

听力文本:

This is the VOA Special English Technology Report.

The satellite-based Global Positioning System is a great way to locate places -- or people. But, last week the United States Supreme Court ruled that law enforcement officials must get approval from a judge before placing a GPS device on a vehicle.

The case involved a suspected drug dealer in Washington. Police put a GPS device on his car and tracked his movements for almost a month. That led them to a house with nearly one hundred kilograms of **cocaine** and eight hundred fifty thousand dollars in cash.

Antoine Jones was found guilty and sentenced to life in prison. He appealed his case all the way to the Supreme Court.

Law professor Christopher Slobogin at Vanderbilt University in Nashville, Tennessee, takes the story from there.

CHRISTOPHER SLOBOGIN: "Mr. Jones' argued that evidence was obtained illegally because the police did not have a **warrant**. And his argument was in essence that use of the tracking device was an unconstitutional search under the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution, which provides that the government may not engage in unreasonable searches and seizures. Mr. Jones claimed that the absence of a warrant made this search unreasonable."

And, says Professor Slobogin, the high court agreed.

CHRISTOPHER SLOBOGIN: "All nine members of the court, conservative members as well as liberal members, decided that the Fourth Amendment was violated in this case."

But the ruling only dealt with the physical act of placing the GPS device on the vehicle and tracking Mr. Jones. Justice Antonin Scalia wrote the majority opinion. Justice Scalia said the case did not require the court to decide if electronic monitoring without **trespassing** onto someone's property is also a violation of privacy.

Law professor Renee Hutchins at the University of Maryland says that is a big question that remains to be answered. We spoke with her on Skype.

RENEE HUTCHINS: "Most people have smartphones. A lot of people have cars that have GPS pre-installed. So the government doesn't have to do the installation. The installation, which was the hook for Justice Scalia, is already accomplished. We do it voluntarily."

Justice Sonya Sotomayor suggested that modern technology may soon force us to reconsider expectations of privacy. Professor Hutchins explains.

RENEE HUTCHINS: "Justice Sotomayor, actually in talking about the modern society that we live in, said, you know, we really have to perhaps rethink what it means for things to be private in a world where we voluntarily give up so much information. In a world where there's Facebook and GPS on your cell phone and GPS in your car, how should the court be thinking about constitutional protections in a world like that?"

Four other justices, led by Samuel Alito, questioned the wisdom of limiting the ruling only to a trespass of private property. They said the more important issue is the use of GPS for the purpose of long-term tracking.

And that's the VOA Special English Technology Report, written by June Simms. I'm Steve Ember.

注：文本来自51VOA

词汇解释:

1.cocaine n.可卡因，古柯碱

He was addicted to cocaine.
他吸可卡因上瘾。

2.warrant n.授权令

warrant for arrest
逮捕状

3.trespass v. 非法侵入, 侵害, 冒犯

I shall trespass on your hospitality.
我要来叨扰你了。

参考译文:

这里是美国之音慢速英语科技报道。

用基于卫星的全球定位系统（GPS）确定方位或找人是个极好的办法。但上周美国最高法院裁定，执法人员在车辆上安置GPS设备前必须获得法官批准。

该案件涉及华盛顿一名贩毒嫌犯，警察在他的汽车上安装了GPS设备，跟踪了他一个月。警察最后跟着到了一处住宅，在那里发现100千克的可卡因和85万美元现金。

Antoine Jones被判有罪并处以终身监禁，他一直上诉到最高法院。

田纳西州纳什维尔市范德堡大学的法学教授Christopher Slobogin讲了这个案例。

Christopher Slobogin：“Jones称证据是非法获得的，因为警察没有逮捕证。他的理由的核心在于，根据美国宪法第四修正案规定，政府不得从事不合理的搜查和扣押，所以使用跟踪设备是违宪的搜查行为。Jones称警方没有搜查令，所以这次搜查不合法。”

Slobogin教授称最高法院表示认可。

Christopher

Slobogin：“法院的9名法官，包括保守派与自由派成员均认定该案件违反了第四修正案。”

但判决只针对放置GPS设备跟踪Jones的这一实际行动,Antonin Scalia撰写了主要观点。Scalia表示，该案件并不需要法院裁决在不侵入他人财产的情况下进行电子监控是否也是侵犯隐私。

马里兰大学法学教授Renee

Hutchins称这是一个有待解决的大问题，我们在skype上与她交流。

Renee Hutchins：“大多数人都有手机，很多人车上都安装了GPS系统。所以政府没必要非要安装。Scalia法官认为安装这件事是个陷阱。但我们是自愿安装的。”

法官Sonya Sotomayor表示，现代科技或许将迫使我们重新考虑人们对隐私的要求。Hut

hins教授解释说：

Renee Hutchins：“Sotomayor法官的意思是，在现代社会，我们确实可能需要重新考虑，在这个我们自愿放弃这么多信息的世界里，隐私究竟意味着什么。如今的世界，手机上有Facebook和GPS，汽车上也有GPS，法院应该考虑如何进行宪法保护。”

以Samuel Alito为首的其他四名法官质疑将该裁决仅限制于侵犯私有财产的情况下是否足够明智，他们说，更重要的是长期使用GPS来跟踪的问题。