The article from Wall (2019) presents a brief overview of the dangers of using facial recognition software in police and military operations. While this article is somewhat outdated, the concerns remain relevant today.

Facial recognition is not a new technology, and has been used as far back as 2008 by Lenovo for laptop access (Almeida, Shmarko and Lomas, 2021). While that was functional in a limited, controlled environment, widespread use in unpredictable conditions is less dependable. Recent stories include those being arrested and charged with crimes based simply on a positive result from this software. Law enforcement officials claimed that on its own the software would be wrong “96% of the time” (*When artificial intelligence gets it wrong - Innocence project*, 2024). Concerns have been raised regarding racial bias, as well as the idea of “indiscriminate surveillance” by automated programs (*Biased technology: the automated discrimination of facial recognition*, 2024). While futuristic looks at how facial recognition might be used for consumers may be interesting (*Minority report*, 2002), this is a far cry from how it may be used in law enforcement. The ACLU has raised a number of concerns beyond accuracy, such as the lack of testing that replicates real-world usage, misleading performance scores, and false positive rates (Gerchick and Cagle, 2024).

The threat of this software has led to the creation of new consumer products, such as anti-camera scarves and hoods, face masks, and temporary face paintings (Tichy, 2025). With the current state of society around the globe, and the number of protests happening against authoritarian regimes, the use of and defense from these algorithms has become more important than ever. Fortunately or not, the use of this tool is both widespread and limited in acceptance. Despite advances, more work is needed before this can truly be dependable.
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