could be used as a reason for increasing political surveillance.” He added, “You were fighting a never-ending war that gave you a never-ending excuse for looking into people’s lives.”

Data collection and video surveillance are only going to continue to grow as technology seeps into more areas of our culture, either strapped to our bodies as wearable computers or hovering over cities as inexpensive drones that monitor people from the sky.

So what can people do? Those who want to protect people’s civil liberties say more cameras is the only real check and balance left.

“In the hands of an individual, the video camera can be a very empowering thing,” Mr. Stanley said. “When it’s employed by the government to watch over the citizens, it has the opposite effect.”
Here is what to do if you’re approached by the police, immigration agents, or the FBI.

The Muslim Ban is part of the Trump administration’s targeting of Muslim, Arab, Iranian, Middle Eastern, and South Asian communities. Make sure you and other community members know your rights.

This information is not intended as legal advice. Some state laws may vary.

If you believe your rights have been violated or for more information, contact your local ACLU at

www.ACLU.org/affiliates

ACLU
125 Broad St
New York, NY 10004
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YOUR RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES DURING POLICE, IMMIGRATION, AND FBI ENCOUNTERS:

- You have a right to remain silent. If you wish to use this right, say out loud “I choose to remain silent.”
- You have the right to refuse to consent to a search of yourself or your belongings.
- Ask if you’re free to leave. If they say yes, calmly and silently walk away.
- If you are taken into custody, ask to speak to an attorney immediately and assert your right to remain silent.
- Keep your hands where the police can see them.
- Do not run, resist, or obstruct the police even if you are innocent or the police are violating your rights.
- Do not lie or give false documents, including about your immigration status.
- Regardless of your immigration or citizenship status, you have constitutional rights.

If you are approached by immigration (ICE or CBP) on the street, in your car, or in other public spaces (entering or reentering the U.S. are discussed below):

- **U.S. citizens:** You do not have to show proof of your citizenship or answer questions about where you were born or how you entered the country. You may also state that you want to remain silent.
- **Non-U.S. citizens:** If an agent requests your immigration papers and you have them, show them to the agent. If you do not have them, state that you want to remain silent. (Note: Separate rules apply at international borders and airports, and if you are on certain nonimmigrant visas, including tourists and business travelers. Please contact the ACLU for more information.)

If FBI asks to question or interview you:

- You have a right to refuse to be interviewed.
- You do not have to answer any questions, even if they have a warrant.
- Before answering questions or being interviewed, you have the right to speak with an attorney and have an attorney present.
- Even if you didn’t do anything wrong, it is better to have an attorney present.

If the police, FBI, or immigration agents come to your house:

- Ask them to show you a warrant. You do not have to let anyone into your home unless they have a warrant signed by a judge.
- Immigration agents (ICE) may have a document that says “warrant” or “warrant for arrest of an alien” but is not signed by a judge. If the document is signed by an ICE officer or supervisor, but not a judge, you do not have to let them into your home or speak with them.
- If they show you a warrant signed by a judge:
  - You still do not have to speak to them and may want to talk to an attorney before you decide whether to speak with them. If you choose to speak with them, step outside of your home and close the door (unless they have a search warrant to enter the home).
  - An arrest warrant signed by a judge will allow them to come inside if they think the person they are arresting is inside the home.
  - A search warrant signed by a judge will allow them into specific areas or allow them to look for specific items listed on the warrant.
- Questions about your immigration status:
  - If you are a U.S. citizen and present a passport, you do not have to answer their questions, though refusing to answer routine questions about the nature and purpose of your travel could result in a delay or longer inspection.
  - If you are not a U.S. citizen and you refuse to answer questions, they may refuse to allow you to enter the country. If you choose to answer questions, be truthful.
- Questions about your religious beliefs and practices or political opinions: You do not have to answer these questions. You can request to see a supervisor if such questioning continues.
- Requests to search electronic devices such as laptops and cell phones: Whether officers have the authority to search the contents of these devices without any suspicion or a warrant is currently a contested issue.
  - You may refuse to provide passwords or unlock devices, but doing so may lead to a delay, lengthy questioning, and/or your device being held for further inspection.
- **U.S. citizens:** You cannot be denied entry if you do not provide this information.
- **Non-U.S. citizens:** It’s possible that not providing this information could result in denying you entrance into the country.

If you are returning to the U.S. at an airport or at an international border:

- Customs officers can stop you at the border or ports of entry and search your belongings, even without any suspicion of wrongdoing. However, they cannot target you simply because of your religion, race, ethnicity, national origin, gender, or political beliefs.