

Education, population, poverty, tax...getting views on topics like those in Jersey isn't the difficult part – but have you ever noticed how many people sound eminently credible when talking about them, even though they may actually be basing their views on conjecture, false facts and blind guesswork?

There is a real danger in making the 'facts' fit the opinion, rather than the other way around – which is exactly the point at which someone with an eye on the latest buzzwords will smugly insert the phrase 'post-truth' into the conversation, imagining its actually helpful.

So, we've asked the Jersey Policy Forum to add some robust material to those crucial local debates – the point is not to provoke agreement or acquiescence; it is to provide reliable material on which others can build their views.

Gailina Liew, Director, Jersey Policy Forum

"Smile, you're on Candid Camera!"

Candid Camera was a popular American television show that ran from 1948 to 2014 in various formats. It featured practical jokes and pranks being played on unsuspecting ordinary people, while being filmed by a hidden camera. A UK version of the series ran from 1960 to 1976. The title of this article is the phrase that was used by the host when he did the big reveal at the end of each show and everyone would generally have a good laugh. Contrast that with BBC One's latest suspenseful mini-series, The Capture, that shows how CCTV (closed-circuit television) camera footage can be manipulated by different entities to advance their respective aims. It's worth watching for the issues it raises for consideration, so no spoilers here. Let's just say that being caught on camera in that show is no laughing matter. So, how many cameras are out there looking at us as we go about our daily lives?

According to data gathered by Comparitech and published in Paul Bischoff's blog post on August 15, 2019, people living in big cities in China, UK, US, UAE, Australia and India are under the most intense CCTV camera surveillance. The top 20 most surveilled cities in the world are shown in the following chart: (Pictured right)

Almost half of the cities are in China and this is not surprising in light of the social credit system (see an earlier article here:

<https://www.jerseypolicyforum.org/static/files/Think%20Tank%20November%202018.pdf>) that has been rolled out there.

| Rank | City, Country | # CCTV Cameras | Population | # CCTV Cameras per 1,000 people |
|------|-------------------|----------------|------------|---------------------------------|
| 1 | Chongqing, China | 2,579,890 | 15,354,067 | 168.03 |
| 2 | Shenzhen, China | 1,929,600 | 12,120,721 | 159.06 |
| 3 | Shanghai, China | 2,985,984 | 26,317,104 | 113.46 |
| 4 | Tianjin, China | 1,244,160 | 13,896,402 | 92.87 |
| 5 | Ji'nan, China | 591,163 | 7,521,200 | 73.82 |
| 6 | London, UK | 627,797 | 9,175,530 | 68.40 |
| 7 | Wuhan, China | 500,000 | 8,235,275 | 60.79 |
| 8 | Guangzhou, China | 894,000 | 12,967,862 | 52.75 |
| 9 | Beijing, China | 600,000 | 20,035,455 | 39.93 |
| 10 | Atlanta, US | 7,800 | 501,178 | 15.56 |
| 11 | Singapore | 86,000 | 5,535,676 | 15.25 |
| 12 | Abu Dhabi, UAE | 20,000 | 1,452,057 | 13.77 |
| 13 | Chicago, US | 35,000 | 2,573,044 | 13.66 |
| 14 | Urumqi, China | 42,391 | 3,500,000 | 12.10 |
| 15 | Sydney, Australia | 60,000 | 4,859,432 | 12.36 |
| 16 | Beghalpur, India | 120,000 | 9,750,000 | 12.30 |
| 17 | Dubai, UAE | 35,000 | 2,883,072 | 12.14 |
| 18 | Moscow, Russia | 146,000 | 12,476,171 | 11.70 |
| 19 | Berlin, Germany | 38,765 | 3,555,792 | 11.18 |
| 20 | New Delhi, India | 179,000 | 18,600,000 | 9.62 |

THINK-TANK

Based on China's projections to increase the number of public cameras, it is estimated that there will be 2 CCTV cameras for every person in China by 2020!

In other parts of the world, the increasing use of video surveillance is primarily linked to concerns about terrorism and the general deterrence of crime. Coupled with the use of facial recognition technology, shouldn't we all feel much safer in the public spaces we live in while criminals tremble in their boots? It turns out that there is very little correlation in the data between how safe we feel and how intensely we are surveilled. Perversely perhaps, the combination of these technologies have enabled people to create fake video footage that is virtually indistinguishable from real footage. This is the world of deep fakes, and BBC One did a marvellous job of exploring some of the implications in The Capture.

As we approach the Christmas season, we might look forward to being entertained by the now common videos where pictures of the heads of favourite family members and co-workers are obviously pasted onto the forms of dancing and singing elves. This is all harmless good fun, right? We

all know it's not real and these types of videos are generally created with good intentions, right? What about the video that was played at a Republican party event last year where President Trump's face was substituted for Colin Firth's in an excerpt from The Kingsmen? In that blockbuster film, Colin goes on a killing spree in a church and the altered version shows President Trump doing the same thing to identified political opponents and media personnel in the "Church of Fake News." At least the viewer can see that this video is unmistakably altered so it might fall within the description of a satirical caricature. In the world of deep fakes, intentions are generally not so good, and people's faces and bodies are increasingly being combined with other video footage to create fictional stories that are passed off as being "real" or "true." Instead of being worried about a kiss on the cheek being misread as a sign of an affair, now the worry is that people will see a video clip and think, and maybe even believe that you're a child molester, jaywalker or a porn star!

We used to say that 'seeing is believing.' People and courts of law have long relied upon eyewitness accounts to determine what actually happened. Different people

might pick up on different aspects of what actually happened so it is not unusual to have conflicting eyewitness accounts and video surveillance might be used to sort out the conflicts, particularly in relation to sequencing of events. Today, we know that video surveillance can be manipulated and completely manufactured to show things that did not happen in reality. How can we distinguish fiction from reality? Perhaps one advantage of living in a small island, or within a small community, is that people are more likely to interact in person and develop deeper relationships so that when something appears odd in an image or video clip, personal knowledge can be a strong factor in evaluating its veracity.

But most people in the world live in large urban environments and the reliance on technology to facilitate communication is reducing the amount of personal contact between people to such an extent that some have suggested it may be a key factor in the sky-rocketing rates of depression and mental illness. Can we evaluate human behaviour in a video if we are losing our ability to interact with one another as human beings? Who is doing the surveillance and for what reasons? Should private CCTV cameras be subject to the same regulation as CCTV used by governments for public safety and law enforcement? How do we ensure that the artificial intelligence that is being utilized to sift through the overwhelming quantity of surveillance video is targeting those legitimately under surveillance by those we collectively authorise as a society to protect us? Can we come up with, and learn to trust, a 'tamper-proof' form of video surveillance to provide confidence against the use of deep fakes as evidence? What responsibilities should entities that report and disseminate information have? Facebook's Mark Zuckerberg has just defended its policy to allow deceptive or misleading political advertising and was quoted in The Times a couple of weeks ago as follows: "While I worry about an erosion of truth, I don't think most people want to live in a world where you can only post things that tech companies judge to be 100% true."What do you think?