

**Thursday, July 8, 2004 – 7:30 p.m.
Chicago**

Moderator: Good evening everybody. My name is Malcolm Saravanamuttoo – we'll just call me Malcolm with a last name of 14 letters. I work for a company called EKOS research associates, and we've been hired by one of the universities today and we're going to talk about a number of issues which will become very clear very quickly. As you may or may not have noticed, this is a special type of room, a special focus group room. There are microphones in the ceiling. We are audiotaping the discussion tonight. I've just done two hours of this and I'm doing this for another two hours. I cannot take very good notes as I go along. I go back, listen to my tapes and see, oh, that's what was said. That being said, when we actually do write our report, everything is kept confidential. We say men versus women, younger versus older, but that's the extent to which we will identify anything. That is a one-way mirror. Usually there are people behind watching this. There is nobody there today, my client is unable to come, and so we are videotaping it. In terms of tonight and the ground rules for tonight, very easy going. The first thing I always say is there are no right answers tonight, and there are no wrong answers tonight. We just went through two hours of something where people just saw it, some things they say very similarly, but other things they just find things very differently. So the way we're going to start this, I'm going to ask you a couple questions, and again I'll sort of say there are no wrong answers, I'm going to say that. It is also okay to disagree, if John has one view, and Carol has another, I want to hear some of the differences. It's also okay to change your mind if, after you've heard something, you sort of say, you know what I'm thinking differently and I'm going to change my mind. And the other thing that I ask is that we just, individuals speak one at a time.

I basically have three roles as a moderator. I'm going to raise issues for discussion, then I guide what we're going to talk about. I may not always answer a question, if you put it back to me I may say, well, what does it mean to you, Peter? Just to get a sense of how you interpret my question. My second role is to make sure everybody has a chance to speak. There are 10 of us in the room, sometimes I have to play that traffic cop role and say, okay, hold on a second, I need to hear from – Maria. And as I always say, my third and my most important role is I keep track of time. We've asked you here from 7:30 to 9:30 tonight, we will be done no later than 9:30, I assure you. Any questions so far?

Can we go around the table and introduce ourselves by our first name only and say something, a little bit about yourself, your occupation or what you do.

Mark: Hi, my name's Mark. I rehab [?] properties and work in quite a few buildings, putting in kitchens, bathrooms.

Moderator: Okay.

Wyfred: Hello, my name is Wyfred I'm a med tech.

Carol: I'm Carol, I'm a bookkeeper. Got two children, three grandchildren.

Sandy: My name is Sandy and I'm a secretary at a community college.

Maria: My name's Maria. I'm a college professor. I teach English and Italian literature.

Peter: My name's Peter. I do carpentry work, mostly additions onto homes up the north shore.

Moderator: Okay.

Ben: My name's Ben and I'm the senior art director for a publishing company that does children's books.

Susanne: Susanne, and I'm an accountant. Which makes me, by definition, dull. You can all fall asleep.

John: My name's John. I am a department manager in a financial services company.

Moderator: Okay. Good. Now you all have a pen and paper. I want you to write down the first thing that comes to mind when you hear the word "privacy". The first thing that pops into your mind. So I'll always say, no wrong answers, no right answers. First thing that pops into your mind: privacy. Everybody have something? And when you hear the word "security". I want you to write down, what's the first thing that comes to mind? John, what did you write for privacy?

John: Bathroom.

Moderator: Susanne.

Susanne: I lied. I wrote down eavesdropping. For some reason the first thing that popped into my head was Patriot Act.

Moderator: Okay. Would you just write down "Patriot Act". Ben

Ben: Home.

Moderator: Home. Peter.

Peter: I was going to go your way, I was going to say invasion of, corrosion of. My space and time.

Moderator: Maria.

Maria: A civil right.

Moderator: Sandy.

Sandy: Home.

Moderator: Home.

Carol: Act.

Moderator: Act.

Carol: As in Privacy Act.

Moderator: Wyfred.

Wyfred: I said rights.

Moderator: Rights. Mark.

Mark: Government.

Moderator: Government.

Moderator: Security.

Mark: Banks.

Moderator: Banks.

Wyfred: Protection.

Moderator: Protection.

Carol: Home.

Moderator: Home.

Sandy: Money.

Maria: Homeland.

Peter: Feeling of well-being.

Ben: Police.

Susanne: Safe.

John: Retirement.

Moderator: Okay. People often talk about privacy as a value. What is a value? To begin. Can you give some examples?

Male Participant: It's by what you live.

Male Participant: Aspects of your life which you put in some sort of quantitative order some meaning more than others, some being more protective, taking care of some better than others.

Moderator: Okay.

Male Participant: Personal rules.

Moderator: Personal rules.

Female Participant: Kind of ideals.

Moderator: Ideals? Anybody else?

Female Participant: Things that you attach the characteristics of right and wrong to.

Moderator: Okay.

Female Participant: And good and bad.

Moderator: So thinking from another perspective, a value, as Americans – freedom. Equality. They're often cited as some values which sort of represent the US. What do you think of the concept of people talking about privacy as a value? Does that makes sense, or is that –

Male Participant: You said the concept of it?

Moderator: Yes. I mean, freedom, equality – those are kind of pretty easily understood. And I think you would get, most people would agree that those are values of this country. Privacy as a value.

Wyfred: As opposed to a right.

Moderator: Okay. As opposed to a right.

Male Participant: You're putting it in the context of a national sense, though.

Moderator: Well, in the same context as freedom and equality, which could be national, but could be individual, too. Does that make sense?

Male Participant: In social parameters that have been set in social mores and, the social boundaries. Certain boundaries that we've come to expect as a society, and to get along in that society.

Moderator: What do you think? Privacy as a value.

Female Participant: What do you mean that what do we think? How do we feel about it? What do we think we as a people have done with it –

Moderator: When you hear me say, when you hear me give an example, like freedom, equality. Does privacy belong in that list if we were to expand that list?

Female Participant: I would think that privacy does belong to it. I do very strongly believe that no one has the right to invade your home or pry into how you think or feel, uninvited. I also feel that way about the Internet. I don't think, I think you should have to invite things into your home, and not have to protect your borders.

Moderator: Okay.

Male Participant: You mean you don't like those 400 emails a day?

Female Participant: No, I really don't.

Moderator: Carol?

Male Participant: Takes me longer to get rid of them.

Carol: I agree with you, because I think value is something that is worth something. So I would agree with you that privacy as value.

Moderator: Okay.

Male Participant: It goes hand in hand with freedom.

Moderator: Goes hand in hand with freedom?

Female Participant: I put it above value, I put it as a right.

Moderator: Okay. You put it as a right. And you said that as your first, your first comment. Well, one of the things that my company does in addition to focus groups is we survey a lot of people. And we often ask questions about privacy, and we ask them to agree or disagree with a statement. And we give them a scale from one to seven where one is they strongly disagree, seven is they strongly agree, and four is neither. And the statement is that you have less personal privacy in your daily life than you did five years ago. I want you to write down a one to seven.

Female Participant: One being strongly disagree?

Male Participant: Strongly agree.

Moderator: One being strongly disagree, and seven being strongly agree, and four is neither. You have less privacy in your daily life than you did five years ago. I just want you to write down a number. Mark.

Mark: Six.

Moderator: Wyfred.

Wyfred: That one's a seven.

Carol: Seven.

Sandy: Four.

Moderator: Maria.

Maria: Six.

Moderator: Six? Peter.

Peter: Five.

Ben: Six.

Moderator: Six?

Susanne: Seven.

Moderator: Seven.

John: Four.

Moderator: Four. Why did two of you say four? Start with you, John.

John: I thought about the question and I thought of it two different ways. Me as an individual and – which is, I think, the way you're looking for the answer – and that's the way I feel about my own circumstances.

Moderator: Okay.

Sandy: And I feel nothing's changed that much.

Moderator: Okay. The others?

Male Participant: Well, somebody used the Internet as an example earlier. I think that automatically is a good example of how privacy and feeling like you have your own space and stuff has changed because of that, and then on top of that the Patriot Act also.

Moderator: Okay. Susanne?

Susanne: I feel that I'm – as long as I'm off of everybody's radar screen, my privacy has not changed. But if something happens in my life, there is a greater ability to look into every aspect of my financial transactions, you know, charge card purchases, even the people I connect with on a daily basis. So I feel like right now I have no real invasions on my privacy, because I'm not on anybody's radar screen. But the minute I would become a blip ...

Moderator: Okay. Peter.

Peter: I put five. I would like to believe, I would like to be a four, actually, I'm just – the facts as I see it, well, in my personal life, in my personal relationships, i.e., family, people close to me and stuff, there have been some privacy things, but I have a feeling that this discussion has a little larger sense you have in society. The truth is, I don't think we really know what has happened to our privacy and our security, you

know, unless you get flagged for some reason, you really don't know what they've done as far as invading your privacy.

Moderator: Okay.

Mark: I've got a good idea what they've done. The last February I had wanted to go down to a piece of property down in Lafayette, Louisiana, and I was putting everything on the charge card as far as gas purchases and lodging purchases. And I was in Jackson, Mississippi and it's an 18 hour drive, and my wife had already got the call from the credit card company wanting to know what's with it, because this is not normal usage. Hey, you know, what do they care whether it's normal usage or not, I didn't buy a five thousand dollar mink coat, you know? I was buying tankfuls of gas and I bought one night of lodging. *Somebody's* watching what I'm doing, okay? Wouldn't have happened five or six years ago. So that's where I came up with my six.

Moderator: Okay. Wyfred?

Wyfred: Everybody wants your Social Security Number, you know – you order a cup of coffee – what's your Social Security Number? [Laughter] So I really don't see much privacy. Also with the cameras on the street lights, they put cameras on the street lights, so I don't see much privacy at all. And if you do anything on the Internet they can track that too on the Internet, so ...

Male Participant: ... cellphones, two-way radio ... [?]

Female Participant: I personally have no objections to things like cameras on streetlights, because these are in places where I have no expectation of privacy. I mean, I go out on the streets and I don't expect this to be a private place. I, you know, I feel like if there were – I wouldn't talk about personal family matters where somebody might overhear them. But when you come within my house, and onto my property, or in the space I consider my space, then there is an expectation of privacy, and that's the one that I feel most sensitive about. As I said, I like the fact that we're ticketing red light runners and that, as a pedestrian, it has made me a lot safer.

Moderator: Carol.

Carol: I think in applying for a job, the checks that they can do, which kind of touches on what Wyfred said with the Social Security, they do physical, they do a background check, they do a drug check, they do a have you every filed bankruptcy check, I mean, they've got checks like ... and some of these things absolutely do not pertain to the job that you're applying for.

Moderator: Okay. Maria.

Maria: I forgot what I was going to say, I was so interested in what other people were saying. I guess the –

Moderator: You said – what number did you say?

Maria: I said six.

Moderator: Okay.

Maria: The thing I was thinking of, besides the Internet, well, with respect to the Internet, my partner does not have a cell phone, has never logged onto a computer, and never gets any phone calls, any solicitation, he's off the radar screen. Whereas I get constant solicitation through the mail, and the phone, on the computer, so that's one thing. And then the other thing is I'm involved with the National Library Association, and we're very aware that our privacy is potentially being violated and that books you take out of the library can be flagged by the FBI, without your knowledge, and it's going back to – potentially going back to the days of the '50s when, you know, the CIA and the FBI were monitoring.

Moderator: Why do you say potentially?

Maria: I read a lot about the CIA, and the unbelievable hold they had on intellectual life in the '50s, I don't know how interested they are ...

Moderator: But are they looking at what people are taking out of the libraries?

Maria: Oh yes, they are, but – not the same people. I don't think they're looking at me right now, they don't care what I do. So my personal feeling is my privacy is probably the same as far as that, but if I had the wrong last name, I think my privacy would be being violated.

Moderator: Okay. If I asked you a follow-up question where, again, a sort of seven-point scale where one is you're not at all concerned, and seven you're extremely concerned, and four you're somewhat concerned. How concerned are you actually about your privacy today? I want you to write down one to seven again.

Male Participant: Concerned about our privacy?

Moderator: Yes. How concerned are you personally about your privacy. One is you're not at all concerned –

Male Participant: You mean that it's vulnerable?

Moderator: But your own personal privacy. How concerned are you about it? So you could – vulnerability?

Male Participant: Is this like the other question, as compared to five years ago or ...

Moderator: No, just today. One is you're not at all concerned, seven is you're extremely concerned, and four you're somewhat concerned.

Moderator: Mark.

Mark: Six.

Moderator: Wyfred.

Wyfred: Six.

Carol: Six.

Sandy: Two.

Maria: Six.

Peter: Six.

Ben: Six.

Susanne: Four.

John: I'm dumb. One.

Moderator: Why one?

John: A couple of reasons. One, the primary one is I feel like in large part I'm in control of what is accessible or available, and I know that on the way in. If I do something with my computer or fill something out or give somebody some information, I know I'm potentially opening a door.

Moderator: Okay.

John: And secondly, I just don't feel, you know, that – I understand all the concerns and so forth, or at least I feel I do, in a lot of ways – but I don't feel like I've got something to hide, and you want to look at what I've done in the library, or look at my credit card – help yourself, you know.

Moderator: Okay. Sandy, why two?

Sandy: It's similar. I know I have friends who are really concerned and are buying shredders and I was never like that, but nothing bad has ever happened to me, ever. So that could be part of it.

Moderator: Who said four?

Susanne: I did. You know, I hadn't really thought so much about the charge card stuff because that, well, part of it is I don't use that much, and I feel like I'm living a pretty overt lifestyle, I mean, I am active in the community, so anything that people want to know is pretty much out there. I think that could easily change. This is my level of comfort at this time and in the place I'm in, which is this community I've lived in for 27 years, and in a job I've been at 17 years. Now, as I said, that could very very quickly change. But in my position in life, it is a four.

Moderator: Okay. And the others? At sixes?

Male Participant: Well, the Internet, so it's just easier to obtain your address, phone number, other things like that, so, that is a concern. I mean, let's say some girl's got a stalker, he can easily track her down, a lot easier than he could previous times.

Moderator: Okay. Others?

Male Participant: The medical profession has just opened so many doorways to insurance companies and everyone else looking into your records, and then either denying your or mitigating the kind of insurances they'll sell you, okay? Take a genetic test, you have a potentially life-threatening disease that's going to cost a lot of money, and we have a friend who has been in that situation, she can't leave her job, she can't go anywhere else, because that knowledge has gotten out, okay? So if she goes to another place of employment, they're going to be, well, we're not going to write you any insurance because our premiums are going to go up because of ABC, and my wife does work in the medical profession, and just through knowing what she brings home, there's a lot of people looking into medical records. And even with this new privacy act, it's more of a "look, we did something" than we've done something. It's smoke and mirrors, I mean, you know. To go visit my sister-in-law either I had to know her name and the exact spelling or ABC, or I had to have a password that she puts into the computer, for me to find her. Otherwise the people at the front desk would not have allowed me to go up and visit with her. So, you know, I think that's, you know, kind of foolish, and it really does nothing, because other people are still able to look at our records. And they shouldn't have that kind of access.

Moderator: Anybody else?

Male Participant: I have sixes.

Male Participant: I feel in the last, well, the last couple years specifically transactions, Internet usage, cell phone usage, all that stuff, if it's not being watched and monitored all the time, something can happen as it did to – I'm sorry, ... --

Mark: Mark.

Male Participant: Mark. I'm sorry. As did when he took his trip, you know, the – I don't know if that would've happened pre-9/11, and pre-Patriot Act, and I think this pendulum is swinging a little too far, as someone here said, back towards the '50s, you know. The information is there, and it can be abused, and anything you do, anything you do that involves your vitals, especially in the medical profession, i.e., you know, the insurance, dealing with insurance companies or anything like that, that information, those people sell lists to each other. It's been going on for, you know a long time, but, you know, now that the government has access to them as well I'm a little uncomfortable with that.

Moderator: Wyfred?

Wyfred: I rated it a six. It – once they obtain the knowledge they – it's always something that's used against you, in most cases. And once they acquire the knowledge it's either to raise the price of something that you like [Laughter] or, as he mentioned, you know, you have some health issues that's used against you or even for, as she mentioned, with financial issues too, you know, if I have a bad credit reference, or if I haven't paid my bills, I should need a job more than anybody else to be able to pay my bills, not to not employ a person, you know, and use that against them and say, well, someone had a survey and it says that you don't pay your bills You know, it's ...

Female Participant: It's a Catch-22.

Wyfred: Right, a Catch-22, so...

Susanne: Doesn't there seem to be an overall attitude here, though, that information is something used against you. You know, nobody's brought up how, gee, I'd like them to find out I was an A student, or, you know, nobody's really looking at information they can use in my favour, it seems like we all seem to have the attitude that they're always using it as a weapon against me. Either we're paranoid or there's something wrong.

Moderator: Ben?

Ben: Your an example of the credit card, I mean, yeah, we're all happy that we have that security and we know that if somebody did steal the credit card, and, you know, drove to Louisiana that the credit card would start looking for you, it's just, you know, that is the Catch-22. With this added security comes less privacy.

Male Participant: When we were issued the credit card, there was a number, if lost or stolen, call this, okay? Let's face it, how many times a day do we go into our wallet to pull out identification or credit card, voter's card, ABC, here you're in and out of your wallet almost every day. The fact that I could be 12 hours from home and it was exactly 12 hours from home, that means somebody's watching pretty damn close to make it 12 hours. I mean, I was pulling into Jackson, Mississippi and they're calling my wife saying, hey, you know, what's going on. The technology was there to check that fast. And that's the scary part. It was that fast.

Female Participant: What's even scarier is I had a boss, I have a boss who was a victim of identity theft, and they knew his mother's maiden name, you know, all the usual checks, and it took him about six months, and he actually knew where the people were who were using the information, and he had to daily call the police department to find out if anybody went to the PO box. He finally had it down that fine. But he kept getting these, this information about new credit cards he applied for, so it – on the one hand what I find so frustrating is that we have these tremendous checks, and yet we have these huge holes. I mean, they're just gaping, and you can't get any attention. So you've got this lack of privacy, and yet at the other end you're saying, but when I need you, where are you?

Male Participant: Susanne, you've answered your own question: are we paranoid, or is it really that bad? Okay.

Male Participant: You know, there's a great irony here when you think about it, just thinking about it. The very fact that we're here, if everyone went through the same experience I went through two or three days ago – complete stranger calls, identifies herself on the phone, blah blah blah, some questions, hold on, and then 10, 15 minutes of questions. Fine, you know, I'm giving her the answers, somewhere within the bowels of this building, or some computer somewhere, is information about me, is information about everyone here, and other people, taking the whole, I guess, seven end of the scale, you could be a CIA agent looking for some subversive person here. Hell, I mean, you can't keep looking around corners forever. I mean, yes, protect things, have checks and balances in place, but let's move on.

Moderator: Let me ask – okay, I heard shredder. How many people in this room have a shredder in their household? Okay. Two. That's obviously one example of certain things you can do to protect your privacy, or that some people do. What other things can you do, and I've heard a lot of people say that yes, I'm concerned. What are some things you're doing to actually protect your privacy?

Female Participant: Not throwing anything out. I have checks going back probably five years sitting in a drawer. Anything related to credit cards, I'm afraid to throw them out. I don't have a shredder, but I'm afraid to throw them out.

Moderator: Okay.

Male Participant: Be careful where you release your information.

Moderator: Pardon?

Male Participant: Be careful where you release your information.

Moderator: Okay.

Female Participant: Well, I don't know if anybody's noticed they've been getting all these statements in the mail saying, you have a right to mail a letter back to us, and this is credit card companies, banks, anybody who sells your name to a list, there's a law that, if you say you don't want them to sell your name to a list, they can't do it. But you have to tell them, otherwise they can do it. So, you can write to every single company and corporation that you're – that has your name, and tell them not to sell your name.

Male Participant: That concept's called negative response. If you don't act – don't act, you are condoning whatever it is, you are giving them the opportunity to act on. And they're going with the, it's kind of what's going on with this cell phone don't list your number thing right now.

Female Participant: And that's true of the health care companies, too, you know.

Male Participant: They try to twist it around. I mean, the proponents for *not* having the directory are saying no, make people opt *in* to it, as opposed to opt out of it, so you're not part of it. But the negative consent thing is what you're talking about, and that's retaining. Because people are lazy, or they won't read it *and* they're lazy.

Male Participant: Why should it be that we have to take time out of my day, okay, to make sure that my privacy's taken care of, instead of saying *you*, business, corporation, or whatever, have to take time out of your day to get a hold of me for me to say it's okay.

Male Participant: I agree.

Male Participant: Just playing the devil's advocate backwards, why should, you know, do you have time in the day to call, you know, and sit on the phone and wait for these people? And then you get, of course, the rocket scientist at the other end who doesn't spell your name right, so it goes nowhere else? At home we've signed up for that –

Female Participant: Do not call?

Male Participant: Solicitation on the telephone.

Female Participant: Is that the block you're talking about?

Male Participant: Yes.

Male Participant: Well, it's not necessarily a block. When they go look, they're not – because my wife did send it in on the Internet, it's from the federal government, now there's – that's another initiative where there's teeth in it. What is it, 50 thousand dollars, 10 thousand dollars, whatever it is. My calls at dinner time, just like all of yours, dropped off by 95 percent. So it was something that I actually saw initiated that had enough teeth behind it, where it's protecting me, not me having to spend my entire day protecting myself. I mean, it sounds convoluted, but you almost want to protect yourself, but if you spend the entire day just doing that, you're not making a living, you're not feeding your family, and within six months, they've put you in a rubber room, because just think about it –

Male Participant: [inaudible]

Male Participant: Exactly. Exactly.

Moderator: Thinking about 9/11. What's different in terms of your privacy? Anything?

Female Participant: Airports.

Moderator: Airports?

Male Participant: Fear that we're not able, you know, I think that 9/11 brought about a certain amount of fear, whether it's at the airport about your privacy, you know, who could be next to you, and information. It's just [inaudible].

Male Participant: Again, going back to fraud or whatever, the fear that this could happen, I think people have gotten a lot more frightened since 9/11, not only about like terrorists or airport, but about everything, you know. There's so much that could happen to you out there nowadays when really, statistically, it's not, you know – it's kind of just, it's just fed the fear of everyday life that we have.

Male Participant: As far as privacy itself is concerned, again, I'm not sure that we know – I feel certain, first of all, that there are more eyeballs paying attention. More databases, more personnel, more databases, more things that will get flagged, you know, rightly or wrongly. For very benign, you know, as a result of very benign behaviour on my part, that's – because of, you know, the creation of the, it's part of homeland security and the personnel who run the Justice Department and so forth, and the attitudes that they seem to have, God only knows the attitudes that we don't hear about, I fear that there's more surveilling going on than we know. I mean, it's an unknown. It's like trying to prove a negative. You just can't prove it, but it's just, I think that's what they're trying to do. And they've, you know, it's dragged some, they've brought some people in for no reason, and they've brought some wrong people in just because of ...

Moderator: Okay. 9/11 and your privacy. Any other comments. Susanne.

Susanne: I guess, I'm not so – it's funny, it's not so much my privacy, but I've, my cousin is an attorney and he does a lot of immigration work, and the havoc it's wreaking within the immigrant community, where the father is an American citizen, the mother goes back to visit her sick mother in Mexico, they have three children here, and she can't get back into the country. She's no threat. The amount of, you know, they've had cases, well, this is – we were discussing this once about, you know, suburban baseball, you know, Little League coach, has all the right virtues, but left the country to back to Mexico, returned, and because he got into a fight, was arrested for assault when he was about 17 or 18, again, it was the battle to stay

here. He's now, you know, it's 18, 20 years later, he is now a model citizen a taxpayer, and suddenly we decide our borders are closed to these people.

Male Participant: I think what the government's worried about is the next cell or next people that are going to pull something off in this country, catastrophic, are going to look like Timothy McVeigh, John Walker Lind, and I think that is what they are afraid of, and either they – I think that they're, as they say, that their hair's on fire about it. They don't know how to go about stopping something like that because there are, what is it, 290 million people in this country, there have got to be some McVeighs and Nichols and crazy people like that that sympathize with them just because they hate this government, and that they're willing to blow a plane [?]. Jeff Ford is sitting in prison because he was caught, willing to do the Libyan government's bidding for them, yeah, with stinger missiles that the Libyan government was going to provide for a million or 10 million, and they were going to commit terrorist acts in the US, so, you know, this concern about Middle Eastern, or Islamic terrorists, the next one's going to look like, you know, Timothy McVeigh.

Moderator: Susanne.

Susanne: Did you notice, though, the people you're talking about are not – they're not immigrants.

Male Participant: Right. Exactly.

Susanne: I mean, we are targeting immigrants – I mean, I find it, you know, I was a person who found it unconscionable that we invaded a sovereign nation, and if they hate us for it, I can really understand it. I mean, we have not been sensitive to how they feel, you know, the kind of nice Christian West, well, we ain't all Christians, you know? It's – some people are atheists, some are Muslims, some are Jewish, I mean, but we keep trying to push this majority value, and it seems to me as if we had been doing our jobs, and rather than taking, just taking oil from the Middle East but actually giving back and helping them develop. I mean, I remember when Kennedy announced, I was in college when Kennedy announced, you know, the Peace Corps, and this was going to be something where we were going to go to third world nations and teach them how to live in a 20th, 21st century world. And we failed abysmally at that, and when they didn't, don't want to give us their oil because we're taking a few families and making them rich beyond their wildest dreams, and they are so selfish they will not take care of their own people, now, if they don't like us, I can sort of understand their point.

Moderator: Let me see a show of hands: who has ever experienced a serious invasion of privacy? The one you were mentioning?

Male Participant: No. Something much worse. I was involved in an industrial accident, and I worked at a Fortune 500 company, I'd been there 13 years, hold 25 suggestion awards for modifying and improving machines, a machine decided to make love to my hand, needless to say, the machine won. My hand lost. The company sent me to a physician to get my hand put back together. Because of a problem I had with the physician, he proceeded to call up the company and said that this man is crazy. Okay. And what was he there to do? To tell the company that I was having problems with him? That he didn't want to take care of the surgery that was needed? Or to call the human resource department and say, this guy is crazy, you better watch out for him? Is that not an invasion of privacy? Subsequently, three years later, I was terminated. I was assistant foreman. So, nothing, nothing – and this happened in the mid-eighties, by the way. This was not recently, this was in the mid-eighties.

Moderator: Pretty visible example.

Male Participant: And subsequently I took it to the civil rights commission in the City of Chicago, 47 pages of how they violated my civil rights, six and seven times, perjury by the major human resource person, under oath, okay, they handed it to me and said, sorry, we don't have enough money to fight this corporation. You handle it. We find in your favour, but we're not going to do anything about it. Kind of to let you know that, this was in 1985, kind of let you know that things are not necessarily as secure as you think that they are.

Male Participant: Did they do things to try to, once they determined you were crazy, did they do things to try to undermine your character, find character flaws to prove, to back that theory?

Male Participant: Oh, yeah. I was a tinker, I was a tinker. The heaviest thing I picked up was 60 pounds. I worked with nuts and bolts and screws that are 440s, you know what I'm talking about, very small things. They put me in a position where I had to empty hoppers of a product that weighed 1500 pounds. It was a gum factory, so you figure it out. And instead of being a tinker, here's a scraper this wide, they had a man – the only part of my thumb that moves is this, they moved my ulnar nerve and a lot of other funny things. We want you to take this scraper and scrape 1500 pounds of gum out of a hopper, and this is the only job we can find for you. In the trades this is called the elephant lean. Peter knows exactly what I'm talking about. We'll put you in the steel mill where you have to lift buildings of steel that weigh 600 pounds and, you know, that's hand intensive type situation.

Moderator: That's a pretty serious invasion.

Male Participant: Yes it was.

Moderator: Susanne.

Susanne: Okay. We had moved into our home, and it had been abandoned, and we had done a major rehab job, so we had all work down on the outside and I think we moved in February and it was a nice day, and opened up all the curtains, and it was about 8 or 9 o'clock on Saturday morning, and I was standing at my kitchen sink and all of a sudden the police came bursting in my front door with guns drawn. And, you know, we looked startled at each other, and they said, "Do you live here?" And I said, yeah. And they said, "Oh, we thought this place was abandoned." Well, you know, we had been working on it for about six months to make it habitable, and, I mean, it was an embarrassing – they were embarrassed, and, you know, it was – but it was scary that they felt that they could go, come bursting in on a Saturday morning with guns drawn.

Male Participant: There's something in that example that I thought of earlier and I still believe. As far as the people at the top having certain attitudes or, let's say, very narrow views about privacy, whatever, or their ability to invade your privacy, or the Patriot Act that now we're entitled to do whatever we want in the name of –

Female Participant: Security.

Male Participant: Security, protection of the country, blah blah blah. If you go down the food chain, ultimately, a lot of the people that are there to enforce these things aren't six months in tune with what's going on. There are still a lot of weak links in the chain. And those weak links, they may act the wrong way, but by the same token, they're also going to be goofing off in the right way, which in a sense, if somebody say, you go ahead and violate their privacy, that guy's going to be as – that guy, that woman, that person – is going to be as likely, in my mind, today as he was yesterday and last year and as next year, to be a goof off as well as a hard worker. You're not going to have, I don't think, an elite group of Arnold Schwarzeneggers who are going to be robotically enforcing these ridiculous or very narrow edicts, or judgments, rules, laws.

Moderator: Okay. Carol.

Carol: Did anybody hear about, it was just before the month of July, recently, that homeland security was on TV and they were saying please look out for people that are, that look suspicious.

Male Participant: Yeah.

Carol: That just – I didn't get that.

Male Participant: That's not the first time.

Male Participant: You sent them to my house. [Laughter]

Carol: And then they kind of detailed what they thought a suspicious person would look like, which makes you kind of like, a little more paranoid than you might be, but I thought that was kind of really ridiculous.

[talking at once]

Moderator: Can you give me some other examples of what potential privacy invasions that could happen? Things in your daily life.

Female Participant: Could happen?

Moderator: Could happen.

Male Participant: Call Walt Disney. Anything can happen.

Moderator: Some examples.

Male Participant: These microphones. Who knows where they're going.

Moderator: Okay. What about by government?

Male Participant: Who said that's not the government? [Laughter]

Moderator: It's not the government, it's not. What – some examples: how could the government invade your privacy?

Male Participant: They already are.

Moderator: How?

Male Participant: Some people would say by Social Security Number. Other people would say by filing your income tax, okay? Other people would say you have to give very, very intimate information. Think about it, when you do your income tax – you're an accountant, aren't you? How many children do I have? How old am I? Am I married, divorced, single? What's my racial background?

Female Participant: Well, that isn't on your income tax form. That's on your census form, which is the one that bugs me sometimes.

Moderator: Why did you say student loans?

Male Participant: Because I haven't paid them. [Laughter]

Moderator: But how is that invading your privacy?

Male Participant: Well, I don't know, that was more of a joke. I mean, they have information and, but I don't really think it's ...

Moderator: Okay.

Male Participant: I think it leaves the door wide open for a greater percentage, or a greatly likelihood of watching for suspicious characters and, it completely misusing, wasting, diverting resources to nothing, you know, to nothing things that, you know, because your neighbour took her garbage out three times in one day, or whatever, and boy, that's suspicious, isn't it, better call someone. I think there's a danger of

overreacting to that kind of stuff and stretching already thin resources even thinner, with inexperienced who will overreact or not react the right way, and that I think, you know, I betcha if we could see the data on this, the number of names that have been added to their databases has probably, you know ...

Moderator: What about – Susanne?

Susanne: I was just thinking, I do not have the same objections to looking up people who are dressed oddly, now, when I was in college I worked as a sales girl at Fields and you notice that if people were wearing heavy winter clothes in the summer, and this happened, they were likely to be hiding something. I mean, I think that as vigilance – being a good citizen demands a level of vigilance. Nobody's, you know – and this does not say that I'm for saying, oh, look at that guy I think we need to call the police on him, let's frisk him. But if I see somebody who, you know, walking around in winter clothes in the middle of summer, and I sort of – there's – I would look askance at them if they walked into a crowded area. I might decide to go elsewhere if they started mumbling to themselves, and I decided they were one of the neighbourhood schizophrenics, and I wouldn't worry about anything.

Male Participant: [inaudible]

Moderator: Okay. Carol.

Carol: It's interesting, a couple of weeks ago I was coming back from Naperville and I was taking the train back, and my girlfriend drove me to the train and we were waiting and there was a guy that had a large instrument case. However, it didn't look like there was an instrument in the instrument case because there was a lot of give in it. But she made a comment about it, and we just kind of laughed, and then, this has never happened when I've been on a metro train, there were metro police walking back and forth, I have no idea what this was about, I'm quite sure that this guy probably had nothing to do with it, but there were two metro police and they walk like back and forth, probably three or four times through all of the trains while we were there. And I just flashed on what my friend said about this guy with the instrument case.

Moderator: Okay. Nobody – I've heard identity theft – I hope I didn't ask this, how many in this room have either experienced it or know somebody, family or friend, that dealt with identity theft?

Female Participant: I know somebody, but ...

Moderator: Are some groups in society more susceptible to invasions of privacy than others.

Male Participant: Yes.

Female Participant: Yes.

Moderator: Those are quick yeses.

Male Participant: I think profiling generates it.

Moderator: Profiling?

Male Participant: Yes.

Moderator: What kind of profiling?

Male Participant: Stereotypes, I think that's what profiling is.

Moderator: Okay.

Male Participant: I don't know how many different ways you can do it. You can do it with computer information, the kinds of things you're talking about, pull it from a tax return, pull it from a credit card application, pull it from –

Female Participant: Focus groups.

Male Participant: Pull it from immigration information – hell, anything.

Moderator: Okay. Susanne? Which groups?

Susanne: Which groups? Well, see, I still think it's a white boys' game out there, pretty much. But you can go right down the scale, you know, from white men, then it's, the next top group is probably black men, white women, black women, and then you go down through the different nationality chains. And they will use private information in order to discriminate according to their prejudices. And I think women tend to have not as an aggressive a style in business, and that is looked upon as a weakness.

Moderator: Okay. You had a quick yes. Which groups?

Male Participant: Anyone, it's not necessarily a group. It's the attitude. People are taken advantage of. Senior citizens, because I do work a lot of work in senior homes, okay, for whatever reason their capabilities are somewhat diminished. You cannot believe the amount of money that is absconded with, you want to find identity theft? Start talking about the seniors, who will readily give out all of their information because they came from a generation, if a person in authority asked for something, you gave it to them. Uninformed people, okay? It goes across the colour bounds, it doesn't make any difference. You have people who have immigrated from all sorts of different countries, which is great, but they're really not aware of their rights, okay?

Moderator: Okay. So you said seniors? Are there other certain groups in society?

Female Participant: Well, economic, the under class. That's the common denominator here. Seniors without money.

Moderator: Okay, so low income.

Maria: Yes, and I think that's the thing that connects the two different areas we've been talking about, politics and sort of the reactionary direction the country's taken politically, and these things having to do with the Internet and all of the profit that's being made with all this technology.

Moderator: In my last group they said high income.

RP: I would think seniors with high income would be the biggest victims.

Moderator: But they picked, like, they said, when I asked the same question, are some groups in society more susceptible to invasions or privacy, they said high income. They weren't looking at seniors, they just said high income, and Maria said low income. Thoughts?

Male Participant: I disagree, with the high income.

Male Participant: So do I.

Male Participant: Depends on what they're looking for.

Moderator: Why do you disagree?

Male Participant: I think they're generally more sophisticated. They have defenses in place.

Moderator: Okay.

Female Participant: I say high income because low income – what do they care about them, what are they going to do?

Male Participant: Depends on who's looking –

Male Participant: If they're more excluded, and they're continuing to be more excluded because they are low income.

Female Participant: Yes, but they're excluded, and I think their rights are very much diminished. We're talking about privacy as opposed to all other rights. In many ways their liberties are very much, you know – but not the one of privacy, because who's going to put, who's going to go into a house, a CHA highrise and put in cameras to try and get financial information, unless they think there's gangs there? They're really the ignored people, I think.

Male Participant: They're not looking for financial information, that's just an indicator to them, I mean, if you look at the – well, you can't say this about the, I keep going back to the 9/11 and the terrorists, they came from well-to-do families, but – there are people who will do it for mercenary reasons, and that could be an indicator to – you know, depending on who's looking. If it's homeland security, they could be looking for low income people who would be susceptible to, you know, to some sort of mercenary offer, but high income people, their privacy can be invaded by someone who, you know, sees a way to get at their dollars.

Female Participant: But isn't it the movement of wealth that would be the indicator that suddenly when wealth moves, that's – I mean, they're not watching the individual, they're watching the movement of money.

Male Participant: We talked about security. The aspect of security and wealth is definitely a linkage. Your invasion of security –

Female Participant: But privacy is different from security.

Male Participant: Your privacy can not necessarily have anything to do with money.

Female Participant: I think the people that complain about lack of privacy the most are movie stars and sports figures that are popular, they can't even walk down the street.

Moderator: Okay.

Female Participant: Go into restaurants, whatever. And they complain about it a lot.

Moderator: Okay. If you, sort of, thinking forward, thinking sort of, let's say over the next five years, what types of invasions of privacy could you see happening to yourself?

Male Participant: Personal advertising when you're walking down the street. Whether it's linked to a cell phone or billboards that address you. There are some that are being tested now, but it's not widespread use. But I could see that becoming an actual reality where you walk down the street and, because your cell phone's on, or whatever, advertising is personally addressed to you. Which is kind of pretty invasive [?].

Male Participant: You know, much more specialized or targeted advertising.

Moderator: Okay.

Male Participant: Travel restrictions. Where a certain group will be able to go.

Male Participant: Where a convicted felon can't go, or who they restrict.

Male Participant: I happen to have a Slavic background. Chechnya is a Slavic country. I'm familiar with the situation where a Russian priest's family could not come back. The wife and the four children, terrorists all, because of a snafu, as you were talking about the immigration, the reason they couldn't come back is because there has been thefts of Russian nationals' immigration papers and everything else, by Chechen rebels. You can't tell a Chechen from somebody from Moscow, okay? If you come up with a piece of paper and it says, "I'm from Chechnya," try to get into the United States. You're not going to be able to do it. If, now that Russia's a quote unquote "immigrant-friendly" partner with the United States, if I have a Russian passport I can get in. So what they've done is, they've just said, the amount of people from Russia, do this.

Moderator: Travel restrictions. What other types of restrictions could you see potentially happening in the next few years?

Female Participant: I guess I feel like there's differences in the invasion of privacy and my liberty to move around. I mean, one is – privacy means that you can't gather personal information. I see there are other threats here, like your ability to move –

Moderator: But how would you answer the question in terms of potential invasions of your privacy in the future?

Female Participant: Well, I'm getting close to retirement age, so the minute I retire I become part of that senior victim class we were talking about. And because I have a relatively good pension plan, I'm very fortunate, that this means I will have some disposable income in those years. So I'm, I'll probably – in fact, I have a very dear friend who's turning 90, and owns his own home, and the calls he gets from people. They're always, we've got this – oh, the first with stocks, an initial offering, and you're just such a good person we're going to allow you to do, you know, we're going to take you in on this initial offering. Well, usually when a stock goes tumbling, if it's any kind of a stock, those are all privately placed. So they've got this 90 year old guy they're trying to tell, oh, yeah, you know, just give us, you know 50, 60 thousand dollars and we'll –

Moderator: Okay, so targeting you because you're in that age segment, or will be there. What other things could you see happening?

Male Participant: I've got a question, it just occurred to me. When you talk about privacy, in my mind – I want to ask you a question. What is, how would you defined privacy?

Moderator: I would answer it by saying that people will define it in very different ways, there will be no common – there will be no common, so for some –

Male Participant: The reason I'm asking is because I was asking myself that, and I don't know –

[end of side one]

Moderator: ... a serious invasion, one person ones – so in terms of your privacy being invaded –

Male Participant: In my mind, privacy is something I don't want others to know.

Moderator: Yes.

Male Participant: Now, if I'm retiring, and –

Moderator: So what could you see as threats using that definition? What could you see as threats to you, looking forward?

Male Participant: Offhand? Nothing. Because I, I mean, God knows I'm not Mr. Talker, and Mr. Blah Blah Blah, I'm kind of cautious about what I say and who I say it to. But nevertheless, it's not that I have, you know, if I was talking in my sleep or sort of on some drug-induced stupor that I would blurt out some secret that I've been carrying around for 50 years, it's not in me. So I don't have something that I'm looking to protect in that sense. But that's the difference – somebody said liberty a minute ago. That's a different story, as opposed to privacy.

Male Participant: What about the privacy to have, like with genetic research stuff where, you know, having, knowing that your child or whatever, something's going to be wrong, and having that, other doctors or whatever, anybody that does that test, knowing those, like what could go wrong in your family, what you're at higher risk for.

Male Participant: I'd say, generally, that would be more positives than negatives to that kind of activity.

Male Participant: But I mean, is that something that you want, you know, what if it's not something, you know, as black and white as, like, oh, you know, he's going to have cancer, that's, you know, bad. What if it's something where it's mental illness or something where you may not want that information out?

Female Participant: Or alcoholism.

Male Participant: Yes.

Male Participant: Or drug addiction.

Male Participant: I mean, if you're going to keep it in a closet, fine. But, I mean, it depends – I think things are, and again, I'm me, as well as the family I come from, we're not on the radar, so to speak, or, you know, like here's my story, here's my biography. But by the same token, I also don't think that if you have, you know, a crazy cousin in the closet, that in this day and age, if you do, fine. But generally it's going to be pretty much known anyhow.

Male Participant: What about the future, though, where let's say, because the question dealt with more, you know, how could this affect us in privacy in the future. You know, with kids and being vaccinated and stuff, what if it started to come to where they wanted blood tests for children to see who was going to be a problem child, who's going to, you know, be the good student, and you know, that's a possible –

Male Participant: Eugenics comes into it real quick.

Male Participant: Yes.

Male Participant: There was a really frightening movie out there, the title escapes me now, I saw a snippet of it in relation to a story they were doing about DNA and genetics, and predictability of a newborn and, you know, what would be, what this person would develop, what this child would develop at a later age. And within seconds of the umbilical cord being cut, and a certain, you know, materials taken by a nurse or technician and put into a machine, they said, you know, 74 years, 9 months, 3 days, cancer. You know, and it's not that far off from happening, you know, that they could –

Moderator: So, if I asked you to –

Male Participant: I mean medical, you know.

Moderator: I know.

Male Participant: Medical's the one that's going to be the privacy. That's going to be the worst.

Moderator: If I asked you to pick one thing, I want you to write this down, what would you say is the biggest threat to your privacy in the future?

Male Participant: Can only pick one?

Moderator: Yes. Biggest threat to your privacy in the future. John.

John: I wrote the government.

Moderator: Government. Susanne.

Susanne: I said age and vulnerability.

Moderator: Ben.

Ben: Information. Lost information, medical or financial.

Moderator: Peter.

Peter: The sharing of personal info, mostly between health, healthcare insurance and government.

Moderator: Maria.

Maria: I said it too, I said government spying and circulation of information.

Moderator: Sandy.

Sandy: I put a question mark, I couldn't think.

Moderator: Carol.

Carol: I put financial and medical information.

Moderator: Okay. Wyfred?

Wyfred: I said access to information.

Moderator: Mark?

Mark: I said the information that could be used by corporate business, large corporate business and governments.

Moderator: Okay. Who uses – let me see a quick show of hands – who uses the Internet? Virtually everybody. How confident do you think you are in terms of knowing how the Internet can affect your privacy? Big nodding from Peter.

Male Participant: I believe I have a – I think if you're most defensive, which is the most cautious, I mean, that's the way I would describe myself. I believe anything's possible. So if I don't want something potentially to seep out through my computer, I won't get it near my computer.

Moderator: Okay.

Male Participant: Anything can be tapped.

Male Participant: Right.

Moderator: Are you confident?

Male Participant: Not at all. I'm sure it's being utilized by people right now.

Moderator: Wyfred?

Wyfred: What's the question?

Moderator: Are you confident about using something like the Internet, how that – how your privacy could be affected?

Wyfred: Am I confident about it, that my privacy *will* be affected or *won't* be affected?

Moderator: Well, do you know how it could affect your privacy.

Wyfred: No, I really don't know the full extent about it.

Moderator: Carol.

Carol: I wouldn't put anything out on the Internet that I didn't want everybody to know.

Moderator: Okay.

Female Participant: I have. I buy off of eBay and I buy off credit cards, and I've been doing it since '98, I guess. I haven't had any problems.

Moderator: And do you have any sense of what happens to that information and where it goes and all those kinds of things?

Female Participant: Kind of. Sometimes if it says credit card number or you can call, you know, the 1-800 number to order whatever, I'll pick up the phone. Just because I don't – I just do it.

Female Participant: I'm confident that in some cases when I enter information on the Internet, other information that I have *not* entered then becomes accessible.

Moderator: Okay. Ben.

Ben: I mean, there's no question that it doesn't matter what, how secure of a website you go onto, you know, whether it's booking airline tickets or whatnot that that information has the chance of leaking out somehow. There's not – I mean, we may do it every day, and there may be websites that are, bring more confidence to us or make us feel more secure, but I think we all know that it's not secure. I mean, there's always a leak.

Moderator: Susanne?

Susanne: I use it mostly in business, and I know that we keep building bigger and bigger firewalls, because there's only a limited number of sites I can get onto, I mean, I can't just go on and say W-W-W Martha Stewart dot com and get a recipe for lemon bars, which I do have. You know, because we pass tremendous amounts of financial information back and forth, and it's just constantly building firewalls to keep anybody from getting in.

Moderator: Okay. What things exist today that protect your privacy? What laws? What laws are out there?

Male Participant: I think a lot of the ones that are getting a lot of attention now is the children on the Internet and protecting the privacy of having them share information while they're a minor. So I think laws dealing with that.

Moderator: Are there laws that exist to protect your privacy?

Male Participant: Supposedly the medical privacy act is supposed to do it, but it's a toothless tiger, really.

Male Participant: That's the one that I can think of really, too.

Moderator: Okay. What about, I mean, I've heard you mention sort of tax information, the census collecting various things, governments, whether it's the federal or the state, they have information on you. Department of Motor Vehicles knows your information, they give you your driver's license. Are there laws that put restrictions on how government departments, what they can do with the information they have on you and what they can't do?

Male Participant: Susanne, you're an accountant, aren't you?

Susanne: Mmhmm.

Moderator: Let me see a show of hands, who thinks that – so, the Department of Motor Vehicles, housing, or whatever – are there laws that place restrictions on how these departments –

Female Participant: Isn't the DMV sell your information –

[talking at once]

Male Participant: – it was shut down for that.

Moderator: So the first question is, do laws exist?

Male Participant: Yes, but they're not followed.

Male Participant: Restricting what they can do with that information?

Moderator: Yes, right. So for example, like, whoever has all your tax data that you've done through filing your income tax over whatever number of years. It resides somewhere. Are there restrictions on what that department can do with it?

Male Participant: I don't know about that entity in itself. You're talking about the IRS, presumably, or the Treasury Department.

Moderator: Yes.

Male Participant: I don't know. But I think that's different than the Illinois Department of Transportation – whatever it's called, the Secretary of State.

[talking at once]

Male Participant: So I think in some cases, definitely, yes.

Moderator: So in some cases yes. Susanne?

Susanne: No, he was just asking me about –

Male Participant: I was asking, if I'm not mistaken, the IRS, if it's queried by the FBI, CIA, any government agency investigation to look for possible wrongdoing, I believe they're now linked up, where they can transfer information.

Male Participant: If they've got a subpoena, it depends. They have to subpoena it in some cases, they can't just say –

Female Participant: A lot of information you can just request through the Freedom of Information Act.

Male Participant: I'm Mr. Paranoid. I've never seen this subpoena and they never said that they're investigating me. So how do I know it was generated? As a devil's advocated, I've never seen it, so I don't know it happened.

Moderator: But do you – let me just see a quick show of hands, who thinks laws exist?

Female Participant: Exist? Or get followed?

Moderator: Well, that's the second part of the question.

Female Participant: Okay.

Moderator: Are there laws? Like even for DMV.

General Response: Yes.

Moderator: Are they effective?

General Response: No.

Peter: One hundred percent compliance, you need 100 percent of the people working there to be on their absolute 100 percent, ethical, best ethical behaviour, and that's just not human. That's not happening.

Moderator: Carol?

Carol: Now that we have homeland security in place, doesn't it get all of these organizations talking to each other, building up a dossier on us to some extent? They have a lot more information that each one had separately now.

Moderator: John? What were you going to say?

John: I think the way you asked the question in itself is, I mean, you can structure that question the other way around. What Peter was saying, I think, was that to give you a yes answer means that you don't believe that anyone is doing something the wrong way.

Moderator: So how would you nuance my question, or nuance the answer? Because you sort of said not IRS ...

John: I would say I think there are people who violate the law. But if you asked me what percentage, I would just be guessing. I don't think a great percentage. Whether it's in the DMV –

Moderator: But then, and you're – and Peter's right. People are people, and some people are good, and some people are – don't follow laws and, but like, the laws are in place to sort of say, the government or the IRS or whatever, they can do this and they can't do that. Putting aside sort of the human factor that is that employee an honest person, are these laws effective at sort of keeping them in check, and following what the laws say?

Male Participant: No.

John: There's no way to judge – I don't know how to judge it.

Moderator: Okay. What about laws, are there laws that govern the private sector saying companies can do this, and they can't do that.

Female Participant: Oh yes. There's the Freedom of Information Act which is the reverse thing. You, before your records were private to them, but now you can look at your own records, which makes the privacy, you know, in itself.

Moderator: Can anybody, can I look at your –

Female Participant: No. But I can, but I couldn't before.

Male Participant: Have you tried?

Wyfred: And they still won't –

Female Participant: Before the freedom –

Male Participant: I know, but have you tried?

Female Participant: No, no, but I don't want to know.

Male Participant: Wyfred knows exactly what I'm talking about.

Wyfred: They say freedom of information, but go to try to get some of this information that's supposedly free, and they will not give you access to it. You know, I called for something, how many black fellows are there in this black coalition or whatever that the city has, and they refused to give me the information. I mean, how many number of black fellows sit on this black club group [?]. That was a city group, and they still told me I couldn't have that information.

Moderator: So the example of you being able to obtain your own information, but you're confident that I couldn't obtain your information.

Female Participant: Right. But a personnel knows, human resources know. They'd have access to those files.

Female Participant: But how do they know that you're you? And he's not you?

Female Participant: Well, I assume that you'd have to, you know, show some identification, photo ID.

Male Participant: What about computer?

[talking at once]

Female Participant: For a fairly small sum, you can find out, you can pay someone on the Internet to find out if person X, you have a criminal record.

Female Participant: That's what I was talking about with the job application, you know, \$25 dollars, and you know everything about me.

Female Participant: A private person can find that out, so God only knows what a person can do.

Moderator: Earlier I heard Susanne talk about, or someone talk about surveillance cameras at the traffic lights.

Susanne: I think we were –

Moderator: Yes, you both were. Okay. I'm going to come back to that issue, and the whole issue not just of red light cameras, but the broader issue of surveillance cameras. How are surveillance cameras being used today? In your community.

Male Participant: On south side they're used as crime deterrents.

Moderator: Where?

Male Participant: South side of Chicago they have the globes with the flashing lights to let everybody know that there's a camera around there and they could be watched.

Male Participant: Their all over the place.

Female Participant: So imagine when –

Male Participant: School yards.

Female Participant: Casinos.

Moderator: Casinos.

Female Participant: ATM machines.

Male Participant: Parking lots.

Female Participant: My building, you know, we have security cameras in the lobby.

Female Participant: Grocery stores.

Male Participant: There's probably one on the elevator we came up on.

Mark: Just a question: did anyone see CNN today? A gentleman in Britain – Britain's had these surveillance cameras in certain towns –

Moderator: Hold on, I'm not going to let you go down there yet, just a sec – that's one of the things You made the distinction that they're on private property. I'm not from Chicago, so, what were you talking about in terms of –

Male Participant: It's been on the news that in problems they've had with gangs in those neighbourhoods, they stuck on top of lightposts security cameras in areas, whether it be corners or alleys, whatever, where people congregated.

Moderator: In Chicago?

Male Participant: In Chicago.

Moderator: Okay, so they were targeting specific areas.

Male Participant: Problem areas.

Moderator: And I'm sure what Mark's going to say well, in London, England, people are using, the police are using surveillance cameras to monitor public places. So this is not on private property, this is public places. And basically to try to deter crime and sort of assist in prosecuting offenders, I saw you steal this and ... in fact, London itself is not a very big city, the actual city centre is I think it's quite small. And there are roughly 150,000 surveillance cameras in a very small part. All over, these are all over the place, so basically you walk down the street, they can keep track of what's going on. What do you think of surveillance cameras in public places? Because you're right, there is a distinction between this building, your apartment building, private places, public places –

Male Participant: I have no expectation of privacy in a public – on the street.

Moderator: No expectation.

Male Participant: But, on the other hand, they, I know that they should be, now these are on telephone polls –

Moderator: These are everywhere.

Mark: They're everywhere.

Male Participant: Well, in Chicago, they supposedly see three or four blocks down, now, and if you're in some innocuous behaviour, you, you know, lend a guy a cigarette and he gives you your lighter back, they're going to be – your going to be swamped because there's a cop with a joystick a block away watching, and they're going to swamp down on you because they think you're –

Moderator: Okay. First question, what do you think of the concept of these surveillance cameras, and I want you to get away from just the crime-ridden areas.

Peter: It's wrong. It's wrong.

Moderator: In London, they're everywhere. So let's say we just could have anywhere in public places.

Peter: In general, they're wrong.

Moderator: You think they're wrong.

Peter: Wrong.

John: I always see it as a positive.

Susanne: I don't have a real problem with them.

Ben: Wrong.

Peter: Wrong.

Maria: Wrong.

Sandy: Fine.

Carol: I don't have a problem with them either.

Wyfred: I say Big Brother.

Mark: What's next?

Moderator: Big Brother. So what are the pros? And what are the cons?

Male Participant: Security.

Female Participant: Crime deterrent, children who are being abducted or lost.

Moderator: Okay.

Female Participant: Drunk drivers. Red lights.

Female Participant: That thing with red lights – I don't get this. It's sitting up there and it says that this license plate ran a red light, but how do they know who's driving that car?

Male Participant: It's your license plate.

Female Participant: But that –

Male Participant: Doesn't make any difference, you could've lent it to a friend.

John: You made a judgment –

Male Participant: In other words, you got it.

Moderator: So pros – other pros.

Mark: I see pros in this as well, I mean, I think it's wrong and I – because it concerns me, what next, okay? It's – there's a gradual erosion of rights and privacy and I see it looking more like Moscow and the Eisenhower fifties, and but I do see the positives. As you said about the children, they've actually found children as a result of surveillance cameras that have been in place. You never –

Peter: But where? Not out on the street corners.

Mark: Shopping malls.

Peter: In the shopping – in a private store.

Mark: Exactly. Okay. Different story.

Female Participant: That's not a private store.

Male Participant: In a parking lot.

Moderator: Susanne, what were you going to say?

Susanne: No, I mean, I've been – my neighbourhood when we moved in many years ago was very heavily crime-ridden area. It's now become a very fashionable area, but we've had – you know, we've walked crime walks, whoever is on the public way owns the public way. We've had to be out there at night, and I kind of appreciate a little bit of relief if I'm the – in my neighbourhood there are two buildings, the Brinmar and the Belshore. Now, there was a big deal made because before it's affordable housing, one of the newspapers took on the cause of the tenants, because they have to be drug screened before going in. And the tenants have all said, wait a second, we like that. We know we are living in a safe building, we have good, affordable housing, and I don't have to worry about drug pushers in my building. So we have this, I mean, this is something that, I'm not sure if it was the Sun-Times or the Tribune that decided to take on the tenants' cause, and the tenants said mind your own business, because we're happy with it.

Mark: Private opposed to public.

Susanne: But the point is, it's subsidized housing. It's affordable housing. It's public money that's out there.

Mark: That's wrong. In my opinion.

Moderator: Okay. But –

Susanne: But it's not a place where I expect privacy.

Moderator: Okay, let me – do you think that they're actually effective at reducing crime?

General Responses: Yes.

Mark: Are they effective? Actually, I wasn't going to bring up the number of cameras. The gentleman that was on CNN, in England, knew he got a picture taken of him running a light, he got out of his car, went up on the top, unloaded the camera, took all the film, and left.

Carol: Then why did he run the light?

Mark: And there was another camera watching him. [Laughter] Okay, Carol, exactly. Is it a deterrent? Yeah. What level of surveillance or invasion or your privacy are you willing to accept.

Carol: My property.

Moderator: Maria, are they effective?

Maria: Are they effective?

Moderator: Do they actually reduce crime?

Maria: I have no idea.

Moderator: Peter.

Peter: They're so relatively new, probably in the last 12 or 18 months, I'd say no at this point.

Moderator: Ben?

Ben: It's a displacement.

Moderator: Displacement?

Ben: I mean, they –

Male Participant: Move it.

Ben: Going back to the public, you know, if you have something on the corner where you're watching this neighbourhood, they're just going to go to the next block.

Female Participant: Well, I have a converse question. Who here would live in a building without a secure, without a you know, someone at the front door, without a security camera?

Male Participant: I do.

Female Participant: I do.

Susanne: I mean, my house, but I'm talking about a high rise building, where there's this kind of density. Because this one of the things that happened – this is why the CHA high rises fell. I mean, they could not secure those buildings. The tenants were not safe within their own homes, because they had no security there.

Male Participant: You're begging a separate question: is the government responsible for my security or am I responsible for my security?

Susanne: Do you want to then – you know, as I said, these are places where I have no expectation of privacy. When you come into my home. I consider it an invasion of my privacy when people call me at dinner time. I don't feel like if I have to – I'm not under any obligation to answer the door or the telephone. You come to my door, I don't care what you're selling or what, I have the right not to open that door. And I have the right to call the police if you keep banging. Or turn into a nuisance to me. I'll just take the phone off the hook. But, in the public way, I think we're talking about a different case. You know, we're – I am very guarded about my privacy, because I don't go on the Internet except for business, I feel that, even the Internet is a guest in your house, and guests should behave as a guest. But out on the public way, I would not feel comfortable going up – and especially I think some of this also has to do with your gender and your vulnerability. If you take a senior citizen who's out on the streets at night and you ask them how they feel about the camera, they're going to feel a lot different from a 21 year old who doesn't understand why they're being watched. So you have a lot of different needs within a society. And I don't know who's watching all this stuff. I think the only time they really go after most of the stuff is when there has been a crime, or when there is the expectation of a crime.

Female Participant: But that raises a different question. It's hard to address the issue of privacy and security without looking at it in terms of the whole complex of issues. I mean, if in a bad neighbourhood or a high crime neighbourhood you have the cameras, but the government isn't doing anything to improve the housing conditions or address a whole other set of social issues that have led to the crime in the first place, it's very hard to say whether it's a good or a bad thing, without talking about all the other issues.

Moderator: Wyfred then –

Wyfred: I'm sorry.

Male Participant: No, no, you go ahead.

Wyfred: I think in terms of where is it going to start, now as this, start now in some of the bases of crime, but where does it come, where will it be in the next 10 years, 20 years, would I be able to go out and protest without them putting my name down, okay, we've got you here –

[talking at once]

Wyfred: Filing petitions or whatever else. You know, if I want to actually exercise my rights, or I want to do something contrary to what the government is doing, once they have 100,000 cameras all in place –

Male Participant: But that's what they're doing.

Female Participant: But then you stop that at that. That's not a crime. And then at that point you stop that and say no, this is not a crime.

Wyfred: But if they were putting me on a list.

Male Participant: There were the red squads in the sixties and seventies, they did exactly that.

Male Participant: And our names are all on there, guys.

Male Participant: Out there in groups that protested anything that Mayor Daly, essentially, or the state's attorney thought was subversive or potentially subversive, they went out there with cameras as journalists or documentarians, or reporters and asked people their names and so on and so forth, and it was finally struck down in federal court, to get rid of the red squad. This was known as the red squad, and they had their red squad files.

Male Participant: But the FBI still has them, by the way.

Male Participant: Of course. I mean, they say they got rid of them, but they're still somewhere.

Wyfred: They recently passed it so that they could start back doing it again.

Male Participant: Yeah, right.

Moderator: So, I mean, think of – and this is why I was asking some of these questions about thinking forward, I mean, who would have thought –

Wyfred: I'm worried about the erosion.

Moderator: Okay, so, who would've thought that so many millions of Americans have a computer and the Internet in their house? Who would've thought that 20 years ago? So, thinking of, like there's 150,000 cameras in London, which basically capture all of the public places, and they could follow you walking into the city and they can keep track. So, it's quite conceivable that you could do the same thing in a city like Chicago, so not just certain neighbourhoods, but all of downtown Chicago, every public space. So what do you think – I want to see, I'm forcing you to go one way or the other way – is this a good idea or a bad idea?

Male Participant: For now, or in the long run?

Moderator: Let's say in the next five, ten years. So that they would move to there are public surveillance cameras all over the city, keeping track of –

Female Participant: To me it's a good idea.

Moderator: Okay, I'm just going to go around.

Mark: Bad idea.

Moderator: I'm just going to write this down. Bad. Good. So, bad. Wyfred.

Wyfred: Bad.

Carol: Good.

Sandy: Good.

Maria: Bad.

Peter: Bad.

Ben: Bad.

Susanne: I have a lot – I can't say. That depends on the political climate. Because –

Male Participant: It can change.

Susanne: I think, well, everybody is looking at the government as the enemy and not taking the responsibility of government on themselves. I mean, about, we see ideas of grassroots movements, governments happen at the you and I level. So if we abandon more and more of our rights, then we – if everyone were out there protesting when something was wrong, no matter how many cameras there were, there wouldn't be enough people, there wouldn't be enough population, to cover the number of people they'd have to look at.

Moderator: Okay, but bad idea or good idea?

Susanne: Again, it just depends if we're –

Moderator: Once you open a door, let's say you – I'm sure they're not going to take away the cameras in London now. They're there forever, I'm sure. So is it a good idea or a bad idea? Your mind can wonder what it could –

Female Participant: We're talking strictly public places, right?

Moderator: Yes.

Susanne: On the whole, I think I would have to go along with those that say it's a good idea, because I'm counting every elevator in my building, and 100,000 doesn't really overwhelm me if – because I've got four, eight, I've got 24 elevators.

Moderator: No, but let your mind run wild, that there would have to be enough to cover, because obviously Chicago's bigger than London, because London's a small –

Susanne: Even downtown Chicago, just how many – we'd probably have 100,000 elevators if we were to put one in every elevator. And who's going to watch these, unless there's something that happens.

Moderator: Or it's computer monitored.

Male Participant: Facial recognition –

Susanne: Yes, but how does a computer, what does it –

Moderator: Good or bad?

John: Good.

Moderator: Okay.

Susanne: But doing what, is what I'm curious about.

Male Participant: These questions, it's kind of ambiguous because, I mean, you're assuming what – Bush gets re-elected or, and Ashcroft dies, you know, or turns into Hoover, like 10 or –

Moderator: But you don't know what's going to happen to governments over time, with Bush or Kerry and Edwards or something.

Mark: Who's watching the watchers? I don't care if it's Bush, Kerry, Malcolm – it doesn't make any difference. It's a voiceless, mindless machine that there's an eye behind and I don't know where that eye is going to. And I don't know where it's recorded, it's going. It's hooked up.

Sandy: But if you're not doing anything wrong, why do you care?

John: It's open, it's not watching the machine all the time.

Mark: Oh, excuse me. What do you – and I'll have to stop. Sandra, I left my wife's house, I walked down three blocks, a camera followed me, I walked into my girlfriend's house. Okay? You as a public citizen need to know that I'm having an affair?

Sandy: I don't think they care about that. You're not abducting children, you're not stealing, you're not murdering.

Mark: But what if I protested, what if I had protested against the war, and now somebody says, anybody who protested against the war, we're looking for dirt, so we can start looking further.

Sandy: But that's what I said, you're going on beyond crime, protesting against the war is not a crime.

Mark: But who reads [?] that kind of stuff, they collect dirt on people and then when they did something –

Male Participant: It could be abused.

Moderator: So. Let me ask you this. Who's comfortable – show of hands – who's comfortable with the idea of being monitored, you don't know who's watching you, you spend an afternoon in a public park and there's cameras on you. Are you personally comfortable with that idea? So the system's built, and you happen to be sitting in a park all day, and there's cameras watching you all day. Are you comfortable with that idea?

John: The way you just asked it?

Moderator: Yes.

John: No.

Maria: That's interesting – excuse me – because you, we just had that same question a question ago, and you answered a totally different answer.

John: He asked the question differently. He's got it focused on me instead of 150,000 cameras – [laughter].

Male Participant: But you weren't doing anything wrong, John –

John: And I'm still not. But I want to know that if I've got an itch, I'm not coming up on somebody's tape.

Male Participant: Thank you so much.

Moderator: So, I mean, this is either you do it or you – and this is – it's either [? Unintelligible] – so it's you're not comfortable –

Sandy: I am.

Moderator: So let's say you're having a remote public park that you're the only one on that camera.

Sandy: Because I'm, am I the only one at the park?

Moderator: Yes.

Sandy: I definitely want to be surveyed, then.

Carol: Me also. I take my granddaughter to the park, and I have to look – did she run away, where is she.

Moderator: Okay. Maria? Are you comfortable with it?

Maria: Probably not.

Mark: No. And I'll tell you why. I mean, real quickly, I'm even standing, five, ten things waiting for a bus. I, you know, sometimes I, I don't know, call it an anxiety attack or whatever, I just don't like being, you know, standing there doing nothing and then I feel, like I get anxious or I'm in a hurry, and that could look suspicious.

Peter: Situations could dictate different things.

Moderator: Ben. Are you comfortable with the idea?

Ben: No.

Moderator: Susanne?

Susanne: I'm probably comfortable with it, but then I have another question, which is, who here has been mugged? You know?

Mark: How many times? [Laughter]

Moderator: I don't think we have time to hear your stories, but – okay. So you're still comfortable then.

Susanne: In the public, in the park, certainly. Now that's totally public behaviour, I mean –

Moderator: What if – a park or whatever, you just happen to be in a public space where, by virtue of the time of day or whatever, the camera's only seeing you.

Susanne: Well then, if it's only – oh, you mean, in it's surveillance, I'm the only person there, but it's not focusing in on me.

Moderator: No, because these are tracking the whole city. So now it's not 30,000 people along the street, it's Susanne.

Susanne: Well, yeah, but it's 100,000 tapes they've got to look at to find out if I'm in the elevator, in the park.

Male Participant: You're not safe, you're not safe. Somebody's got to be watching you every second if you're alone in the park and you get a –

John: And they've got to respond, so it's a moot point anyhow, even if they see it.

Male Participant: Exactly.

Susanne: Well yes, but they can at least prosecute –

[talking at once]

Moderator: Hold on. You're the only one who's got on both sides of this.

John: Yes, I guess I am.

[talking at once]

John: I'm going to take it in the broader sense that I am, sort of, like the earlier part. If you want to look at me, go ahead and look. I think as a concept, I'm okay with it.

Moderator: Okay. That's fair. And this is why I always start with there's no right answers here. Everybody has – it's a diverse segmentation.

Peter: I agree with what he just said. If you want to live, then go ahead and live. But I just don't like, the Pandora's box that it opens. For if it comes down the line, I'm very uncomfortable with that. You know, I don't have anything to hide 95 percent of the time. But if me and my girl wanted to throw up against the wall and neck, you know, I don't want them – you know, we could get hassled for that. I mean, the cops come – there's not, like we said before, like I said before, about having 100 percent of people with 100 percent virtuosity, you're not going to get that in the people that are watching. As Mark said.

Moderator: Who participates in any loyalty programs, so, credit cards you get points, frequent flyers, you go to the grocery store and you buy your –

Female Participant: Do you mean like Jewel?

Mark: Do you mean like the little disks that –

Moderator: Or anything where you –

Mark: Allows them to track you?

Female Participant: A preferred card.

Female Participant: You know, I wouldn't consider it loyalty though, I would consider it that I'm getting something at a better price.

Moderator: But they're typically called loyalty programs. Who participates in any of them? Sandra? None.

Sandy: None.

Moderator: Okay. Why do these things exist?

Female Participant: Track your shopping.

Female Participant: Yes.

John: For business purposes.

Moderator: And what do they do? Track your –

Ben: Coupons come out when you buy certain things.

John: Helps them, just as this is probably helping whoever's sponsoring this, know more about the way people think, the way they act, to allow them business to improve, to flourish, to get better.

Moderator: Do they sell the information to other companies to market to you?

Male Participant: Of course.

Female Participant: Sure.

Female Participant: No.

John: Maybe just the opposite: to keep it for their own purposes. United's not telling American what you're doing.

Peter: No, but they're telling the government, or Jet Blue anyway.

Moderator: So, what do you think of the whole concept that all your purchases are being tracked?

Peter: The concept of it?

John: You're allowing them to. They're not. If you're – you're not in one of these programs, so your answer would be they're not, right?

Sandy: No. I don't even know what it is.

John: So you're letting them in the door by signing up.

Susanne: I'm bugged, I don't know why, but it's – well, yes, I think I do – I'm bugged by when the cashier refers to me by name. That is more personal than I want to get with my cashier. And when she says –

Male Participant: That's very strange to me. That you say that the camera can be on me, but – [laughter]

Susanne: Because I don't have a personal relationship –

Male Participant: That's why God in his smarts [??] was really great by making everybody different, because when I walk out of Sam's and I go – Mr. Rubon [?], have a nice day, I'm going – because you know, everybody, at least in my opinion, likes to be called by their name. Instead of that faceless person that just – you know, that guy just walked out. There's a lot of "that guys" in the world.

Moderator: But you don't mind the fact that they know everything you bought –

Susanne: No, because they're plotting trends. I don't have a personal relationship with the person who waits on me. I, you know, there are times when I think it's – I feel like suddenly they're trying to make a whole group of assumptions that, you know, it's the way my grandmother felt when people didn't call her Mrs. So-and-so, they come in and say, "Hi, Anna." The person who's taking care of her at the hospital, and I know her teeth were just on edge. Because it's a lack of formality, we've lost a certain formality in our society, or a certain respect for boundaries.

Moderator: Okay. So, as John says, you're agreeing to it, with the issue. So everybody – so they only thing that you've raised is you don't like the fact the profile comes up and they know on the cash register –

Susanne: But the person that's right in front of me knows my name, and it leads me to believe that that person can get my address. I don't care if a big anonymous company has it, because I feel like what they want to do is they want to stock my store for my needs. And let's face it, what it's all about is money. Why are we afraid of our medical histories getting out? Because we do not have universal health care coverage. We wouldn't be nearly as sensitive about it if we knew that no matter what disease we had, we would be covered. Because nobody would be denying us access to medical care. So that's what – we're afraid. We're afraid that information is the gatekeeper.

Male Participant: The business about going through the checkout is, it's a desperate, patronizing, insulting, humiliating, [laughter] shameless way for them to try build –

Female Participant: Across the board.

Susanne: It's phoney.

Male Participant: -- customer loyalty, a rapport, and again, some people can say, you know, that they like that, and it can repel others. And, you know, I don't know.

Peter: Look, hey, I just spent my dough with you, you know, I've been to the store, I'll probably be back, you don't have to call me Joe. You know, when I leave.

Female Participant: Especially since your name is Peter. [Laughter]

Moderator: Show of hands: who has ever bought something on the Internet before?

Female Participant: On the Internet?

Moderator: Yes. Bought something. One ...

Male Participant: Does my wife count.

Susanne: Oh right. One purchase.

Moderator: Okay. Any concerns in doing it?

Maria [?]: I would never put my credit card out there. Ever, ever, ever.

Male Participant: Yes, I agree.

Moderator: Okay, but you have.

Male Participant: No. Somebody bought something for me.

Moderator: Okay.

Male Participant: Because I wouldn't have done it.

Male Participant: I'm against it as well.

Susanne: I've bought one thing, which was a – a cousin of mine was sitting on the tarmac waiting for his airplane to go off and to take him to Tokyo. His wife's grandmother had died in Sapporo, and he was having to make all these connections, and he was sitting there. And I had read this Japanese mystery novel, years ago, called *Points and Lines*, and it has to do with how the – how a murder was committed because someone was able to use the train schedules and the plane schedules and how everything ran on time. Every time I went on, I twice more went on Amazon.com, because I bought the book, the next two times they kept popping up with Japanese mysteries. I was defined as a lover of Japanese mysteries. I have read one in my life.

Moderator: Who reads the privacy statements on websites?

Male Participant: I have.

Ben: I'll uncheck the box down at the bottom that says –

Male Participant: You mean the disclaimers before you can download something that kind of a ...

Moderator: Or when you're, yes – Mark, can you pass them down –

Mark: Oh, I'm sorry.

Moderator: Okay. What I'm going to get you do here is, some privacy experts often talk about four different types of privacy. Bodily, communication, information, and territorial. Two part question. I'm going to ask you to rank them. These four types in terms of – the first part, how important for you to ensure that your privacy is maintained in these areas. Rank one to four. So one is the most important to protect, then two, then three, then four, and four is the least important. The second part of the question is, and how would you rank the same four types in terms of the degree to which these areas are under threat for you personally. Where one is it's most under threat, then two, then three, and then four which is the least under threat.

Female Participant: Can we use the same number twice?

Moderator: No.

Female Participant: Okay.

Male Participant: When you say we personally, does that – could that reflect the fact that in the last six months I've got a felony conviction – which I don't, but, I mean. [Laughter] Or do you mean just in society ...

Moderator: No. Your personal circumstances.

Male Participant: Okay.

[Pause]

Moderator: So the first part most important to protect to four the least important. And then the second part is one most under threat today, two, three, four, four is least under threat today.

[Pause]

Male Participant: I'm sorry, what did you say about using the same one twice?

Female Participant: You've got to use one, two, three, and four.

Male Participant: Okay.

Moderator: Yes, you can't have two ones.

Male Participant: I see, rank them.

Moderator: Yes.

[Pause]

Female Participant: We've got to put our names on them right?

Moderator: No.

Male Participant: They've got it anyway.

Female Participant: And our fingerprints.

Male Participant: Hey, we've left our DNA all over this room, too. [Laughter]

[Pause]

Male Participant: Do we get the chance to rank you?

Female Participant: Are you from like the Boston, Massachusetts area?

Moderator: I'm from Canada.

Female Participant: I could tell. You did an "about" or one of those. It's always a give-away.

Female Participant: You said "out" before, and I thought that was Kennedyesque.

[Pause]

Male Participant: I have to ask you a question: going back and forth on the airlines, how is it for Canadian to come into the United States?

Moderator: A lot tougher than it used to be.

Male Participant: Okay. Would you like to know where to go and it's not as tough?

Moderator: Where.

Male Participant: Land in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Moderator: No, but you see now, I'm in a big city, I'm from Ottawa, the nation's capital, and so I have to, I flew in today, I cleared customs in the Ottawa airport. So there's a part of the Ottawa airport which is US property, so, it wouldn't matter where I landed. And I bought my ticket online, and I had to give my passport online, and I gave my birth date, my nationality, my name.

Female Participant: And do you give your social online, too?

Moderator: No.

Male Participant: Who's been to O'Hare recently? Okay. Try dropping somebody off. The 30 seconds to open the door, help your wife, throw up the trunk, pull the stuff out of the back, and here there's Mr. Policeman, "You're going to jail."

Susanne: I've been on a plane, well, six times, three roundtrip flights in the last month. And I brought a Swiss Army knife on the plane with me every time.

Male Participant: Wow.

Susanne: Forgot I had it in my purse.

Female Participant: So did you go through?

Susanne: Nobody noticed.

Male Participant: I had just the opposite experience –

[talking at once]

Male Participant: – I had a toilet kit in a carry-on thing, and I completely forgot, and I was so – it was like an out of the way airport, but they had people going through and stopped the belt, take a look, somebody's supervisor came over, said you've got three choices –

Moderator: Can I just cut you off for a second so I can get you to finish, because I can't finish late. I'm going to get you to read on the first one, your number one. So if you put – so Mark put ...

Mark: Informational privacy.

Moderator: And why?

Mark: I think that's where, right now, especially a lot of corporate businesses are really working hard, and I believe that some of the government agencies are doing the same thing, collecting more information.

Moderator: Okay. In the first question, which did you put as number one?

Wyfred: Being watched and monitored without your knowledge.

Moderator: Okay, so bodily privacy. Why?

Wyfred: I just like to have knowledge if I'm being watched.

Moderator: Okay. Carol.

Carol: I put one. I had a friend who was brutally murdered back in 1990 and it changed my life.

Moderator: Sandy.

Sandy: Bodily is number one.

Moderator: Why?

Sandy: It's like she said it's –

Moderator: Okay. Maria?

Maria: I put bodily. I just think that's where the social contract completely breaks down.

Moderator: Peter.

Peter: Informational privacy because, don't know who hears what [??], I mean.

Moderator: Okay. Ben.

Ben: Communication, because what you say can easily be turned against you, or taken out of context.

Moderator: Susanne.

Susanne: Territorial.

Moderator: Because?

Susanne: I just think – our whole fight for freedom was based on the privacy in one's home, could not billet soldiers there, you could not – there was no right to search or seizure within your home, you are totally and completely free, and a man's home is his castle, and I just feel very strongly about that.

Moderator: John?

John: Territorial for very many of the same ideas that we just heard.

Moderator: Okay. Second part of the question, what did you put as number one, most under threat?

Mark: On second one? Number one. Information.

Moderator: Alright. Information. Wyfred?

Wyfred: I put territorial.

Moderator: Why?

Wyfred: [unintelligible]

Moderator: Carol.

Carol: Information.

Moderator: Why?

Carol: Just what Mark just said, I don't want anybody knowing, I don't have anything to hide – I don't have anything to hide, but I –

Moderator: Okay. Sandy.

Sandy: Number one, information privacy.

Moderator: Maria?

Maria: I put informational as well.

Moderator: Why?

Maria: I think that's just with my particular demographics, I think that's most [rest inaudible].

Moderator: Okay. Peter?

Peter: Informational privacy. Again, a Pandora's box has been opened up and that would ...

Moderator: Ben?

Ben: Informational because it's the most vulnerable right now.

Susanne: Informational.

Moderator: Okay. John?

John: Informational. There you go.

Moderator: It is 9:28. I promised to be done by 9:30. Thank you very much for taking the time out of your day.

Female Participant: Is anybody taking the red line tonight?

Female Participant: Yes.

Female Participant: Can we walk together?

Female Participant: Sure.

Female Participant: After this bodily thing.

Ben: Am I safe to be safe to be seen with you?

[talking at once]

Male Participant: With this camera situation, they're recording crime, but they're not stopping crime. I remember when we used to have Officer Friendly in the neighbourhood, and he knew when we were going to get out of line, and he stopped the stuff before ...

[general leave-taking sounds]

[tape turned off]