TRAFFIC IS TERRIBLE. Late for a meeting, your mind is working overtime on how to adjust your presentation. Suddenly, there’s a clearing ahead. You hit the gas—and fly right into a speed trap. Blue lights flash in your rearview mirror.

On the side of the road the police officer takes your license and registration, returns to his car, and feeds them through an optical scanner. While you sit fuming, your name is being checked at a remote government computer center that keeps track of the websites you visit, the books you buy online, your long-distance phone bills, and hundreds of other pieces of both public and private information. Something in your past suggests behavior that authorities deem suspicious: Perhaps your name was included on a suspicious activity report for using binoculars and taking pictures “with no apparent esthetic value” in Los Angeles, as police policy there now dictates. As you wait, two more squad cars appear, their lights flashing, and the officer—now sounding a little nervous—says, “Please step slowly out of your car and spread your arms.”

It may sound like a futuristic dystopian nightmare, but the possibility of this kind of scenario is closer to reality than many people imagine. Government run or sponsored data clearing houses are now active in nearly every state. Known as fusion centers, they are funded by the federal government as part of the national response to the 9-11 terrorist attacks. Originally envisioned as a means of sharing anti-terrorism intelligence among federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies, fusion centers are generally unknown to the
Professor of Law Danielle Citron says, "I'm a privacy person." She is also a national leader in studying legal issues surrounding government reliance on information technologies.

"People say, 'Oh, you worry too much.' I think now is the time to be considering these issues," said Roundtable co-leader Frank Pasquale, a visiting professor of law at Yale, and the Loftus Professor of Law at Seton Hall University, at the session opening.

But identifying the issues means knowing what, exactly, fusion centers are doing. Beyond bland generalities, most centers refuse to say. And the task is made all the more difficult by the fact that no two fusion centers are quite alike. The Department of Homeland Security reports that as of February 2009 there were 58 fusion centers around the country. To date, the Department has provided more than $380 million to state and local governments to build and equip the centers, but does not directly operate or control them. For the most part, fusion centers evolved locally on an ad hoc basis beginning around 2003. Each fusion center is run by a unique set of state and regional partners and, beyond having a general mandate of information and intelligence sharing, they often have widely differing approaches to what information they collect, and with whom and for what reasons they share it.

Fusion centers use powerful computers and sophisticated programming techniques to scan huge quantities of data, looking for anomalies that may indicate terrorist threats. But in addition to public records such as court appearances and tax reports, the centers can "fuse" private information such as phone bills and credit reports and even secret information provided by other government agencies. This is what happened when Baltimore peace activists and antiwar demonstrators found themselves on federal terrorist watch lists after the Maryland State Police infiltrated their organizations and compiled extensive dossiers on the protesters in 2005 and 2006. The Baltimore Sun reported in 2008 that the undercover state police reports failed to identify any criminal or even potentially criminal acts on the part of the protesters, yet nonetheless entered their names on a database of potential terrorists or drug traffickers. "If you get put on a watch list, that means airlines can deny your ability to fly. You can potentially lose your employment if you are deemed a security risk, or perhaps be unable to get a job, depending on who gets to see these lists," notes Citron. "You're talking about real concrete harm."

Both the theory and technologies that undergird the fusion systems are new—and, say many experts, unproven—and little legal framework exists to regulate or direct the
centers’ activities. The possible misuse of such extensive new information collection and analysis capabilities first drew attention in December 2007, when the American Civil Liberties Union published a white paper titled “What’s Wrong with Fusion Centers?” The report identified several areas of general concern, citing ambiguous lines of authority; participation by both private sector subcontractors and military personnel; the likelihood of “data mining” in which centers go looking for suspicious individuals without probable cause; and the aura of excessive secrecy that surrounds the centers. It went on to suggest a number of legal and political safeguards that could prevent misuse of the centers’ unprecedented information gathering ability, dryly observing that the best solution might be to abandon the concept entirely, and “return to traditional law enforcement techniques based upon reasonable suspicion that have kept America safe and free for over 230 years.”

Many observers—including report co-author and ACLU policy counsel Michael German—believe there is no turning back. “The horse is out of the barn,” he said at the Roundtable. “Fusion centers are not going away. So what do they do? Are they being used to collect information on lawful dissent? Are these places where information on innocent activity is collected and shared? We are very concerned that because there are ambiguous lines of authority there is no policing mechanism in place to prevent abuse.”

—Michael German, ACLU policy counsel
standing the risk. "The reservoir metaphor suggests we underestimate the dangers inherent in damming up and collecting data," Citron says, reflecting her article's central premise that new economic eras bring about new concepts of personal harm.

If large uncontrolled databases pose risks—as recurring stories of identity theft and wide scale security breaches would seem to indicate—then the danger becomes even more acute, says Citron, when the scope of information collected is hidden behind veils of national security. "What we are seeing with fusion centers is mission creep. They started out as anti-terrorism tools, but now we are seeing their mission changed to the protection of all infrastructure from all risk. The danger is that they are combining unproved theories of data mining with use of private databases that may or may not be accurate. If the data used is incorrect then the results are going to reflect that. It's the old story of garbage in, garbage out."

But the centers are not without their defenders. According to Sean Kates '07, a law and policy analyst in the Law School's Center for Health and Homeland Security, first responders such as police, fire fighters, and other emergency personnel are especially likely to see benefits in the centers. "What falls apart first in a large scale emergency is communications," he says. "First responders look upon fusion centers as a positive because they provide a reliable central source of good information. "I have had police officers verify to me that fusion centers have been helpful to them in looking across county lines, and across differing criminal records systems, to aid in investigations. From that perspective it's a good concept," says Kates.

Homeland Security's Robert Riegle, who directs the state and local program office of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis, pointed to two recent success stories involving law enforcement, in testimony last April before a subcommittee of the Committee on Homeland Security. In one, a DHS operational specialist coordinated with federal officials on an Amber Alert for a 3-year-old girl being taken out of the country by a suspect wanted for rape and murder. Using information and contacts gathered through a California fusion center, he was able to track the youngster to a flight bound for the Netherlands; she was ultimately recovered unharmed. In the second case, the Denver fire and police departments worked with a Colorado fusion center to track and apprehend a suspect wanted for seven different fire-bombings of SUVs.

Skeptics note, however, that a good concept does not always translate into good practice. In order to truly understand the dangers posed by fusion centers that operate with virtually no public awareness or oversight, we must first invent new ways of describing our rights, says Professor of Law and Government Mark Graber. "The great danger is that very often we think of constitutional rights purely in traditional paradigms that don't reflect current reality. For example, we think that freedom of speech means an individual can stand on the corner and denounce the government without fear of interference. But today free speech often involves someone on the Internet. How do we ensure free speech is not inhibited in this environment?" Fusion centers, he says, pose a special challenge in this new world. "In the old days the concept of privacy meant that there was information that the government couldn't learn about you without going to court to obtain a warrant. And then they had to go look. In the past if a government official asked me, 'What have you been reading?' I would say, 'None of your business.' Now they
Since most fusion centers involve at least some participation from commercial data brokers, there is, practically speaking, no limit and no quality control on the kinds of information that might be sifted in search of unusual patterns that indicate a threat. An individual whose purchases, opinions, Internet use, political donations, or general activities are deemed potentially subversive—by whom or by what standards to be determined by fusion center operators and not shared publicly—could be flagged for questioning, monitoring, or observation. Since private databases are often error-prone and not subject to consumer control or review, Citron’s “garbage in/garbage out” dictum means the system would generate a relatively high number of “false positives”—flagging innocent individuals for further scrutiny or surveillance based on faulty information. The ACLU report points out that even if fusion centers obtain the unrealistically high accuracy rate of 99 percent, in the U.S. population of 300 million citizens with a hypothetical 1,000 terrorists at large, 990 of the terrorists will be “caught”—as will 3 million innocent Americans. “We have decided we want to live with more false positives than negatives,” says Citron. “This approach relies on crude algorithms which mean that, for a large number of people, you’re going to be pulled aside.”

If, as most Roundtable panelists agreed, “the horse is out of the barn” for fusion centers, then the need for effective legal oversight and vigilant public scrutiny is compelling. The Roman poet Juvenal once asked, “Who will guard the guardians?” Ultimately, the experts concluded, there will need to be some kind of online presence “watching the watchers.”