



CIVILLIBERTY101.COM

RED LIGHT CAMERA COMPANIES
VIOLATE FEDERAL RESEARCH MISCONDUCT LAWS



ATTENTION ALL LAWYERS (who hate red light cameras):

CAN WE USE THIS FEDERAL LAW TO ACCUSE RED LIGHT CAMERA COMPANIES OF RESEARCH MISCONDUCT^[1] Through falsification and/or manipulation of research processes?

REF: <https://www.aps.org/policy/statements/federalpolicy.cfm>

Falsification is manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.³

Red Light Camera Companies which issued reports giving credit to the cameras for improved red light running statistics at intersections where no cameras are installed (a term they call "the halo effect") may have violated a critical standard of statistical analysis. If so, then they have therefore violated Federal law by **"Manipulating the research process"**.

Researchers may not take credit for change at the control sites. (The placebo cannot cure the disease.) Statistically significant change at control sites (where no cameras are installed) should not occur. If statistically significant change occurs at the control sites, it indicates an environmental force outside the parameter of the induced influence is affecting behavior.

In this case, the environmental force affecting behavior is **fear** induced by advertising (but not the cameras). Government would have the same statistical affect on behavior if they would send goon squads to wake civilians up in the middle of the night, beating them mercilessly & warning them against running red lights.

The significance of fear: Fear should not be the first resort of law enforcement within free societies. It should be the last! Furthermore, the fear induced by cameras is upon all drivers (not just the guilty)

An accurate analysis of the influence of cameras on safety would be to state the facts as follows:

Statistically significant change at control sites (where no cameras are installed) proves that driver behavior was influenced by something other than the cameras. In this case it was the advertising campaign which elevated the driver's level of fear. Fear tactics may have a marginal benefit to improve safety (reported by some to be as high as high as 20-30%) but fear also contributes to (and explains) the increased occurrence of rear end collisions at intersections with red light cameras. (Again, it's not the camera which causes the rear end collision but the fear created by the advertising campaign) Government sponsored fear tactics also have long term negative effects of contributing to increases in civil unrest and disobedience.

Drivers deserve a better method to obey the law

Science long ago proved "Safety behaviors are improved when we provide more mission critical information to operators and by providing this information in advance of critical decision points".

Further proof that the cameras do not contribute to improved safety behaviors is the fact that the cameras do not provide drivers with any mission critical data in advance of the red light. (They don't begin to operate until after a violation has occurred).

The Amber (Yellow) light fails to provide drivers with mission critical data in advance of the red light:

The MUTCD defines the amber light as follows: "The red is imminent".

The word "imminent" is ambiguous (different authorities have different translations).

The word "imminent" does not provide any mission critical information to operators.

The word "imminent" does not establish a critical advance decision point in either space or time.

Pure time solutions will always create conflict in the safety plan because individual operators each have a different ability to perceive time (Based on stress). (**Mass*Acceleration+Conflict = Death & Destruction**)

Any way you look at it, the research is not accurately represented in the research record. We believe it is an outright fraud to give credit to "the cameras" for any change in behavior and the Government should investigate and vigorously prosecute any and all Red Light Camera Companies that influenced the findings of their reports in the manner described above.

The safest solution, to resolving red light running, begins by accommodating the laws of physics and by delineating the braking distance requirements of the heaviest vehicle rated to be on the road (as described in CivilLiberty101.com's #StopGoLine and #FinnLine initiatives).