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### Topic Introduction

#### Police violence is a deadly reality for far too many Americans. The Police kill an average of three people a day with a disproportionally high number of those killed being black and brown. Solutions must be found. Debating about different proposals to stop police violence is a way to test out potential options and see what will work and what will not work. By examining all sides of the issue, you can figure out what you want to advocate for to ensure that the incredibly high numbers of police shootings, assaults, and communities destroyed through harassment and mass incarceration is reduced.

#### Even if we agree that something needs to be done about police violence, we can disagree about what should be done about it.

#### The affirmative will propose a plan that all uniformed police officers should be required to wear body cameras. They will claim that making body cameras mandatory for the police will:

#### Make violence less likely in encounters between police and citizens because they know their actions are being recorded

#### Create accountability when violence does occur so that video evidence can be presented in court

#### Allow better training so that police culture can change to reduce the number of violent incidents and curb systemic racial bias

#### The negative will demonstrate problems with the affirmative’s proposal to require the use of body cameras but pointing out that:

#### Police violence and racism is a result of larger cultural issues. We need to change systemic problems throughout society first before we can change the police

#### The police have too many ways to misuse cameras and avoid accountability. Body cameras wont make a difference

#### The use of body cameras can have effects that are the opposite of what the affirmative intends leading to more arrests and more violence

### Welcome and Hot Tips

Welcome to Debate!

Debate is an opportunity for you to build your voice and be heard.

When you debate, you will have the chance to speak your mind and to prove your skills against young people from all over the bay. Debate is a sport: it calls on you to join a team, represent your school, and win trophies.

What is Debate?

Debate is a competition between two teams, each with two debaters. One team takes the Affirmative, proposing a plan to change the world and explaining why it is a good idea. The other team is the Negative, who attacks the plan and tries to prove that it will do more harm than good.

There are 8 speeches and 4 cross-examinations in a debate round. You and your partner will each take the lead on 2 speeches (1 Constructive and 1 Rebuttal) and 1 cross-examination.

****

### What’s in this pack?

#### An important part of policy debate is using evidence to prove important facts that show your argument to be true and to get ideas and opinions from experts who agree with your position. In this pack we’ve provided evidence that both sides can use to form the foundation of their argument so that a debate can take place. However, a debate can’t be won with just evidence alone! We’ve also provided opportunities for you to expand upon the evidence by explaining important concepts through your own words and personal experiences to make your arguments more interesting and engaging with the judge.

#### Cards have three different parts:

#### (1) The Tag – This is a short summary of the evidence that’s read first so the judge can right down what the main idea and purpose of the card is. *The entire tag is read in the speech.*

#### (2) The Cite – This gives important information about who the author is to demonstrate if they are qualified to speak on that subject and to show where the evidence comes from so other people can find it. *Only the author’s last name and the year it was published are read in the speech.*

#### (3) The Card – This is the actual text of the evidence that is directly copied and pasted from the publication where it was produced without any changes made. *Only the underlined and highlighted parts of the evidence are read in the speech.*

#### Example:

#### (1) Debating in the BAUDL is the best

#### (2) Whitaker 20, Program Director of the Bay Area Urban Debate League (Mya, Police Body Cameras Novice Pack, www.baudl.org)

#### (3) BAUDL is the best organization not only in the Bay Area but in the whole entire world and indeed in the Universe. BAUDL has the best evidence that it gives to its students and it also has the best clothing, stickers, and other SWAG. Students who didn’t do debate will look back at when they were in high school and wish that they had because all of the cool travel, college, and fun opportunities they missed out on.

### What should I do with this pack?

#### Read it – To be an effective debater you need to do more than just have evidence and put it in your speech, you need to know what it says! Carefully read over what’s written in the evidence and ask your coach any questions that you might have on the meaning or use of the evidence

#### Make notes explaining the evidence – In cross examination and in your rebuttal speeches you will need to talk about what the evidence says and if you are able to have notes handy on what the evidence means to you so that you are able to explain it in your own words, the better and more convincing you will sound

#### Highlight it – It may not be necessary to read every single word that’s underlined in the evidence so you can use a highlighter to make the speech more efficient or remove unnecessary parts. It all depends on how time you have in your speech. If you find that you are not able to fill all the time in your speech than read more and if you find that you are running out of time before you say everything you want to say than you will need to highlight more and read less

#### Organize it – You will not be able to read all the evidence in every speech so make sure you pick and choose which ones you think are the best and most useful pieces of evidence. You can also use an accordion or file folders to sort and label the evidence so you know where to find the pieces of evidence that best respond to what your opponents are saying. If you are affirmative and your opponents spend most of their time on the 3D printed guns argument, and don’t spend very much time on the Transfers argument, then you need to make sure you are reading more of the 2AC 3D printed guns evidence and not as much of the 2AC transfers evidence

### Vocabulary

**Here are some important words, phrases, and abbreviations that you will see used in the evidence**:

**BWC** – Body Worn Cameras

**Curtailing** – To reduce in extent or quantity; impose a restriction on. "civil liberties were further curtailed"

**Deterrence** - To discourage or restrain from acting or proceeding. “The large dog deterred trespassers.”

**Explicit Bias** - Attitudes and beliefs that are at the conscious level, are known to us, and are deliberately formed.

**Genocide** - The deliberate killing of a large group of people, especially those of a particular ethnic group or nation. "a campaign of genocide"

**Implicit Bias** - Attitudes and beliefs that are at the unconscious level, are involuntarily formed and are typically unknown to us.

**PTSD** - short for post-traumatic stress disorder. "military veterans suffering from PTSD

**Stop and Frisk** - the policing practice of stopping a person briefly in order to search them for weapons or prohibited items. "he believes that stop-and-frisk is being misused as an anti-gun tactic"

**Surveillance** - close observation, especially of a suspected spy or criminal. "he found himself put under surveillance by military intelligence"

**Systemic Racism -** “Systemic racism”, or “institutional racism”, refers to how ideas of white superiority are captured in everyday thinking at a systems level: taking in the big picture of how society operates, rather than looking at one-on-one interactions.

These systems can include laws and regulations, but also unquestioned social systems. Systemic racism can stem from education, hiring practices or access.

## Affirmative Evidence

### 1AC Advantage

#### Police violence is rampant – more people are killed every day by police than are killed in a whole year in other countries. Minority groups, particularly black men, are at the greatest risk

Peeples 19, Science Journalist (Lynne, What the Data Say about Police Shootings, https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/what-the-data-say-about-police-shootings/)

In the United States, police officers fatally shoot about three people per day on average, a number that’s close to the yearly totals for other wealthy nations. But data on these deadly encounters have been hard to come by. A pair of high-profile killings of unarmed black men by the police pushed this reality into the headlines in summer 2014. Waves of public protests broke out after the fatal shooting of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri, and the death by chokehold of Eric Garner in New York City.Those cases and others raised questions about the extent to which racial biases—either implicit associations or outright racism—contribute to the use of lethal force by the police across the United States. And yet there was no source of comprehensive information to investigate the issue. Five years later, newspapers, enterprising individuals and the federal government have launched ambitious data-collection projects to fill the gaps and improve transparency and accountability over how police officers exercise their right to use deadly force. “It is this awesome power that they have that no other profession has,” says Justin Nix, a criminologist at the University of Nebraska Omaha. “Let’s keep track of it.” Social scientists and public-health researchers have begun to dig into these records and have produced more than 50 publications so far—up from a trickle of papers on the topic before 2015. They are mining the new numbers to address pressing questions, such as whether the police are disproportionately quick to shoot black civilians and those from other minority groups. But methods and interpretations vary greatly. A pair of high-profile papers published in the past few weeks come to seemingly opposite conclusions about the role of racial biases. Scientists are now debating which incidents to track—from deadly shootings to all interactions with the public—and which details matter most, such as whether the victim was armed or had had previous contact with the police. They are also looking for the best way to compare activities across jurisdictions and account for misreporting. “It’s really contentious because there’s no clearly right answer,” says Seth Stoughton at the University of South Carolina in Columbia, a former police officer who now studies the regulation of law enforcement. Although the databases are still imperfect, they make it clear that police officers’ use of lethal force is much more common than previously thought, and that it varies significantly across the country, including the two locations where Brown and Garner lost their lives. St Louis (of which Ferguson is a suburb) has one of the highest rates of police shooting civilians per capita in the United States, whereas New York City consistently has one of the lowest, according to one database. Deciphering what practices and policies drive such differences could identify opportunities to reduce the number of shootings and deaths for both civilians and police officers, scientists say.“We need to standardize definitions and start counting,” says Stoughton. “As the old saying goes, ‘What gets measured, gets managed.’” SPOTLIGHT ON A BLIND SPOT In December 2014, spurred by unrest in the wake of Ferguson, then-US president, Barack Obama, created a task force to investigate policing practices. The group issued a report five months later, highlighting a need for “expanded research and data collection” (see go.nature.com/2kqoddk). The data historically collected by the federal government on fatal shootings were sorely lacking. Almost two years later, the U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) responded with a pilot project to create an online national database of fatal and non-fatal use of force by law-enforcement officers. The FBI director at the time, James Comey, called the lack of comprehensive national data “unacceptable” and “embarrassing”. Full data collection started this year. But outsiders had already begun to gather the data in the interests of informing the public. The database considered to be the most complete is maintained by The Washington Post. In 2015, the newspaper began collecting information on fatal shootings from local news reports, public records and social media. Its records indicate that police officers shoot and kill around 1,000 civilians each year—about twice the number previously counted by the FBI Recognizing that ‘lethal force’ does not always involve a gun and doesn’t always result in death, two other media organizations expanded on this approach. In 2015 and 2016, UK newspaper The Guardian combined its original reporting with crowdsourced information to record all fatal encounters with the police in the United States, and found around 1,100 civilian deaths per year. Online news site VICE News obtained data on both fatal and non-fatal shootings from the country’s 50 largest local police departments, finding that for every person shot and killed between 2010 and 2016, officers shot at two more people who survived. Extrapolating from that, the actual number of civilians shot by the police each year is likely to be upwards of 3,000.

Unofficial national databases have also popped up outside the major news organizations. Two small-scale private efforts, Fatal Encountersand Mapping Police Violence, aggregate and verify information from other databases with added details gleaned from social media, obituaries, criminal-records databases and police reports (see ‘Shootings by police—the data’).

The results paint a picture of definite disparity when it comes to race and police shootings. Although more white people are shot in total, people from minority ethnic groups are shot at higher rates by population. One paper published in August found that a black man is 2.5 times more likely than a white man to be killed by the police during his lifetime. The difference, albeit smaller, is also there for women. But the authors did not make any conclusions regarding racial bias of police officers, in part because not everyone has an equal chance of coming into contact with the police. Crime rates and policing practices differ across communities, as do the historical legacies that influence them. Aggressive policing over time can increase local levels of violence and contact with the police, says Frank Edwards, a sociologist at Rutgers University in Newark, New Jersey, and an author on the paper. “This is inherently a multilevel problem,” he says.Researchers have used various approaches to try to determine the best benchmarks for the data, such as looking at the arrest rates where the shootings occurred or factoring in the context of encounters that end in a shooting. Did the suspect have a weapon? Were officers or another civilian being threatened? In a 2017 study, for example, Nix determined that black people fatally shot by the police were twice as likely as white people to be unarmed. Those findings align with many studies published since 2015 suggesting that racial biases do influence police shootings.

### 1AC Advantage

#### Police violence is a public health issue – the consequences spread throughout communities to create an environment of stress with cascading negative health consequences

Edwards 19, Professor of Sociology at Rutgers (Frank, Why police violence needs to be treated as a public health issue, https://www.vox.com/identities/2019/8/14/20803872/police-violence-mortality-public-health-black-men-rutgers)

We think the research community has provided ample evidence that the way police operate is harmful to both individual and community health. Think about all the ways that policing affects communities that are less extreme than a killing.

A police killing affects more than the deceased. There’s been great research finding that when an unarmed African American man is killed in a state, there is an increase in symptoms of depression among African Americans in that state following the shooting. When a white unarmed man is killed in a state, there’s no similar increase in depressive symptoms among white residents. It strongly suggests that black people see police as a distinctive threat to their well-being, and they — I would argue rightly — perceive police as dangerous. It increases their feelings of outsidership, their feelings of dehumanization, and it increases fear in their interactions with police. We also know that with policies like stop-and-frisk in New York City, where police aggressively target young men of color, and other policies in other areas as well, the young men who go through this and experience physical searches have increases in PTSD symptoms afterward. They become hypervigilant, and that can have all sorts of cascading negative health consequences as you’re inducing these chronic stresses on relatively young people. Heavily policed neighborhoods also see increases in anxiety, as people are fearful and they deal with the sorts of chronic stress that we know can be especially toxic.

The research community has documented a litany of negative consequences for health that this sort of aggressive and violent policing produces. The time has come for us to take this seriously as a cause of harm to public health and something that is particularly expanding health inequality among racial groups. It’s particularly harming young African American men, but you look at the tragic cases of women like Erica Garner who are exposed to these deaths, and you see how it has an incredible toll on well-being that can lead to early mortality. We think the time is long past for the medical community and health community to not only identify these issues but design interventions that can help.

### 1AC Advantage

#### Police violence is genocide – a persistent, prevailing, and destructive force systemically killing people of color

Crump 19, Civil rights lawyer who represented the families of Trayvon Martin and Michael Brown (Ben, Open Season: Legalized Genocide of Colored People, pg. 18-19)

“Genocide” amply describes what transpires between the US judicial system and this country’s colored people. I will argue throughout this book that, in effect, the judicial system in this country targets, whether consciously or not, Black and brown people—robbing them on every level, including, in the end, of their very lives. The physical, financial, mental, and even spiritual deaths can be evidenced in newspaper articles, numerous studies, and courtrooms and on the streets of our impoverished neighborhoods. You can see them in our prison over again, these injustices; technical reasons are always found for their legality. In Open Season , I expose the undeniable pattern of atrocities perpetrated against people of color. I show that “Hands are up, don’t shoot” doesn’t work for us. Cooperation doesn’t work. Polite responses and nonthreatening retreat don’t work. So often, too often, no matter how we respond, police shoot us. And the police get off, which sends the message that it’s acceptable to kill colored people. Compare these stories to how white men, even those who go against the government in armed actions such as the Bundy standoff, remain relatively safe and protected by the law.

It is not okay for people of color to be killed by police or assaulted by the justice system. Absent the privilege of legal protections and designated as a threat to society, people of color are prime targets for genocide. As we know, this pattern of unequal and disproportionate policing of people who have been racialized as well as criminalized and even exterminated based on race has a long history, beginning with Native Americans, who were targeted when the early settlers wanted the land we enjoy today. This is American’s original sin, from which all else has sprung. In fact, in 1951 the Civil Rights Congress charged the United States with genocide on behalf of its African Americans. This report and petition bore the signature of Paul Robeson, among others. Today, there is in America a persistent, prevailing, and unhealthy mindset regarding people of color. It’s rooted in our history as a slave-owning nation, and it has given rise to voter disenfranchisement, unequal educational opportunities, disparate health-care practices, and job and housing discrimination—all of which mask legalized genocide. To comprehend the presence of genocide, we must acknowledge that our society is one that is built on violence and condones arming its people.

This genocide is fueled by police brutality, unfair treatment in the judicial system, and Stand-Your-Ground and Shoot-First laws, which are influenced by the gun lobby. I show how those laws have contributed to and have too often justified the killing of people of color by private, mostly white male citizens or the police. I saw it when I represented the family of Trayvon Martin, an unarmed teen who was shot and killed by a police proxy in Sanford, Florida. I saw it when I represented the family of Michael Brown, unarmed and shot and killed by police in Ferguson, Missouri. I saw it when I represented the family of Terence Crutcher—who was seen on video as unarmed and walking away in broad daylight with his hands up —shot and killed by a policewoman in Tulsa, Oklahoma. And I’ve seen it in so many other of my cases. Over and over, police and their proxies overreact from a deep-seated premise based on implicit and explicit bias that Blacks are dangerous, and the court system reinforces this notion by giving police a pass.

### 1AC Advantage

#### [\*\*\*Here is an opportunity to contribute your own voice to the speech and add some context for the judge to further emphasize why they should be concerned.

#### If you would like to, you can share an experience of how police violence has affected your life, the lives of your family, or the lives of people in your community.]

### 1AC Plan

#### Therefore, we offer the following plan: The United States Federal Government should require all uniformed police officers to wear body cameras and continuously record every encounter.

### 1AC Solvency

#### Body cams can reduce police violence but only a small number are currently being deployed

Stanley 15, ACLU Senior Policy Analyst (Jay, Police Body-Mounted Cameras: With Right Policies in Place, a Win For All, https://www.aclu.org/sites/default/files/assets/police\_body-mounted\_cameras-v2.pdf)

"On-officer recording systems" (also called "body cams" or "cop cams") are small, pager sized cameras that clip on to an officer's uniform or are worn as a headset, and record audio and video of the officer's interactions with the public. Recent surveys suggest that about 25% of the nation’s 17,000 police agencies were using them, with fully 80% of agencies evaluating the technology. Much interest in the technology stems from a growing recognition that the United States has a real problem with police violence.

In 2011, police killed six people in Australia, two in England, six in Germany and, according to an FBI count, 404 in the United States. And that FBI number counted only “justifiable homicides,” and was comprised of voluntarily submitted data from just 750 of 17,000 law enforcement agencies. Attempts by journalists to compile more complete data by collating local news reports have resulted in estimates as high as 1,000 police killings per year in the United States. Fully a quarter of the deaths involved a white officer killing a black person. The ACLU’s Interest Although we at the ACLU generally take a dim view of the proliferation of surveillance cameras in American life, police on-body cameras are different because of their potential to serve as a check against the abuse of power by police officers. Historically, there was no documentary evidence of most encounters between police officers and the public, and due to the volatile nature of those encounters, this often resulted in radically divergent accounts of incidents. Cameras have the potential to be a win-win, helping protect the public against police misconduct, and at the same time helping protect police against false accusations of abuse.

We're against pervasive government surveillance, but when cameras primarily serve the function of allowing public monitoring of the government instead of the other way around, we generally support their use. While we have opposed government video surveillance of public places, for example, we have supported the installation of video cameras on police car dashboards, in prisons, and during interrogations. At the same time, body cameras have more of a potential to invade privacy than those deployments. Police officers enter people's homes and encounter bystanders, suspects, and victims in a wide variety of sometimes stressful and extreme situations. For the ACLU, the challenge of on-officer cameras is the tension between their potential to invade privacy and their strong benefit in promoting police accountability. Overall, we think they can be a win-win—but only if they are deployed within a framework of strong policies to ensure they protect the public without becoming yet another system for routine surveillance of the public, and maintain public confidence in the integrity of those privacy protections. Without such a framework, their accountability benefits would not exceed their privacy risks.

### 1AC Solvency

#### The benefits of body cams have been proven. Where body cams have been used police violence has drastically declined.

Scheindlin 15, Senior United States district judge for the Southern District of New York (Shira, Will the widespread use of body cameras improve police accountability? Yes, https://www.americasquarterly.org/fulltextarticle/will-the-widespread-use-of-body-cameras-improve-police-accountability-yes/)

The point should be clear: people behave differently when they know they are being watched, and police are no exception. Officers wearing body cameras will be less aggressive and more respectful when they interact with members of the community. They will also be more reluctant to use force unless it is necessary to protect themselves and the public. While body-worn police cameras may not be a panacea, they will not only lead to a reduction in the use of unnecessary or excessive force by police officers, but will also be beneficial for both the police and the community.

Evidence supporting this belief comes from jurisdictions in which experiments with the use of body-worn cameras have produced encouraging data. In one such jurisdiction—Rialto, California—after the police force had worn body cameras for a full year, citizen complaints against police declined by 60 percent. Other jurisdictions that have implemented body cameras have seen similar results. In Mesa, Arizona, for example, use-of-force complaints decreased by 75 percent for officers using cameras in a pilot program.1 In Nampa, Idaho, they dropped by 24 percent. Another important statistic from the Rialto study is the number of incidents that resulted in the use of force by an officer, which dropped by 88 percent after the use of body cameras.

Officers who were not equipped with cameras were twice as likely to use force as officers who were. Even more tellingly, when officers wore cameras, every incident of physical contact was initiated by a member of the public, but in the absence of cameras, 29 percent of the incidents involving physical force were initiated by the officer. Such studies have taken on increased significance in the wake of controversy over the deaths of several African Americans at the hands of police over the past year. This includes Michael Brown, an unarmed teenager who was shot by an officer in Ferguson, Missouri, and Eric Garner in Staten Island, New York, who died after being placed in a chokehold by a police officer. President Barack Obama and Attorney General Eric Holder have called for greater use of body-worn cameras by police officers. But even before these incidents, I concluded that such cameras could play a role in curtailing abuses of the long-standing police practice in New York of stopping and frisking young men—most of them African American—on suspicion of criminal behavior. As part of my August 2013 ruling in Floyd v. City of New York that the disproportional use of stop and frisk constituted a pattern of racial profiling and violated the U.S. Constitution, I ordered the New York City Police Department to conduct a trial in selected precincts requiring officers to wear body cameras. The use of body cameras will also protect police officers. No longer will a person be able to claim that a police officer punched or kicked him without cause, when in fact it was that person who initiated the encounter by threatening or attacking the police officer. The contemporaneous record of what occurred should make it clear whether the officer was justified in using force. Everyone has a right to act in self defense.

A video presents an unbiased account of the events. It has no motive to lie and no stake in the outcome. It merely records the event as it happens. If a police officer acts lawfully, then he should not be wrongly accused, forced to defend himself and risk a punishment he does not deserve. The camera will provide his defense. There are some drawbacks to the use of body cameras—such as privacy concerns for both officers and the citizens they encounter, the storage of data capturing images of innocent people, the possible tampering with the images, and the accuracy of the images (with issues relating to lighting, lens clarity, movement, and angles). However, there is far more benefit than harm associated with their use. Once people know their actions are being recorded, their behavior changes. I am confident the widespread use of body cameras will reduce the amount of excessive force by police officers and will improve their relationships with the citizens they encounter and protect.

### 1AC Solvency

#### Increasing the use of body cameras allows systemic issues of racism and violence within police departments to be effectively addressed – change is possible

Armacost 16, Professor of Law at the University of Virginia (Barbara, The Organizational Reasons Police Departments Don’t Change, https://hbr.org/2016/08/the-organizational-reasons-police-departments-dont-change)

So what might happen if departments did more closely analyze violent incidents? The Washington Post recently asked several police experts to examine five dramatic videos of police shootings, including those of Castile and Sterling. One of the experts’ repeated criticisms was that officers ignored standard police tactics intended to diffuse conflict, control suspects, and promote their own safety. They moved in too fast and too close to armed suspects; declined to apply non-lethal force; and failed to establish effective communication with suspects, bystanders, and other law enforcement officers. Significantly, the reviewers deemed the moments leading up to the shootings as “crucial” to understanding whether the shootings could have been avoided by the application of better policing techniques.

This kind of analysis rarely occurs in police departments today (though the rapidly increasing use of police body cameras to record police citizen encounters could change this).

Institutional racism is rarely addressed. There is an additional, systemic factor that has played into this summer’s violence, as evidenced by the recent Department of Justice reports on Ferguson and Baltimore: widespread patterns of systemic racial bias affect police officers’ conduct, including their use of force. African Americans are more likely to be stopped, frisked, and arrested, and are two-and-one-half times more likely to be shot by police than whites, differences that have not been adequately explained by crime rates, level of threat, or bad neighborhoods.While some part of this disparity may result from intentional discrimination, it also results from deeply entrenched, unconscious racism affecting the way police officers perceive potentially dangerous circumstances. Studies have consistently found that police view black suspects as more threatening than white suspects, they are more likely to expect blacks to be criminals, and they expect violence when patrolling black or minority neighborhoods. These kinds of stereotypes may affect the speed and/or accuracy of officers’ judgements whether suspects are armed or pose a threat.

Research also suggests that racial stereotypes can be self-fulfilling: Black suspects who worry that they might appear threatening or suspicious often adopt behaviors that police interpret as dangerous or suspicious-looking, such as showing anxiety.

There is hopeful evidence that clear non-discrimination policies, sophisticated training, and good leadership can, over time, begin to correct for these kinds of unconscious racial biases. In addition, good data collection and transparency can document the nature, circumstances, and demographics of police enforcement patterns, and shift the debate about racial profiling from anecdotal reports to informed discussion.

Changing the culture of an organization is hard; law enforcement no exception. Addressing racial bias — an intractable result of years of structural and societal racism — is especially difficult. But other systemic recommendations urged by policing experts are more straightforward and actionable. Many departments have made progress over the years, including — in a tragic irony — the Dallas Police Department. There is also hope for Baltimore, which like other police departments around the country is now subject to federal oversight requiring systemic change.

In order for reforms to stick, however, police departments need to understand and address the underlying issues that stand in the way of learning and change. By stepping up to focus on what the organization can do, police departments have a better chance of saving more lives — both black and blue ones.

### 1AC Solvency

#### Mandatory body cameras will change police cultures allowing better transparency, training, and cooperation between the police and communities

Marlow 17, Senior Advocacy and Counsel at ACLU (Chad, Should We Reassess Police Body Cameras Based on Latest Study?, https://www.aclu.org/blog/privacy-technology/surveillance-technologies/should-we-reassess-police-body-cameras-based)

First of all, let’s note that this study was only focused on one aspect of body camera police oversight — their deterrent effect on officers inclined to engage in abusive or unprofessional behavior — which is only one possible benefit of the technology from a civil liberties perspective. It does not have implications for other potential benefits of body cameras such as resolution of factual disputes in critical incidents or other situations where complaints have been lodged against officers, better training, better overall police transparency and accountability, and increased trust between police departments and communities. It also does not have implications for the chief downsides of police body cameras: their potential to invade privacy, their risk of being reduced to just another tool for government mass surveillance, for example through their integration with face recognition capability, and their risk of becoming a propaganda tool if the police control what footage the public is allowed to see.

Still, the finding in this study seems surprising. A big reason we are concerned about surveillance is that it changes people’s behavior. There is a wealth of social science research showing that being monitored brings chilling effects and otherwise changes behavior. When it comes to police officers, who have been given the authority to use brutal, sometimes deadly force, we think such monitoring would be helpful if it improves their behavior. That is why we have been willing to accept body cameras if they are deployed with strong policies, despite the fact that they are government cameras with a very real potential to invade privacy.

### 1AC Solvency

#### Body cams work by tapping into the psychological principles of deterrence and self-awareness

Braga 17, Professor of Criminology at Northwestern (Anthony, The Benefits of Body-Worn Cameras: new findings from a randomized controlled trial at the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/251416.pdf>)

Two theoretical perspectives, deterrence and self-awareness, are commonly applied to support the position that placing BWCs on officers will improve the civility of police citizen interactions by deterring undesirable behaviors (e.g., not wanting to be recorded on video doing something inappropriate or illegal) and stimulating desirable behaviors (e.g., remembering to treat others with respect).

Deterrence theory suggests that crimes can be prevented when the costs of committing the crime are perceived by the offender to outweigh the benefits. Much of the literature evaluating deterrence focuses on the effect of changing certainty, swiftness, and severity of punishment associated with certain acts on the prevalence of those crimes. The available research suggests that deterrent effects are ultimately determined by offender perceptions of sanction risk and certainty.

BWCs have been suggested as a deterrent to noncompliance with the rules of proper behavioral conduct in police-citizen encounters. In his discussion of the influence of cameras on behavior, Tilley argues that deterrence is one prominent prevention mechanism triggered by the technology: the presence of a camera ‘‘reduces… [noncompliance] by deterring potential offenders who will not wish to risk apprehension and conviction by the evidence captured on videotape or observed by an operator on a screen on which their behavior is shown.’’ For officers and citizens alike, the presence of a camera during encounters increases the likelihood that any misconduct and illegal behaviors will be captured on video and, as such, generates a deterrent effect by increasing their perceptions of the likelihood of apprehension and celerity of punishment.

Self-awareness theory states that when we focus our attention on ourselves, we evaluate and compare our current behavior to our internal standards and values. This theory further suggests that when human beings are under observation, they modify their behavior, exhibit more socially acceptable behavior, adhere to social norms, and cooperate more fully with the rules. People are more likely to align their behavior with personal standards when made self-aware and believe that they will be negatively affected if they do not live up to these standards. Various environmental cues and situations induce awareness of the self, such as mirrors, an audience, or being videotaped or recorded.

A well-developed line of research suggests that people do alter their behavior once they know that they are being observed. The presence of BWCs during police-citizen encounters is suggested to stimulate self awareness by making these individuals conscious that they are being watched and their actions are being recorded. As a result, police and citizens alike become self-aware and compare their behavior in the encounters with objective standards, which are socially-desirable behaviors. If encounter participants notice a discrepancy between their behavior and what is socially desirable, then they will alter their behavior. As will be discussed further below, these socially-desirable behaviors include procedurally just treatment of citizens by police officers. In summary, there is solid theoretical support for the use of BWCs as a prevention mechanism to influence the behaviors of those who are under observation. BWCs are suggested to have both an intrinsic effect (self-awareness theory) and an extrinsic effect (deterrence theory) on those being watched and, as a result, police and citizens will exhibit socially-desirable behavior in their interactions. While it remains unclear whether deterrence, self-awareness, or both are generating the observed effects, several recently completed RCTs and quasi-experiments suggest that BWCs improve the civility of police-citizen encounters by reducing complaints against officers and officer use of force incidents (both excessive and non-excessive).

### 2AC Deeper Problems

#### The negative has it backwards – instead of focusing on larger power structures first we should start by correcting the police who can than serve as agents of social change

Marx 2000, Professor Emeritus MIT (Gary, The Police as Social Change Agents? The Curious Case of Poland’s Transition, https:/Marx /web.mit.edu/gtmarx/www/forpol.html)

A view held by many social critics is that police are invariably agents of those in power and will do whatever is necessary to perpetuate the regime. This is thought to be particularly true of traditional authoritarian and totalitarian governments believed to be lacking popular legitimacy, or at least offering procedural means by which that could be determined. In such societies the police, along with the military, use their monopoly on the means of violence and direct control over the means of mass communication to protect the status quo.

The police role in protecting the state and in engaging in abuses is of course not restricted to non-democratic governments. The original French conception of a "high police" (referring to position in the hierarchy, rather than to stoned) was for an absorbent police who would saturate the society in the interests of protecting the state. (Brodeur 1983) Activities such as the FBI’s COINTELPRO, Watergate, the Iran-Contra Affair and the investigation of CISPES continue to be part of our political landscape.

However a distinction can be made between the police role in supporting laws of the state when these are developed through democratic procedures and embody universalistic values, such as those associated with the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights or the protection of democracy and the police role in acting to perpetuate the rule of those in power beyond democratic procedures (e.g., Watergate, the Iran-Contra Affair, CISPES). In the former dissent is not automatically labeled as crime.

In the West over several centuries police power has been limited by constitutions, law and policy and oversight from executive, legislative, and judicial agencies, interest groups and the mass media. The development of permanent police bureaucracies with significant autonomy (whether formally mandated or de facto) and the rule of law formally limits what can be asked of police and offers some insulation from political pressures. The police role has also greatly broadened to offering services to citizens through maintaining order, control of street crime (and to a lesser degree white collar crime) and carrying out administrative functions such as licensing and traffic management. Relative to the past, when they could operate with impunity and perceived pragmatism, police in the West have also softened their approach to political challenges, staying broadly within the confines of non-violence. (Della Porta and Reiter 1998).

Yet whatever the continuing commonalties with respect to the political role of the police across societies, the repressive role of police in the Soviet dominated countries, is archtypical in literature and social science. Indeed we describe such states as "police states." 2

But as a character in a David Mamet play observes, "things change." The relatively peaceful transition in Poland documented in an important new book by Maria Los and Andrzej Zybertowicz Privatizing the Police State is essential reading for anyone interested in the police role. The book requires questioning the automatic equating of police with the established order and calls for a more nuanced view. Police are not automatically puppets of those in, or with, power. Police also have their own interests and resources. Given differentiation within and between police agencies, their resources may be used independently and in complex and contradictory ways and these may change over time.

In discussing commentators on the Black Muslims, Malcolm X observed, "those that know, don’t say and those that say, don’t know." Until the appearance of this well argued and documented book with its provocative thesis about the central role of the secret police in political and economic affairs, the same might have been said of many commentators on Poland’s transition from a communist to a privatized state. The study suggests that under certain conditions police may undermine rather than protect the state.

For ideological and logistical reasons this view has rarely been acknowledged, let alone studied by social scientists.

The social scientist seeking to understand the iceberg of complex, impassioned social events such as the recent changes in Poland must go beyond the methodological purists who hold that only that which can be quantified and stated in propositional form is worthy of study, as well as the oversimplified and distorting lens which views police only, and always, as agents of a monolithic power structure. Police also serve there own interests. Given their national and international resources, increased blurring of lines between public and private police, the development of international police related agencies such as Inter-Pol and Euro-Pol and various international control regimes, they seem increasingly able to act independently.3 Their role in blocking or encouraging social change and their dependence on, or independence from, different elites should be approached as issues for empirical inquiry.

### 2AC Deeper Problems

#### Changing police culture is possible without broader societal change first

Cohen 17, JD Harvard Law (Ryan, THE FORCE AND THE RESISTANCE: WHY CHANGING THE POLICE FORCE IS NEITHER INEVITABLE, NOR IMPOSSIBLE, https://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1207&context=jlasc)

It is worth noting that the disparate treatment of people of color is not unique to police, leading some to conclude that without broader societal change, changing the culture of policing may be impossible. While it may be true that complete transformation is not a feasible short term goal, this article assumes that some change is possible, and it is worth exploring how that change can be achieved.

#### Focusing on root causes is misleading – prefer specific causes like lack of video evidence

Swanson 05Jacinda Swanson is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Western. Michigan University – Theory, Culture & Society August 2005 vol. 22 no. 4 87-118 – DOI: 10.1177/0263276405054992 –The online version of this article can be found – http://tcs.sagepub.com/content/22/4/87

**It is** thus **misleading to suggest that social relations are ever solely economic, political or cultural, or that the causes of and remedies for unjust social arrangements are singular** (see also Butler, 1997c: 273, 276; Young, 1997: 154–6; Sayer, 1999). Although Fraser insists on the thorough imbrication of culture and economics, her **emphasis on** the two categories of redistribution and recognition and on **root causes undermines** the **more complex understanding** she articulates elsewhere.6 Moreover, despite her commitment to perspectival dualism – and thus her rejection of substantive dualism and economism – in several instances Fraser describes the economy and capitalism in economically reductionist and determinist terms (2003: 53, 58, 214–18). **For instance**, although she correctly insists that capitalism and culture interact, **she often appears to conceptualize capitalism** and other economic activities **as** in themselves fundamentally economic **practices that function independently of political and cultural processes**, and, related, appears to conceive economic behavior/phenomena as devoid of values. To cite just a few examples, Fraser provides the following conceptualizations: ‘In this marketized zone, interaction is not directly regulated by patterns of cultural value. It is governed, rather by the functional interlacing of strategic imperatives, as individuals act to maximize self-interest’ (2003: 58); ‘system integration, in which interaction is coordinated by the functional interlacing of the unintended consequences of a myriad of individual strategies’; and ‘a quasi-objective, anonymous, impersonal market order that follows a logic of its own. This market order is culturally embedded, to be sure. But it is not directly governed by cultural schemas of evaluation’ (2003: 214). **As the concept of overdetermination shows, ‘economic’ practices themselves depend on specific (cultural) knowledges**, values and discourses, as well as specific (political) rules and regulations (and vice versa). Values are therefore not confined to the cultural status order.7 In addition to discourses and knowledges, values, for example, constitute ideas and behavior related to business enterprise success and purposes, rational considerations and calculations, individual self-interest, appropriate and desirable objects of economic production and exchange, etc. (Amariglio and Ruccio, 1994; Watkins, 1998). The theoretical perspective I am advocating here thus urges both the multiplication of analytical categories and concrete empirical investigations of the numerous conditions of existence (located throughout society) of any unjust practice (see also Smith, 2001: 121). It consequently suggests that overcoming any given form of oppression most likely will require transforming a wide range of cultural, economic and political practices.

### 2AC Police Noncompliance

#### The affirmative removes officer discretion by requiring that every interaction be recorded. This ensures proper compliance

Schumm 17, Professor of Law at Indiana (Robert, Policing Body Cameras, https://bja.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh186/files/bwc/pdfs/BWC-NACDL-March2017.pdf)

Recording every public encounter between police and citizens offers the best chance of achieving the goals of police accountability and protection of the rights of the criminally accused. As detailed in this report, clear and well­known policies limiting access to the video can mitigate the intrusion on privacy caused by the recording and can address most of the concerns with potential misuse of the resulting footage.

In public areas, ensuring preservation of evidence and accountability counsels in favor of continuously recording citizen encounters even if a request is made to stop recording. Private homes, on the other hand, are an area entitled to greater privacy, and officers should request consent before recording.

Discretion in deciding when a camera should be turned off during non­public interactions must rest with the person interacting with the police — not the officer. When individuals ask that the camera be turned off in a private home, the request should be made on camera and include a standard, carefully crafted advisement from the officer in response.

The continuous recording by body cameras is essential to increased transparency, accountability, and evidentiary documentation, but NACDL readily acknowledges concerns that these cameras are not watching police, but are instead pointed at “the community being policed,” which raises the potential for their use as “tool[s] of high­tech racial profiling.” NACDL also acknowledges that body cameras should not supplant other methods of ensuring police accountability. Individuals must also be free to videotape the police, whether occasionally when they see something that seems awry or in a more organized way.

### 2AC No Behavioral Effect

#### Studies which randomly distribute cameras within part of a police population show large reductions in police violence when cameras are used

Ariel 15, Fellow in Experimental Criminology and Lecturer in Experimental Criminology at Cambridge (Barak, The Effect of Police Body-Worn Cameras on Use of Force and Citizens’ Complaints Against the Police: A Randomized Controlled Trial, https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10940-014-9236-3)

Police use-of-force continues to be a major source of international concern, inviting interest from academics and practitioners alike. Whether justified or unnecessary/excessive, the exercise of power by the police can potentially tarnish their relationship with the community. Police misconduct can translate into complaints against the police, which carry large economic and social costs. The question we try to answer is: do body-worn-cameras reduce the prevalence of use-of-force and/or citizens’ complaints against the police? MethodsWe empirically tested the use of body-worn-cameras by measuring the effect of videotaping police–public encounters on incidents of police use-of-force and complaints, in randomized-controlled settings. Over 12 months, we randomly-assigned officers to “experimental-shifts” during which they were equipped with body-worn HD cameras that recorded all contacts with the public and to “control-shifts” without the cameras (n = 988). We nominally defined use-of-force, both unnecessary/excessive and reasonable, as a non-desirable response in police–public encounters. We estimate the causal effect of the use of body-worn-videos on the two outcome variables using both between-group differences using a Poisson regression model as well as before-after estimates using interrupted time-series analyses.ResultsWe found that the likelihood of force being used in control conditions were roughly twice those in experimental conditions. Similarly, a pre/post analysis of use-of-force and complaints data also support this result: the number of complaints filed against officers dropped from 0.7 complaints per 1,000 contacts to 0.07 per 1,000 contacts. We discuss the findings in terms of theory, research methods, policy and future avenues of research on body-worn-videos.

#### Studies on actual use of body cameras by police show a significant decrease in police violence

Braga 17, Professor of Criminology at Northwestern (Anthony, The Benefits of Body-Worn Cameras: new findings from a randomized controlled trial at the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/251416.pdf>)

Many community stakeholders and criminal justice leaders have suggested placing body-worn cameras (BWCs) on police officers improves the civility of police-citizen encounters and enhances citizen perceptions of police transparency and legitimacy. In response, many police departments have adopted this technology to improve the quality of policing in their communities. However, the existing evaluation evidence on the intended and unintended consequences of outfitting police officers with BWCs is still developing. This study reports the findings of a randomized controlled trial (RCT) involving more than 400 police officers in the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD). We find that BWC-wearing officers generated significantly fewer complaints and use of force reports relative to control officers without cameras. BWC wearing officers also made more arrests and issued more citations than their non BWC-wearing controls. In addition, our cost-benefit analysis revealed that savings from reduced complaints against officers, and the reduced time required to resolve such complaints, resulted in substantial cost savings for the police department. Considering that LVMPD had already introduced reforms regarding use of force through a Collaborative Reform Initiative prior to implementing body worn cameras, these findings suggest that body worn cameras can have compelling effects without increasing costs.

### 2AC No Behavioral Effect

#### Lack of standardization regarding police body cameras in the United States is a major reason why body cameras are yielding mixed reviews. Currently, public advocacy groups have been denied access to body camera footage from police departments. New York is a prime example of why individual state’s attempts to employ laws regarding police body cameras have failed because lack of federal oversight breeds local circumvention.

Durkin 20 (Erin, Erin Durkin is a reporter for POLITICO New York and the co-author of New York Playbook. “Body cameras aid police misconduct investigations, but CCRB faces hurdles getting footage” https://www.politico.com/states/new-york/albany/story/2020/02/27/body-cameras-aid-police-misconduct-investigations-but-ccrb-faces-hurdles-getting-footage-1263841

The city’s police watchdog board has been able to stand up more complaints against police officers using body camera footage — but the NYPD has dragged its feet on turning the tapes over to investigators, a new report found. The Civilian Complaint Review Board reports that the number of complaints where it was able to either substantiate a complaint or clear the officer on the merits surged to 76 percent when it had body camera footage, up from just 39 percent with no video, according to a report set to be released Thursday. But the board found that the amount of time it took for police to hand over footage doubled in the first six months of 2019, and the NYPD also denied more requests. Since the body camera program began, the board has requested footage more than 4,000 times, but only received it half the time. They also reported that officers often failed to use their cameras properly, and sometimes obstructed them intentionally. “Obtaining [body-worn camera] footage has not come without difficulties. As is the case in many jurisdictions, the process of getting police oversight agencies more streamlined access to [body-worn camera] footage has been fraught with challenges,” CCRB chair Fred Davie said in a statement accompanying the report. The NYPD has given body-worn cameras to all of its uniformed patrol officers, who are supposed to turn them on when conducting police activity. In full investigations, CCRB substantiated complaints against cops 31 percent of the time when they had body camera video, compared to 13 percent without video. They also exonerated more officers in 30 percent of claims with video, compared to 20 percent without. By contrast, complaints went unsubstantiated — meaning investigators did not have enough evidence to determine what happened — in just more than half of cases with no tape, compared to 23 percent with body camera footage. In particular, CCRB was able to substantiate 56 percent of discourtesy allegations and 37 percent of offensive language allegations using video, compared to 19 percent and 15 percent without. “This Report’s findings firmly establish that video footage is integral to determining whether an officer behaved professionally or engaged in misconduct,” the report says. But the board found a big jump in delays in getting their hands on body camera footage. In the final months of 2018, it took an average of 20 days for the NYPD to produce footage — that jumped to 42 days by summer of 2019. Over the same time, the NYPD denied more requests citing confidentiality and privacy laws. They also redacted more footage — up to 63 percent of videos in the second quarter of 2019 — and often provided no explanation for why redactions were made. “Restrictions in gaining access to [camera] footage can significantly compromise the integrity of CCRB’s investigations and negatively impact the use and effectiveness of [body-worn cameras] for oversight,” the report says. In November, the oversight board and the police department reached an agreement to give investigators more access to video, creating a secure facility for them to view it and promising it would be available within 25 days..

### 2AC No Accountability

#### Video evidence from body cameras is critical to holding violent officers accountable

Doleac 17, Director of the Justice Tech Lab and Professor of Econoimcs at Texas A&M (Jennifer, Do body-worn cameras improve police behavior?, https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2017/10/25/do-body-worn-cameras-improve-police-behavior/)

BWC advocates hope that the cameras will have a civilizing effect on all involved: officers and civilians alike should behave better when they know their behavior is being recorded, reducing the number of violent interactions between officers and civilians. In cases where officers do use force, the video footage will offer factual evidence about what occurred, so that abusive officers can be quickly disciplined, fired, or even convicted of crimes, preventing them from further abusive use of force. If BWCs have either of these effects, use of force by police should fall.

### 2AC Increased Arrests

#### Body cameras are necessary to provide data used to correct over policing in black communities

Neusteter 19, Policing Program Director at the Vera Institute of Justice (S. Rebecca, Gatekeepers: The Role of Police in Ending Mass Incarceration, https://www.vera.org/downloads/publications/gatekeepers-police-and-mass-incarceration.pdf)

Of course, police commonly arrest and cite people who are both sober and essentially compliant. An officer’s temperament and level of experience come into play. Race and ethnicity in some instances also matter. As noted above, black people are nearly three times more likely than whites to be arrested for disorderly conduct in circumstances where the behavior is comparable. Some researchers and other experts have suggested that analysis of data from police body cameras should be the first step to better understand officer decision making and minimize the influence of officer variations and biases. In one such study, Stanford University researchers analyzed Oakland Police Department body camera data and found that officers consistently spoke less respectfully to black community members as compared to their white counterparts. This finding was consistent despite the race of the officer and the type, severity, location, and outcome of the encounter.

Rob Voigt, Nicholas P. Camp, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran et al., “Language from Police Body Camera Footage Shows Racial Disparities in Officer Respect,” Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 114, no. 25 (2017), 6521-6526, <https://perma>. cc/GUP3-7BF4. However, the mere act of deploying body-worn cameras may affect officer interactions with the community, decreasing the likelihood of negative interaction. See for example 60 Vera Institute of Justice Michael D. White, Janne E. Gaub, and Natalie Todak, “Exploring the Potential for Body-Worn Cameras to Reduce Violence in Police-Citizen Encounters,” Policing 12, no. 1 (2017), 66-76, 66 (“Following BWC deployment, the percentage of officers with a complaint in each group declined by 50% and 78% (Control and Treatment, respectively); the percentage of officers with a use of force declined notably (39%) for one group only”), <https://perma>. cc/253H-NU82.

### 2AC Increased Violence

#### Body camera requirements shut down police terrorizing of minority neighborhoods

Braga 17, Professor of Criminology at Northwestern (Anthony, The Benefits of Body-Worn Cameras: new findings from a randomized controlled trial at the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/251416.pdf>)

The results of this RCT suggest that the placement of BWCs on LVMPD officers reduced complaints and use of force reports for treatment officers relative to non-BWC wearing control officers. These results support the position that BWCs may de-escalate aggression or have a “civilizing” effect on the nature of police-citizen encounters. The complaint and use of force reductions associated with placing BWCs on police officers may be particularly important for improving police-community relations in impoverished minority neighborhoods. We found that BWC-wearing officers generated moderately more arrests and issued more citations than their control counterparts. Extrapolating BWC costs and benefits to a department-wide implementation, we estimated that BWCs could produce a net annual savings of $4.1 million to $4.4 million. The findings of this study suggest that BWCs have strong potential to benefit police agencies and communities alike. Not only do they reduce complaints against officers and use of force incidents in large measure (and the corresponding costs of resolving those complaints and use of force incidents), they seem to increase police productivity, evidenced by the modest but significant increases in police citations and arrests. Further research is needed on this count to determine whether bias exists in the increased stops and arrests, and whether this increase in productivity has negative effects on community perceptions of police. Our study also suggests that the benefits of cameras (at least in terms of cost savings due to the reduction in complaints) far outweigh the costs of the BWC program. This too requires additional research —the benefits might not be so great in a community characterized by positive police community relations prior to the introduction of BWCs. As the policing profession moves towards further implementation of BWCs, jurisdictions implementing BWCs will hopefully be open to rigorous research regarding outcomes and cost-benefit analyses, as well as the unintended benefits or consequences of their implementation.

#### Body worn cameras reduce violence – awareness of recordings creates restraint

Ariel 15, Fellow in Experimental Criminology and Lecturer in Experimental Criminology at Cambridge (Barak, First scientific report shows police body-worn-cameras can prevent unacceptable use-of-force, https://www.cam.ac.uk/research/news/first-scientific-report-shows-police-body-worn-cameras-can-prevent-unacceptable-use-of-force)

Researchers from the University of Cambridge’s Institute of Criminology (IoC) have now published the first full scientific study of the landmark crime experiment they conducted on policing with body-worn-cameras in Rialto, California in 2012 — the results of which have been cited by police departments around the world as justification for rolling out this technology.

The experiment showed that evidence capture is just one output of body-worn video, and the technology is perhaps most effective at actually preventing escalation during police-public interactions: whether that’s abusive behaviour towards police or unnecessary use-of-force by police.

The researchers say the knowledge that events are being recorded creates “self-awareness” in all participants during police interactions. This is the critical component that turns body-worn video into a ‘preventative treatment’: causing individuals to modify their behaviour in response to an awareness of ‘third-party’ surveillance by cameras acting as a proxy for legal courts — as well as courts of public opinion — should unacceptable behaviour take place.

### 2AC Increased Violence

#### While evidence on body-cameras effectiveness in the past has been mixed, requiring police officers to wear cameras, turn on their cameras whenever contact is made, and announce that they are recording has shown positive outcome trends. Standardization of body cameras is a critical step in developing research towards the most positive policing protocol.

Rayes 2020 (Adam, is a community reporter for KUNC. “Protect And Serve (And Record): The Role Of Body Cameras For Police And Communities” https://www.kunc.org/news/2020-07-01/protect-and-serve-and-record-the-role-of-body-cameras-for-police-and-communities)

“The evidence on body-worn cameras has been fairly mixed,” said John Hollywood of the Rand Center for Quality Policing, adding that the research tends to be “positive-ish” in its conclusions. Hollywood says the “best hypothesis” researchers have is that requiring officers to turn on the cameras during contacts (which the new state law does) and announce that they are recording (which state law doesn’t) tends to lead to better outcomes. One group of European researchers released studies of departments across America and the world in the last few years that showed cameras reduced use of force and assaults against officers while another of their studies reached the opposite conclusion. The researchers cautioned against abandoning body-worn cameras based on that study though, saying much more research still needs to be done. Officers turning their cameras on during an intense situation can “backfire” and escalate things, Hollywood added. And even their effectiveness after an incident is questionable. In 2017, at the direction of the Department of Homeland Security, researchers at Johns Hopkins looked at 102 studies and found large gaps in knowledge about how the characteristics of camera footage (like lighting or field of view) and the characteristics of the person watching it (like race and gender) affect interpretations of what happened. “Sometimes situations where reasonable people can disagree on the relative actions that the officers did or what the bystanders did,” Hollywood said. “That’s where you can kind of have the biggest problems and the body worn camera doesn’t help there.” Take the case of De’Von Bailey, who was shot in the back by Colorado Springs police while running away. The body camera footage of his death exonerated officers in the eyes of a grand jury, but was simultaneously seen as damning evidence to people like Rep. Leslie Herod. Hollywood also says there is some concern that officers can use body camera footage to change their story if they can view the footage before or while writing up a report about a use of force incident.“I think there’s been strong legal arguments to record what they thought they saw first, or what they experienced first,” he said. “And then maybe they can go back and look at (the footage).” Regardless of the complications and swirling questions about body cameras, like the citizen and victim privacy issues police chiefs said they worry about, Hollywood does think cameras are very important to policing. “If George Floyd being murdered hadn’t been caught on camera I expect some things may have still happened because the situation was so egregious,” he said. “But there is a risk that those officers, Derek Chauvin in particular, could have gotten away with this to some extent.” And the new state law may provide an opportunity for researchers worldwide to better understand the intricacies of body cameras and what does or doesn’t work best. “If we can actually get good use of force data,” he said. “That would be gold. We really don’t have much right now.” The author of Colorado’s police reform law, Rep. Herod, puts a lot of stock into the use of cameras too. And, in a nod to the Defund Police movement, she said departments that are concerned about cost “need to divest in other things in order to make that (body-worn cameras) happen. And that is intentional.” “They need to prioritize the body cameras,” she said. “They haven’t been and it’s time to.”

### 2AC Police Propaganda

#### Body cameras reveal the truth about police violence and spread awareness and resistance

Muggah 14, Research Director of the Igarape Institute (Robert, Why Police Body Cameras Are Taking Off, Even After Eric Garner’s Death, https://igarape.org.br/en/why-police-body-cameras-are-taking-off-even-after-eric-garners-death/)

So far, the introduction of body cameras is being pursued cautiously. They are already shining a light on events long kept in the shadows: the thousands of extra-judicial killings committed by police around the world each year. While there are still questions concerning the integrity of video evidence in various legal systems, cop cams can reveal the dark truth of such encounters. The long-term success of these tools depends in large part on public confidence in the integrity of the technology and the way it is applied. If crime victims do not call for help owing to a fear that their interactions will become public, then the experiment will fail. But if implemented effectively and with carefully considered checks and balances, then future Michael Browns and Eric Garners could be prevented. Whatever the future holds, this revolution is being televised.

### 2AC Privacy

#### State regulations will ensure privacy protections for police body camera footage

Marlow 19, Senior Advocay and Policy Counsel at ACLU (Chad, Ohio Bucks a Bad Trend With New Police Body Camera Law, https://www.aclu.org/blog/privacy-technology/surveillance-technologies/ohio-bucks-bad-trend-new-police-body-camera-law)

It is for these reasons that the law passed by the Ohio Legislature and signed by its outgoing governor, John Kasich, in January was so important. The new Ohio law makes all police body camera footage subject to the state’s strong open records laws, which is a big win for transparency. It then proceeds to exempt certain highly sensitive and private footage from disclosure in the absence of permission from the video’s subject, such as videos showing personal financial or health information, the identity of certain crime victims, children, confidential informants, and persons who have been seriously injured or killed. That’s a victory for privacy and practical policing.

Finally, and most importantly, none of the law’s exemptions applies to videos showing a person being seriously injured or killed through a police use of force. That goes directly to the principal reason why body cameras were widely adopted in the first place: to provide transparency and accountability when a civilian is harmed by a police officer.

With the adoption of its law covering the disclosure of police body camera footage, Ohio joins New Hampshire in demonstrating that it is possible for states to adopt well-balanced body camera laws that center their polices around the interests of the public instead of the police. By adopting strong, well-balanced statewide laws, Ohio and New Hampshire now assure all their state’s residents and visitors will be protected by the same body camera rules, regardless of where in those states they may be. Let’s hope other states follow their admirable leads.

## Negative Evidence

### 1NC Deeper Problems

#### The affirmative distracts from where change needs to occur – new policies like body cams won’t stop police violence since they are the result of a racist and violent culture

Lopez 17, Senior Correspondent at Vox for Criminal justice and public health (German, The failure of police body cameras, https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2017/7/21/15983842/police-body-cameras-failures)

This was something experts emphasized again and again: Video can only do so much. There are simply much bigger systemic problems facing police than whether there’s enough evidence to convict them in the courtroom or hold them accountable in the public eye. For one, the legal standard for use of force is so broad that it’s going to be very difficult to convict police officers even with solid evidence. The law requires that an officer reasonably perceive a threat to justify use of force even if a threat isn’t actually present. So if an officer thinks that someone is pulling a gun, that justifies use of force even if the person is really pulling out his wallet. It comes down to what a “reasonable” officer would do — an incredibly vague standard.

Some experts argue this standard is too loose. “The legal standard, I think, makes it very, very difficult to establish the criteria for an unreasonable use of force,” Michael White, a criminologist at Arizona State University, said.Police and other experts argue that the standard needs to be loose, so officers don’t hesitate in moments of split-second decisions — because the legal consequences may be on their minds — and fail to protect themselves or bystanders. But in the real world, this also allows officers to get away with some cases of excessive uses of force.Abt argued that part of the problem is we often don’t explicitly define what a reasonable police officer would do in a lot of situations. We might expect a police officer to deescalate, not escalate, dangerous encounters and avoid unnecessarily aggressive tactics like chokeholds, but that’s not always in writing. That contributes to the vagueness under the current legal standard.To remedy this, Abt argued that far more of our expectations for police should be clearly written down in police training manuals, guidelines, and other tools used to train police — so supervisors and prosecutors have something clear to point to when an officer does something wrong. “If you forbid a chokehold and it’s in the field manual, the police won’t do the chokehold,” Abt said. “And if they do, they can be disciplined more easily, and you have a stronger case if you need to go to court.” He added, “It’s one thing to do deescalation training, but it also has to be down on paper to impact policy.”Several experts also argued that the courtroom and law place too much emphasis on the seconds before and the moment of a shooting when, in reality, what went wrong may have come much earlier.“That moment in time when the officer uses force, we can look at and evaluate that — and we should,” Chris Burbank, former Salt Lake City police chief and director of law enforcement engagement at the Center for Policing Equity, told me. “But what I’m personally concerned about is all that led up to that circumstance.”An example several experts cited is the Cleveland police shooting of 12-year-old Tamir Rice. In that shooting, officers suspected that Rice had an actual firearm, when he was in fact playing with a toy gun. And officers drove right into the park where Rice was playing, putting themselves right in front of the boy and shooting him within two seconds of getting out of their squad car.What if officers had, instead of driving into the scene, parked farther away, surveyed the area, and walked into the park more slowly, while giving warnings to Rice? It’s of course impossible to say what the outcome would be — but it certainly seems much more likely that Rice would be alive today.

It’s this kind of strategic change that experts argue is necessary: Police need to start looking at situations to emphasize deescalation and avoiding the use of force, as is common in other developed countries. But in the US, the standard is frequently to take control of the situation by any means necessary — and that can lead to rapid, unneeded escalation.

Policy and law also aren’t always going to be the answer. Consider racial disparities in police shootings: If part of the problem is that American society as a whole is racist, that will spill over into police departments no matter how many policies are put in place to try to limit officers’ personal biases. It is on society in general to fix those problems, not just police. More than laws and policy, police are also going to be guided by certain norms — such as the widespread slogan among officers that “I’d rather be tried by 12 than carried by six.” Some policies can push police in another direction.

But until cops are fundamentally cultured to respect all human life and try to make sure that everyone, not just officers, gets home safely at the end of the day, there’s only so much that new policies can do. “Overwhelmingly, we are controlled by culture, not formal sanctions,” Abt said. “Policing is no different in some ways.”

### 1NC Police Noncompliance

#### Body cams can’t overcome police resistance to change – officers will sabotage recordings and there won’t be proper oversight

Manning 15, Professor of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Northeastern University (Peter, Will the widespread use of body cameras improve police accountability? No, https://www.americasquarterly.org/fulltextarticle/will-the-widespread-use-of-body-cameras-improve-police-accountability-no/)

It should surprise no one that when cameras or other devices are used to monitor patrol officers, they have responded by turning off cameras and microphones, by “forgetting” to turn them on or to insert fresh tapes, by changing the camera angle, and by deleting strips of images. Officers have also failed to replace tapes and have taped over previous recordings by reusing tapes. Departments amplify these practices by failing to properly supervise the processing of data. Even if there are rules about keeping cameras and microphones on, supervising officers may not regularly view and monitor the tapes, check officers’ use of them, maintain records of taping, or sanction officers who do not follow policies and procedures.These actions are forms of resistance to new IT, and they are rooted in the occupational culture of patrol officers. Any new surveillance technology is viewed with ambivalence. Although it could be argued that recordings of the officers’ words and actions protect the officer in internal investigations, civil suits or criminal charges, they could also reveal the everyday brutalities and incivilities that research has shown are routinely employed in policing in this country.It has been proposed that miniature cameras worn on the uniform will increase accountability. This claim has no empirical basis. There has been little systematic research on the question. Police typically announce the success of innovations before they are evaluated. The police position generally is, “Why would we do it if we did not think it would improve things?” So, this begs the question: What would accountability-based body cameras mean? There are two kinds of accountability: an in-advance definition of what is expected, and an after-the-fact justification for the decisions made. In policing, organizational accountability of either kind is an empty illusion because law enforcement is a profoundly conservative, stable and ossified institution. It has survived the community policing movement with little or no change in training, deployment, rewards systems, or management. The closest thing to true organizational accountability might be when the federal government places a department under a consent order for a specific pattern of abuses—for example, the Consent Decree Regarding the New Orleans Police Department in 2012.5 But even with such oversight, the same structure, supervision, training, rules, regulations, and protective mandate—the tacit agreement between society and the police that gives police latitude to define how best to do their jobs—remain unchanged. Consider why holding individual officers accountable in any case is problematic. The organizational structure gives officers significant discretion on patrol, and leaves them unsupervised with respect to when, how, why, and to what end they intervene in an incident. They are required after the fact to justify their actions—if they were known to the organization. But many actions are not recorded, or are labeled “action taken.” The tacit assumption within the police hierarchy is that you cannot easily judge individual decisions because “you had to be there” to understand. This ideology makes investigations, and holding individual officers accountable, very difficult in practice. Let us assume that there are few, if any, changes in the police organization except for the introduction of body cameras. If cameras are used, one might ask about the processing, use and management of the incredible number of hours of data that would be generated. How will they view, code, store, analyze, and apply these data? If you trust the police, you trust their words and deeds—it’s a contract. The hope is that body cameras or statements by commissioners or chiefs regarding changes in policy will transform practices. But there is little evidence that top-down management policies or local and state legal rulings change police practices. Since supervision, training, rewards, and practices have not changed, what evidence is there to suggest that a camera on an officer’s lapel will change behavior?

### 1NC No Behavioral Effect

#### The studies which analyze the most data show that there is no effect on behavior from body cams

Yokum 19, Director of The Policy Lab at Brown University (David, A randomized control trial evaluating the effects of police body-worn cameras, https://www.pnas.org/content/116/21/10329.full)

We consider here a few possible explanations for our null findings. First and most obviously, it is possible the null finding needs no explanation: The devices, in fact, have no effect on behavior. Perhaps neither the officer nor civilian involved in an interaction are actually aware of or affected by the camera, either due to attention being diverted elsewhere or desensitization over time to the presence of the cameras.Second, Washington, DC may be different from other places in important ways. Perhaps BWCs have no effect in the nation’s capital, but they do in other municipalities. We are sympathetic to this possibility, but we also note that, as BWCs were randomly assigned within each of the seven police districts, we conducted the equivalent of seven mini-experiments. Despite substantial district-to-district heterogeneity in baseline outcomes, we observe small, insignificant effects in all seven districts. A third explanation for the null findings considers the possibility that other factors are masking the true effect of the BWCs: The cameras do affect the measured outcomes, but these effects are being hidden by interference across units, or spillovers from treated to control officers. Approximately one-third of calls were responded to by control officers only, one-third by treatment officers only, and the last third by a mix of treatment and control officers. This distribution of calls indicates that control officers were frequently performing their duties without cameras nearby. As a check of whether the introduction of cameras affected both treatment and control officers, we examined time trends for documented uses of force and civilian complaints before and after cameras were deployed (analysis presented in SI Appendix). We observed no differences in precamera versus postcamera outcomes for either group. Finally, the true effect of BWCs may be masked by the widespread presence of nonpolice cameras (e.g., civilians’ cell phones). Civilians regularly record encounters with MPD members with their own cameras, and closed caption television (CCTV) is widespread. Perhaps the BWCs do not change behavior at the margin, simply because there is no more room to have an effect. To explore this possibility (we note that this analysis was not preregistered), we examined the effect of treatment on use of force at night, when exposure to nonpolice cameras is lower. We also found no effect of cameras on this alternative dependent variable. Other researchers have suggested that BWCs may fail to affect results because of nonadherence: Officers, for a variety of reasons, may not use their assigned cameras according to departmental policy (15, 22, 26). Officers may fail to activate the camera, for example. We have no indication that nonadherence was a widespread problem in our experiment. For 98% of the days in 2016, MPD averaged at least one video (and often many more) per call for service associated with a treatment officer. Further, even for the 2% of days in 2016 in which the number of videos uploaded was less than the number of incidents for which we would expect them, the difference is minimal, with 96% average adherence based on our measure. That said, effects may depend on the level of discretion officers are given to activate the cameras, although evaluation of that possibility will have to await further experiments. We acknowledge that BWCs may have had effects that are not measurable with administrative data. For example, it may be the case that there were uses of force that were previously going unreported, and those have now dropped with the introduction of BWCs. However, because our data do not capture unreported uses of force, we are unable to detect this kind of change. As a matter of speculation, however, we find it implausible that we would measure very small effects on reported outcomes but that the true average effect on unreported outcomes is large.In summary, we measured the average effects of BWCs on documented uses of force and civilian complaints as well as a variety of additional policing activities and judicial outcomes. Our sample size was unusually large, enhancing our ability to detect differences, should they exist. In addition, our comparison groups were constructed from an individual-level officer randomization scheme, which avoids several problems of inference present in other methodologies used to date. We are unable to detect any statistically significant effects. As such, our experiment suggests that we should recalibrate our expectations of BWCs as a technological solution to many policing difficulties.

### 1NC No Accountability

#### Video evidence doesn’t lead to convictions for police shootings – cops can always claim that they believed there was a threat and video can’t disprove that

Miller 19, Associate editor of data and business for Government Technology (Ben, What Body Cams Do: Behavior, Accountability and Trust, https://www.govtech.com/biz/What-Bodycams-Do-Behavior-Accountability-and-Trust.html)

They are only a sampling of all the times officers have shot African Americans in the U.S. in the past several years, an event that happens far more frequently per capita than for other racial groups. And though many of the shootings are captured on video — from body cameras, police car dash cameras, nearby security cameras or cellphones — few result in charges being brought against officers, and even fewer result in the conviction of an officer. The conviction of an officer in Balch Springs, Texas, last year for the murder of a 15-year-old African American boy received national attention precisely because of its rarity.

Not that officers should be convicted in every case. Like with any killing, it is up to courts and juries to decide whether they were justified under the law.

The calls for cops to wear body cameras were at least partially based on a hope that they would help juries see when officers were not justified. But the proliferation of video evidence in those cases — from body cams, as well as camera-equipped smartphones — doesn’t seem to be changing much in that regard. At least one study that surveyed prosecutors found that the majority of them use body camera footage primarily to try citizens, not officers.

There are a variety of reasons. One of them is that the cameras, though they produce evidence a juror can see for themselves rather than taking the word of an officer or witness, are not all-knowing arbiters of truth.No, a camera catches a particular moment in time within a limited frame pointed in one direction, and it does so at a given frame rate and resolution.The frame rate is very important in determining how a jury and court should interpret a video. That’s the opinion of Fredericks, who runs a lab that tests body cams for police departments that want to purchase them and who has served as a video interpretation expert on both sides of court cases involving officers shooting civilians.A slower frame rate — say, below the standard 30 frames per second — can make motions captured on video look faster. That means a fist swung at a person, for example, will look like it was thrown with more force than it actually was.Then there’s the problem of blurriness, which is exacerbated under the circumstances that many officer-involved shootings happen in. That blurriness can make it hard for a police captain, a district attorney, a Justice Department official, a juror, a judge or a community member to see the exact conditions under which an officer decided to shoot.“About two-thirds of all public contact with police is going to occur at night, usually when it’s dark, usually outside,” Fredericks said. “And body-worn cameras are designed to be worn on the uniform and (most videos) are going to be shot when the officer’s in motion.”

Another problem is that cameras don’t capture what will often amount to the most important question in a case involving an officer shooting: What was the officer who pulled the trigger thinking?

In order to bring charges or convict an officer, it doesn’t necessarily matter whether the person they killed was actually armed. It doesn’t matter whether the person actually meant to threaten the officer. What matters is whether the officer believed that they were armed; that there was a threat.

Hence, an iPhone becomes a legal justification for killing. The presence of a camera won’t change that.

### 1NC Increased Arrests

#### While body cams don’t reduce police violence, they do increase police arrests fueling mass incarceration and terror among communities of color

Braga 17, Professor of Criminology at Northwestern (Anthony, The Benefits of Body-Worn Cameras: new findings from a randomized controlled trial at the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/251416.pdf>)

The findings of this study suggest that BWCs have strong potential to benefit police agencies and communities alike. Not only do they reduce complaints against officers and use of force incidents in large measure (and the corresponding costs of resolving those complaints and use of force incidents), they seem to increase police productivity, evidenced by the modest but significant increases in police citations and arrests. Further research is needed on this count to determine whether bias exists in the increased stops and arrests, and whether this increase in productivity has negative effects on community perceptions of police. Our study also suggests that the benefits of cameras (at least in terms of cost savings due to the reduction in complaints) far outweigh the costs of the BWC program. This too requires additional research —the benefits might not be so great in a community characterized by positive police community relations prior to the introduction of BWCs. As the policing profession moves towards further implementation of BWCs, jurisdictions implementing BWCs will hopefully be open to rigorous research regarding outcomes and cost-benefit analyses, as well as the unintended benefits or consequences of their implementation.Further research is needed to determine whether the increases in enforcement activity were driven by enhanced officer confidence that the video evidence would be used to hold offenders accountable for their transgressions, officers’ concerns that supervisors who view videos of the interactions would hold them accountable for their discretionary actions, or both. Further research would help determine whether increased arrest and citation activity affected communities of color or other communities of concern disproportionately. It is also unknown how the observed increased enforcement activity of BWC officers might influence police legitimacy. It is possible that increased enforcement activity associated with BWCs might enhance legitimacy by improving police effectiveness in controlling crime, the departments’ capacity to hold offenders accountable, or both. Alternatively, increased enforcement activity could undermine police legitimacy if citizens view increased arrests and citations as harmful to their communities. Citizens’ appraisals of the police are largely influenced by the style of policing in their communities. Policing strategies that emphasize increased investigative stops, criminal summonses, and misdemeanor arrests across jurisdictions have been shown to generate concern about racial disparities and are suggested to contribute to the increased incarceration of young minority males. The findings of this RCT raise the possibility that, in our most vulnerable neighborhoods, increased enforcement activity associated with the placement of BWCs on officers could possibly undermine the improvement in citizen perceptions of the police generated by reductions in complaints and use of force incidents.

### 1NC Increased Violence

#### Body cameras increase the use of force because officers think that it will protect them

Doleac 17, Director of the Justice Tech Lab and Professor of Econoimcs at Texas A&M (Jennifer, Do body-worn cameras improve police behavior?, https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2017/10/25/do-body-worn-cameras-improve-police-behavior/)

However, it’s also possible that BWCs could increase use of force: Perhaps most officers show restraint in heated situations to avoid being accused of bad behavior. You might think this implausible, given how rare it is for police officers to face disciplinary action. But facing an accusation can be quite unpleasant, even if it does not lead to penalties, and even a small chance of losing your job or going to prison might be enough to make at least some police officers wary of using force in a borderline situation. Those officers may become more likely to use force when they know camera footage will demonstrate the facts were on their side.

### 1NC Police Propaganda

#### Video evidence gets released selectively to create propaganda for the policy to undermine resistance to violence and mass incarceration

Miller 19, Associate editor of data and business for Government Technology (Ben, What Body Cams Do: Policy, Discretion and Deeper Problems, https://www.govtech.com/biz/data/What-Body-Cams-Do-Policy-Discretion-and-Deeper-Problems.html)

In other cases, states have enacted laws exempting body camera footage from public record requests.

Giving police broad authority to decide which videos get released can be a problem for a few reasons, Marlow said. One is that it contradicts one of the main reasons for adopting the cameras in the first place: Transparency. Another is that it opens the door for the cameras to become a propaganda tool.

“They can present some significant threats to privacy, particularly if they transform into either a mass surveillance tool or a tool where there’s a propaganda-ish nature to it, meaning videos that paint the police in a positive light get released fairly quickly and easily and those that do not get withheld,” Marlow said.

Some police might fight the release of footage, but there are many who see rapid release of footage for events involving officer violence as being in the best interest of the department.

“(Agencies are) using it to mitigate riots and protests and that sort of thing in the community,” said David McNeil, chief of the Aberdeen, S.D., Police Department.

### 1NC Privacy

#### Body cams undermine privacy protections creating new traumas and civil rights violations

White 14, Professor in the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Arizona State University (ASU) and is associate director of ASU’s Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety (Michael, Police Officer Body-Worn Cameras: Assessing the Evidence, https://bja.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh186/files/bwc/pdfs/diagnosticcenter\_policeofficerbody-worncameras.pdf)

Body-worn cameras create citizen privacy concerns. Although civil rights advocates have generally supported the use of body-worn cameras by police (Stanley 2013), the impact of the technology on citizen privacy is not fully understood. Federal and state laws regarding the expectation of privacy place some restrictions on using audio and video recording. Moreover, body worn cameras capture in real time the traumatic experiences of citizens who are victims of crime, who are involved in medical emergencies and accidents, and who are being detained or arrested. Recording these events may exacerbate citizens’ trauma. In their model policy template (see Appendix B), the Body Worn Video Steering Group cautions law enforcement agencies about the collateral intrusion of the technology, particularly with regard to religious sensitivities, intimate searches, witnesses and confidential informants, victims, and communications governed by legal privilege. More research is needed.

### 2NC/1NR Deeper Problems

#### Body worn cameras distract from the work that needs to be done to resolve the underlying conditions that lead to violence

Davis 18, Director of Public Safety at Northeastern University (Michael, Evaluating the Impact of Police Body Cameras, https://www.urban.org/debates/evaluating-impact-police-body-cameras

I agree with Mr. Lynch that body worn cameras seem to be what many consider the panacea to police misconduct. While clearly these devices add more transparency to the interactions that police officers engage in they often do not give the most complete picture of any particular event. Aside from many of the considerations that have been mentioned, I would add another consideration in terms of the direction that we really need to be headed with police-community relations. I would submit that over dependency on tools of oversight, such as BWCs, could distract from the real work that needs to done, both inside police departments and within communities. Sometimes in policing we can gravitate towards a "fix" and don't work on the more causal conditions that created the problem/s in the first place.

We are in a moment in time where the need to bring the police closer to the community has never been greater. Our collective time is best spent looking to build mutual understanding of perspectives and collectively working to challenge those conditions that lead to crime .

### 2NC/1NR Deeper Problems

#### Lack of video evidence isn’t the issue – racism and militarism in the police must be the starting point for change

Miller 19, Associate editor of data and business for Government Technology (Ben, What Body Cams Do: Policy, Discretion and Deeper Problems, https://www.govtech.com/biz/data/What-Body-Cams-Do-Policy-Discretion-and-Deeper-Problems.html)

If they were put in place to hold police accountable for bad behavior, then success has come infrequently.

If they were to promote transparency, they certainly do so under the right conditions.

If body cameras were meant to protect the police, they appear to be working.

But just like any other kind of technology, body cameras are secondary to human behavior. So behind all the questions about whether body cameras are doing what they were meant to, or what people were hoping they would do, or whether they’re worth it, there is a truth: A lack of video is not the reason police disproportionately shoot and kill African Americans.

There are other reasons. Marlow pointed to the questions courts are given to answer when an officer kills a civilian.

“The real issue in many cases is how permissive our laws are when it comes to police use of force,” he said.

That’s part of the problem, agrees Scot Esdaile, who sits on the NAACP's board of directors. But there is a much older issue underneath.

“I think it’s good for us to see the videos,” he said. “But I don’t think the cameras are going to solve the problem of racist police or the military-minded police that are carrying out this behavior in communities of color.”

### 2NC/1NR Deeper Problems

#### There are no easy fixes to police violence – the culture at the root of the problem must be addressed before change is possible

Lopez 17, Senior Correspondent at Vox for Criminal justice and public health (German, The failure of police body cameras, https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2017/7/21/15983842/police-body-cameras-failures)

This was not the story that Americans — and especially Black Lives Matter protesters who’ve rallied against police brutality — were told about body cameras. These devices were supposed to be key to police accountability and making police more transparent.

The thinking was simple: Once the public sees video of police officers in their day-to-day job, the world will have a clearer picture of just how widespread police abuses are. For racial justice advocates in particular, the hope was that the video would force jurors to discard their typical pro-police biases in the courtroom — and be more willing to convict officers for bad uses of force.

The idea got a lot of traction, leading the Obama administration to push police-worn body cameras and for police departments around the country to adopt the technology — especially in the aftermath of high-profile police killings of black men, which led to massive Black Lives Matter protests in cities like Ferguson, Missouri, and Baltimore. The policy was extremely popular, with some polls finding nearly 90 percent support among Americans, including Democrats and Republicans.

Yet as the policy has rolled out, we’ve seen the sharp limitations of cameras and video — not just in the Tensing trial, but also other cases in which video provided evidence of what happened. The courtroom failures point to the fundamental limitation in recording the police: While it can help hold cops accountable in some cases, the problems with American police and how they use force are simply far bigger than a lack of video. So what was once thought of as a relatively easy fix to police use of force issues has ended up falling short of what many supporters and activists anticipated.

### 2NC/1NR Police Noncompliance

#### Body camera limitations make it too messy to be an effective check on police

Lopez 17, Senior Correspondent at Vox for Criminal justice and public health (German, The failure of police body cameras, https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2017/7/21/15983842/police-body-cameras-failures)

Sometimes the lack of clarity can be caused by the technological limits of the cameras themselves. The video may not be very high-quality. If it comes from a body camera, it’s filmed from a narrow view — whatever is visible from the officer’s perspective. It might miss key moments if the cameras aren’t activated quickly enough, or it might not capture a shooting at all.

“The video can be ambiguous,” Rachel Levinson-Waldman, an expert on body cameras at the Brennan Center for Justice, told me. “It’s hard to interpret sometimes. It’s shaky. Often, the body cameras aren’t turned on at the right time … so they may not capture all of a particular incident.”

One of those problems was present last week in the police shooting of Justine Damond in Minneapolis: Officer Mohamed Noor, who shot Damond, and his partner were both wearing body cameras. Minneapolis Police Department policy requires cops to turn on their cameras before they use force and when interacting with civilians. Yet they didn’t — and we still have little idea how, exactly, the shooting played out.

This shows another flaw of body cameras in particular: The cameras can’t, at least for now, be left on at all times due to technological constraints (especially battery and storage limits) and privacy concerns (particularly for civilians whom police are filming). So it’s ultimately up to individual officers to decide when the camera is turned on — and that makes it possible for cops, on purpose or not, to effectively cover up acts of bad policing.

Combined, these limitations make it so body cameras were always doomed to fall short of the expectations that some supporters had. The problems with policing are just too messy and complicated for one piece of technology — or video more broadly — to fix.

### 2NC/1NR No Behavioral Effect

#### No demonstrable effect that cameras reduce violence

Miller 19, Associate editor of data and business for Government Technology (Ben, What Body Cams Do: Behavior, Accountability and Trust, https://www.govtech.com/biz/What-Bodycams-Do-Behavior-Accountability-and-Trust.html)

If body cameras were supposed to provide an undisputable record of the truth — thereby holding officers accountable when they unlawfully kill civilians — then the results have been a mixed bag. And if they were meant to prevent killings and violence from ever happening, it appears they have failed.

In fact, the clearest beneficiary of body cameras has been police agencies themselves. In the coming days, Government Technology will examine what research, experts, advocates and police say body cameras are and aren’t good for.

BEHAVIOR

It doesn’t appear likely that body cameras cause big changes in police behavior.

Research on the question has turned up mixed results. Many studies of varying quality have been conducted on the question; some have found that officers wearing cameras were less likely to use force while many found no difference with the cameras. RAND Corp. and a George Mason University research team both found that officers whose cameras are turned on for their entire shift are less likely to use force than those who have discretion over when to turn them on, or who are only required to turn them on under certain circumstances.There are those who believe that they lead police to behave more politely in certain situations, such as when dealing with a person who is being rude — for pragmatic reasons.“Generally the officers use the video to their benefit to demonstrate professionalism, especially if somebody’s getting out of hand,” said Grant Fredericks, an expert witness in cases involving video evidence and owner of a testing lab for body cameras. “They know they’re recording, they know they’re going to look good in court … and the bad guy’s going to look bad.”

But does the presence of a camera change the actions officers take in the heat of the moment? Police and experts seem skeptical.

They certainly don’t expect officers to admit it.

“We haven’t had any occurrence in the department where an officer said, ‘I didn’t want to do something because the camera was on,’” said David McNeil, chief of the Aberdeen, S.D., Police Department. “Haven’t seen any hesitation in that respect.”

Scot Esdaile, who sits on the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People’s board of directors, said things don’t seem to be getting better. If anything, he feels there’s been more police violence against communities of color.

And it’s not like cameras are new when it comes to police misconduct either. It’s been nearly 30 years since the Los Angeles Police Department’s beating of Rodney King was captured on video tape. The initial acquittal of the officers involved — two of them were later convicted in federal court — caused mass outrage and disruption too. Just like in Ferguson, and Milwaukee, and Sacramento.

“Whether it’s on camera or off camera, they don’t seem to be changing their behaviors,” Esdaile said.

As body cameras have become more popular, the number of police killings of civilians has not substantially changed. According to data compiled by The Washington Post, there were 994 fatal police shootings in the U.S. in 2015, the year body cameras really started taking off in law enforcement. In 2016, there were 962 fatal police shootings. In 2017, there were 986. In 2018, there were 992.

### 2NC/1NR No Behavioral Effect

#### There isn’t sufficient evidence to prove a “civilizing effect” from body cameras

White 14, Professor in the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Arizona State University (ASU) and is associate director of ASU’s Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety (Michael, Police Officer Body-Worn Cameras: Assessing the Evidence, https://bja.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh186/files/bwc/pdfs/diagnosticcenter\_policeofficerbody-worncameras.pdf)

Body-worn cameras have a civilizing effect, resulting in improved behavior among both police officers and citizens. Several of the empirical studies have documented substantial decreases in citizen complaints (Rialto, Mesa, Plymouth, and Renfrewshire/Aberdeen studies) as well as in use of force by police (Rialto) and assaults on officers (Aberdeen). There is also anecdotal support for a civilizing effect reported elsewhere (Phoenix and in media reports cited in the references list). However, the behavior dynamics that explain these complaints and use of force trends are by no means clear. The decline in complaints and use of force may be tied to improved citizen behavior, improved police officer behavior, or a combination of the two. It may also be due to changes in citizen complaint reporting patterns (rather than a civilizing effect), as there is evidence that citizens are less likely to file frivolous complaints against officers wearing cameras (Goodall 2007; Stross 2013). Available research cannot disentangle these effects; thus, more research is needed.

#### No evidence that police will act differently if they know they are being recorded

Yokum 17, Director of The Policy Lab at Brown University (Evaluating the Effects of Police Body-Worn Cameras: A Randomized Controlled Trial, https://bwc.thelab.dc.gov/TheLabDC\_MPD\_BWC\_Working\_Paper\_10.20.17.pdf)

Police officer body-worn cameras (BWCs) have been promoted as a technological mechanism that will improve policing and the perceived legitimacy of the police and legal institutions. While there is a national movement to deploy BWCs widely, evidence of their effectiveness is limited.

To estimate the average effects of BWCs, we conducted a randomized controlled trial involving 2,224 Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) officers in Washington, DC. Our pre-analysis plan was publicly registered in advance. We compared officers randomly assigned to wear BWCs to officers in the control condition who did not wear BWCs. The primary outcomes of interest were documented uses of force and civilian complaints, although we also measure a variety of additional policing activities and judicial outcomes. We estimated very small average treatment effects on all measured outcomes, none of which rose to statistical significance. These results suggest that we should recalibrate our expectations of BWCs’ ability to induce large-scale behavioral changes in policing, particularly in contexts similar to Washington, DC.

### 2NC/1NR No Accountability

#### Body cameras don’t create accountability – courts wont convict even with video evidence

Lopez 17, Senior Correspondent at Vox for Criminal justice and public health (German, The failure of police body cameras, https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2017/7/21/15983842/police-body-cameras-failures)

It’s not just Ray Tensing. Over the past several months, there have been several other high-profile police shootings that didn’t result in convictions despite the existence of body cameras or, in their absence, other video evidence.

Another particularly egregious case is the North Charleston, South Carolina, police shooting of Walter Scott. The video, from a bystander’s cellphone, showed ex-cop Michael Slager shooting a fleeing man in the back at least eight times, even though Scott had never posed a threat to Slager or others. Yet a judge was forced to declare a mistrial after a jury hung. (Slager, however, later pleaded guilty to federal charges for violating Scott’s civil rights.)

This was a case in which many people, including a very conservative, pro-police pundit like Sean Hannity, said the officer was clearly in the wrong. Yet a jury could not reach a verdict — showing just how strong pro-police biases are among the general public and jurors.

“All it takes is one juror,” Thomas Abt, a criminal justice expert at Harvard University, told me, “and there are people out there in the general population who are just not going to second-guess a police officer — even when the evidence is overwhelming.”

### 2NC/1NR Increased Arrests

#### Body cameras will be used as new surveillance tools that will increase mass incarceration in minority communities

Chapman 16, Journalist for NBC News (Catherine, Police Body Cams Spark Concerns About Privacy, Mass Surveillance, https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/police-body-cams-spark-concerns-about-privacy-mass-surveillance-n690536)

“Our main findings with the report is that with body-worn cameras accountability doesn’t come automatically,” said Harlan Yu, principal technologist at Upturn. “That’s the bottom line. These are tools that are completely powerful and that are used by officers to point at the community and not inward at the officers. If body-worn cameras are owned and operated by police departments, I think that there are legitimate fears that they will just be used as a new surveillance system gathering evidence about crimes that will be used to over-police and over-prosecute people of color.”

#### Existing body camera use proves that it causes more arrests

Braga 17, Professor of Criminology at Northwestern (Anthony, The Benefits of Body-Worn Cameras: new findings from a randomized controlled trial at the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/251416.pdf>)

Two controlled studies suggest that officers do increase their law enforcement activities when outfitted with BWCs. In the Phoenix, Arizona quasi-experimental evaluation, Katz et al. concluded that BWCs increased officer productivity as measured by the number of arrests. They reported that the number of arrests increased by about 17 percent among officers in the BWC treatment group compared to 9 percent among officers in the comparison group.41,42 In the Essex (UK) randomized controlled trial, Owens et al. found that incidents attended by BWC officers more likely to result in criminal charges as compared to incidents attended by control officers.

### 2NC/1NR Increased Arrests

#### Body cameras encourage police to make more arrests in minority neighborhoods

Braga 18, Professor of Criminology at Northwestern (Anthony, THE EFFECTS OF BODY-WORN CAMERAS ON POLICE ACTIVITY AND POLICECITIZEN ENCOUNTERS: A RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIAL, https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=7632&context=jclc)

There is also growing evidence that suggests BWCs may result in increased enforcement activity by police officers. Controlled evaluations reveal that BWC officers make more arrests and citations relative to their non-BWC counterparts. These unexpected outcomes could undermine improvements in police-citizen encounters associated with adoption of the technology in urban environments. To some observers, too many police departments engage in excessive surveillance and enforcement practices in urban neighborhoods.

#### Studies show that arrests increase with body cameras

Katz 14, Director of the Center for Violence Prevention and Community Safety and is a Professor in the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Arizona State University (Charles, Evaluating the Impact of Officer Worn Body Cameras in the Phoenix Police Department, https://publicservice.asu.edu/sites/default/files/ppd\_spi\_feb\_20\_2015\_final.pdf)

Exhibit 16 displays our findings of arrest activity. Analyses for both camera-wearing officers and comparison officers showed that average daily arrests increased significantly from the pre to the post camera deployment period. During both the pre and post deployment period, comparison officers made more arrests, about 0.11 pre to 0.12 post, compared to 0.08 pre to 0.12 post among camera-wearing officers. On the other hand, examining the percentage change in average daily arrests, officers with body worn cameras showed a significant increase (0.04 arrests per day on average) in the number of mean daily arrests when compared to officers without cameras (0.01). Put another way, the camera officers increased their average daily arrests by 42.6%, which was nearly triple the change among comparison group officers (14.9%), which was statistically significant.

### 2NC/1NR Increased Violence

#### Body cams escalate volatile situations making violence more likely

Braga 17, Professor of Criminology at Northwestern (Anthony, The Benefits of Body-Worn Cameras: new findings from a randomized controlled trial at the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/251416.pdf>)

While there is some promising evidence that BWCs de-escalate confrontation and aggression in police-citizen encounters, not all evaluations support this position. A randomized experimental design was used to evaluate the effects of BWCs on complaints against officers in the London Metropolitan Police Service (UK). The study did not reveal any statistically-significant differences in overall complaints made against officers with BWCs relative to officers not wearing BWCs. There were also no statistically-significant differences in self-reported assaults on officers or injuries for BWC officers relative to control officers. A multisite randomized experiment involving 2,122 officers in eight police departments reported no overall reduction in officer use of force and an increase in assaults on officers wearing BWCs during treatment shifts relative to officers not wearing BWCs during control shifts. In a re-analysis of the multisite randomized experiment data, Ariel et al. show that use of force by treatment officers decreased by 37 percent in three sites with high compliance to a BWC policy that required officers to notify citizens that they were being recorded at the beginning of the encounter. Ariel et al. also reported a 71 percent increase in officer use of force in sites with low compliance to the BWC policy. Based on these findings, the authors hypothesized that unchecked BWC discretion may increase use of force as camera activation during situations with escalating aggression may further increase aggression during these volatile situations. The authors also suggested that verbal notification of video recording by officers at the commencement of encounters may be helpful in deterring aggressive behavior and stimulating civil behavior before police-citizen interactions escalate.

### 2NC/1NR Police Propaganda

#### Police have control over what footage gets released ensuring that body cameras will only help coverup violence

Chapman 16, Journalist for NBC News (Catherine, Police Body Cams Spark Concerns About Privacy, Mass Surveillance, https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/police-body-cams-spark-concerns-about-privacy-mass-surveillance-n690536)

“Police body cameras onto themselves are neither a good nor a bad thing,” the American Civil Liberties Union's Chad Marlow said. “It’s all dictated by the policy that govern their use. If you have the right policies in place, body cams can be an important tool to help promote police transparency and accountability, while at the same time protecting privacy. If the wrong policy is in place, they turn into nothing more than a mass surveillance and police propaganda tool.”

"On-officer recording systems" are fitted onto uniforms, intended to record daily interactions with the public in an unbiased manner, particularly when force is used.

Demands for accountability due to racial discrimination and profiling within police forces prompted a New York judge in 2013 order a body cam pilot program after deeming the state’s stop-and-frisk policy unconstitutional.

Social unrest triggered by the 2014 shooting of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri, resulted in such programs spreading nationwide — assisted by $20 million of initial funding from the Justice Department.

However, no privacy or other requirements were mandated in order to acquire financing.

That has created problems. In Albuquerque, New Mexico, officers independently chose whether or not to delete body-worn camera footage at the end of their shifts.

In Charlotte, North Carolina, a new law passed in the wake of Scott's shooting makes it difficult for the public to view any police video. That decision triggered even more protests.

But in Chicago, a police officer who failed to record the shooting of 18-year-old Paul O’Neal, despite wearing a body camera at the time, was placed under administrative leave.

Body cams worn by police officers in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, also failed to capture footage during the shooting of Alton Sterling. They blame on the equipment's manufacturer.

“If police use their body cameras to capture footage on everything that they experience in the day, but the police get to determine solely what the public gets to see and they have the ability to only release videos that show them in the best light or promotes their perspective, that’s the definition of propaganda,” Marlow added.

### 2NC/1NR Privacy

#### Body cameras allow violations of privacy rights and enable new modes of surveillance

Pearce 14, Staff Write at LA Times (Matt, Growing use of police body cameras raises privacy concerns, https://www.latimes.com/nation/la-na-body-cameras-20140927-story.html)

But equipping police with such devices also raises new and unsettled issues over privacy at a time when many Americans have been critical of the kind of powerful government surveillance measures that technology has made possible.

For many departments, questions remain about when officers should be allowed to turn off such cameras — especially in cases involving domestic violence or rape victims — and the extent to which video could be made public.

Such video “sometimes captures people at the worst moments of their lives,” American Civil Liberties Union senior policy analyst Jay Stanley said.

“You don’t want to see videos of that uploaded to the Internet for titillation and gawking,” he said.

Video from dashboard cameras in police cars, a more widely used technology, has long been exploited for entertainment purposes. Internet users have posted dash-cam videos of arrests of naked women to YouTube, and TMZ sometimes obtains police videos of athletes and celebrities during minor or embarrassing traffic stops, turning officers into unwitting paparazzi.

Officers wearing body cameras could extend that public eye into living rooms or bedrooms, should a call require them to enter a private home.

Faced with the challenge of striking a balance between transparency for police and privacy for citizens, U.S. law enforcement agencies have not adopted a uniform policy for body cameras, which come in various sizes and can be worn on shoulders, glasses and lapels.

A recent federal survey of 63 law enforcement agencies using body cameras said nearly a third of the agencies had no written policy on the devices. (It is not known how many agencies overall currently use body cameras.)

“Unfortunately, you’re seeing a lot of departments just sticking cameras on their officers without thinking through the policies very well,” says Stanley, who supports police use of body cameras, but only with careful regulation.

Some observers have raised the possibility that such cameras would not only be used to review officer behavior — to potentially overbearing levels, if used to crack down on minor disciplinary infractions — but someday also may be used with facial-recognition technology the way many departments already use license-plate scanners.