

Transcript: TV News Clips: CBS, Oprah, Nightline, Others—1986-88

For our series on the wonders of life in the year two thousand one, we have been wandering through the inside of a computer. This totally artificial room was drawn by one of the biggest and fastest computers yet invented. For tonight's reports, we have asked Jerry Bowen and Bob Schieffer to investigate how the computers of the future might amuse us and spy on us in two thousand and one. It's the classic play at first base, but is the runner safe or out?

With this sophisticated computer used now to enhance newspaper and magazine pictures, it can be your call. Move the runner, move the ball. By the year two thousand one, technology will give you undreamed of power. Prediction.

In two thousand and one you will dictate to the television networks. You pick the program, you pick the time. Captain's log, stardate twenty eight eighteen. That's the educated projection of the man who created his own future in the Star Trek television series and movies.

Networks will really become electronic libraries which you and I, when we want to see something, we'll punch it in on a code like a telephone and we will have it right then. And it may not be just one dimensional television, but something along the lines of a hologram, three-dimensional images captured by laser beams.

We'll be able to sit at home and turn on our holographic home entertainment system and get Princess Leia actually walking around our living room.

The man who created the special effect around Princess Leia and the other Star Wars characters sees not only that possibility but a whole new way of sharing the fantasy of movies.

I won't go so far as to say that in within ten years we'll be transmitting alpha, beta and sundry waves into your brain, so that you can actually experience what your what has been taped originally, but I think that that's the direction things are gonna go.

Another direction is simulating reality. The computer is the tool, the reality, whatever the imagination dictates.

In the future, if one picture is worth a thousand words, we'll make it move and it'll be worth a million.

The big challenge, human appearance and movement created by computer. A process taking baby steps right now. Prediction, by two thousand one a computer created actor will star in a movie.

We had a request from a movie director to to simulate a now dead star from photographs. And and I think it is possible.

Enormous possibilities in the year two thousand one to entertain, amuse, inform, or manipulate. Enormous ethical questions too. If Hollywood can alter reality, simulate reality, what is to stop the politician, the journalist, a government? Technology is the wonder tool taking us to two thousand and one and technology has no conscience. Jerry Bowen, CBS News, Los Angeles.

To your health, ladies and gentlemen? Cheers. Cheers.

Cheers. Cheers.

Checking fingerprints, a computer at a New York restaurant can tell who's been in the wine cellar and how often.

A machine at a high-tech company in Washington State can tell if people have clearance into its computer room by scanning the retina of their eyes. Already science fact, not fiction. And that's just the beginning.

Futurists say that by the year two thousand, technology will make it so easy to identify us, to track our movements, to know our business, that it may erode our whole concept of privacy as we now know it.

It's possible that we're on the way to becoming a maximum security society, where practically everything that could be known is known.

We're getting used to constant surveillance.

Oh honey, I'm the big sister.

But computer advances will allow charting of our lives in even more frightening detail. Because computers can now talk to each other, scientists call it networking, and they're talking about us. For example, the Internal Revenue Service shares the information in its computers with thirty eight other government agencies.

If you just examine your bank account, a person can determine the organizations you support, therefore whether you're liberal, conservative. He can determine the places you go, determine the books you read, he can determine the things you buy.

Some experts worry there may literally be no secrets. Many companies already tap into employee computer terminals to measure how hard an employee is working.

Prediction. By the year two thousand and one the tap may go directly to a person's brain waves.

Workers would be wired up with electrodes and at the end of the month they'd get paid according, partly according to the percentage of time that they were concentrating.

By the time these youngsters are ready to look for a job in the year two thousand and one, everything about them may well be in somebody's computer bank.

You remember when you were in the third or fourth grade and your teacher stood up in front of the class and sternly warned that might go on your permanent record. But now it really might.

So far the technology to collect information has moved much faster than the laws to regulate it. If that trend continues, our children will still have the right we have today, the right to remain silent. But it won't much matter.

Bob Schiefer, CBS News, Boston.

For the conclusion of our special series of reports on life in two thousand and one, tomorrow night we'll examine terrorism in the twenty first century, the threat to the world's animals, the search for ET, and the promise of the future through the eyes of children.

For now, Dan Rather for CBS News. Thank you for joining us. Good night.

Yes, I don't think those cards are in order. Thank you very much.

Ever wonder what James Bond's closet must look like? With us now is John Demeter, who's owner of Spy Shops International, who has brought with him some of the latest and most popular forms of spying and anti spying gadgetry to give us a glimpse into the world of espionage. Also joining in my next guests say that privacy today is a myth and that from the hour we are born and foot printed, our lives become an open book, opening even wider with the growing popularity of specialized credit cards and cash cards. He ought to know because he's been a private investigator now for over thirty minutes to get the goods on others. Please welcome Erwin Bly, author of Secrets of a Private Eye.

Gary Marx also believes that privacy is a figment of the imagination, takes it one step further to suggest that not only have we reached the point depicted in George Orwell's nineteen eighty four, but with the advent of computer surveillance, we may have traveled beyond nineteen eighty four. Professor of sociology at MIT, Gary's the author of Undercover Police Surveillance in America. We're glad to have First of all, I'll start with you, John. So, what kinds of things are available now? Are all of these available to the general public too?

No, they're not. First of all, strictest surveillance is a violation of federal statute, means it's illegal. And to general public, certain things are available wherever you can basically buy in Radio Shack stores and a little bit more in our stores to the general public.

So what kind of things do you have there that people can Well, first of all, we have this device which is a spray.

It's a spray, you spray on the envelope, and you can read through the envelope whatever's written on it.

Oh.

I'm so glad I'm doing a rewrite, because I know I put all this stuff in the book.

Oh really?

How do they justify this?

How do they justify selling all this?

Okay, do you justify that? John Rudolph wants to know.

The manufacturer calls this letter bomb detection envelope compromise spray.

So you can tell what's in the envelope. Can you tell what's written in the envelope too?

Yes, you can.

You can.

There's a certain amount of hype here too, I think.

And the stuff often doesn't work as well as those who are pushing a claim that it does. Okay.

Go ahead, Irwin.

I don't justify You don't?

You were a private being a private investigator, you don't justify it? No. Why?

The gentleman's right. We've gone to the point in certain areas of illegality.

Someone calls me up and says, what do you get for bugging?

I said, Last time I knew it was five years. He's right. But in the context of a legal investigation, doing what we can legally, I approve of it. Not illegally.

I concur. I concur. In fact, me respond to that statement of my ex wife. I'm sorry this is degenerating to a personal situation.

First of all, I've never battered her. I've never touched her. Secondly, she has she has an attorney. The fact of the matter is the reason I'm here, the fact that I've gotten my state representative to introduce in the state house in Pennsylvania legislation to ban such devices as these voice activated tape recorders.

The fact that I'm working now with Ralph Nader. The fact that I'm working with Pennsylvania congressman Austin Murphy and Pennsylvania Senator Arlen Specter to introduce legislation in the United States Congress is because, as the gentleman quite correctly says, big brother is here. This is a much larger issue.

You think nineteen eighty four has come true, Gary?

Well, I think we're, what, five four years beyond it.

But in fact, it's a different society than Orwell envisioned. He talked about a boot snapping on a human face in Big Brother, but in fact we primarily have more manipulative kinds of forms. I worry that with things like computer dossiers, biometric testing such as drug testing, there's now a drug test you may not know about where you can take one strand of that beautiful hair of yours and determine your entire drug history.

Really?

Yeah. Just like rings are laid down around a tree, drug residues are laid down around hair. If you look at electronic kinds of surveillance, whether beepers are the kinds that we've been talking about here, we're moving into a different kind of a society.

I like to use the image of a maximum security prison or an intensive care unit in a hospital and ask whether we aren't becoming those kinds of situations where things are much more visible than they ever were John, who comes to you?

Who buys these things?

Basically, governments. South American governments and US governments are my biggest clientele.

And Well, that's always nice to know that it's the government doing it.

But open open may I say, please?

I gotta go to break.

Gotta go to break. Sorry. Back in a moment. Back in moment.

We're taking a situation I got a little closer with me which is illegal. But take a situation. For instance, someone is going to be hired at a baby care center, a day care center, are we entitled to know their background and their history? I think so.

So there's good and bad. Good and bad.

What the gentleman is saying is what we call in my industry the pirates. If a private investigator would do that type of work, he would be called a pirate. Most won't touch it, won't come near it. But yes, we'll do the background because your background is open.

Your privacy is a myth. It's non-existent. All of you feel very very secure sitting here and looking at me like this. But I can get your finances, your personal, sometimes your criminal history, your credit history, and we can go as far as we can provided time and money.

So can the time and the money, we'll get it.

And so can you.

And it has you can violate the law.

No. What kind of a society do you end up with when everyone mistrusts everyone else? I think the issue partly here is, are we dealing with Darth Vader or Luke Skywalker? Exactly. And how do you know? And it's great.

And how do you know, Gary?

If it's you How do I black or white.

There's there's a lot of gray here. Because when the women are checking on their husbands, they're trying to find out the truth. And they're doing it they're doing the wrong thing for the greater good. Yes. They are. Or when the husband is checking on the wife, it's for the greater good so that she knows the truth and so the marriage can proceed from there. And to check on a person who's gonna be in a child care center, that's for the greater good.

The fact What about doing a premarital? And the fact that we're getting two people who live together, we know something about them, the family doesn't know enough about them, what's wrong?

Where does it stop?

I'm talking about legitimate cause.

Do premaritals, we do girls checking up on their boyfriends all the time.

And and many times we get information that that saves these people before they get into my relationship before they get started.

But it's necessary.

And you do and you use it personally accessible to the general public.

Husband gets Yes.

Thank God.

Anti family, anti holy, anti decent, everything in this country.

Wait a minute. Okay. No.

Have any of you ever experienced Yes.

Have you had one in your bedroom?

How do you feel about it?

You're talking about using it using anything negative.

Kids and drugs.

There's a drug war going on Erwin's book is called Secrets of a Private Eye and Gary's book is called Undercover.

Very special thanks we want to say to Forrest Security for setting up our office surveillance. It's now out though. It was only going on for for two hours just just so that we could talk. It's out.

It's definitely out. It was it was in my office, so I know it's out. Wanted to say what, Gary?

I have a story to tell. I'd like to leave you with a question. And this has to do with the creeping nature of surveillance. It's said by Cooks that if you take a frog and you put it into hot water, it will immediately jump out.

But what happens if you put the frog in cold water and you slowly turn up the heat? I think that applies to the gradual spread and the justifications for these surveillance devices. Each one standing alone with a persuasive person arguing can be justified. But if you look at the big picture, the totality, you end up with a very different situation.

There's a big difference between Big Brother and Big There's no justification for any difference.

Are we just stop processing?

What is the difference between Big Brother and Big Mama?

Big Brother is the government invading your privacy and Big Momma is watching out for her kids.

Gives every citizen the right to invade privacy violate the law.

John, yes.

You can prevent your eavesdropping in country.

We have equipment for counter surveillance. To prevent all those eavesdropping ninety nine point nine percent I can protect you from being eavesdropping.

From being eavesdropped. Thank you all for sharing your stories today. Been very interesting.

Thank you very much.

For written transcripts, send three dollars to Oprah Transcripts, two sixty seven Broadway, New York, New York, one zero zero zero seven.

Therefore, we monitor the job performance of our reservation sales representatives.

What United does and what a lot of other companies are doing is to listen in on their employees. They time their telephone calls, allocate precisely how much time they've got to go to the bathroom. As Nightline correspondent James Walker reports, it's not the idea that new, it's the application.

In nineteen thirty six, America laughed at Charlie Chaplin's story of an insensitive and crazed boss.

Back, section five, more speed, four seven.

But now, fifty years later, it's no longer funny. Computers and high-tech telephone systems have enabled employers to spy on employees in the name of productivity and to do it every second of the workday.

The computer washes everything.

Computer monitors the Well, the company has achieved a three second improvement.

What's happening to the worker?

I've seen a lot of people that have had stress problems and I think that Taking the focus away from service to catching up with the machine quota.

If I don't keep up with this, it's like an eye that is constantly focused on you and it never blinks.

About six million clerical workers are now being at work by the unblinking eye. Another four million Americans with professional technical and managerial jobs may find their performance electronically evaluated in the next few years.

Millions of employees work at terminals like this one. What they don't know is that with certain computer programs, everything they type in can be seen by their boss, and they won't even know they're being watched.

Okay, this is the long distance Union officials estimate that one in one half million telephone operators are monitored. Hundreds of them gathered in the nation's capital recently to complain about it.

We have in house observing, which is we have a manager who sits on another position down the room and she's in on somebody, you don't know who it is, you're just praying to God it's not you, and she's listening.

The monitoring is not used for customer service.

It is used for harassment. It is not used for training.

Monitoring in short is the whip of the electronic workplace.

Bonnie Conwell and Tony Watson feel as though they've been whipped by the computer.

They're employed at PSA Airlines in San Diego as reservation agents. During the seven and one half hours they work at the computer, they're allowed only twelve minutes away from the terminal. That's twelve minutes in seven and a half hours to go to the bathroom or to eat a snack, much less deal with family problems.

I used to have a bladder problem, and I took more than twelve minutes away from my position frequently, I had to. And I was frequently getting three points towards termination.

Timing the bathroom break. It sounds like a joke.

Hey, quit stalling, get back to work. Go on.

Toni Watson says she was ordered to appear before her supervisor on several occasions.

It was the most humiliating experience of my life. I had to sit there in managers' offices and tell them the most intimate personal details that no human being should have to go through about their personal health problems, or how often they have to go to the bathroom.

Reservation agents like Tony Watson work on a demerit system monitored by a computer. If agents spend an average of more than one hundred and nine seconds talking to each customer about reservations or airline fares, they get one demerit point. If they spend more than eleven seconds in between talking to customers, they get two demerit points. Six demerits, for example, earns a warning. Thirty six demerits, dismissal.

When you have a computer matched quota to meet every single day, you are working for the computer. You're no longer a human being.

We asked PSA if they would let us watch them monitor their employees. They said no. We also asked them to explain why they feel monitoring is necessary. Again, they said no.

A PSA official said other airlines do it, and we don't want to be singled out. In fact, a lot of companies monitor employees. In Issaquah, Washington, Lakeside Sand and Gravel tracks its trucks and drivers using a high frequency radio signal called LARAN. That, coupled with a computer generated street map, allows the dispatcher to monitor every move.

If the driver gets lost or stops unexpectedly for a cup of coffee, the dispatcher knows it.

It's improved our productivity or truck utilization about eight or ten percent. Put it another way, we can deliver the same amount of concrete with two last mixer trucks.

Silver Spring, Maryland. At Holy Cross Hospital, officials set up a hidden camera in the nurse's locker room when they suspected a nurse was stealing drugs. What the cameras saw was broadcast in the doctor's lounge.

Would you want somebody to have a camera in your locker room, you know, while you're undressing? And, you know, anybody, anybody could be looking in, you know. That's, you know, the really, that's the bad part about it.

Holy Cross Hospital stopped their surveillance.

And in Seattle, Washington, another abuse. This woman, afraid of showing her face for fear of reprisals from her company, says that in monitoring employee performance, customers' phone calls were recorded.

I saw occasions where these call where these tapes were played for people's entertainment, where they had a little laugh over something that the customer may have said.

And some software programs have been designed to allow the boss to surreptitiously check everything an employee has ever written on his computer terminal.

You might be looking for the corporate computer being used for personal reasons. Let me give you a couple of examples. Game playing, balancing the checkbook, and this has happened before, using the computer to run an outside consulting business.

Even the best employees, those who perform consistently well, object to the monitoring. Vicki Marquess is a medical transcriptionist. The computer counts every line she types.

It's like I don't ever have the feeling that I can relax or have a bad day or be a little bit less than what I considered my best.

Workers increasingly find that instead of confronting a supervisor, they're confronting a machine. And I think that has, some serious costs to it in terms of helping the employee to grow, to learn, and the humane ness of the environment.

It just may be that all the advances are too much to handle. This is James Walker for Nightline.

Later we'll hear two opposing views on whether the practice of monitoring employees does more harm than good in terms of efficiency and productivity. But first, when we come back, we'll talk with a woman who's been subjected to surveillance and considers it an illegal invasion of privacy.

Airline reservations agent, Mary Williams.

I'm Richard Heffner, your host on The Open Mind. As happened so often, a colleague at Rutgers directed me to a book the other week. A good title, an interesting subject, Police Surveillance in America, underwritten by the prestigious twentieth Century Fund, published by the University of California Press. Even a good read.

But what I hadn't expected was to have it quite so literally, quite so forcefully overwhelm me with its provocative insights not just into police undercover work in near twenty first century America, but also into what modern surveillance techniques generally signal about our nation's changing patterns and evaluations of private and public morality, of privacy, of social control.

Perhaps one could say that in America's early years, our small nation period, with its quite natural premium on personal independence and without today's technical means of intruding upon individual privacy and of controlling masses of people, physically. Perhaps then we just came naturally as a people to an abhorrence of social controls and institutionalized that abhorrence into what we did and surely what we said about ourselves as a people. No police stayed here on these shores. No official snooping. No governmental surveillance of my activities or of yours. Besides, and perhaps most important, the need for such controls wasn't there.

With its frontier traditions, ours was in its way a violent nation, but essentially a safe one. Not now, however. Not safe from crime or terror or a threatening interdependence of often hostile nations. Now we are so much more at their mercy, though armed too with the technological and organizational means to identify these threats to the good life, even to control them.

So that how we use these means and whether they justify our ends, these questions must inform our discussion today of this stunningly provocative book, Undercover Police Surveillance in America. And I

want to ask its author, Gary T. Marx, professor of sociology at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, to elaborate on his statement that in starting his book, he said, I viewed undercover tactics as a necessary evil. No, strike it.

He said as an unnecessary evil. But in the course of his research, he had concluded, however reluctantly, that indeed in these states they had become a necessary evil.

But that's unexpected from a card carrying academic. And I want to ask Professor Marx if it doesn't at least start us down what may become the slippery slope to a maximum security society. Professor Marx, what about it?

Thank you, Dick. Well, that's very well put. I think there are always trade offs. There are always risks.

When I began the study, I drew on my experience as a student and a teacher at Berkeley during the 1960s. And at that point, I was active in a group called CORE that was concerned with integration. It was non violent. And we worked hard peacefully demonstrating and also raising funds.

And after one particularly intense fundraising period, we came to our Wednesday night meeting expecting to tally up the proceeds, and we were shocked to find out that our treasurer was not there. It turned out that she was a police agent. She had disappeared with our funds. That, along with a number of other revelations about police infiltration, created in me the feeling, which was also consistent with American traditions, of an abhorrence of secret police and covert kinds of activities.

But something has changed for some of the factors that you mentioned with respect to the interdependence in society and also the ways in which the tactic is now being used. When Hoover died, shifted its attitude toward undercover tactics. Most people don't realize this, that during that Hoover first was brought in as a reformer. And there are wonderful quotes where he promises never to use undercover tactics because they're too reminiscent of European police states.

The infiltration that the FBI engaged in was primarily through using informers, using citizens, not agents. Hoover thought it was too risky to do. But when Hoover died, a number of changes occurred. And one was that the FBI, to some extent, redefined their priorities.

Rather than dealing with bank robberies or auto theft, they came to focus on more serious kinds of offenses, particularly those involving white collar crime.

Now we've seen many new laws passed, for example, to control pollution, to protect endangered species, and you can only deal with offenses of that nature by becoming a party to them. We also see the great concern over street crime that appeared in the late 1960s and through the mid 1970s. And there, undercover tactics can be very effective. For example, if there is a crime pattern, say nurses are being attacked in a parking lot as they leave their late night shift, then it's very appropriate I think to have an undercover police officer posing as a nurse to go and see if she can invite an assault with other police waiting waiting in the wings.

I think also with respect to political corruption, the undercover tactic can be very powerful. Now one of the problems with a crime like corruption, of course, is that it's not clear that who the victim is, although we're all victimized. We may not know about it. Victimization is diffused and it's often only by becoming a party to a crime and videotaping it to boot that the public interest will be served.

These can list a number of kinds of offenses where the tactic is certainly appropriate. Another good one has just to do with something like taxi cabs where, particularly large cities that have many foreigners coming in, taxi cabs unfortunately sometimes take advantage of people. And one way to deal with that is to have police agents pretend to be tourists, get in the cab, they know exactly what the fare is from the airport to downtown, and then they see whether or not cab drivers charge the appropriate amount. One recent case in New York City, twenty out of fifty cab rides ended up with exorbitant charges.

The cab drivers in fact then were arrested and subject to various kinds of sanctioning. So I think in the case of consumer issues, which we're all very concerned with, the tactic can certainly be appropriate. The key thing of course is bounding it, is having it be done by people who are well trained, carefully chosen, well supervised, and have always realized that there is a grave risk and that the cure may well end up being far worse than what you are trying to address with it.

Yeah, but I don't want you to cop out on that, really. To say as you did at the end, well maybe the cure can be worse than the disease, don't you and don't we all individually have to make a choice whether these beings are justified by the ends that you elaborate upon? I mean, you don't want to draw a white herring across this trail. It's too important to question.

No, think it's like certain very dangerous kinds of surgery where we may conclude that under appropriate conditions the surgery is necessary. The key thing is to specify those conditions. What I tried to do in the book was to indicate on the basis of my research of both local police departments and federal agencies what it was that I felt had to be there before, in fact, the tactic could be used. Kenneth?

Yes, but you know, again I must say to you that I'm puzzled because this is a it really is a stunning book because it makes you think about problems that I think otherwise don't come to our attention. And when I say drawing a white herring, I mean you mentioned all of the instances in which probably most of the people who are watching us now would agree that is legitimate use of undercover surveillance. The other one is a legitimate use, etc. But you make such an important point here where you talk about the sub societies impose a maximum security society where you say, in a sense, if we do all these things, at least that is the way I read these pages, we are in danger of letting those means bring us to ends that are rather horrendous. And that you seem at times to be saying, I don't trust our society to use this power consistently in the right way because the power seems almost necessarily to corrupt. Now.

Not necessarily corrupt, but first of all I would separate out the undercover tactic from a variety of other forms which I call the new surveillance. Forms involving drug testing based not only on your urine but on a strand of that lovely hair of yours. Drug testing based on the movement of your eyes. Video cameras that can record everything not only on public streets but in restrooms and in employee lounges. Computer dossiers.

A variety of hotlines for reporting everything. Whether you're going to report your children using drugs, your children are going to report you using drugs. I think in Connecticut there's a line for reporting poaching. In the state of Washington there's a hotline where citizens can call in and report people who are littering or people who are driving in a lane on the freeway that's reserved for buses or for carpools. The book deals with undercover police, but that's really more a vehicle to get at something more general.

Responded to your question, I was responding to certain uses of the undercover tactic. And if I separate that out and see that as part of something more organic, something larger, then I think I do have a number of concerns, which you correctly picked up in reading the book.

Is it fair to say that perhaps you're establishing your credentials by saying, Okay, undercover surveillance, this has its important uses and you don't see that it is necessarily starting us down the slippery slope. Having said that, you legit your role in saying, Let's look at all these other things that may lead us to a maximum security society.

That's correct, but let's also look at how to do undercover work in such a way that it doesn't lead us on that slippery slope, that it doesn't expand, that you don't have the domino kind of effect. In general, think we should probably have less undercover work in the United States because the capability simply isn't there, particularly at the local and state levels. And I think it's important when we consider the means and ends issue that you referred to, to realize that more is at stake than simply obtaining an end. Americans are pragmatic.

At the same time, I think the genius of our system is that we care about means, that process is somehow very important. And the notion of efficiency should not be our only goal. And even if these things worked, there are other costs to it. I think unfortunately in a society that's dominated by perspectives of lawyers and economists, you tend to get two points of view in evaluating public policy.

One is, is it legal? By and large, undercover activities as done in the United States are legal. And to some extent, with certain qualifications, they tend often to work, as do some of these other surveillance technologies. But just because something is legal and it works doesn't mean that it is wise to do it because it can change the nature of the society that you have.

But Professor Marx, if you take your explanation of why you once felt that it was an unnecessary evil, the undercover surveillance, and have come to feel that it is an evil still but a necessary one, wouldn't that explanation, I won't call it a rationalization, wouldn't that rationale fit for drug testing, for AIDS testing, for wiretapping, for almost all of the chambers of horrors that you list in this book as building up to a maximum security society?

I don't think that that justification is necessarily there. I think you have to take it on a case by case basis. I think most of the things, the techniques that we are aware of are not things that will be abolished by the society. They're sort of facts on the ground.

They're fate to complete. They're there. And perhaps if we were starting over and building a different kind of society, one would want to affect the culture, affect the laws in such a way that these things wouldn't have the foothold that they have. But I think with an economic system that we have, with the great concerns that are there, whether it's health concerns, whether it's international competition, whether it's concern over crime, whether it's concern over terror, there is a demand to do something.

And academics can write books and use quotations and say nice things, but in fact there's a real world out there that's wheeling and dealing, and to a significant extent runs according to principles of the dollar. I think it's that set of concerns that's there that drives this.

I don't think that most of these things are like nuclear weapons, where I would say categorically we ought to ban abolish nuclear weapons, they just shouldn't be there. Most of these things, there are

multiple sides to them. And I think as an academic I've tried to listen to what the different sides are saying. Of course as a human, as a person, as a citizen, I have my own concerns.

I think there are choices and there's no free lunch. And it's easy for privileged people to say, we really, and I hear I'm being devil's advocate and reversing the kind of libertarian position that I think you're taking, those of us who are relatively privileged, it's easy for us to ignore the kinds of everyday concerns that people have who are a lot involved with public transportation, worry a lot about crime, who are concerned about the nature of benefits and so on.

Look, I don't want take that position, but when you said before, let's do it on a case by case Method by method.

The polygraph, I would agree, in general ought to be out and there is congressional legislation to that effect now. We're moving in that direction. But many other kinds of things, I don't know. Mean, I've written against drug testing and I'm very worried about categorical drug testing.

But the notion of testing selectively people who work in nuclear facilities or people who are involved with transportation, I don't have the same feeling about that as I have when I read in the newspaper that all seventh graders in Texas town are going to be tested, and if they don't pass they can't be in the band, they can't do extracurricular activities. I would kind of limit it. I put conditions around it. I'm worried about throwing the whole thing out as I am about unleashing the whole thing.

Well, but you know you can't have it both ways, it seems to me. If you have to make a bet, what's your bet as to what will happen if we begin to acclimatize ourselves to this notion of further and further invasions upon what used to be privacy and stick your nose out of my business.

Well I think we may well have a safer society, a more competitive society, a physically healthier society, but I think it would be a less innovative society, a less dynamic society, a society where people were less willing to take risks, a society where people didn't feel free, and it would certainly not be a society that I would choose or I would vote for. Again, it's when, you know, there's a social science, there's a science part of it. And that science part communicates the idea that we really ought to try and be objective in our analysis, as objective as we can be. And what I'm doing in the book is two things, and maybe it's tricky.

First, I'm saying here's what's going on. Here's what I think is happening. Here are the social trends that I see. And someone, at one level, can say, well you're right or you're wrong or there are other things going on.

A second role to play, and social scientists unfortunately get uncomfortable playing this role, and that is to take a moral position. And when I take a moral position it gets complicated. There's a wonderful line from Tolkien in the Lord of the Rings where he says, Go not to the elves for advice, for they will say both yes and no. I think a little bit you get that with academics who have the pretension of still trying to be social scientists, trying to be observers, who try and listen to what it is that's being said.

But I'm not willing to unleash it nor am I willing to in general categorically ban it. I'm not troubled when there is a video camera in a public square. I wasn't troubled when I came up here, a little troubled, and I saw a sign that said there's a video camera in the elevator. I am troubled when I go into a changing room in my department store and I see a hidden video camera.

I'm not told that there's a video camera there. I am troubled when I read that there are video cameras in restrooms in some instances. So, again, it's a question of how it's done.

You're saying that it's a matter of how it's done and it's a matter of degree.

It's a matter of degree. It's also a matter, I think, of public consciousness, a matter of public debate. I don't presume to sort of speak for broad society and to issue ultimatums that we ought to do it this way, we ought to do it that way. I'd rather say here's what's at stake and here's sort of what I think. One of the things that I did find in doing this study, and I was fortunate to have the cooperation of federal agencies, which surprised me in some ways because I had previously been involved with congressional committees that had been critical of undercover practices and of surveillance practices. And I came in with, I was surprised by what I found.

That people were concerned about many of the issues that I was concerned about. They had tried to design policies to minimize problems.

And they were constantly seeking ways to be on their guard, particularly at the federal level.

But you know that's the forgive me. It sounds to me a little bit Pollyannaish. And it seems to me again you have it both ways because I asked you before what kind of bet that you would What kind of bet would you make when you have this wonderful section here in your wonderful book. You say important American values are increasingly threatened by the permanent and accessibility of computerized records.

You are not saying here, Do we keep good ones? Do we keep bad ones? You are talking about computerized records. The idea of starting over or moving to a new frontier is a powerful concept in American culture.

And what you are saying here is that idea goes by the boards in a very real sense because of the seeming inevitability of what this serpent in the garden, this technology enables us to do. Now that seems to be a fairly all out devastating critique.

Well again, I'm not sure it's either or. I think there are trends and tendencies, but there are also counter tendencies. And I think again, apart from what I personally may think about this, there is the reality out there and the ways in which the information technology is changing our society. I think there's always variation and there probably are good and less good uses of record systems.

There's some record systems where you have a high degree of confidentiality, where it's very hard to break into the system, where the people running those systems have incentives to keep the data current, to obey the law, and where there's both self policing and external policing. And in those situations I'm not troubled by the records. There are probably, we now prohibit gathering certain kinds of information such as about gender, about race, some aspects of lifestyle. And maybe there should be other kinds of information as well that should not be contained in databases.

But again I don't see it as somehow pulling a plug and stopping the whole thing. Why not? Where's the political power going to come from? Privacy is more or less a dead issue in the United States, I think, aside from small coterie of people who often concentrate around universities and the mass media.

So we get a sense that it's a bigger issue. Now there was something very exciting that happened in nineteen eighty six, and that was the nineteen eighty six Electronic Privacy Protection Act. And all kinds of groups from the left and the right came together to extend to computer communications, to extend to phone communication that is sent not over a wire, which was the kind of protection we had from nineteen sixty eight, but which went up in the air through satellites or microwaves. Those are now protected.

But the reason that happened was that the companies that are in the data, in the communications business, saw privacy as something they could sell. So they brought their enormous power together and that act was passed. But lots of other acts die and they've not been passed.

Know, doomsday scenarios, they're kind of glamorous. You get a certain drama out of them and people respond to them and they're provocative. And there's I think a role for that kind of polemic. But when I look at it as, again, a kind of social scientist, my initial concern was to say, look here's what it is that I think is going on and I hope that the book might be judged initially with respect to whether am I right or wrong about the patterns that I see.

In terms of my own values, yeah, it scares me a lot but I don't see an easy solution. I could give you lots of examples. I imagine living here in New York that you may well take the subway or the train home tonight. And I know you want to get there safely.

And many people, are you willing to trade the possibility that the person driving that train will be stoned for the other side of it which is the liberty. You may well have grandchildren. We want children in schools to be taught by people who will respect their integrity. I have a car.

I drove across the country this last summer and I was a bit concerned by some of the driving that I saw on the part of truckers. One of the big concerns has been that people can drive trucks in an unsafe way, have a license lost in one state and simply go to another state. Now there's a national database for unsafe drivers. I think that's good.

We also saw an announcement where doctors and records of censoring doctors are going to be gathered in Washington so that a doctor can't get in trouble in one state and then move to another state. I can give you lots of examples of how they are positive aspects of this.

Yes, we just have a few minutes left, three or four minutes left, but I want to make the point that what you are talking about is once again something that I am basically asking you. Is it essentially all over because you and I have values? And I am not talking about the privacy values now, the questions you ask. Do I want to endanger myself, my wife, my children on that subway tonight?

Or on the car you drive? And you know that the answer is no. But if the answer is no, don't we have to face the consequences of who we are and what we are and what we are capable of doing in terms of this information revolution and recognize that there is really a transvaluation of values and stop kidding ourselves and saying we don't have to go all the way because when you start down that slippery slope, nobody says you shouldn't have started it given the good things we can accomplish. But there it goes.

The old days are over.

I think the old days are over, but I don't see it as being something like being pregnant, you know, where either you are or you're not. Mean I think there are degrees of it. Through the media, through concerned

people in Congress, through concerned public interest groups, that these things can be attended to, that reasonable protections can be developed.

You think we can have all of these abilities and protect against Well, think you have to have a dream, have to believe, you have to act as you have to do the best you can with what you've got.

What I hear you saying is a kind of Luddite point of view where, you know, throw the whole thing away because it's just going to lead to change. I'm in a funny position, you make me be an advocate. That's not the role I usually play.

No, no, no. Don't misunderstand me. Luddite never, because it doesn't work as you have suggested. Recognition of where we are and where we are going, not to turn the hands of the clock back, but to understand a certain kind of phase of human history has fast come to an end.

Sure, sure. That's right. We have to revise our notions of privacy. We need new concepts for thinking about these things.

We need new laws. And I think public awareness is terribly important. I mean people are often so differential and we've all been hassled by someone on the phone who says, But the computer says. But the computer says it only because people have programmed it in such a way.

There are a couple of points I want to make. You say we're

Yeah, there are three short, two stories actually I'll tell which indicate the concerns that move me. It's said by a culinary artist that if you are cooking lobsters or if you're cooking frog, if you put them in hot water, a big stove on the pan, they will immediately jump out. But what happens if you put them in the stove, in the pot, in cold water, and you slowly turn up the heat? I think that's the kind of situation we're in now.

That by accretion, by this variety of techniques, whether it's computers, whether it's drug testing, whether it's genetic screening, whether it's undercover, things are moving very slowly but we may well wake up to a very different kind of situation. In hot water, you mean? In very hot water, indeed. The second story In one minute.

In one minute, is about three social scientists who are about to be a guillotine in the not too distant future. And the first is led to the block and the rope is cut and nothing happens. And she looks up and says, she's a religious person, it's a sign from God and is let go. The second is a political activist and he's led and the rope is cut, nothing happens.

And he says it's the will of the people and he's let go. And the third is led and that person is a social engineer and as his head is put on the block he looks up and he says, Hey, wait a minute, I think I can fix that.

The point there, of course, being that all problems don't necessarily have to be fixed.

Sounds like Charles Murray. Thanks very much today for joining me on this discussion of this incredible book that you've just written, Police Surveillance in America and a Lot More, Professor Gary Marx.

And thanks to you in the audience. I hope you will join us again next time. And if you care to share your thoughts about today's program, please write The Open Mind, PO Box seven thousand nine hundred

seventy seven, FDR Station, New York, NY ten thousand one hundred fifty. For transcripts, send two dollars in check or money order. Meanwhile, as an old friend used to say, Good night and good luck.

Continuing production of this series has generously been made possible by grants from the Roslyn P. Walter Foundation, the M. Weiner Foundation of New Jersey, the Mediators and Richard Angloria Mani, The Richard Lounsbury Foundation, Mr. Lawrence A. Wean, and The New York Times Company Foundation.

One of the most dramatic news clips NBC aired last year was shot by an amateur.

A bystander with a camcorder was rolling when a rocket fuel plant exploded in Nevada.

On after eight this morning, home video cameras, seven million of them are turning amateurs into spot news cameramen. Here are some of the other stories that have made TV newscasts.

Last year when an aloha airplane peeled open like a sardine can and made a miraculous landing, someone happened to have a home video camera and produced these dramatic pictures.

An amateur got this tornado speeding toward Emporia, Kansas and a major train derailment in Pittsburgh.

Last week, when a runaway plane careened all over the tarmac at this Marysville, Washington airport, someone happened to be in the right place at the right time.

All these stories aired on a TV newscast. Like this demonstration in New York City that turned into a police riot and a major local news story. Now some news organizations are soliciting this type of footage.

I'm getting down.

If you see and record news on your home video camera, call one eight hundred five forty four NEWS and become a CNN news hound.

Cissy Baker is the managing editor for CNN and the person in charge of their news hound program. She joins us in our Atlanta bureau and good morning. Good to have you.

Good morning.

Thank you, it's good to be here.

How good are your news hounds proving to be?

They're good.

The news hounds that we have received have been of actual news events as they're happening. You said in your introduction, people will be at the right place at the right time and they'll have their home video tape camera with them and will be able to capture a news event that normal camera crews from television stations or professional stringers aren't at.

How many stories do you use from amateurs like that?

We use several a month. It averages anywhere from two to three to five a month.

And how many offers do you get?

The offers that we're receiving are numbering anywhere from five to ten a month.

Oh, what judgment do you use whether or not to use something that was shot by an amateur? Well, the most important thing that we have to do once we get a phone call from a news hound is to verify that story.

We'll receive a phone call at CNN on the assignment desk and someone will tell us of a news event that has happened, say, their backyard.

Like the alligator story. Anybody who seen alligator in the swimming pool. How do you know for instance that some Frankster didn't throw an alligator in a swimming pool just to shoot pictures of it for CNN?

Well verification is the most important part of our job. What we do is when we receive a call from a news hound, we'll ask to get their phone number and we return the phone call and at the same time we will, try to confirm the story with local, officials. In this case, with the local police and animal shelter that helped to try to get the alligator out of the pool.

And Gary T. Marx is a professor of sociology at MIT, author and specialist on electronic surveillance and joins us in our Boston bureau this morning. And you, I take it, are not convinced that this wave of camcorder news is in everyone's best interest. What are your reservations?

I think it's very much a mixed bag. There's a danger of creating journalistic vigilantes who will offer fraudulent or contrived news, invade privacy, and debase the quality of television news.

Can we talk about one at a time? How would you debase on the quality of the news?

Well, I think with all due respect to Ms. Baker, even if the alligator story is true, I'm not sure that doesn't trivialize television news. I think with seven million potential reporters around, what happens is the board focusing on what's sensational and immediate as against what's enduring and important.

Ms. Baker, you want to field that one?

Well, I think it's a matter of distinguishing what is news and what is sensational picture.

I've received tape that is just sensational picture and has absolutely no news value and, we have chosen not to air it.

Looking, at, being had, this network, was had once along with some others. We'd like to show you some tape now that was sold to us, purported to be of the Chernobyl nuclear reactor. If you'll wait, we we even do you the favor of outlining in that scene the nuclear reactors, the four of them themselves. There they are. There you can see them.

Or at least that's what they we thought they were.

That was a factory in France that, as I say, we weren't the only network that had been had Aside from our verification That's misrepresentation, but there's another big problem.

Saint Thomas said, except I shall see, I will not believe. But with today's computer graphic technologies, it's possible to create images that don't exist in reality but are very believable. One of my favorites is of a spacecraft landing in the middle of San Francisco. And also the famous case where the National

Geographic lowered the size of one of the pyramids to fit on its magazine, so technical editing is a big problem.

You mean that the best verification that CNN or NBC or another news organization could offer could still be taken advantage of by someone who was intent on I think it could without very elaborate investigations.

You also make another another interesting point where that doesn't involve the abuse of a network news organization, but abuse of private citizens. If nothing is private, then private citizens are exposed to the potential of being shot in the act of being themselves at any time, in any place.

The camcorders are large, you can see those, but there also are video camera handed the size of a deck of cards. Video cameras can be purchased in briefcases, in picture frames, in mirrors. I think it's a great danger we'll all become actors on episodes of Candid Camera.

But is that Sissy Baker's problem or Jane Pawley's problem?

Well, I think it's everybody's problem. It's the problem of the person whose privacy is potentially invaded. Even if Sissy Baker rejects a tape that invades privacy, as I'm sure she would, the person whose picture has been taken still suffers. One of the problems within the United States is that sound has legal protection.

We have federal statutes that say that authorities can't listen to you and I talking without a warrant if they're not a party to a conversation. For a private citizen to listen in, it's a felony. Alright. But that's not the case for taking your picture.

Professor Marx, I'm gonna video images. I'm gonna have to thank you for being with us, and Sissy Baker understands the pressures of a newscast moving along. Thank you again. This is today on NBC.

This is ABC News Nightline from Washington.

One of these days, someone is going to explain to me just how these statistics are compiled.

For example, the House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control estimates that drugs cost our society approximately one hundred and seventy seven billion dollars a year.

It's reassuring that they put in approximately. This, after all, is one of those estimates in which they calculate absenteeism, lost productivity, injuries, deaths, all sorts of elements that have rather vague price tags.

But if the larger point is meant to be that drugs cost society at large some indefinably huge sum, then the point is well taken. It has certainly scared US business and industry to the degree that critical measures are being adopted to deal with critical times. Jo Burgentino has the story.

It has become as routine as life on the assembly line.

There's people smoking pot in the plant, people snorting coke in the bathroom. When they go out for breaks at lunch, they're there smoking coke out of a pipe.

Second shift, whirlpool, I had worked for five years, it was very easy to obtain drugs.

I mean, a lot of young people, lot of young single people, and it was everywhere.

Drugs have infested the nation's workplace. The most recent industry survey estimates drug abuse is costing American corporations fifty two billion dollars a year. Companies are worried about safety on the job. In the railroad industry alone, there have been sixty major accidents during the past two years involving employees who tested positive for drug use.

A person on drugs, if he's not of complete mind, may injure himself, kill himself, injure a worker next to him.

Many businesses are fighting back with drug testing and rehabilitation program.

But now an increasing number of companies are trying another tactic. They are hiring private detectives who pose as workers to hunt for dealers and drug users.

You need someone who knows the law, who knows how this activity tends to happen in workplaces, who can come in and find out about it for you.

At the Champion Corporation's paper mill near Houston, private undercover agents infiltrated the workforce for nine months.

Nineteen employees were eventually fired for use or sale of drugs. At the San Diego Zoo, private detectives found a pattern of drug abuse. Nineteen employees were fired and nine suspended.

At two whirlpool plants in Ohio, the outcome of an undercover investigation, eighty four individuals arrested on drug charges. Some are now serving time, including this man, convicted of selling small amounts of marijuana and cocaine. He takes issue with Whirlpool's decision to hire undercover agents.

I felt betrayed. Is. Wars are won with spies.

Bill Taylor is president of a Dayton, Ohio based firm currently overseeing thirty six undercover operations nationwide at a cost to companies of fifty eight hundred dollars per week for agents.

Everybody keeps saying that we are involved in a war on drugs.

We call it a war. We're certainly not If you wanna call our people spies, then call them spies.

Yeah.

Need some blow.

Interested in a gram?

Yeah. Got I can take care of you here, man, you know. Taylor's agents, many of them former small town police officers and recent graduates of criminal justice programs, are trained to spot drug abuse and to snag the dealers and the users. Users like Tammy Baes, now serving time in Ohio for six counts of selling small amounts of cocaine to an undercover agent.

She befriended me for several months and, you know, made herself appear to be a good friend of mine.

For almost a year, the agent worked with Tammy Bayes in this whirlpool plant in Findlay, Ohio.

She would repeatedly and constantly ask me to get her some cocaine.

Workers never know when they're being watched. Agents use high powered surveillance cameras to monitor the factory parking lot. Cameras are even hidden in a company's emergency lines.

When you go into any organization in undercover work, everybody's a suspect.

Sure they are.

You don't know who's drug free and who's not.

Civil libertarians equate that with the old adage, hang everyone to get the guilty.

I don't think we want to live in a society where, all all private employers become agents of the police and where you create a kind of a police state inside every company.

I want you to understand one thing. You're here to protect the property and that's all.

Keep away from the bridge, right?

But sirs, pull the Trump and start. General.

There won't be any trouble.

During the first part of this century, it was common practice for companies to hire private security officers for union busting. And labor hasn't forgotten. Distrust of the company's spies still runs deep. For example, when US manufacturing in Port Huron, Michigan ran an undercover drug investigation that resulted in seven workers arrested and nine others fired, the union chief here questioned the company's motives.

What they wanted to do was reduce our work force for some reason. I don't know why.

Others are convinced the private eye in the workplace reports back every single thing he learns, drug related or not.

Part of the problem is that you don't just pick up evidence of drug use or drug dealing. You pick up everything.

The company spy is a vacuum cleaner. He ingratiate himself into your confidence and he learns everything about you, including what you think of the boss.

And one agent concedes it all gets back to the boss.

Everything's documented.

If there's problems with supervisors in there, that's documented too. Any information at all that would help out the corporation.

But what is helpful to the employer might not be helpful to the employee. Many drug experts believe arresting and imprisoning addicts doesn't make sense.

If the purpose of these kinds of operations is to identify people and to fire them, it really doesn't serve society very well to essentially dump the problem off on someone else, back on society. That user has got to be held accountable too and so far we've been haven't been able to do that. Corporations are starting to do that.

But who will hold corporations accountable as they experiment with increasingly invasive tactics? The more business searches, the more drug abuse it's likely to find.

It's been hired by banks, hospitals, nuclear power plants, and other corporations to investigate drug use and other possible criminal activities by employees. Mr. Newman is with us from our O and O KTRK in Houston. Gary Marx is a professor of sociology in the Department of Urban Studies and Planning at MIT.

He is the author of the book, Undercover: Police Surveillance in America. Professor Marx is with us from our Boston bureau and why don't I start, Professor, by asking you what's wrong with it? Of course. I mean, we've reached a point where drugs have so invaded the marketplace and the workplace that the employer's gotta have some way to to sort out the weight from the chaff.

You know, Shakespeare observed that he who the sword of heaven would bear should be as holy as severe. And I worry about how holy are undercover private police officers. How are they chosen? How are they trained?

How are they supervised? How are they rewarded? What rights do citizens have with respect to the actions that they take? After all, Ted, public police operate in an adversarial system, whereas private police have as their goal not due process or justice, but making a profit and serving the interests of their client.

And I find that troubling. They're not as restrained in the means that they use.

Let me ask you this. Set aside for a moment all those elements you talked about. Just speak in general about the principle of an employer hiring a private investigator to find out if his employees are doing drugs.

Think if a predicate, if there's some reasonable suspicion that it is appropriate if the investigator does not act as an agent provocateur. But I think to sort of have phishing expeditions encourage people I'm also worried about how do you verify the account and how is this information used? For example, once someone is suspected of dealing drugs or using drugs in the work workplace and they're fired, is a permanent dossier created? Is that dossier then with the person for life? Does the private detective agency that creates the dossier sell it?

The individual You're giving us far too long a list right now. Let's see if we can take a few of these and have Mr. Issue, for example, about the training of these people. How well trained are they?

In most instances, our investigators have police backgrounds.

Most of them are ex Houston narcotic officers. Some of them are ex state officers. Some are ex federal agents.

In ninety five percent of the cases, the people have extensive police backgrounds and have conducted extensive or narcotic investigations prior to ever going to work for us.

All right. Now explain to us how does the payment of these folks work? They are on a fixed salary?

Yes, sir. Are paid by well, it's a salary or paid by the hour and we charge the client an hourly rate for our services plus any expenses that we have.

Well, mean, let's say that I was one of your operatives there and I was going to work for Capital Cities as an undercover officer.

Well, I'm with ACTA Investigations.

I don't know who Capitol Cities is.

Well, Cities is the company that employs me.

It owns ABC, so don't worry about it. If we ever go to work together, I probably won't be working here. The question was though, capital cities is going to be paying me. Let's say I am working in one of the cleanup services here. Let's say I'm the guy who goes around vacuuming the halls at night. I get a salary for that, right?

You're talking about if you're employed by my agency and working at Capital Let's say I'm employed by the ACME drilling company.

I don't care what the company is. I'm working there as a cleanup fellow at night. They pay me a salary.

They are paying for my services as a cleaner, right, as well as an investigator. Yes, sir, they are. Okay. Now what other money am I getting?

So I'm getting that salary, I'm also getting the salary from It not matter what you're paid by that company.

We have a contract with the company that it's a certain rate and whatever that company charges, whatever they pay the investigator, that amount is taken off of our invoice. So actually we pay the investigator.

Okay.

So the investigator Does the investigator get any more or he is successful?

Absolutely not. In fact, the company would prefer that we don't find any narcotics. They're not going in there hoping that we do.

Ninety five percent of the time when we do narcotic investigations, it's because employees have come to management and said, There's narcotics in the workplace and you need to do something about it. In almost every instance, employees are the ones that have complained about it and made management aware that they have a problem and then management calls us and we go in and try to determine who is abusing, who is selling these narcotics.

Can I just ask you a very simple question? If I'm an employer and some of my employees come to me and say, boss, there's a lot of, coke snorting going on here, wouldn't the easiest way to find out what's going on and who's doing it and where it's going on is by asking the people who've complained about it?

I don't really understand that question.

Well, it's a very simple question. You are saying that ninety five percent of your business comes to you from employers who say that their employees are coming to them and say there is drug use going on here in the company. Right?

Isn't that what you're telling Yes, sir.

That's true. So why the boss just turn around and say, Okay, tell me, who? Point some fingers.

Well, in some instances they do point fingers. But the employee also has to work with this individual and he wants the company to do something about it without him becoming involved other than notifying management that they do have a problem.

Okay.

I guess I'm missing something here.

If they're so concerned about it that they're going to the boss, why wouldn't they want to turn those people in?

Well, in some instances they do tell management who's involved, but they never know everybody. They never know everybody that's involved. Okay.

Let's take a break and we'll continue our conversation in a moment.

Compaq has consistently led the industry with products that incorporate the latest technology.

Ms. Lucas, it's time to board.

You have time for this?

Namely that employees, on the one hand, had terribly drug use in the workplace, but that also they would be worried, I suppose, about turning in a fellow employee. Doesn't it almost need someone from the outside to come in and check what's going on?

I think one of the extreme cases it may, but one of the questions I have about this is that it really has not been evaluated in any broad systematic fashion.

Well, who's gonna better Who's gonna evaluate it?

Well, the National Institute of Justice spends a lot of money studying the consequences of criminal justice interventions. Is it better to do this or is it better to put our money in rehabilitation and educating people and training supervisors to recognize drug abuse? And I have a question which I'd like to ask Mr. Newman.

Supposing one of his well trained operatives, and I have no doubt but that his operatives are well trained, we don't know how representative they are of the private police in this country. The private police sector is twice as large as the public police sector. Supposing one of his agents says that Ted Koppel is using drugs and Ted Koppel says, no, that's not really true. The agent gave me the drugs.

What happens then?

Who do we believe? In a court of law, you have an attorney. There are standards.

Okay. I I get the question, mister Newman.

Do Yes, sir.

I understand. And in most instances, we have backup proof usually with body mics or with tapes.

In a lot of instances, narcotics are actually purchased and then turned over to the Texas Department of Public Safety. They're lab tested and then a report is given back to us what the narcotic consisted of and they hold it for prosecution or destruction. It's not a swearing match.

It's not against the law though to have a private citizen be purchasing purchasing drugs?

Mean, that's why sorry. It's no different than if you found narcotics or someone gave you narcotics or sold you narcotics and you notified the police and gave to them immediately after you received it.

Let me ask you about And the police worked very closely with us on these cases.

Let me ask you about something else, Mr. Newman, which I found a little more troublesome. It just kind of slipped by at the top there. You said that some of operatives might be wearing mics and are wired.

They do that a lot, do they?

When the time when it is possible to do it, yes, sir, they do and it's perfectly legal. If one person is aware that the conversation is being recorded, it is legal.

What happens if you learn about union organizing activities or that an employee has an illness that the boss does not The company never asked us about any union organizing activity.

We're not in there for that purpose and we could care less about union organizing activity.

And what do you learned?

A key employee was going to leave the company.

Would that be kept They're not interested in that and we don't we don't report that sort of information.

We report narcotic abuse. We report possession or delivery of contraband narcotics. We report theft. We report things of that nature. They are not interested in what the union is doing, not what they hired us for.

Mr. Newman, just as a matter of curiosity, let's say you have got a fairly large company, five hundred people or so, and you have got a good sized management team up there, a president, half a dozen vice presidents, a couple of senior vice presidents. Normally, how many people know who the agent is?

As a general rule, it's a need to know basis.

Most of the time there's not more than two or three people in the entire company that knows the investigation is ongoing and it's usually no more than that to know who the investigators are.

Ted, I think there's another point about equity Hold on, Professor, if you don't mind, may I just pursue my own questions for a Please.

Thank you. What I was trying to get at here is most of these people come in at a fairly low level in the company, don't they?

Most of your Yes, most of them come in at entry level positions.

However, over the years my investigators have gained skills. Some of them are electricians, Some of them are welders. Some of them work in labs.

No, the I'm trying to get to is the only kind of folk that they're going to find out about are those with whom they are working. They're not going to have access, for example, to the executive suite. Sir.

Well, they don't usually have access to the executive suite, no sir, but they do have access to middle line supervisors and immediate supervisors.

So I mean the bosses up there I mean you get my point.

The bosses up there could be snorting coke all they want. It's really just the guys down at the bottom of the line who are being surveilled.

Well, you know, if we come in contact with the bosses, we're going to get them just as as do anybody else.

And there's been many instances where we have found twenty year foremen who were involved. In fact, in the last investigation that you mentioned at Champion, we got twenty year employees there.

Some of them were foremen. And we didn't consider that just minor drug infractions. We bought as much as pounds of cocaine and could have bought as much as ten kilos.

These were not just minor drug dealers.

Professor?

Well, there was the equity issue that you clearly spoke to, and it seems to me there is a certain amount of equity in arresting workers as well as foremen. But I think there's also a question, especially in terms of what some of the studies until recently suggested were main users of cocaine, and that's high status, well-to-do executives who could afford it, who led high pressured lives. And it seems to me that apart from whether it's right or wrong, let's assume that it right to do this in the workplace, then it certainly is appropriate to do it all up and down the occupational hierarchy.

I can assure you that go ahead, In every instance where we ve been there, management has informed us the people that you plant in these operations would have access to people on the assembly line.

They wouldn't have access to people up in the executive offices. But let's just take a quick break, and we'll continue in a moment.

Let me show you everything I know about electricity.

On law.

Secretaries and to the executive suites when there was an indication that there was a problem with the executives being involved in it. So we don't just zero in on the lower level echelon of employees.

Let me just ask you something. Where do your reports go? Do they go back to the employer or would they go to law enforcement agents?

They go to both. Our reports go back to the employer on a weekly basis. They are called field report sheets. They indicate everything that happened during the workday. Then a summary report is given to

the client company every two weeks and we hold regular meetings where we discuss what's going on and what people are involved.

But I'm still not sure I understand.

And at the same time a report goes to the local law enforcement agents?

Yes, sir it does.

We tell local With or without the company's knowledge or mean if I say I don't want you to do that, I, you know, I want to have a chance to talk to my employee.

Well, if there are narcotics involved, we're going to notify the authorities of it.

We are going to turn those narcotics over to the authorities and that the company cannot have any say in No, wasn't really getting at that.

If your operative buys narcotics or makes a purchase like that he has to turn them over. But let's say you find out that two or three people are smoking joints in the john every day, That goes into your report. The report goes to the police. The employer does not have the opportunity to say, Well, me talk to these people first and see if they want to take treatment before the In other words, the police are automatically involved.

Is that what you're saying?

They're only notified in case of a purchase of narcotics. We do keep them informed if people have offered large quantities of narcotics to us. We bring the police in because a lot of times they furnish the flash money, especially when it's a large buy. And we introduce the police to the people and in many instances they make their own buys from the major dealers.

So We've only got a few seconds left.

Just want to make sure I understand this. Does the weekly report, whether or not it involves a buy, does the weekly report go to the police as well as lawyer?

It only goes to the police if a purchase has been made of narcotics.

Okay, sir. I think I got it now. Mr. Newman, thank you very much. Professor Marx, thank you for being with us.

That's our report for tonight. I'm Ted Cawplin, Washington. For all of us here at ABC News, good night.