

Mr. SQUIRES. One way this country could be turned into a police state is by means of a military force, conceivably. We go to great expense and effort to prevent this from happening. Our activities in southeast Asia are indicative of the cost which this community is willing to endure in an effort to prevent any such occurrence.

Mr. Baran has testified already this morning how the information contained in such a system could be used to create a very efficient police state. One might even say that, similar to the way coups occur in other countries, one would capture the building in which all this information is contained and one might be able to establish a police state just by virtue of having the information in his hand.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Instead of the radio station, they capture the machine.

Mr. SQUIRES. You capture the information center because the information center is not only going to contain all the information you need to know to run the state, but very likely in the future it may contain all the information you need to control the flow of information.

Mr. GALLAGHER. And you agree substantially that a statistical data center could easily become a center of intelligence on individuals?

Mr. SQUIRES. Yes, it would be.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Do you see any way presently, in view of your experience, that the two could be separated?

Mr. SQUIRES. It would be most difficult. I would not say it would be impossible.

If the way in which you stored the information—this was alluded to by Mr. Baran—were not in raw data form, that is to say, if the way in which the information was stored was in the form of statistical summaries in which no summary dealt with fewer than say 100 or 200 people or some arbitrary number that would be sufficiently high to guarantee individual privacy, then of course at no time could you retrieve any such information out of the center because it wouldn't be in there. It was there only while it was being collected, and it was immediately destroyed.

On the other hand, this makes it difficult or almost impossible to ask at some later time a question which you had not previously anticipated asking at the time you made the summaries. Consequently, the information you collected is not nearly as useful as it might be because you have no ability to reorganize it in a different way simply because you destroyed it after you collected it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Squires, on the question of liberty, where you quote John Mill's essay, you went on and your whole presentation gave the illusion that liberty could be fast disappearing in the new environment upon which we are now entering.

How can liberty be protected if these things will happen anyhow? Assuming somebody could get into the computer center?

Mr. SQUIRES. That is a very difficult and disturbing question, Mr. Chairman, and it is one which disturbs me and I frankly do not know the answer. I do feel that we ought to address ourselves to this question in a very real way in our society. I do feel it is a question to which we can address ourselves intelligently, but I don't necessarily feel that it is a question where we will be able to come up with answers without a great deal of effort.

Mr. GALLAGHER. What would be your suggestion to at least get on a track headed toward this end?