# Drones Aff – Novice

## 1AC

### 1AC – Plan

#### The United States federal government should prohibit the use of unpiloted aerial vehicles for domestic surveillance without a warrant

### 1AC – Solvency

#### Drone surveillance should be restricted to times when there is a warrant

Jay Stanley and Catherine Crump, DECEMBER 2011, Protecting Privacy From Aerial Surveillance: Recommendations for Government Use of Drone Aircraft, American Civil Liberties Union, https://www.aclu.org/files/assets/protectingprivacyfromaerialsurveillance.pdf, /Bingham-MB

Usage restrictions. UAVs should be subject to strict regulation to ensure that their use does not eviscerate the privacy that Americans have traditionally enjoyed and rightly expect. Innocent Americans should not have to worry that their activities will be scrutinized by drones. To this end, the use of drones should be prohibited for indiscriminate mass surveillance, for example, or for spying based on First Amendment-protected activities. In general, drones should not be deployed except: o where there are specific and articulable grounds to believe that the drone will collect evidence relating to a specific instance of criminal wrongdoing or, if the drone will intrude upon reasonable expectations of privacy, where the government has obtained a warrant based on probable cause; or o where there is a geographically confined, time-limited emergency situation in which particular individuals’ lives are at risk, such as a fire, hostage crisis, or person lost in the wilderness; or o for reasonable non-law enforcement purposes by non-law enforcement agencies, where privacy will not be substantially affected, such as geological inspections or environmental surveys, and where the surveillance will not be used for secondary law enforcement purposes.

#### Plan is key for a roadmap for effective drone integration into society

Jay Stanley and Catherine Crump, DECEMBER 2011, Protecting Privacy From Aerial Surveillance: Recommendations for Government Use of Drone Aircraft, American Civil Liberties Union, https://www.aclu.org/files/assets/protectingprivacyfromaerialsurveillance.pdf, /Bingham-MB

Unmanned aircraft carrying cameras raise the prospect of a significant new avenue for the surveillance of American life. Many Americans have heard of these aircraft, commonly called drones, because of their use overseas in places like Afghanistan and Yemen.1 But drones are coming to America. Their deployment has so far been held up by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) over safety concerns, but that agency is under strong industry and Congressional pressure to pave the way for domestic deployment. Meanwhile, the technology is quickly becoming cheaper and more powerful, interest in deploying drones among police departments is increasing, and our privacy laws are not strong enough to ensure that the new technology will be used responsibly and consistently with democratic values. In short, all the pieces appear to be lining up for the eventual introduction of routine aerial surveillance in American life—a development that would profoundly change the character of public life in the United States. We need a system of rules to ensure that we can enjoy the benefits of this technology without bringing us a large step closer to a “surveillance society” in which our every move is monitored, tracked, recorded, and scrutinized by the authorities. In this paper, we outline a set of protections that we believe would protect Americans’ privacy in the coming world of drones.

### 1AC – Privacy

#### Drones are inevitable—we need rules on drone surveillance to ensure privacy protections

Tiffany Sommadossi, 8-5-2014, Domestic Surveillance Drones: To Fear or Not to Fear?," Legislation & Policy Blog, A Publication of The American University Washington College of Law Legislation & Policy Brief, http://www.legislationandpolicy.com/1425/domestic-surveillance-drones-fear-fear/ /Bingham-MB

The FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 is a federal mandate requiring the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to develop a plan to safely integrate UAVs into U.S. airspace by 2015, but there is not a single enacted federal law that deals with the implementation of rules specifically designed to safeguard privacy interests. The ACLU reports that laws relevant to drone surveillance were enacted in thirteen states between 2013 and 2014. In other words, our state citizenship, rather than our national citizenship, dictates the degree to which the government may conduct and share surveillance information on us using drone technology. Under existing jurisprudence the government may use UAVs for domestic surveillance purposes without a warrant or any judicial order, except in states with legislation requiring that law enforcement use surveillance drones only pursuant to a warrant. The Supreme Court has so far only considered three cases involving manned aircrafts. All three cases were decided in the 1980’s just after Smith v. Maryland, a landmark case that has been the Rosetta Stone for understanding what constitutes a “reasonable expectation of privacy” under the Fourth Amendment for search or surveillance purposes. In California v. Ciraolo, Dow Chemical v. United States, and Florida v. Riley, the Court held that the use of manned aircrafts to conduct warrantless surveillance was not a search under the Fourth Amendment because evidence gathering occurred in a “public, navigable airspace.” Yet some, like John Villasenor at Forbes, have opined that a careful read of the opinions would suggest that the Fourth Amendment may provide more protection in cases involving UAVs than is often assumed. Besides the fact that those cases were decided over three decades ago and did not address unmanned aerial systems or the evolving technology that is being attached to them, the recent, unanimous holding in Riley v. California suggests it may be time to reconsider outdated notions of what privacy is and how much privacy protection we expect the Fourth Amendment to provide us. The government likes to assert that it can, without violating the Constitution, use UAVs without a warrant for domestic surveillance purposes, but there is a growing trend in statutory law to ban the warrantless use of drones and the courts may soon follow. There is no doubt UAVs and the technology they can carry are cost-effective and efficient tools for local law enforcement and federal agencies to use in carrying out their missions. Soon, it could be commonplace for drones to assist with disaster relief, immigration control, environmental monitoring, and border protection. Although reports of UAVs interfering with airport airspace have convinced the FAA and others that comprehensive safety rules are needed to govern the private use of UAVs, the real battle is going to be over privacy rules. Federal rules requiring the government to use domestic surveillance drones responsibly are needed to ensure that as we modernize our government we do so without sacrificing our constitutional rights and privacy interests.

#### Damage to privacy rights erodes broader rights regimes in the United States

Rand Paul, Special To Cnn, 6-15-2012, Don't let drones invade our privacy," CNN, http://www.cnn.com/2012/06/14/opinion/rand-paul-drones/, Accessed: 5-25-2015, /Bingham-MB

If the warrant is not obtained, this act would allow any person to sue the government. This act also specifies that no evidence obtained or collected in violation of this act can be admissible as evidence in a criminal, civil or regulatory action. Allowing domestic drones to act as spies for the government is a complete violation of our basic right to personal privacy. Unrestricted drone surveillance conjures up images reminiscent of Orwell's "1984" -- a totalitarian police-state. According to the Fourth Amendment, "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated." I am sure our police force had good intentions with their suggested drone policies, but do they understand the consequences? Do they realize that they are allowing the government to act as the eye in the sky? By infringing upon our rights and watching over our every move, the government is not going to protect us, but they will push us one more step closer to completely losing our Fourth Amendment rights. My bill will protect individual privacy against governmental intrusion by these drones and establish a balance by requiring judicial action and allowing protection in court.

#### Privacy protections are a critical part of international human rights law and international law—key to democratic norms

This report was written by Privacy International with a grant provided by the Open Society Institute. The primary authors of this report are David Banisar of the Electronic Privacy Information Center and Simon Davies of Privacy International. Additional research was provided by Wayne Madsen, Michael Kassner, Ronnie Breckheimer, and Shauna Van Dongen. Knowledgeable individuals from academia, government, human rights groups and other fields were asked to submit reports and information. Their reports were supplemented with information gathered from Constitutions, laws, international and national government documents, news reports, human rights reports and other sources. A list of contributors is located at Appendix D. 1998, Privacy and Human Rights," Open Society Institute, http://gilc.org/privacy/survey/intro.html, Accessed: 5-26-2015, /Bingham-MB

OVERVIEW Privacy is a fundamental human right recognized in the UN Declaration of Human Rights, the International Convenant on Civil and Political Rights and in many other international and regional treaties. Privacy underpins human dignity and other key values such as freedom of association and freedom of speech. It has become one of the most important human rights issues of the modern age. The publication of this report reflects the growing importance, diversity and complexity of this fundamental right. This report provides details of the state of privacy in fifty countries from around the world. It outlines the constitutional and legal conditions of privacy protection, and summarizes important issues and events relating to privacy and surveillance. Nearly every country in the world recognizes a right of privacy explicitly in their Constitution. At a minimum, these provisions include rights of inviolability of the home and secrecy of communications. Most recently-written Constitutions such as South Africa's and Hungary's include specific rights to access and control one's personal information. In many of the countries where privacy is not explicitly recognized in the Constitution, such as the United States, Ireland and India, the courts have found that right in other provisions. In many countries, international agreements that recognize privacy rights such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights or the European Convention on Human Rights have been adopted into law. In the early 1970s, countries began adopting broad laws intended to protect individual privacy. Throughout the world, there is a general movement towards the adoption of comprehensive privacy laws that set a framework for protection. Most of these laws are based on the models introduced by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and the Council of Europe. In 1995, conscious both of the shortcomings of law, and the many differences in the level of protection in each of its States, the European Union passed a Europe-wide directive which will provide citizens with a wider range of protections over abuses of their data.[fn 1] The directive on the "Protection of Individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data" sets a benchmark for national law. Each EU State must pass complementary legislation by October 1998. The Directive also imposes an obligation on member States to ensure that the personal information relating to European citizens is covered by law when it is exported to, and processed in, countries outside Europe. This requirement has resulted in growing pressure outside Europe for the passage of privacy laws. More than forty countries now have data protection or information privacy laws. More are in the process of being enacted. Reasons for Adopting Comprehensive Laws There are three major reasons for the movement towards comprehensive privacy and data protection laws. Many countries are adopting these laws for one or more reasons. To remedy past injustices. Many countries, especially in Central Europe, South America and South Africa, are adopting laws to remedy privacy violations that occurred under previous authoritarian regimes. To promote electronic commerce. Many countries, especially in Asia, but also Canada, have developed or are currently developing laws in an effort to promote electronic commerce. These countries recognize consumers are uneasy with their personal information being sent worldwide. Privacy laws are being introduced as part of a package of laws intended to facilitate electronic commerce by setting up uniform rules. To ensure laws are consistent with Pan-European laws. Most countries in Central and Eastern Europe are adopting new laws based on the Council of Europe Convention and the European Union Data Protection Directive. Many of these countries hope to join the European Union in the near future. Countries in other regions, such as Canada, are adopting new laws to ensure that trade will not be affected by the requirements of the EU Directive. Continuing Problems Even with the adoption of legal and other protections, violations of privacy remain a concern. In many countries, laws have not kept up with the technology, leaving significant gaps in protections. In other countries, law enforcement and intelligence agencies have been given significant exemptions. Finally, in the absence of adequate oversight and enforcement, the mere presence of a law may not provide adequate protection. There are widespread violations of laws relating to surveillance of communications, even in the most democratic of countries. The U.S. State Department's annual review of human rights violations finds that over 90 countries engage in illegally monitoring the communications of political opponents, human rights workers, journalists and labor organizers. In France, a government commission estimated in 1996 that there were over 100,000 wiretaps conducted by private parties, many on behalf of government agencies. In Japan, police were recently fined 2.5 million yen for illegally wiretapping members of the Communist party. Police services, even in countries with strong privacy laws, still maintain extensive files on citizens not accused or even suspected of any crime. There are currently investigations in Sweden and Norway, two countries with the longest history of privacy protection for police files. Companies regularly flaunt the laws, collecting and disseminating personal information. In the United States, even with the long-standing existence of a law on consumer credit information, companies still make extensive use of such information for marketing purposes. THREATS TO PRIVACY The increasing sophistication of information technology with its capacity to collect, analyze and disseminate information on individuals has introduced a sense of urgency to the demand for legislation. Furthermore, new developments in medical research and care, telecommunications, advanced transportation systems and financial transfers have dramatically increased the level of information generated by each individual. Computers linked together by high speed networks with advanced processing systems can create comprehensive dossiers on any person without the need for a single central computer system. New technologies developed by the defense industry are spreading into law enforcement, civilian agencies, and private companies. According to opinion polls, concern over privacy violations is now greater than at any time in recent history. [fn 2] Uniformly, populations throughout the world express fears about encroachment on privacy, prompting an unprecedented number of nations to pass laws which specifically protect the privacy of their citizens. Human rights groups are concerned that much of this technology is being exported to developing countries which lack adequate protections. Currently, there are few barriers to the trade in surveillance technologies. It is now common wisdom that the power, capacity and speed of information technology is accelerating rapidly. The extent of privacy invasion -- or certainly the potential to invade privacy -- increases correspondingly. Beyond these obvious aspects of capacity and cost, there are a number of important trends that contribute to privacy invasion : GLOBALISATION removes geographical limitations to the flow of data. The development of the Internet is perhaps the best known example of a global technology. CONVERGENCE is leading to the elimination of technological barriers between systems. Modern information systems are increasingly interoperable with other systems, and can mutually exchange and process different forms of data. MULTI-MEDIA fuses many forms of transmission and expression of data and images so that information gathered in a certain form can be easily translated into other forms. Technology transfer and policy convergence The macro-trends outlined above have had particular effect on surveillance in developing nations. In the field of information and communications technology, the speed of policy convergence is compressed. Across the surveillance spectrum -- wiretapping, personal ID systems, data mining, censorship or encryption controls -- it is the West which invariably sets a proscriptive pace.[fn 3] Governments of developing nations rely on first world countries to supply them with technologies of surveillance such as digital wiretapping equipment, deciphering equipment, scanners, bugs, tracking equipment and computer intercept systems. The transfer of surveillance technology from first to third world is now a lucrative sideline for the arms industry. [fn 4] According to a 1997 report "Assessing the Technologies of Political Control" commissioned by the European Parliament's Civil Liberties Committee and undertaken by the European Commission's Science and Technology Options Assessment office (STOA), [fn 5] much of this technology is used to track the activities of dissidents, human rights activists, journalists, student leaders, minorities, trade union leaders, and political opponents. The report concludes that such technologies (which it describes as "new surveillance technology") can exert a powerful 'chill effect' on those who "might wish to take a dissenting view and few will risk exercising their right to democratic protest". Large scale ID systems are also useful for monitoring larger sectors of the population. As Privacy International observed, "In the absence of meaningful legal or constitutional protections, such technology is inimical to democratic reform. It can certainly prove fatal to anyone 'of interest' to a regime." Government and citizen alike may benefit from the plethora of IT schemes being implemented by the private and public sectors. New "smart card" projects in which client information is placed on a chip in a card may streamline complex transactions. The Internet will revolutionize access to basic information on government services. Encryption can provide security and privacy for all parties. However, these initiatives will require a bold, forward looking legislative framework. Whether governments can deliver this framework will depend on their willingness to listen to the pulse of the emerging global digital economy and to recognize the need for strong protection of privacy.

#### The US is key

Freedom House, August 2, 2012, Ten Critical Human Rights Challenges for the Next American President, This paper is a product of Freedom House and the Connect US Fund and is endorsed by the following individuals and institutions: American Civil Liberties Union Amnesty International USA Better World Campaign Center for Justice and Accountability Center for Victims of Torture The Connect US Fund The Enough Project Freedom House Futures Without Violence Global Rights Global Solutions Global Witness Chris Hennemeyer International Development Consultant Human Rights First Human Rights Watch Ambassador Mark P. Lagon International Relations Chair, Georgetown University MSFS Program Physicians for Human Rights Project on Middle East Democracy Resolve Eric Sapp Executive Director, American Values Network Ted Piccone Brookings Institution United to End Genocide Jennifer Windsor Associate Dean for Programs, Georgetown University School of Foreign Service, https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/Ten%20Critical%20Human%20Rights%20Challenges%20For%20The%20Next%20American%20President.pdf, /Bingham-MB

The upcoming presidential election and inauguration of the next administration is a critical moment to review and update U.S. policy on human rights. Among the challenges the United States faces in the coming years are human rights abuses committed by governments and other actors across the globe that flout internationally accepted principles and undermine U.S. values and interests. The next administration, whether a second Obama administration or a Romney administration, will need to address a range of international issues. We believe that human rights merit particular attention. The promotion of human rights is both an expression of the universal values that Americans share with people throughout the world and an integral component of the pursuit of American interests abroad. The next administration’s record on foreign policy will depend to a significant degree on its ability to effectively protect and advance human rights. U.S. leadership is critical to effectively address international human rights issues. International responses to gross violations and systematic abuses of human rights around the world tend to have the greatest impact when the United States plays a prominent role or is otherwise actively engaged in promoting a rights-based response. Multilateral human rights institutions similarly make the greatest progress in drawing attention to abuses and maintaining human rights standards when the United States exercises leadership. Human rights affect almost every aspect of U.S. engagement abroad. Governments that abuse human rights make unstable and unreliable partners across the range of U.S. interests, from business to arms control to counter-terrorism. By strengthening the protection of human rights, the United States not only promotes its own values but also advances its strategic interests.

#### Human rights law prevents global war

William W. Burke-White 4, Lecturer in Public and International Affairs and Senior Special Assistant to the Dean, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University, Spring 2004, Harvard Human Rights Journal, 17 Harv. Hum. Rts. J. 249, p. 279-280

This Article presents a strategic--as opposed to ideological or normative--argument that the promotion of human rights should be given a more prominent place in U.S. foreign policy. It does so by suggesting a correlation between the domestic human rights practices of states and their propensity to engage in aggressive international conduct. Among the chief threats to U.S. national security are acts of aggression by other states. Aggressive acts of war may directly endanger the United States, as did the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor in 1941, or they may require U.S. military action overseas, as in Kuwait fifty years later. Evidence from the post-Cold War period [\*250] indicates that states that systematically abuse their own citizens' human rights are also those most likely to engage in aggression. To the degree that improvements in various states' human rights records decrease the likelihood of aggressive war, a foreign policy informed by human rights can significantly enhance U.S. and global security.¶ Since 1990, a state's domestic human rights policy appears to be a telling indicator of that state's propensity to engage in international aggression. A central element of U.S. foreign policy has long been the preservation of peace and the prevention of such acts of aggression. n2 If the correlation discussed herein is accurate, it provides U.S. policymakers with a powerful new tool to enhance national security through the promotion of human rights. A strategic linkage between national security and human rights would result in a number of important policy modifications. First, it changes the prioritization of those countries U.S. policymakers have identified as presenting the greatest concern. Second, it alters some of the policy prescriptions for such states. Third, it offers states a means of signaling benign international intent through the improvement of their domestic human rights records. Fourth, it provides a way for a current government to prevent future governments from aggressive international behavior through the institutionalization of human rights protections. Fifth, it addresses the particular threat of human rights abusing states obtaining weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Finally, it offers a mechanism for U.S.-U.N. cooperation on human rights issues.

#### And international law solves multiple scenarios for conflict

Martin Shaw, Professor, International Relations & Politics, University of Sussex, “The Unfinished Global Revolution: Intellectuals and the New Politics of International Relations,” REVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, October 2001, http://www.martinshaw.org/unfinished.pdf, accessed 4/6/04.

From these political fundamentals, strategic propositions can be derived. First, democratic movements cannot regard non-governmental organisations and civil society as ends in themselves. They must aim to civilise local states, rendering them open, accountable and pluralistic, and curtail the arbitrary and violent exercise of power. Second, democratising local states is not a separate task from integrating them into global and often Western-centred networks. Reproducing isolated local centres of power carries with it classic dangers of states as centres of war.84 Embedding global norms and integrating new state centres with global institutional frameworks are essential to the control of violence. (To put this another way: the proliferation of purely national democracies is not a recipe for peace.) Third, while the global revolution cannot do without the West and the UN, neither can it rely on them unconditionally. We need these power networks, but we need to tame them too, to make their messy bureaucracies enormously more accountable and sensitive to the needs of society worldwide. This will involve the kind of ‘cosmopolitan democracy’ argued for by David Held85. It will also require us to advance a global social-democratic agenda, to address the literally catastrophic scale of world social inequalities. This is not a separate problem: social and economic reform is an essential ingredient of alternatives to warlike and genocidal power; these feed off and reinforce corrupt and criminal political economies. Fourth, if we need the global-Western state, if we want to democratise it and make its institutions friendlier to global peace and justice, we cannot be indifferent to its strategic debates. It matters to develop international political interventions, legal institutions and robust peacekeeping as strategic alternatives to bombing our way through zones of crisis. It matters that international intervention supports pluralist structures, rather than ratifying Bosnia-style apartheid.86 As political intellectuals in the West, we need to have our eyes on the ball at our feet, but we also need to raise them to the horizon. We need to grasp the historic drama that is transforming worldwide relationships between people and state, as well as between state and state. We need to think about how the turbulence of the global revolution can be consolidated in democratic, pluralist, international networks of both social relations and state authority. We cannot be simply optimistic about this prospect. Sadly, it will require repeated violent political crises to push Western and other governments towards the required restructuring of world institutions.87 What I have outlined is a huge challenge; but the alternative is to see the global revolution splutter into partial defeat, or degenerate into new genocidal wars - perhaps even nuclear conflicts. The practical challenge for all concerned citizens, and the theoretical and analytical challenges for students of international relations and politics, are intertwined.

#### Democracy solves extinction

Diamond, CARNEGIE COMMISSION ON PREVENTING DEADLY CONFLICT, 1995

 “Promoting Democracy in the 1990’s,” October 1995. Available from the World Wide Web at: <http://www.carnegie.org/sub/pubs/deadly/dia95_01.html>, accessed 2/20/04.

OTHER THREATS This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most of these new and unconventional threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness. LESSONS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY The experience of this century offers important lessons. Countries that govern themselves in a truly democratic fashion do not go to war with one another. They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse" their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. They do not build weapons of mass destruction to use on or to threaten one another. Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They are more environmentally responsible because they must answer to their own citizens, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments. They are better bets to honor international treaties since they value legal obligations and because their openness makes it much more difficult to breach agreements in secret. Precisely because, within their own borders, they respect competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the rule of law, democracies are the only reliable foundation on which a new world order of international security and prosperity can be built.

#### Regulating use of drones without a warrant solves privacy protections

Rand Paul, Special To Cnn, 6-15-2012, Don't let drones invade our privacy," CNN, http://www.cnn.com/2012/06/14/opinion/rand-paul-drones/, Accessed: 5-25-2015, /Bingham-MB

When assuming office, every government official must take an oath to abide by and uphold our Constitution. Since 2010, I have made that my mission in Congress. Unfortunately, the Obama administration is not upholding nor abiding by the Constitution -- in fact, this administration is going to great lengths to continually violate it. Its most recent transgression involves the use of domestic drones. These small drones are to be used as a crime fighting tool for law enforcement officials. But is unwarranted and constant surveillance by an aerial eye of Big Government the answer? In a memorandum issued by President Barack Obama's secretary of the Air Force, the stated purpose of these drones is "balancing ... obtaining intelligence information ... and protecting individual rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution." However, flying over our homes, farms, ranches and businesses and spying on us while we conduct our everyday lives is not an example of protecting our rights. It is an example of violating them. The domestic use of drones to spy on Americans clearly violates the Fourth Amendment and limits our rights to personal privacy. I do not want a drone hovering over my house, taking photos of whether I separate my recyclables from my garbage. When I have friends over for a barbecue, the government drone is not on the invitation list. I do not want a drone monitoring where I go, what I do and for how long I do whatever it is that I'm doing. I do not want a nanny state watching over my every move. We should not be treated like criminals or terrorists while we are simply conducting our everyday lives. We should not have our rights infringed upon by unwarranted police-state tactics. I have introduced legislation into the Senate that restates the Constitution. This bill protects individual privacy against unwarranted governmental intrusion through the use of these drones. The Preserving Freedom from Unwarranted Surveillance Act of 2012 will protect Americans' personal privacy by forcing the government to honor our Fourth Amendment rights. I want to make it clear that I am not arguing against the use of technology. But like other tools used to collect information in law enforcement, a warrant needs to be issued to use drones domestically. The police force should have the power to collect intelligence; however, I believe they must go through a judge and request a warrant to do so. The judicial branch must have some authority over drones, as they do with other law enforcement tools. My bill will restate the Fourth Amendment and protect American's privacy by forcing police officials to obtain a warrant before using domestic drones.

### 1AC – Agriculture

#### Failure to reform drone privacy standards results in public backlash

Sara Sorcher, 2-21-2013, The Backlash Against Drones," nationaljournal, http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/the-backlash-against-drones-20130221, Accessed: 5-29-2015, /Bingham-MB

Public concerns are not limited to Seattle. Lawmakers in at least 11 states want to restrict the use of drones because of fears they will spy on Americans, and some are pushing to require warrants before the robots collect evidence in investigations. Just this month, the Virginia General Assembly passed a two-year moratorium on drones. The outcry comes after the Electronic Frontier Foundation sued last year for a list of drone applicants within the U.S. When that information went public, staff attorney Jennifer Lynch says, “it really got people up in arms about how drones are being used, and got people to question their city councils and local law-enforcement agencies to ask for appropriate policies to be put in place to regulate drone usage.” Drones change the game: Nearly continuous surveillance could be possible without a physical intrusion such as a property search or an implanted listening device. The flying robots can carry high-powered cameras, even facial-recognition software or thermal imaging to “see” through walls. They can hover, potentially undetected, for hours or days at a time. As of yet, however, there are no laws governing the use of domestic drones when it comes to privacy. Unless Congress or the executive branch moves to regulate the robots’ use before they take to the skies en masse, states will likely continue to try to limit or ban drone use altogether, which could stymie their potential for other, beneficial uses. And failing to enact privacy limits only increases the likelihood of an incident in which the public perceives that the technology is being misused.

#### Privacy protections are key to integrate drones into commercial airspace

Evan Baldwin Carr, 3-26-2013, research associate with the National Center for Policy Analysis. Drones: Look to the Sky!," No Publication, http://www.ncpa.org/pub/ib119, Accessed: 5-25-2015, /Bingham-MB - See more at: http://www.ncpa.org/pub/ib119#sthash.cEGZYkAD.dpuf

The Constitution’s Fourth Amendment guarantees citizens freedom from unreasonable search and seizure. Many people feel that drone surveillance infringes Fourth Amendment rights. Therefore, strict privacy protections must be implemented before the public will support drone use in domestic airspace. No court has yet addressed Fourth Amendment considerations with respect to drones, but existing jurisprudence provides guidance for future rulings. Among the applicable court decisions: In the case of California v. Ciraolo (1986), a California appeals court found that an individual’s private property is not protected by the Fourth Amendment as long as an aircraft is in navigable airspace.16 In Dow Chemical Co. v. United States (1986), the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that photography by government agents using equipment readily available to the public does not require a warrant.17 Following Dow, in Kyllo v. United States (2001), the Supreme Court held that warrantless surveillance through extra-sensory equipment such as a thermal imaging device is also permissible.18 Conclusion. With full integration fast approaching, discussion must focus on the civilian, commercial and scientific applications of drones, as well as limits on how this new technology can be used. The FAA is responsible for establishing a system that ensures safety without hindering development. While the regulatory and technical hurdles may delay the eventual date of full integration, public hostility towards drones will continue as long as transparency issues damage the government’s credibility. With substantial economic growth at stake, proper safeguards must be established to provide protection from overzealous government.

#### Restrictions dealing with privacy are necessary to deal with public concerns

Anthea-Mitchell, 5-15-2015, Should America Be Worried About Police Drones?," Cheat Sheet, http://www.cheatsheet.com/politics/are-police-drones-a-privacy-nightmare-or-a-safety-advantage.html/?a=viewall, Accessed: 5-26-2015, /Bingham-MB

State and federal legislative bodies have work to do in developing how drones should best be put to use. An online poll from Reuters/Ipsos showed a high level of public concern, with 73% saying they believe regulation is necessary to control the use both publicly and privately, and 42% even arguing that private drone use should be prevented for the sake of privacy, with only “officials or experts” given permission to fly UAVs. An average of a series of objective polls done both online and by phone, and considered by region, urban or rural, and other factors, would be useful additions to the study. But the fact remains the same. There are concerns about personal use of drones. However there are privacy, regulatory, and legal concerns that come with “official” use of drones as well. FAA and law enforcement agencies have their own vital and highly practical questions to answer in understanding how UAVs can best be put to use. With a 2015 deadline looming and many 2014 requirements reported as being implemented late, it’s unlikely that many necessary steps will be completed on schedule. Part of developing guidelines and restrictions for drone technology is actually learning to use the technology, understanding public response to it, and figuring out practical applications for it. Policy must protect against future capabilities with privacy interests kept in mind, but law enforcement is charged with the task of seeing how UAVs function today. This means testing, experimenting, and training, and it inevitably means successes and failures of equipment and PR.

#### Drones are key to stronger growth in farming

Kelsey D. Atherton, 2-20-2015, Farmers Eye Drones For The Future," Popular Science, http://www.popsci.com/farmers-eye-drones-future, Accessed: 5-29-2015, /Bingham-MB

Here’s what drones promise: cheap aerial photography, with regular and infrared cameras, combined with programs that stitch together and analyze the photos, to give farmers information that was previously unattainable or too costly. In 2013, a vineyard in California used drone photography to find a section of vines that was ripening sooner than expected, prompting an earlier harvest of that area. Last year, the U.S. Department of Agriculture looked into acquiring and testing a drone for farming purposes. Drones can do more for farming than just photographing crops. Sugar alternative giant Stevia considered flying drones with lights over its crops at night to spur extra growth. And a student contest in Maryland last summer considered drone designs to protect corn from insect predators, including a design that landed on corn stalks and picked grubs off of it with mechanical arms.

#### Specifically drones solve food, diseases and pesticide runoff

Christopher Doering, 3-23-2014, Growing use of drones poised to transform agriculture," USA TODAY, http://www.usatoday.com/story/money/business/2014/03/23/drones-agriculture-growth/6665561/, Accessed: 5-29-2015, /Bingham-MB

WASHINGTON — Drones are quickly moving from the battlefield to the farmer's field — on the verge of helping growers oversee millions of acres throughout rural America and saving them big money in the process. While much of the attention regarding drones has focused recently on Amazon and UPS seeking to use them to deliver packages, much of the future for drones is expected to come on the farm. That's because agriculture operations span large distances and are mostly free of privacy and safety concerns that have dogged the use of these aerial high-fliers in more heavily populated areas. The Association for Unmanned Vehicle Systems International, the trade group that represents producers and users of drones and other robotic equipment, predicts that 80% of the commercial market for drones will eventually be for agricultural uses. Once the Federal Aviation Administration establishes guidelines for commercial use, the drone industry said it expects more than 100,000 jobs to be created and nearly half a billion in tax revenue to be generated collectively by 2025, much of it from agriculture. Iowa, the country's largest corn and second-biggest soybean grower, could see 1,200 more jobs and an economic impact topping $950 million in the next decade. "It is endless right now, the applications in agriculture," said Kevin Price, a former professor at Kansas State who left the university this month to join RoboFlight, a Denver-based company that sells drones and analyzes the data collected on corn, soybean and other field crops. Farmers "are going to be able to see things and monitor their crops in ways they never have before. In the next 10 years almost every farm will be using it." Today, satellites, manned planes and walking the field are the main ways farmers monitor their crops. But these methods often can be incomplete or time consuming, and when data is collected it can take a long time to process and analyze. As a result, it can be difficult or impossible for the farmer to react to a problem like a disease outbreak before it's too late or the costs to treat it have soared. Drones — which range in cost from $2,000 for a plane the farmer puts together up to around $160,000 for a military-style device — are equipped with infrared cameras, sensors and other technology controlled by a pilot on the ground. The sticker shock may be steep, but backers of the technology say the data they collect — from identifying insect problems, watering issues, assessing crop yields or tracking down cattle that have wandered off — help farmers recover the investment, often within a year. Farmers also can use drones to tailor their use of pesticides, herbicides, fertilizer and other applications based on how much is needed at a specific point in a field — a process known as precision agriculture — saving the grower money from unnecessarily overusing resources while at the same time reducing the amount of runoff that could flow into nearby rivers and streams.

#### Pesticide runoff collapses biodiversity—kills critical species

PANNA, not date but cites research from 2010, Environmental Impacts," Pan north America pesticide action network, http://www.panna.org/issues/persistent-poisons/environmental-impacts, Accessed: 5-29-2015, /Bingham-MB

Some pesticides seep through the soil into groundwater; others are washed by rain into creeks, rivers, and lakes where they can poison fish and other aquatic organisms. Depending on the type of chemical, contamination can last for days, weeks, months – even decades. California: Pesticides used by homeowners on lawns poison invertebrates at the bottom of aquatic food chains, upsetting fragile ecosystems statewide. Florida Everglades: Endosulfan runoff from tomato fields threatens the small fish that feed ibises, storks, and egrets. Pesticide runoff remains largely unregulated, and government agencies have shown little initiative in protecting complex aquatic ecosystems. Fortunately, when tainted runoff threatens a species already listed as endangered, the government can be forced to act. In the pacific northwest, creeks that are home to endangered salmon now require substantial buffer zones from toxic pesticides. The Center for Biological Diversity recently took legal action to force EPA to protect 887 threatened and endangered species from 400 of the most dangerous pesticides.

#### Biodiversity loss leads to extinction

Diner gender paraphrased 94

Military Law Review Winter 1994 143 Mil. L. Rev. 161 LENGTH: 30655 words ARTICLE: THE ARMY AND THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT: WHO'S ENDANGERING WHOM? NAME: MAJOR DAVID N. DINER BIO: Judge Advocate General's Corps, United States Army.

Biologically diverse ecosystems are characterized by a large number of specialist species, filling narrow ecological niches. These ecosystems inherently are more stable than less diverse systems. "The more complex the ecosystem, the more successfully it can resist a stress. . . . [l]ike a net, in which each knot is connected to others by several strands, such a fabric can resist collapse better than a simple, unbranched circle of threads -- which if cut anywhere breaks down as a whole." n79 By causing widespread extinctions, humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems. As biologic simplicity increases, so does the risk of ecosystem failure. The spreading Sahara Desert in Africa, and the dustbowl conditions of the 1930s in the United States are relatively mild examples of what might be expected if this trend continues. Theoretically, each new animal or plant extinction, with all its dimly perceived and intertwined affects, could cause total ecosystem collapse and human extinction. Each new extinction increases the risk of disaster. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraft's wings, n80 [hu]mankind may be edging closer to the abyss.

#### And, the US is key to food stability- shifting food practices is key to prevent crises

**Coleman ’12** [Isobel Coleman, Senior Fellow and Director of the Civil Society, Markets, and Democracy Initiative; Director of the Women and Foreign Policy Program, “U.S. Drought and Rising Global Food Prices,” August 2, <http://www.cfr.org/food-security/us-drought-rising-global-food-prices/p28777>]

The ongoing drought in the Midwest has affected approximately 80 percent of the U.S. corn crop and more than 11 percent of the soybean crop, triggering a rise in global food prices (RFE/RL) that CFR's Isobel Coleman says may fuel political instability in developing countries. The United States produces approximately 35 percent of the world's corn and soybean supply, commodities that are "crucial in the food chain, because they are used for feed stock for animals," Coleman says. Growing demand for meat and protein from emergent middle classes internationally has made many countries dependent on "relatively inexpensive food stocks" from the United States, she explains. "When you see a crop failure of the magnitude you have seen this summer, it flows through the whole food chain," says Coleman, who recommends reconsidering the U.S. ethanol mandate and building "more resilience into the global food system." How is the U.S. drought affecting commodity crops, food production, and prices? As recently as May, experts were predicting a record crop in the United States--and of course, what the United States does is so important, because the Midwest is the bread basket for the rest of the world. But with severe drought in the Midwest, you've already seen a failure in the soybean and corn crop in the United States. That increased world commodity prices, and it is going to trickle through the whole food chain. This is the hottest summer on record in the United States since 1895, and people are beginning to wonder whether this type of drought that we're experiencing could become a new normal. The United States is a pivotal player in world food production and has the most sophisticated agricultural sector in terms of seeds, technology, irrigation, deep commodity markets, and future markets. If the United States crop is so devastated by drought, what is going to happen to the rest of the world? How do rising U.S. food prices affect global food prices down the world's food supply chain? Which areas of the globe are most at risk? There are many large food producers in the world. China is the largest wheat producer, but it is also the largest wheat consumer. What makes the United States unique is that we are the largest exporter, so we produce about 35 percent of the world's corn and soybean supply. Those two commodities are crucial in the food chain, because they are used for feed stock for animals. Around the world you have rising middle classes, a growing demand for meat and protein in the diet, and countries around the world are becoming increasingly dependent on relatively inexpensive food stocks from the United States. When you see a crop failure of the magnitude you have seen this summer, it flows through the whole food chain. Right now you have American livestock producers taking their pigs and cattle to the slaughter house because they simply don't have the food to be feeding them. So you're going to see meat prices in the short term in the United States go down, but over the longer term you're going to see rising meat prices; [experts] are predicting already 4 to 5 percent price increases in meat for the next year. That flows through the whole food chain, [to] big-population countries that import a lot of food, such as the Philippines, Afghanistan, Egypt. And when you see rapidly rising food prices, of course it leads to instability. We've seen [this] in the last five years across many of those countries, and you see rising food prices translate almost directly into street protests. You're going to see the continuation of [political] instability driven in part by rapidly rising food prices. In 2008, we had food protests across much of the Middle East, so governments are going to be very much on the alert for unrest and very sensitive to it. Egypt is already spending about one-third of its subsidies on food, and it is draining the Egyptian foreign exchange reserve to continue those subsidies. This combination of an already mobilized population out on the streets demanding lots of different changes [in Egypt], and rising food prices is going to create a very unstable atmosphere. What are some policy responses for alleviating the pressures being felt in the United States and other countries because of rising food prices? In the United States, we have to look at our own policies that are part of the problem, [including] our mandated use of ethanol in gasoline. This is something that is a mandated [10] percent that is not flexible, and when you have rising food prices and a problem with the failing crop, you would think that maybe we could lighten up on the ethanol mandate. Because right now so much of our food production is going into ethanol. So you've already seen governors across the United States in some of the hard-hit states saying, "Shouldn't we review our ethanol policies?" That's not a short-term fix, but it is potentially longer-term and something we should be looking at carefully. In terms of policy, we have a rising global population. We have more mouths to feed every year, and food security for the world is a critical issue. We should be looking at how to build in more resilience into the global food system. Africa, which has the highest population growth rates of any continent in the world, used to feed itself and used to export food, but [its] agriculture has suffered tremendously over the last half century. Only 4 percent of the land in Africa is even irrigated, and you've seen a green revolution occur in many parts of the world that has really passed Africa by. And so building in greater resilience and improving the agricultural capacity of Africa is a critical part of this equation, so that Africa has more of an ability to feed itself and become more a part of the global supply chain and not be so dependent on it. Unfortunately, governments have not made the investments in the agricultural sector that they needed to over the past half century, which is why you have this situation in Africa today.

#### Food insecurity causes wars that go nuclear

**FDI ’12** [Future Directions International, an Australian-based independent, not-for-profit research institute, “International Conflict Triggers and Potential Conflict Points Resulting from Food and Water Insecurity,” http://www.futuredirections.org.au/files/Workshop\_Report\_-\_Intl\_Conflict\_Triggers\_-\_May\_25.pdf]

There is little dispute that conflict can lead to food and water crises. This paper will consider ¶ parts of the world, however, where **food and water insecurity can be the cause of** conflict ¶ and, at worst, result in **war**. While dealing predominately with food and water issues, the ¶ paper also recognises the nexus that exists between food and water and energy security. ¶ There is a growing appreciation that the conflicts in the next century will most likely be fought over a lack of resources. Yet, in a sense, this is not new. Researchers point to the French and Russian revolutions as conflicts induced by a lack of food. More recently, Germany’s World War Two efforts are said to have been inspired, at least in part, by its perceived need to gain access to more food. Yet the general sense among those that attended FDI’s recent workshops, was that the scale of the problem in the future could be significantly greater as a result of population pressures, changing weather, urbanisation, migration, loss of arable land and other farm inputs, and increased affluence in the developing world. In his book, Small Farmers Secure Food, Lindsay Falvey, a participant in FDI’s March 2012 ¶ workshop on the issue of food and conflict, clearly expresses the problem and why countries ¶ across the globe are starting to take note. . ¶ He writes (p.36), “…if people are hungry, especially in cities, the state is not stable – riots, ¶ violence, breakdown of law and order and migration result.” ¶ “Hunger feeds anarchy.” ¶ This view is also shared by Julian Cribb, who in his book, The Coming Famine, writes that if “large regions of the world run short of food, land or water in the decades that lie ahead, then wholesale, bloody wars are liable to follow.” ¶ He continues: “An increasingly credible scenario for World War 3 is not so much a ¶ confrontation of super powers and their allies, as a festering, self-perpetuating chain of ¶ resource conflicts.” He also says: “The wars of the 21st Century are less likely to be global conflicts with sharply defined sides and huge armies, than a scrappy mass of failed states, rebellions, civil strife, insurgencies, terrorism and genocides, sparked by bloody competition over dwindling resources.” ¶ As another workshop participant put it, people do not go to war to kill; they go to war over ¶ resources, either to protect or to gain the resources for themselves. Another observed that hunger results in passivity not conflict. Conflict is over resources, not because people are going hungry. ¶ A study by the International Peace Research Institute indicates that where food security is an issue, it is more likely to result in some form of conflict. Darfur, Rwanda, Eritrea and the Balkans experienced such wars. Governments, especially in developed countries, are increasingly aware of this phenomenon. **The UK Ministry of Defence, the CIA**, the US Center for Strategic and International Studies ¶ and the Oslo Peace Research Institute, **all identify famine as a** potential **trigger for conflicts and** possibly even **nuclear war**.

## 2AC – Solvency

### 2AC AT “States Solve”

#### Federal rules key to drone integration into commercial airspace

Rotenberg, 2015

Marc Rotenberg, the president of the Electronic Privacy Information Center in Washington and editor of "Privacy in the Modern Age: The Search for Solutions," will be speaking at the National Constitution Center Tuesday at noon. For reservations, call 215-409-6700 or visit www.constitutioncenter.org/debate., Philly, 5-21-2015, FAA needs to set rules on drone surveillance," http://www.philly.com/philly/opinion/20150521\_FAA\_needs\_to\_set\_rules\_on\_drone\_surveillance.html, Accessed: 6-25-2015, /Bingham-MB

The Federal Aviation Administration is in the midst of a public rule-making for drones. This is an important process that will help ensure that drones are safely deployed in civilian airspace in the United States. Among the regulations that the FAA is considering are requirements that commercial drone operators obtain a license, that drones only be operated during daytime, and that operators maintain visual lines of sight with their crafts. That is a good start, but more needs to be done. The FAA should also establish rules to ensure that drones do not engage in unlawful surveillance. As President Obama has explained, the federal government should "take steps to ensure that the integration takes into account not only our economic competiveness and public safety, but also the privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties concerns these systems may raise." This is a real concern, as virtually all drones will carry high-resolution cameras with the ability to record images of people and private property. The FAA needs to ensure that commercial drones are not used for stalking, harassment, or prying into people's private lives. The FAA has acknowledged that its responsibility includes coordinating its efforts with "privacy policies so that the integration of drones into the national airspace is done in a manner that supports and maintains the U.S. government's ability to secure the airspace and addresses privacy concerns." With special capabilities and enhanced equipment, drones are able to conduct detailed surveillance, obtaining high-resolution pictures and videos, peering inside high-level windows and through solid barriers, such as fences, trees, and even walls. Drones pose unique threats to privacy by virtue of their design, their size, how high they can fly, and their ability to operate undetected in urban and rural environments. Many people will have no idea that they are subject to surveillance by small, unmanned vehicles. In addition, drones can track multiple targets across a distance of hundreds of miles and gather sensitive, personal information using infrared cameras, heat sensors, GPS, automated license-plate readers, and other sensors. Of course, there is no dispute that drones can play an important role in rescue operations. They may also be useful for news-gathering. But these beneficial uses should not obscure the very real risks to privacy created by unmanned aerial vehicles loaded with surveillance technology. Freedom of Information Act cases pursued by the Electronic Privacy Information Center (EPIC) reveal that drones may also have the ability to intercept electronic communications and engage in facial recognition. For these reasons, more than 100 experts and civil-liberties organizations petitioned the FAA to develop privacy rules for drones. The FAA denied the petition even after Congress told the federal agency to develop a "comprehensive plan" for the deployment of drones in civil airspace. So EPIC has sued the agency to help ensure that appropriate privacy rules are established. We do not believe that a voluntary "best practices" approach is the right way to establish meaningful privacy safeguards. If the FAA has the authority to establish legal rules for drone safety, it also has the authority to establish legal rules to limit drone surveillance. In response to increasing public questions, many states are already enacting laws to limit drone activities. Most recently, Florida passed a law prohibiting the use of drones to intentionally record images of people on private property if a reasonable expectation of privacy exists. The law applies to law enforcement and civilian individuals, and provides civil damages and injunctive relief. These efforts should be encouraged, and before commercial drones are deployed in the United States, federal baseline rules to limit their surveillance capabilities should be established.

#### Only the aff solves USFG owns the skies

Heverly, 15

(Robert Heverly, Associate Professor of Law, Albany Law School. “THE STATE OF DRONES: STATE AUTHORITY TO REGULATE DRONES” <http://www.albanygovernmentlawreview.org/Articles/Vol08_1/8.1.0029-Heverly.pdf>) Henge

B. Who Owns the Skies36 The question of who owns the skies is one that is oft repeated in the drone discussion. The short answer is: The United States of America owns the skies above the United States.37 Federal control of navigable airspace is based in the commerce clause.38 Pursuant to Congressional enactment and regulatory implementation, with the original statute enacted in 1926, the federal government asserted its “complete and exclusive national authority in the air space” over the United States.39 The current statute provides: (a) Sovereignty and Public Right of Transit.— (1) The United States Government has exclusive sovereignty of airspace of the United States. (2) A citizen of the United States has a public right of transit through the navigable airspace.40 A navigable airspace is defined as “airspace above the minimum altitudes of flight prescribed by regulations under this subpart . . . including airspace needed to ensure safety in the takeoff and landing of aircraft.”41 The statute places the Federal Aviation Administration in the position of defining the boundaries of navigable airspace, which it has set at the low end as being 1,000 feet above the highest nearby obstacles in congested areas and 500 feet above ground level in other, uncongested, areas.42 Pathways to landing and takeoff are also considered part of the navigable airspace.43 That the federal government has the authority to regulate navigable airspace is not seriously in dispute, nor is its authority to regulate nearly all aspects of airlines and aircraft,44 and to preempt regulations that would impose a patchwork of controls over manned flight operations.45 How far the federal government can go, or, more precisely, how low the federal government can go for purposes of aviation regulation, remains a highly contested question.

#### Doesn’t solve our perception advantages- federal action is key

Claussen ’08 (Eileen,- President, Pew Center on Global Climate Change 2-25 “Speech: Eileen Claussen Remarks at Pew Center State-Federal Workshop” http://www.pewclimate.org/speeches/ec-statefed)

Another thing that only the federal government can do is negotiate and enter into international agreements on climate change. At the federal level, the United States needs to commit to play an active part in crafting an effective global response to this problem. We have not been playing a constructive role in this process – and that has to stop.International negotiators, including the U.S., have agreed to a process aimed at producing a new global climate treaty by the end of 2009. This is an extremely ambitious goal, but one worth pursuing. Clearly, we need a global agreement as soon as possible that includes binding commitments from the world's largest economies. And a global agreement that creates a worldwide market for emission reductions will help lower the global costs of achieving our emission reduction goals. Negotiating such an agreement is clearly a federal government responsibility … and it is a responsibility we will carry out more effectively if we commit as soon as possible to a national program of reducing emissions. Right now, emerging economies and major sources of emissions like China and India are hiding behind U.S. inaction on this issue. U.S. leadership, in the form of mandatory emission limits at home coupled with a strong push for binding international commitments, would set the stage for effective global action – and, ultimately, real progress in reducing emissions around the world.

### 2AC AT “Warrants Not Key”

#### The plan is the only way to balance privacy and security concerns

Rothfuss 2014 (Ian F [George Mason School of Law]; Student Comment: An Economic Perspective on the Privacy Implications of Domestic Drone Surveillance; 10 J.L. Econ. & Pol'y 441; kdf)

IV. Legislative and Policy Recommendations This section discusses the current policy and legislative recommendations regarding drone surveillance and applies economic analysis to recommend an optimal way forward. Developing new laws and policies to address the privacy threats presented by domestic drone surveillance will involve the difficult balancing of many special interests and the individual privacy rights of U.S. citizens. n147 Therefore, in drafting a legal framework for domestic drone surveillance, Congress should consider economic factors and establish a framework which allows the use of drones with constraints to protect the privacy interests of U.S. citizens. As an objective methodology, these economic perspectives should lead lawmakers and policymakers to enact rules that will efficiently maximize utility while protecting privacy interests. The new framework should address the privacy concerns arising out of the domestic use of drones, while still allowing society to realize the technological benefits. Congress must consider many factors when determining how to best integrate drones into U.S. airspace. n148 In addition, the proposed policies should be compared with the policies in countries such as the United Kingdom, where general surveillance is more commonplace. n149 In July 2012, the Association for Unmanned Vehicle Systems International (AUVSI) issued a code of conduct that attempted to address concerns associated with the deployment of drones. n150 Among other elements, the code of conduct requires industry members to "respect the privacy of individuals" and "comply with all federal, state, and local laws, ordinances, covenants, and restrictions." n151 The code of conduct has been viewed as insufficient since it only lists broad topics, does not discuss specific privacy concerns, and does not elaborate on how the provisions will be enforced. n152 Current recommendations address a number of concerns regarding the widespread deployment of drones in the United States. Among these are recommendations from the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) n153 and legislation currently pending in both houses of Congress. n154 The first group of recommendations to consider is usage restrictions. It is generally accepted that drones and other means of surveillance may be used when a warrant has been issued because probable cause exists. Therefore, the focus of [\*459] pending legislation and policy recommendations is on when the use of drones should be allowed without a warrant, if at all. The ACLU proposes that drone use should be limited to three purposes: (1) "where there are specific and articulable grounds to believe that the drone will collect evidence relating to a specific instance of criminal wrongdoing or, if the drone will intrude upon reasonable expectations of privacy, where the government has obtained a warrant based on probable cause;" n155 (2) "where there is a geographically confined, time-limited emergency situation in which particular individuals' lives are at risk;" n156 or (3) "for reasonable non-law enforcement purposes . . . where privacy will not be substantially affected." n157 Similarly, both the House and Senate versions of the Preserving Freedom from Unwanted Surveillance Act of 2013 provide for three exceptions to the warrant requirement: (1) "patrol of borders"; (2) "exigent circumstances"; and (3) "high risk" of terrorist attack, as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security. n158 The definition of exigent circumstances differs in the two bills. The Senate bill defines exigent circumstances to only include action necessary to "prevent imminent danger to life," n159 while the House bill uses a broader definition that also includes "serious damage to property, or to forestall the imminent escape of a suspect, or destruction of evidence." n160 The broader definition of exigent circumstances in the House of Representatives version of the bill n161 is appropriate since it will give law enforcement more latitude to protect the American people in addition to providing for civil liability n162 as a check against improper use of this authority. The next recommendation is to consider whether there should be an exclusionary rule that would make any evidence gathered without a warrant or other legal authorization inadmissible in a criminal proceeding. The Senate bill also includes an exclusionary rule that would prohibit evidence collected in violation of the Act from being used in criminal prosecution. n163 Exclusionary rules can overdeter criminal investigations. n164 Therefore, unless a compelling case can be made as to why it is necessary, it would be more efficient not to include an exclusionary rule in the legislation. Another consideration is whether drones operating in the United States should be allowed to carry weapons like drones operating overseas which [\*460] are used to target enemy combatants. One recommendation is to prohibit law enforcement from arming drones. n165 Drones have the ability to conduct remote precision strikes on suspects, but due process concerns and the dangers resulting from armed unmanned aircraft preclude the viability of this option within the United States. Therefore, domestic drones should be prohibited from carrying weapons of any kind. Congress should enact rules to govern domestic drone use. One recommendation is that Congress should require the Department of Transportation to conduct a Privacy Impact Assessment of the operation of drones domestically. n166 Pending legislation proposes amending the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 to address drone privacy concerns. n167 With the proper focus on privacy concerns, drones may be deployed domestically while still protecting the privacy of American citizens. In addition, Congress should require a warrant for "extended surveillance of a particular target." n168 As discussed earlier, the Fourth Amendment would not necessarily require a warrant in these situations. Even so, such a requirement extending warrant protections makes sense and will provide a valuable check against law enforcement abuse of the new technology. Congress should require authorization from an independent official for generalized surveillance that collects personally identifiable information such as facial features and license plate numbers. n169 This recommendation would apply to situations where a warrant was not required but personally identifiable information was still being gathered, such as surveillance at a public event. This recommendation should be enacted as a safeguard of the public's privacy interests. To adequately protect privacy interests, Congress should direct that the independent official, vested with decision-making power on applications for general surveillance, be a neutral and detached magistrate who is completely separated from any law enforcement or intelligence agency. As discussed in the previous section, legislation should be crafted to maximize the social utility from the domestic use of drones. The legislation should be structured according to the three levels of scrutiny proposed by Song to ensure that the governmental interest in the surveillance outweighs the disutility or social cost that will result from the loss of privacy. n170 The neutral and detached magistrate discussed above could determine when a sufficient government interest exists to warrant allowing generalized drone surveillance. [\*461] Additional policy recommendations include an image retention restriction n171 and a requirement to file a data collection statement to obtain a FAA license to operate a drone. n172 These recommendations should be incorporated into the legislation. Congress should require a data collection statement with applications for a FAA license to operate a drone. A key element of the required data collection statement should address the retention of images and other data obtained. n173 Such a restriction would mandate that all images and other sensory data gathered through surveillance be deleted unless the information serves a valid, legal purpose that requires retention. n174 This restriction is necessary to prevent the government or any other entity from amassing an essentially limitless database of information on the activities of U.S. citizens without a valid and specified purpose. Collectively, enacting these recommendations would prevent widespread, general drone surveillance while allowing drones to be utilized domestically when reasonably warranted to maintain security or protect the interests of American citizens. Therefore, these recommendations would adequately protect the privacy interests of American citizens while allowing law enforcement and other entities to utilize drones to protect our country and serve other worthwhile endeavors.

#### Establishing limits on drones is the only method to revitalize the fourth amendment

San Pedro 2014 (Victoria [J.D. Candidate, Stetson University College of Law]; STUDENT WORK: DRONE LEGISLATION: KEEPING AN EYE ON LAW ENFORCEMENT'S LATEST SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY; 43 Stetson L. Rev. 679; kdf)

V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS With the ubiquity of drone licenses among American law enforcement agencies, n288 the drag-net surveillance that was once a laughable concept n289 is now a reality. n290 While state statutes and proposed federal legislation attempt to limit law enforcement's ability to use drones in surveillance efforts, those proposals and statutes do not adequately address the duration of the sur-veillance or the sophistication of the technology used by law enforcement to enhance drone capabilities. Therefore, by requir-ing a warrant and restricting law enforcement from conducting drone surveillance for a period lasting longer than twenty-four hours, the proposed legislation will best address the issues left open by Fourth Amendment jurisprudence. [\*720] Further, including the exigent circumstances language into the legislation will allow law enforcement agencies to better understand the circumstances that would permit the use of a drone. Because the courts have addressed exigent circumstances on numerous occasions, n291 law enforcement agencies may already have protocols and officer training dealing with exigent cir-cumstances. Rather than drafting legislation that attempts to describe a circumstance meriting the use of a drone, n292 using the exigent circumstances language will allow law enforcement agen-cies to comply with Fourth Amendment jurisprudence already defined by the Court. Similarly, legislation imposing a time restriction on the dura-tion of the surveillance will provide law enforcement agencies with a bright-line rule that facilitates application across the board. Since the current Fourth Amendment jurisprudence provides that one does not have a reasonable expectation of pri-vacy from all observations of one's property, n293 this statutory lan-guage will provide a reasonable expectation of privacy from prolonged observations of one's property. This proposal would comply with current Fourth Amendment jurisprudence regarding fly-over aerial observations and would also be consistent with the mosaic theory. n294 Further, this proposal limits law enforcement's ability to use any form of drone technology. Given that the technological advancements in this field will likely continue to progress at a rapid pace, any proposed legislation should incorporate an objective standard defining the permissible level of technology or an outright prohibition on the use of all drone surveillance. In this way, we can align the use of this form of technology with Fourth Amendment protections. Rather than providing vague standards, such as technology that is not in general public use, the general restriction provides a bright-line rule to law enforcement agencies. [\*721] Therefore, this proposal would allow law enforcement to be exempt from the warrant requirement for exigent circumstances, while also allowing them to obtain a warrant from a neutral and detached magistrate when law enforcement intends to conduct long-term surveillance, thereby ensuring that law enforcement agencies comply with the warrant requirement of the Fourth Amendment and respect citizens' privacy rights.

#### The plan resolves privacy rights

Alex Pasternack, Motherboard editor, 3-18-2014, Small Drones Are a Bigger Privacy Threat Than the NSA, Says Senate Intel Chair," http://motherboard.vice.com/read/small-drones-are-a-bigger-privacy-threat-than-the-nsa-says-senate-intel-chair, Accessed: 7-10-2015, /Bingham-MB

Regulating drones for safety concerns on the federal level could help provide more clarity when regulating them for privacy on the local level. When the FAA issued its list of six national testing centers in November, it tackled the privacy issue for the first time, insisting that those sites must have publicly available plans for privacy, data use, and data retention, and that privacy practices must be annually reviewed and open to public comments. But the agency did not specify what those privacy practices should be. Privacy advocates like EPIC and the ACLU have insisted on strict federal laws to tackle drone snooping, including a bipartisan House bill introduced by Rep. Ted Poe (R-TX) and Rep. Zoe Lofgren (D-CA) that would require law enforcement to get warrants before deploying domestic drones, and that explicitly forbids arming them. Another Senate bill introduced by Sen. Edward Markey (D-MA) also includes a warrant requirement for police surveillance with drones. Curtailing privacy risks, said Feinstein, is "going to have to come through regulation—perhaps regulation of size and type for private use. Some certification of the person that’s going to operate it... some specific regulation on the kinds of uses it can be put to.”

#### Federal legislation can create data retention limits, warrant requirements, and sanctions on drone use

EPIC 14 [Electronic Privacy Information Center - Spotlight on Surveillance - October 2014 “DRONES: Eyes in the Sky” <https://epic.org/privacy/surveillance/spotlight/1014/drones.html> c.shack]

Legislation on drone use by law enforcement should ensure that all drone surveillance requires a warrant or a narrowly tailored emergency exception. Laws should also create data retention limits for information collected by drones and minimization for information collected outside the scope of the warrant. Government access to third party drone data should also require a warrant, so that the government cannot avoid obtaining warrants by collecting drone surveillance data from the private sector. Federal agencies must be transparent and held accountable for their domestic use of drones. Agencies should provide clarity around the data collected, how it is used, and how long it is retained. Local and state agencies should provide similarly information to the public whether they are using drones directly or indirectly through federal agencies. All law enforcement agencies should publicly disclose the scope and purpose of the missions it performs. Courts must adapt constitutional jurisprudence to properly address modern technology. The fact that it is now feasible to cheaply perform surveillance on an individual or entire area of individuals should not mean that these actions are constitutional. Particularly when surveillance is conducted on the property of another, or in areas where people would have an expectation of privacy or at least an expectation that they will not be subject to covert observation and recording, sanctions should be imposed. Lawmakers should be concerned with changes in technology that allow commercial or private actors to gather data on or track the movements of individuals. These technological changes mean that individuals need laws to protect their dignity, autonomy, and privacy. At the same time, lawmakers must be cognizant of the fact that there are numerous legitimate uses for drone technology, including public safety and emergency response.. As such, laws passed in an effort to protect victims and consumers must be carefully tailored to separate innocent photography and exploration from stalking, harassment, and the commodification of our personal lives.

## 2AC – Privacy

### 2AC AT “No Privacy Violations”

#### Tech advancing rapidly—will violate privacy concerns

Richard M. Thompson II, Legislative Attorney for Congressional Research Service, 4-3-2013, Drones in Domestic Surveillance Operations: Fourth Amendment Implications and Legislative Responses, https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R42701.pdf, /Bingham-MB

Drones have been employed domestically by federal, state, and local governments in a range of circumstances. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) uses them to police the nation’s borders to deter unlawful border crossings by unauthorized aliens, criminals, and terrorists, and to detect and interdict the smuggling of weapons, drugs, and other contraband into the country.16 Within DHS, Customs and Border Protection’s (CBP’s) Office of Air and Marine (OAM) has flown missions to support federal and state agencies such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the Department of Defense (DOD), Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), the U.S. Secret Service, and the Texas Rangers.17 According to a recent disclosure by the FAA, several local police departments, state and private colleges, and small cities and towns have also received FAA Certificates of Authorization (COAs) to fly unmanned aircraft domestically.18 Recently, a police force in North Dakota conducted the nation’s first drone-assisted arrest.19 DHS, in conjunction with local law enforcement agencies, has been testing drone capabilities in a host of other situations including detecting radiation, monitoring a hostage situation, tracking a gun tossed by a fleeing suspect, firefighting, and finding missing persons.20 Currently, drones can be outfitted with high-powered cameras,21 thermal imaging devices,22 license plate readers,23 and laser radar (LADAR).24 In the near future, law enforcement organizations might seek to outfit drones with facial recognition or soft biometric recognition, which can recognize and track individuals based on attributes such as height, age, gender, and skin color.25 As explained below, the relative sophistication of drones contrasted with traditional surveillance technology may influence a court’s decision whether domestic drone use is lawful under the Fourth Amendment.

#### The current legal framework is inadequate at confronting the privacy concerns posed by drones

Rothfuss 2014 (Ian F [George Mason School of Law]; Student Comment: An Economic Perspective on the Privacy Implications of Domestic Drone Surveillance; 10 J.L. Econ. & Pol'y 441; kdf)

Introduction A sixteen-hour standoff with police began after a suspect took control of six cows that wandered on to his farm and "chased police off his land with high powered rifles." n1 Without the suspect's knowledge, police used a Predator drone to locate and apprehend him on his 3,000-acre farm. n2 In addition to law enforcement, anyone may buy a handheld drone. The Parrot AR.Drone 2.0, for example, costs less than three hundred dollars and can fly up to 165 feet from its controller while recording and transmitting live high-definition video from the sky. n3 Unmanned aerial vehicles (drones) have become essential to government surveillance overseas and are now being deployed domestically for law enforcement and other purposes. The ability of drones to conduct widespread domestic surveillance has raised serious privacy concerns. Both government and private actors may use drones. Given the proliferation of this new technology, Congress has recently directed the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to expedite the licensing process and open the domestic airspace to drones. n4 Situations like the one described above will likely become more common in the near future. n5 Domestic drones [\*442] have the potential to allow the government to effectively and efficiently monitor the activities of people across the nation. Part I of this Comment examines the capabilities of drones, discusses currently planned drone deployments, and examines recent developments that have brought the topic of domestic drone surveillance to the forefront of national security law discussions. This comment concludes that current law does not adequately protect privacy interests from the widespread surveillance that could result from the unrestricted domestic use of drones. Part II discusses the sources of the right to privacy and examines the current state of the law. Part III applies an economic perspective to determine the optimal level of domestic drone surveillance that the law should allow. This analysis is based upon a general economic model of surveillance developed by Andrew Song following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. n6 Economic analysis shows that the uncontrolled domestic deployment of drones would lead to an inefficient and unproductive loss of social utility. Prompt legislative action is therefore necessary to address the fundamental privacy challenges presented by the use of drones. Part IV concludes by proposing a legal framework to balance security and other interests while safeguarding the privacy rights of U.S. citizens. As discussed in this comment, such legislation should allow constructive use of the technology within a framework that protects individual privacy rights. I. Background: Domestic Deployment of Drones Recent congressional legislation has directed the FAA to expedite its current licensing process and allow the private and commercial use of drones in U.S. airspace by October 2015. n7 The FAA has streamlined the authorization process to "less than 60 days" for nonemergency drone operations. n8 Among other requirements, the recent legislation directs the FAA to allow government agencies to operate small drones weighing less than 4.4 pounds. n9 The use of drones can be expected to increase dramatically in the coming years. [\*443] The FAA has already authorized many police departments and other agencies to use drones. n10 As of November 2012, the FAA oversaw 345 active Certificates of Waiver or Authorization that allow public entities to operate drones in civil airspace. n11 Customs and Border Protection uses Predator drones along the nation's borders "to search for illegal immigrants and smugglers" n12 and "the FBI and Drug Enforcement Administration have used Predators for other domestic investigations." n13 Predators owned by Customs and Border Protection and based at U.S. Air Force bases have been deployed on numerous occasions to assist local law enforcement. n14 One law enforcement agency has even deployed a drone capable of being armed with lethal and non-lethal weapons. n15 Drones also have applications beyond government law enforcement. Drones may be used to provide live video coverage of events without the need to use piloted helicopters and by paparazzi chasing after pictures of celebrities and other public figures. n16 Individuals may use drones to spy on their neighbors, to keep an eye on their children, or to keep tabs on a potentially unfaithful spouse. n17 The possibilities for corporate espionage and the theft of trade secrets are also endless. Drones range in size from handheld units to units the size of large aircraft and have a wide variety of capabilities. n18 Nearly fifty companies are reported to be developing an estimated 150 varieties of drone systems. n19 Users of drones may include the military, federal and local law enforcement agencies, business entities, and private individuals. Drones have many diverse domestic uses including surveillance of dangerous disaster sites, patrolling borders, helping law enforcement locate suspects, monitoring traffic, crop dusting, aerial mapping, media coverage, and many others. n20 [\*444] Drones represent an unprecedented convergence of surveillance technologies that could lead to increased security but could also jeopardize the privacy of U.S. citizens. Drones may be equipped with a variety of technologies including high-resolution cameras, n21 face-recognition technology, n22 video-recording capability, n23 heat sensors, n24 radar systems, n25 night vision, n26 infrared sensors, n27 thermal-imaging cameras, n28 Wi-Fi and communications interception devices, n29 GPS, n30 license-plate scanners, n31 and other systems designed to aid in surveillance. Drones will soon be able to recognize faces and track the movement of subjects with only minimal visual-image data [\*445] obtained from aerial surveillance. n32 Drones have the ability to break into wireless networks, monitor cell-phone calls, and monitor entire towns while flying at high altitude. n33 These rapid technological advancements present privacy challenges that were not contemplated when our existing laws were developed.

### 2AC AT “Alt Causes”

#### The federal government is ramping up its use of drones for domestic surveillance, this harms the 4th amendment in unprecedented ways

Gilens 2013 (Naomi [ACLU Speech, Privacy and Technology Project]; New Documents Reveal U.S. Marshals’ Drones Experiment, Underscoring Need for Government Transparency; https://www.aclu.org/blog/new-documents-reveal-us-marshals-drones-experiment-underscoring-need-government-transparency; kdf)

The use of surveillance drones is growing rapidly in the United States, but we know little about how the federal government employs this new technology. Now, new information obtained by the ACLU shows for the first time that the U.S. Marshals Service has experimented with using drones for domestic surveillance. We learned this through documents we released today, received in response to a Freedom of Information Act request. The documents are available here. (We also released a short log of drone accidents from the Federal Aviation Administration as well as accident reports and other documents from the U.S. Air Force.) This revelation comes a week after a bipartisan bill to protect Americans’ privacy from domestic drones was introduced in the House. Although the Marshals Service told us it found 30 pages about its drones program in response to our FOIA request, it turned over only two of those pages—and even they were heavily redacted. Here’s what we know from the two short paragraphs of text we were able to see. Under a header entitled “Unmanned Aerial Vehicle, Man-Portable (UAV) Program,” an agency document overview begins: USMS Technical Operations Group's UAV Program provides a highly portable, rapidly deployable overhead collection device that will provide a multi-role surveillance platform to assist in [redacted] detection of targets. Another document reads: This developmental program is designed to provide [redacted] in support of TOG [presumably the agency’s Technical Operations Group] investigations and operations. This surveillance solution can be deployed during [multiple redactions] to support ongoing tactical operations. These heavily redacted documents reveal almost no information about the nature of the Marshals’ drone program. However, the Marshals Service explained to the Los Angeles Times that they tested two small drones in 2004 and 2005. The experimental program ended after both drones crashed. It is surprising that what seems like a small-scale experiment remained hidden from the public until our FOIA unearthed it. Even more surprising is that seven years after the program was discontinued, the Marshals still refuse to disclose almost any records about it. As drone use becomes more and more common, it is crucial that the government’s use of these spying machines be transparent and accountable to the American people. All too often, though, it is unclear which law enforcement agencies are using these tools, and how they are doing so. We should not have to guess whether our government is using these eyes in the sky to spy on us. As my colleague ACLU staff attorney Catherine Crump told me, Americans have the right to know if and how the government is using drones to spy on them. Drones are too invasive a tool for it to be unclear when the public will be subjected to them. The government needs to respect Americans’ privacy while using this invasive technology, and the laws on the books need to be brought up to date to ensure that America does not turn into a drone surveillance state. All over the U.S., states and localities are trying to figure out through the democratic political process exactly what kind of protections we should put in place in light of the growing use of what Time Magazine called “the most powerful surveillance tool ever devised, on- or offline.” These debates are essential to a healthy democracy, and are heartening to see. However, this production from the Marshals Service underscores the need for a federal law to ensure that the government’s use of drones remains open and transparent. A number of federal lawmakers are already pushing to bring the law up to date. Representatives Ted Poe (R-Texas) and Zoe Lofgren (D-Calif.) recently introduced the first bipartisan legislation to regulate the government’s use of drones. The proposed legislation, which is supported by the ACLU, would enact judicial and Congressional oversight mechanisms, require government agencies to register all drones and get a warrant when using them for surveillance (except in emergency situations), and prohibit the domestic use of armed drones. We believe this bill—and hopefully a future companion bill in the Senate—will provide a strong foundation for future legislation protecting our privacy rights in the face of proliferating drone surveillance and government secrecy.

#### The plan is the catalyst that makes privacy possible

Ahsanuddin et al 2014 (Sadia - principal investigator for the report and MPAC research fellow; Domestic Drones: Implications for Privacy and Due Process in the United States; Sep 8; www.mpac.org/publications/policy-papers/domestic-drones.php; kdf)

Simultaneously, the IHSS survey respondents indicated apprehensiveness over any domestic drone operations: two-thirds expressed concern over potential surveillance in homes or public areas; 65 percent were concerned about safety; and 75 percent were concerned about the government’s ability to regulate use.82 The rapid pace at which drone technology is developing, the lack of clear guidelines protecting privacy and civil liberties, and public concern over these issues indicate an urgent need for action in Congress and state legislatures. Privacy experts agree. In an article in the Stanford Law Review Online, Professor Ryan Calo of the University of Washington School of Law states that drones “may be just the visceral jolt society needs to drag privacy law into the twenty-first century.” American privacy law has developed at a “slow and uneven” pace, whereas technology has developed at a rapid speed. In spite of the development of computers, the Internet, Global-Positioning Systems (GPS), biometrics, gigapixel cameras, face recognition technology, and the widespread use of e-mail and other forms of electronic communication, there has been no attendant development in privacy law. Because drones “threaten to perfect the art of surveillance,” they make for a good catalyst to update privacy law. The need for legislation is clear. With recent revelations that the federal government has been conducting surveillance of the American public on an unprecedented level, the threat that unregulated and immensely capable technologies pose to civil liberties is profound. The law must catch up with technology.

#### Changes to drone surveillance can become the catalyst for broader changes to violations of privacy

Sara Sorcher, 2-21-2013, The Backlash Against Drones," nationaljournal, http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/the-backlash-against-drones-20130221, Accessed: 5-29-2015, /Bingham-MB

As it stands, “there’s really not a lot in American privacy law that’s going to be much of a barrier to using drones,” University of Washington law professor Ryan Calo says. Court cases invoking the Fourth Amendment, which guards against unreasonable searches, largely hold that a person has no reasonable expectation of privacy in public, or from a public vantage point, such as from an aircraft overhead, Calo says. There are signs, however, that the Supreme Court is reexamining this doctrine. In a case decided last term, five of the justices objected to police affixing a GPS device to a car without a warrant, and four more objected to the continuous surveillance of a suspect. Drones can achieve the same goals without touching a vehicle. Calo thus believes that drones could be the catalyst for much-needed changes to privacy laws in a nation in which targeted, unchecked surveillance is becoming increasingly possible. The danger lies in it becoming the norm.

### 2AC AT “Legal Drones Bad”

#### Plan is a good step to fixing drone problems

Sommadossi 2014 (Tiffany; Domestic Surveillance Drones: To Fear or Not to Fear?; Aug 4; www.legislationandpolicy.com/1425/domestic-surveillance-drones-fear-fear/; kdf)

While pending federal legislation is an excellent sign that Congress is taking steps to address privacy concerns related to drone surveillance, the question of what to do until federal laws pass remains. The absence of drone privacy restrictions represents a gaping hole in American privacy protections, and also puts law enforcement offices in a predicament. A growing number of law enforcement offices, like the LAPD, are voluntarily refusing to integrate drone technology into its investigations because of public disapproval. The public has made clear that unless strict privacy rules are in place to govern surveillance drones, the benefits they can provide are not worth the significant privacy implications. Therefore, the lack of federal drone law focused on privacy is simultaneously threatening American privacy interests and preventing law enforcement from taking advantage of new technologies. As the Supreme Court’s interpretation of the Fourth Amendment slowly transforms and Congress remains suspicious of government surveillance programs, it will be interesting to see where the pendulum settles on what constitutes a reasonable expectation of privacy in the United States when it comes to government surveillance, particularly from the air.

#### The plan puts good limits on drones—solves this impact

Galizio 2014 (Gregory; NOTE: A DIGITAL ALBATROSS: NAVIGATING THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK OF DOMESTIC POLICE DRONE TECHNOLOGY VERSUS PRIVACY RIGHTS IN MASSACHUSETTS AND BEYOND; 20 Suffolk J. Trial & App. Adv. 117; kdf)

V. CONCLUSION While law enforcement drones need to be strictly restrained by [\*143] statute, the courts, and government agencies, this emerging technology need not be universally condemned as the advent of George Orwell's dystopian world. American legislatures and courts should legally discourage all dragnet surveillance conducted with drones. If sensible legislation, along with strict judicial review, can be established, domestic drones should be integrated into American skies. The courts must evolve and confront the rapid pace of technology with more stringent approaches to protecting privacy rights. On the practical side, civil libertarians should not unconditionally reject law enforcement's operation of drones if used in the same manner as existing police technology. The arrival of domestic drones offers a new battle within the dichotomy of privacy and security interests. Just as drones may benefit domestic security interests, they burden the right of privacy. As drone and other technologies further complicate this legal clash of competing interests, it will be up to lawmakers and judges to offer reasonable and balanced solutions. While drones possess benefits to public safety, the failure to adapt our Fourth Amendment jurisprudence to the digital age will create a digital albatross upon the privacy interests of us all. n156

### 2AC AT “No Right to Privacy”

#### Privacy is still important for human rights law

Haroon Siddique, 12-26-2013, Internet privacy as important as human rights, says UN's Navi Pillay," Guardian, http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/dec/26/un-navi-pillay-internet-privacy /Bingham-MB

Pillay has been asked by the UN to prepare a report on protection of the right to privacy, in the wake of the former National Security Agency analyst Edward Snowden leaking classified documents about UK and US spying and the collection of personal data. The former international criminal court judge said her encounters with serious human rights abuses, which included serving on the Rwanda tribunal, did not make her take online privacy less seriously. "I don't grade human rights," she said. "I feel I have to look after and promote the rights of all persons. I'm not put off by the lifetime experience of violations I have seen." She said apartheid ended in South Africa principally because the international community co-operated to denounce it, adding: "Combined and collective action by everybody can end serious violations of human rights … That experience inspires me to go on and address the issue of internet [privacy], which right now is extremely troubling because the revelations of surveillance have implications for human rights … People are really afraid that all their personal details are being used in violation of traditional national protections." The UN general assembly unanimously voted last week to adopt a resolution, introduced by Germany and Brazil, stating that "the same rights that people have offline must also be protected online, including the right to privacy". Brazil's president, Dilma Rousseff, and the German chancellor, Angela Merkel, were among those spied on, according to the documents leaked by Snowden. The resolution called on the 193 UN member states "to review their procedures, practices and legislation regarding the surveillance of communications, their interception and collection of personal data, with a view to upholding the right to privacy of all their obligations under international human rights law". It also directed Pillay to publish a report on the protection and promotion of privacy "in the context of domestic and extraterritorial surveillance ... including on a mass scale". She told Berners-Lee it was "very important that governments now want to discuss the matters of mass surveillance and right to privacy in a serious way".

#### Privacy is critical to self-development and actualization—critical to a meaningful life

Jathan Sadowski Studies Applied Ethics and The Human And Social Dimensions Of Science And Technology At Arizona State University., 2-26-2013, Why Does Privacy Matter? One Scholar's Answer," Atlantic, http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2013/02/why-does-privacy-matter-one-scholars-answer/273521/ /Bingham-MB

Cohen doesn't think we should treat privacy as a dispensable instrument. To the contrary, she argues privacy is irreducible to a "fixed condition or attribute (such as seclusion or control) whose boundaries can be crisply delineated by the application of deductive logic. Privacy is shorthand for breathing room to engage in the process of ... self-development." What Cohen means is that since life and contexts are always changing, privacy cannot be reductively conceived as one specific type of thing. It is better understood as an important buffer that gives us space to develop an identity that is somewhat separate from the surveillance, judgment, and values of our society and culture. Privacy is crucial for helping us manage all of these pressures -- pressures that shape the type of person we are -- and for "creating spaces for play and the work of self-[development]." Cohen argues that this self-development allows us to discover what type of society we want and what we should do to get there, both factors that are key to living a fulfilled life. Woodrow Hartzog and Evan Selinger make similar arguments in a recent article on the value of "obscurity." When structural constraints prevent unwanted parties from getting to your data, obscurity protections are in play. These protections go beyond preventing companies from exploiting our information for their financial gain. They safeguard democratic societies by furthering "autonomy, self-fulfillment, socialization, and relative freedom from the abuse of power."

### 2AC AT “Human Rights Fail”

#### HUMAN RIGHTS CHECK AGGRESSION, PROLIF AND TERROR RISKS

William W. Burke-White, Lecturer, Public and International Affairs and Senior Special Assistant to the Dean, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University, “Human Rights and National Security: The Strategic Correlation,” THE HARVARD ENVIRONMENTAL LAW REVIEW v. 17, Spring 2004, p. 268.

Given the linkage between a state's domestic human rights record and its propensity to engage in international aggression, U.S. national security could be enhanced by a greater emphasis on the promotion of human rights in U.S. foreign policy. In short, better human rights practices around the globe make the United States safer and more secure. The human rights informed foreign policy presented here is intended to supplement and alter--not replace--traditional foreign policy. Such a policy would not neglect national security concerns, but rather would understand the promotion of national security and human rights to be related and mutually reinforcing goals. The linkage between human rights and international aggression offers a new means of predicting, preventing, and addressing potential aggressor states. Further, it suggests alternative mechanisms for dealing with pressing threats such as terrorism and WMD. Finally, it offers a new opportunity for renewed U.S. engagement with the U.N. in protecting international peace and security.

#### Hum rights solve global stability

John Shattuck, Assistant Secretary of State, Remarks at the Women’s National Democratic Club, FEDERAL NEWS SERVICE, September 12, 1994, npg.

These are daunting tasks. Why then has the Clinton administration made protecting human rights and promoting democracy such a major theme in our foreign policy? The answer I think lies not only in our values, which could be reason enough, but in the strategic benefits to the United States of a policy that emphasizes our values. We know from historical experience that democracies are more likely than other forms of government to respect human rights, to settle conflicts peacefully, to observe international and honor agreements, to go to war with each other with great reluctance, to respect rights of ethnical, racial and religious minorities living within their borders, and to provide the social and political basis for free market economics. In South Africa, in the Middle East, and now remarkably perhaps even in Northern Ireland, the resolution of conflict and the broadening of political participation is releasing great economic and social energies that can provide better lives for all the people of these long-suffering regions. By contrast, the costs to the world of repressive governments are painfully clear. In the 20th century, the number of people killed by their own governments under authoritarian regimes is four times the number killed in all of this century's wars combined. Repression pushes refugees across the borders and triggers wars. Unaccountable governments are heedless of environmental destruction, as witnessed by Chernobyl and the ecological nightmares of Eastern Europe. These, then, are the reasons why promoting democracy and human rights are at the forefront of this administration's foreign policy agenda.

#### Human rights fail when they aren’t prioritized

Michael **Ignatief 1**, Director of the Carr Center for Human Rights at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, “The Attack on Human Rights”, Foreign Affairs, November/December

But at the same time. Western defenders or human rights have traded too much away. In the desire to find common ground with Islamic and Asian positions and to purge their own discourse of the imperial legacies uncovered by the postmodernist critique, Western defenders of human rights norms risk compromising the very universality they ought to be defending. They also risk rewriting their own history. Many traditions, not just Western ones, were represented au inc drafting of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—for example, the Chinese, Middle Eastern Christian, Marxist, Hindu, Latin American, and Islamic. The members of the drafting committee saw their task not as a simple ratification of Western convictions but as an attempt to delimit a range of moral universals from within their very different religious, political, ethnic, and philosophical backgrounds. This fact helps to explain why the document makes no reference to God in its preamble. The communist delegations would have vetoed any such reference, and the competing religious traditions could not have agreed on words that would make human rights derive from human beings' common existence as Gods creatures. Hence the secular ground of the document is not a sign of European cultural domination so much as a pragmatic common denominator designed to make agreement possible across a range of divergent cultural and political viewpoints. It remains true, of course, that Western inspirations—and Western drafters—played the predominant role in the drafting of the document. Even so, the drafters' mood in 1947 was anything but triumphalist. They were aware, first of all, that the age of colonial emancipation was at hand: Indian independence was proclaimed while the language of the declaration was being finalized. Although the declaration does not specifically endorse self-determination, its drafters clearly foresaw the coming tide of struggles for national independence. Because it does proclaim the right of people to selfgovernment and freedom of speech and religion, it also concedes the right of colonial peoples to construe moral universals in a language rooted in their own traditions. Whatever failings the drafters of the declaration may be accused of, unexamined Western triumphalism is not one of them. Key drafters such as Rene Cassin of France and John Humphrey of Canada knew the knell had sounded on two centuries of Western colonialism. They also knew that the declaration was not so much a proclamation of the superiority of European civilization as an attempt to salvage the remains of its Enlightenment heritage from the barbarism of a world war just concluded. The declaration was written in full awareness of Auschwitz and dawning awareness of Kolyma. A consciousness of European savagery is built into the very language of the declarations preamble; "Whereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind ..." The declaration may still be a child of the Enlightenment, but it was written when faith in the Enlightenment faced its deepest crisis. In this sense, human rights norms are not so much a declaration of the superiority of European civilization as a warning by Europeans that the rest of the world should not reproduce their mistakes. The chief of these was the idolatry of the nation-state, causing individuals to forget the higher law commanding them to disobey unjust orders. The abandonment of this moral heritage of natural law and the surrender of individualism to collectivism, the drafters believed, led to the catastrophes of Nazi and Stalinist oppression. Unless the disastrous heritage of European collectivism is kept in mind as the framing experience in the drafting of the declaration, its individualism will appear to be nothing more than the ratification of Western bourgeois capitalist prejudice. In 'act, it was much more: a studied attempt to reinvent the European natural law tradition in order to safeguard individual agency against the totalitarian state. IT REMAINS TRUE, therefore, that the core of the declaration is the moral individualism for which it is so reproached by non-Western societies. It is this individualism for which Western activists have become most apologetic, believing that it should be tempered by greater emphasis on social duties and responsibilities to the community. Human rights, it is argued, can recover universal appeal only if they soften their individualistic bias and put greater emphasis on the communitarian parts of the declaration, especially Article 29, which says that "everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible." This desire to water down the individualism of rights discourse is driven by a desire both to make human rights more palatable to less individualistic cultures in the non-Western world and also to respond to disquiet among Western communitarians at the supposedly corrosive impact of individualistic values on Western social cohesion. But this tack mistakes what rights actually are and misunderstands why they have proven attractive to millions of people raised in non-Western traditions. Rights are meaningful only if they confer entitlements and immunities on individuals; they are worth having only if they can be enforced against institutions such as the family, the state, and the church. This remains true even when the rights in question are collective or group rights. Some of these group rights such as the right to speak your own language or practice your own religion-are essential preconditions for the exercise of individual rights. The right to speak a language of your choice will not mean very much if the language has died out. For this reason, group rights are needed to protect individual rights. But the ultimate purpose and justification of group rights is not the protection of the group as such but the protection of the individuals who compose it. Group rights to language, for example, must not be used to prevent an individual from learning a second language. Group rights to practice religion should not cancel the right of individuals to leave a religious community if they choose. Rights are inescapably political because they tacitly imply a conflict between a rights holder and a rights "withholder," some authority against which the rights holder can make justified claims. To confuse rights with aspirations, and rights conventions with syncretic syntheses of world values, is to wish away the conflicts that define the very content of rights. Individuals and groups will always be in conflict, and rights exist to protect individuals. Rights language cannot be parsed or translated into a non-individualistic, communitarian framework; it presumes moral individualism and is nonsensical outside that assumption. Moreover, it is precisely this individualism that renders human rights attractive to non-Western peoples and explains why the fight for those rights has become a global movement. The language of human rights is the only universally available moral vernacular that validates the claims of Rights doctrines women and children against the oppression they experience in patriarchal and tribal challenge powerful. societies; it is the only vernacular that enables religions tribes, and dependent persons to perceive themselves a and as moral agents and to act against practices- authoritaran states. arranged marriages, purdah, civic disenfranchisement, genital mutilation, domestic slavery, and so on-that are ratified by the weight and authority of their cultures. These agents seek out human rights protection precisely because it legitimizes their protests against oppression. If this is so, then it is necessary to rethink what it means when one says that rights are universal. Rights doctrines arouse powerfiul opposition because they challenge powerful religions, family structures, authoritarian states, and tribes. It would be a hopeless task to attempt to persuade these holders of power of the universal validity of rights doctrines, since if these doctrines prevailed, their exercise of authority would necessarily be abridged and constrained. Thus universality cannot imply universal assent, since in a world of unequal power, the only propositions that the powerful and powerless would agree on would be entirely toothless and anodyne. Rights are universal because they define the universal interests of the powerless-namely, that power be exercised over them in ways that respect their autonomy as agents. In this sense, human rights represent a revolutionary creed, since they make a radical demand of all human groups that they serve the interests of the individuals who compose them. This, then, implies that human groups should be, insofar as possible, consensual, or at least that they should respect an individual's right to exit when the constraints of the group become unbearable. The idea that groups should respect an individual's right of exit is not easy to reconcile with what groups actually are. Most human groups-the family, for example-are blood groups, based on inherited kinship or ethnic ties, People do not choose to be born into them and do not leave them easily, since these collectivities provide the frame of meaning within which individual life makes sense. This is as true in modern secular societies as it is in religious or traditional ones. Group rights doctrines exist to safeguard the collective rights-for example, to language-that make individual agency meaningful and valuable. But individual and group interests inevitably conflict. Human rights exist to adjudicate these conflicts, to define the irreducible minimum beyond which group and collective claims must not go in constraining the lives of individuals. CULTURE SHOCK ADOPTING THE VALUES of individual agency does not necessarily entail adopting Western ways of life. Believing in your right not to be tortured or abused need not mean adopting Western dress, speaking Western languages, or approving of the Western lifestyle. To seek human rights protection is not to change your civilization; it is merely to avail vourself of the protections of what the philosopher Isaiah Berlin called "negative liberty": to be free from oppression, bondage, and gross physical harm. Human rights do not, and should not, delegitimize traditional culture as a whole. The women in Kabul who come to human rights agencies seeking protection from the Taliban do not want to cease being Muslim wives and mothers; they want to combine their traditions with education and professional health care provided by a woman. And they hope the agencies will defend them against being beaten and persecuted for claiming such rights. The legitimacy of such claims is reinforced by the fact that the people who make them are not foreign human rights activists or employees of international organizations but the victims themselves. In Pakistan, for example, it is poor rural women who are criticizing the grotesque distortion of Islamic teaching that claims to justify "honor killings"-in which women are burned alive when they disobey their husbands. Human rights have gone global by going local, empowering the powerless, giving voice to the voiceless. It is simply not the case, as Islamic and Asian critics contend, that human rights force the Western way of life on their societies. For all its individualism, human rights rhetoric does not require adherents to jettison their other cultural attachments. As the philosopher Jack Donnelly argues, Human rights should human rights assume "that people probably are best suited, and in any case are entitled, not delegitimize to choose the good life for themselves."

### 2AC AT “Democracy Doesn’t Solve War”

#### Democracy solves global wars

Epstien et al, 2007

[Susan B. Epstein, Nina M. Serafino, and Francis T. Miko Specialists in Foreign Policy Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division Congressional research service, Democracy Promotion: Cornerstone of U.S. Foreign Policy?, 12-26-7, http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/crs/rl34296.pdf] /Wyo-MB

A common rationale offered by proponents of democracy promotion, including¶ former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and current Secretary of State¶ Condoleezza Rice, is that democracies do not go to war with one another. This is¶ sometimes referred to as the democratic peace theory. Experts point to European¶ countries, the United States, Canada, and Mexico as present-day examples.¶ According to President Clinton’s National Security Strategy of Engagement and¶ Enlargement: “Democracies create free markets that offer economic opportunity,¶ make for more reliable trading partners, and are far less likely to wage war on one¶ another.”22¶ Some have refined this democracy peace theory by distinguishing between¶ mature democracies and those in transition, suggesting that mature democracies do¶ not fight wars with each other, but that countries transitioning toward democracy are¶ more prone to being attacked (because of weak governmental institutions) or being¶ aggressive toward others. States that made transitions from an autocracy toward¶ early stages of democracy and were involved in hostilities soon after include France¶ in the mid-1800s under Napoleon III, Prussia/Germany under Bismarck (1870-1890),¶ Chile shortly before the War of the Pacific in 1879, Serbia’s multiparty constitutional¶ monarchy before the Balkan Wars of the late 20th Century, and Pakistan’s military guided pseudo-democracy before its wars with India in 1965 and 1971.23¶ The George W. Bush Administration asserts that democracy promotion is a¶ long-term antidote to terrorism. The Administration’s Strategy for Winning the War¶ on Terror asserts that inequality in political participation and access to wealth¶ resources in a country, lack of freedom of speech, and poor education all breed¶ volatility. By promoting basic human rights, freedoms of speech, religion, assembly,¶ association and press, and by maintaining order within their borders and providing¶ an independent justice system, effective democracies can defeat terrorism in the long¶ run, according to the Bush White House.24¶ Another reason given to encourage democracies (although debated by some¶ experts) is the belief that democracies promote economic prosperity. From this¶ perspective, as the rule of law leads to a more stable society and as equal economic¶ opportunity for all helps to spur economic activity, economic growth, particularly of¶ per capita income, is likely to follow. In addition, a democracy under this scenario¶ may be more likely to be viewed by other countries as a good trading partner and by¶ outside investors as a more stable environment for investment, according to some¶ experts. Moreover, countries that have developed as stable democracies are viewed¶ as being more likely to honor treaties, according to some experts.25

#### DEMOCRACY PROMOTION GOOD—FAMINE, WAR, GROWTH

Phar Kim Beng, “Should the US Plug Democracy in Asia,” THE STRAITS TIMES (Singapore), January 14, 2K, LN.

The spread of democracy can enhance US national interests in four major ways. Firstly, by encouraging other nations to democratise, the political conditions of otherwise repressive republics would improve. The pressure and attraction for others to enter America illegally would thus be reduced significantly. Secondly, as more countries democratise, that is by instituting multi-party electoral competition, the prospect of governments launching wars against one another would decline exponentially. This is because the decision to go to war would not be made by any one man or party at the helm, but would be subject to the purview and discretion of the public. Given the greater degree of public accountability, it would be correspondingly difficult for any government to justify the launching of an open war against the US or other nations. Democratic peace would, therefore, prevail across the world, much to the US' interests. Thirdly, democracy is also conducive to economic growth. A World Survey of Economic Freedom for 1995 to 1996, found that the countries rated "free" generated 81 per cent of the world's output even though they had only 17 per cent of the world's population. In another study by The Heritage Foundation, it was found that countries classified as "free" had annual 1980-1993 real per capita Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth rates of 2.88 per cent. In "mostly-free" countries, the rate was 0.97 per cent; in "mostly-not-free" ones, minus 0.32 per cent; and in "repressed" countries, minus 1.44 per cent. Fourthly, the US should spread democracy because the citizens of democracies do not suffer from famines. Most of the countries that have experienced severe famines in recent decades have been among the world's least democratic: the Soviet Union (Ukraine in the early 1930s), China, Ethiopia, Somalia, Cambodia and Sudan. Throughout history, famines have occurred in many different types of countries, but never in a democracy. Democracies do not experience famines for reasons of greater transparency and accountability. To the extent that the incidence of famine continues to fall, massive cross-border human emigration would cease, too. Global and regional security would thus be enhanced, by which the US would no doubt stand to gain due to its extensive political and economic interests abroad.

#### DEMOCRACIES DON’T FIGHT EACH OTHER--MULTIPLE REASONS

Rudolph J. Rummel, Professor Emeritus, Political Science, University of Hawaii, “Democracies Don’t Fight Democracies,” PEACE MAGAZINE, May-June 1999. Available from the World Wide Web at: http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/rummel.htm, accessed 3/10/06.

The first theory goes back to Immanuel Kant's Perpetual Peace, published in 1795, before the empirical research. Kant's theory has yielded the modern explanation, which is that: \* democratic leaders are restrained by the resistance of their people to bearing the costs and deaths of war; \* the diversity of institutions and relations within and between democracies creates checks and balances and cross-pressures inhibiting belligerence among them; \* a democratic culture of negotiation and conciliation means that in their interaction with other democracies, democratic leaders are basically dovish; \* democracies see each other of the same kind, sharing the same values, and thus are more willing to negotiate than fight.

## 2AC – Agriculture

### 2AC AT “Drones Inevitable”

#### Regulations are key to integrate drones into the economy

Kimery 13 [Anthony L. Homeland Security Today “Drones: Force Multipliers For Law Enforcement, Other First Responders” July 28, 2013 <http://www.hstoday.us/columns/the-kimery-report/blog/drones-force-multipliers-for-law-enforcement-other-first-responders/06bfa4d1a8afea68ce724424cb7679f6.html> c.shack]

Economic impact A recent study of the economic impact from the expected explosion in the US drone market in the United States conducted for AUVSI concluded that the UAS industry could create more than 70,000 new jobs with an economic effect of more than $13 billion in the first three years after the integration of drones into the US national airspace system. And this benefit will grow through 2025, when more than 100,000 jobs possibly could be created, with an economic impact of $82 billion, according to the AUVSI study, The Economic Impact of Unmanned Aircraft Systems Integration in the United States, by Daryl Jenkins. Jenkins is an aviation industry economist with more than 30 years of experience and a former director of the Aviation Institute at George Washington University and a past professor at George Washington University and Embry Riddle Aeronautical University. In his Dec. 2012 “oversight” report, Safety at Any Price: Assessing the Impact of Homeland Security Spending in US Cities, OK. Republican Sen. Tom Coburn -- known for his admirable determination in ferreting out waste, fraud and abuse in government spending -- said his staffs’ year-long investigation “expose[d] misguided and wasteful spending in one of the largest terror-prevention grant programs at the Department of Homeland Security -- the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI),” and implied that among the useless and ineffective taxpayer expenditures is the taxdollars that’s been spent for buying “drones.” Granted, Coburn’s 55-page investigative report exposed what can only be described as a lot of politically motivated pork spending, waste, abuse, mismanagement and widespread lack of oversight of UASI on the part of DHS -- and Congress. “Significant evidence suggests that the program is struggling to demonstrate how it is making US cities less vulnerable to attack and more prepared if one were to occur -- despite receiving $7.1 billion in federal funding since 2003,” the study said. But it doesn’t adequately explain the cost-risk benefit of using UASI grants to buy drones for use by first responders. Authorities said the report’s criticism that UASI grants by local police departments to acquire drones amounts to a wasteful use of the funding “failed to understand the drones’ force multiplying effect on law enforcement and other first responders,” as one large metro police official remarked. This is especially true in large municipalities with strained budgets and other fiscal problems that have forced reductions in the ranks and capabilities of their first responders. Police, for example, have had to prioritize responding to violent and high risk crime. Appropriately deployed drones can be used to monitor non-violent situations to gather data that police could later use to make arrests or for criminal investigative purposes. According to Coburn’s report, federally funded drones are already “patrolling the skies like never before” in the United States. However, DHS’ RAPS Test Plan said “Within the United States, almost 50,000 police and fire departments exist but only about 300 (less than 1 percent) have aviation departments, owing primarily to the significant cost of acquiring, operating and maintaining manned fixed-wing and rotary-wing platforms. The estimated cost per flight hour for these assets is 300 times more expensive than commercially available SUAS which can be operated at costs lower than those of a typical police cruiser. But for state, county or city entities to become potential users of SUAS, their adoption must be justifiable and affordable.” The RAPS Test Plan reiterated that SUAS “may soon become valuable tools for first and emergency responders and for those responsible for US border security.” The plan emphasized that “SUAS can provide tactical, rapid-response capabilities and much better situational awareness before field officers and agents respond to and engage in potentially dangerous operations.” The growth in the use of unmanned aerial systems for homeland security and other public sector needs “hinges on the FAA, which is tasked with finding out how aerial drones can coexist with commercial airlines and comply with the privacy concerns of the public,” according to the NCPA study. “As the use of unmanned drones nears full integration into the National Airspace System in 2015,” NCPA is urging “exploration of the civilian, commercial and scientific applications of drones, while taking into account the many concerns over civilian privacy.” NCPA’s Carr said his study concluded “strict privacy protections must be implemented before the public will support transparent drone use in domestic airspace.” Addressing privacy issues are paramount. Carr said, “According to the consulting firm Deloitte, the economic impact of developing unmanned technology will be substantial, particularly for aviation clusters in Texas and the Northwest.” “With full integration fast approaching, discussion must focus on the civilian, commercial and scientific applications of drones, as well as limits on how this new technology can be used,” Carr said. “While the regulatory and technical hurdles may delay the eventual date of full integration, public hostility towards drones will continue as long as transparency issues damage the government’s credibility," he said. “With substantial economic growth at stake, proper safeguards must be established to provide protection from overzealous government," said Carr.

#### And footdragging means FAA implementation isn’t effective

Berry and Syed ’14 (Michael Berry and Nabiha Syed, Washington Post, “The FAA’s slow move to regulate domestic drones”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/volokh-conspiracy/wp/2014/09/24/the-faas-slow-move-to-regulate-domestic-drones/>, September 24, 2014)

The existing legal landscape for drone use reflects a crazy quilt of regulations, policy pronouncements and state laws, with many significant pieces missing. To introduce some structure into the conversation and explain the current state of the law, we’ll lay out each of the three sources of existing domestic drone regulation in this post and in our forthcoming posts: Federal policy, including FAA regulations, federal legislation, and recent litigation; State legislation focused on private drone use; and Laws of general applicability that affect private drone use. Any summary of drone regulation must begin with the Federal Aviation Administration. Safety is central to the FAA’s existence. The agency was established in 1958 when Congress enacted the Federal Aviation Act, which tasked the agency with “develop[ing] plans and policy for the use of the navigable airspace and assign by regulation or order the use of the airspace necessary to ensure the safety of aircraft and the efficient use of airspace.” The 1958 Act was passed in the aftermath of a tragic midair collision between a Trans World Airlines Super Constellation and a United Air Lines DC-7 over the Grand Canyon, which killed all 128 people on board the planes. In keeping with its mandate, the FAA began implementing rules to help aircraft safely navigate the skies. Simultaneously, people began to build and use model airplanes as a hobby. With this hobby literally taking off, in 1981 the FAA issued Advisory Circular 91-57 to promote the safe use of model airplanes. That Advisory Circular asks hobbyists to avoid flying their model airplanes above 400 feet; within three miles of airports; and near full-scale aircraft, populated areas, or noise-sensitive places such as parks, schools, hospitals, and churches. Importantly, the Advisory Circular called for hobbyists’ voluntary compliance. It was not promulgated as a formal FAA rule — and for nearly a quarter century, it stood as the FAA’s only guidance on small unmanned aircraft. In 2005, as drone technology began to enter the domestic marketplace, the FAA issued a memorandum outlining an interim policy for approving drones for domestic use. That memorandum stated that drone operators would “be held accountable for controlling [their] aircraft to the same responsible standard as the pilot of a manned aircraft” and explained that the FAA’s regulation concerning careless and reckless operation of an aircraft applied to drones. Two years later, the FAA issued a new policy statement. That statement provided that “no person may operate a UAS [Unmanned Aircraft System] in the National Airspace without specific authority.” The FAA explained that the 1981 Advisory Circular allowed drones to be flown by hobbyists. But, the FAA warned, that Circular “only applies to modelers and thus specifically excludes its use by persons or companies for business purposes.” Should private companies wish to fly in domestic airspace, they must seek a “special airworthiness certificate.”Likewise, if public entities, including government agencies and public universities, would like to use drones, they must obtain a “certificate of authorization.” In the ensuring years, very few special airworthiness certificates have been issued to private companies, with most being given to defense contractors. Obtaining a certificate requires a rigorous showing of how the drone system is designed and constructed, including software development, control, and quality-assurance procedures. In general, neither the certificates of authorization nor the special airworthiness certificates are broad grants of permission: almost all are granted narrowly for specific times, locations, and operations. Although the 2007 policy statement indicated that the FAA would undertake a safety review of drones and provide new rules as a result, no rules were ever proposed. Frustrated by the FAA’s delay in promulgating comprehensive regulations, and recognizing the growing demand to use this technology, in 2012, Congress enacted the FAA Modernization and Reform Act (“FMRA”). The Act requires the FAA to devise a “comprehensive plan to safely accelerate the integration of civil unmanned aircraft systems into the national airspace” by September 2015. This plan must address public, civil, and commercial use of drones of all sizes, including those drones that are of the greatest interest to most people, including journalists — “small” drones, a category that encompasses any drone under 55 pounds. The Act mandates a series of deadlines to be met by the FAA. The agency has missed many of FMRA’s key deadlines. Last fall, the FAA belatedly issued a “Roadmap” for future regulations and a “Comprehensive Plan” for integrating drones into the national airspace. The FAA also named six drone test sites, which will serve as laboratories to assist in developing drone policies and technologies. At those sites, people will have the opportunity to conduct regional, weather, and purpose-specific research into how drones operate, with each site having a slightly different focus. Each of those sites is now operational. When the FAA announced the six test sites, it also issued privacy requirements for the sites. These requirements offered the FAA its first opportunity to wade into the privacy issues raised by drones. Many people submitted comments in anticipation of this development, with the comments ranging from calls for strict privacy regulations to contentions that nothing was needed because existing privacy laws were sufficient. At the end of the day, the FAA said its mission was safety and that it would not be “taking specific views on whether or how the federal government should regulate privacy or the scope of data that can be collected by” drones. Instead, the agency said that each site should issue its own policies and that operators must comply with local privacy laws. The FAA also said that if drone operations at the test sites “raise privacy concerns that are not adequately addressed by the Test Site’s privacy policies, elected officials can weigh the benefits and costs of additional privacy laws or regulations.” Privacy concerns have, unsurprisingly, captured the eye of elected federal officials. Several drone-related bills are pending in Congress. For example, the Preserving American Privacy Act would prohibit private drone operators from capturing data in “highly offensive” ways that would violate a reasonable expectation of privacy. Similarly, the Drone Aircraft Privacy and Transparency Act would require operators to submit a “data collection statement” to the FAA, delineating, among other things, what data will be collected, how the data will be used and retained, and whether the data would be sold to third parties. There also have been reports of plans to issue an executive order regarding privacy that would task the National Telecommunications and Information Administration with creating privacy guidelines for commercial drones. To date, the FAA still has not promulgated proposed rules on small drones. Originally slated for release in March 2011, a series of “unanticipated issues requiring further analysis” have pushed out the release date to Dec. 22, 2014. In the absence of formal rules, FAA enforcement has largely relied on the Advisory Circular on model aircraft, the 2005 memorandum, and the 2007 policy statement for its authority. For years, it has issued cease-and-desist letters to people and entities using drones domestically. Those letters reflect the FAA’s position that drones cannot be used for commercial purposes and that domestic drone operators must have one of the two certificates to fly. In issuing the letters, the FAA has grounded a wide array of drone operations, ranging from dry cleaners in Philadelphia to the Washington Nationals baseball team, and from journalism schools to an agricultural school. Interestingly, the FAA has construed news gathering to be a “commercial use,” sending cease-and-desist letters to media companies that have used drones in their reporting. The gaps and delays in regulation have not gone unnoticed, nor have the FAA’s cease-and-desist letters and its other enforcement efforts. Rather, each has precipitated lawsuits. We will review those lawsuits and other recent developments at the federal level in our next post.

### 2AC AT “Tech Doesn’t Solve”

#### Integration of drone technology is key to agriculture

The Economist, 12-4-2014, Free the drones," http://www.economist.com/news/leaders/21635489-drones-have-immense-commercial-potentialso-long-regulators-dont-try-tether-them, Accessed: 5-26-2015, /Bingham-MB

One immediate commercial use is surveying land cheaply and effectively. A drone can photograph a road to a resolution of 2cm, compared with the 30cm that a satellite offers—and it can do so at a third of the cost. Already farmers are using them to monitor crop growth, which in turn enables modern farm machinery to deliver exactly the right amount and type of fertiliser. In France, where the technology is widely used, farmers say drones boost revenues by €50 ($62) or so per hectare. Drones also improve safety: they can be used to do jobs, such as inspecting power lines, that currently require dangling a man from a helicopter. And they can deliver goods faster: DHL, a logistics firm, already uses a “parcelcopter” to deliver medicine to Juist, a small island off the coast of Germany.

#### They will revolutionize farming industry

Luke Runyon, 2-16-2015, As Rules Get Sorted Out, Drones May Transform Agriculture Industry," NPR.org, http://www.npr.org/sections/alltechconsidered/2015/02/16/385520242/as-rules-get-sorted-out-drones-may-transform-agriculture-industry, Accessed: 5-29-2015, /Bingham-MB

What makes the drone valuable to farmers is the camera on board. It snaps a high-resolution photo every two seconds. From there, Agribotix stitches the images together, sniffing out problem spots in the process. Knowing what's happening in a field can save a farmer money. At farm shows across the country, drones have become as ubiquitous as John Deere tractors. The Colorado Farm Show earlier this year included an informational session, telling farmers both the technical and legal challenges ahead. "I think it's a very exciting time," says farmer Darren Salvador, who grows 2,000 acres of wheat and corn near the Colorado-Nebraska border. "Can you look at areas of disease concern, insect concern, so now you can be more proactive and treat smaller areas and not treat the entire field," he says. Salvador and about 50 other farmers got an earful from Rory Paul, CEO of Volt Aerial Robotics, a St. Louis-based drone startup. "We really don't know what they're good for," Paul says. "We've got a few ideas of where they could really benefit agriculture. The majority of which are still theoretical."

#### Drones key to Agriculture

Bennett ’13 (Chris Bennett, Farm Press Blog, “Drones begin descent on US agriculture”, <http://westernfarmpress.com/blog/drones-begin-descent-us-agriculture>, February 12, 2013)

No one is laughing now. Once considered only a cut above remote-controlled toys, drones have proven their potency in Afghanistan and the Middle East, and manufacturers are eyeing U.S. agriculture as a tremendous market opportunity. Speaking to Wired magazine, Chris Mailey, vice president of the Association for Unmanned Vehicle Systems International (AUVSI), said, “Agriculture is gonna be the big market.” Wired reports that Japan used drones, or unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), to spray 30 percent of its rice fields in 2010. UAV technology is rapidly evolving and drones are already seeing limited use in the wine industry. In 2012, AirCover Integrated Solutions Corp., a California drone manufacturer, opened a plant in Carroll, Iowa. “UAVs can play a part in helping the American farmer lower costs and increase productivity. Unless an expensive helicopter is hired, or a flyby photo with a plane is done, farmers have limitations in assessing their crops until it’s time for harvest,” CEO James Hill told the Daily Times Herald. According to the Herald, the AirCover drones measure “about 2-1/2 feet by 2-1/2 feet and 3.7 pounds — are slightly larger than a seagull. The drones, managed from the ground by state-of-the-art computer systems, can climb 80 feet per second, or about four stories per second. They travel horizontally at 45 mph.” Drone use advocates for agriculture and other commercial industries will have to navigate through a minefield of privacy and legal issues. Lance Gooden, Texas state representative, has introduced a bill that with few exceptions, would ban the use of drones by private citizens — or state or federal law enforcement. WOAI reported the following: "These drones are going to get so cheap that soon you'll be able to buy your own drone at Best Buy," Gooden said. "You could park it a foot above the ground in your neighbor's back yard and film into their house. If someone wanted to film your children out playing by the pool and put that video on the Internet ... as creepy as that sounds." The Federal Aviation Administration, after getting swamped with thousands of drone applications from universities (with a heavy agricultural focus), law enforcement and private citizens, has a 2015 “deadline” to open up U.S. skies to civilian drones. The San Francisco Chronicle reports: "the drone makers have sought congressional help to speed their entry into a domestic market valued in the billions. The 60-member House of Representatives' "drone caucus" -- officially, the House Unmanned Systems Caucus -- has helped push that agenda." A host of industries are on hold to see what rules and regulations are finalized when concrete laws are laid down. The commercial industry market for drones is extremely difficult to gauge — but the potential is genuinely massive — measured in the billions. The New York Times puts the drone market value at $5.9 billion and growing: "The market for drones is valued at $5.9 billion and is expected to double in the next decade, according to industry figures. Drones can cost millions of dollars for the most sophisticated varieties to as little as $300 for one that can be piloted from an iPhone." Regardless of how good the drone technology is, the market scope and profit potential for agriculture will hinge on drone costs. Mailey believes farming and drones will be a fit, as he told Wired: “Spraying, watering — there’s a whole market for precision agriculture, and when you put that cost-benefit together, farmers will buy [drones].”

#### They’re key to precision farming

Griekspoor ’13 (P.J. Griekspoor, “Precision Agriculture Seen as Big Winner in Drone Technology”, <http://farmprogress.com/story-precision-agriculture-seen-big-winner-drone-technology-9-96113>, March 21, 2013)

The biggest thing on the horizon in precision agriculture is Unmanned Aerial Vehicle flights, according to a new report from the Association for Unmanned Vehicle Systems International. Kansas, already a leader in research on the vehicles that are expected to see explosive growth when integration into national airspace begins in 2015, ranks No. 7 among states likely to see economic benefits the report says, with the state expected to see a $2.9 billion impact and 3,700 new jobs between 2015 and 2025. The greatest area of growth indicated by the report will be in precision agriculture, which is slated to grow 10 times that of the public safety market for UAS. Precision agriculture use of UAS refers to two segments of the farm market: remote sensing used to scan plants for health problems, growth rates and hydration; and precision application of needed pesticides or nutrients in order to save money and reduce environmental impact. Aerial sensing with the hexacopter, can provide mapping of an entire section of land at 1-inch resolution in about 18 minutes – a task that would take hours if not days on a tractor.Aerial sensing with the hexacopter, can provide mapping of an entire section of land at 1-inch resolution in about 18 minutes – a task that would take hours if not days on a tractor. Members of the Kansas Ag Research and Technology Association got an upclose look at the work that is being done at Kansas State University by agronomy professor Kevin Price, who is working closely with Deon van der Merwe, head of the toxicology section at the K-State Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory. UAVs can help monitor crop conditions Van der Merwe is a remote-controlled aircraft enthusiast who is excited about the prospect of using UAVs, commonly referred to as drones, to detect blue-green algae blooms in bodies of water. Price brought two aircraft to the KARTA conference, a flying wing by RiteWingRC called the Zephyr II and a DJI S800 Spreading Wings hexacopter. Price said the promise of using the aircraft to do remote sensing to monitor crop condition, detect diseases and map fields for variable rate application of nutrients or pinpoint areas for fungicide or pesticide application, is huge. Aerial sensing with the hexacopter, for example, can provide mapping of an entire section of land at 1-inch resolution in about 18 minutes – a task that would take hours if not days on a tractor. You can read more about the K-State Unmanned Aerial Vehicle program in the March, 2013 Kansas Farmer magazine. Find it online at the Farm Progress website. Click on Magazine Online and go to Page 21. The entire AUVSI report on the economic prospects of unmanned vehicles can be found here.

### 2AC AT “Alt Causes”

#### They’re key to precision farming

Griekspoor ’13 (P.J. Griekspoor, “Precision Agriculture Seen as Big Winner in Drone Technology”, <http://farmprogress.com/story-precision-agriculture-seen-big-winner-drone-technology-9-96113>, March 21, 2013)

The biggest thing on the horizon in precision agriculture is Unmanned Aerial Vehicle flights, according to a new report from the Association for Unmanned Vehicle Systems International. Kansas, already a leader in research on the vehicles that are expected to see explosive growth when integration into national airspace begins in 2015, ranks No. 7 among states likely to see economic benefits the report says, with the state expected to see a $2.9 billion impact and 3,700 new jobs between 2015 and 2025. The greatest area of growth indicated by the report will be in precision agriculture, which is slated to grow 10 times that of the public safety market for UAS. Precision agriculture use of UAS refers to two segments of the farm market: remote sensing used to scan plants for health problems, growth rates and hydration; and precision application of needed pesticides or nutrients in order to save money and reduce environmental impact. Aerial sensing with the hexacopter, can provide mapping of an entire section of land at 1-inch resolution in about 18 minutes – a task that would take hours if not days on a tractor.Aerial sensing with the hexacopter, can provide mapping of an entire section of land at 1-inch resolution in about 18 minutes – a task that would take hours if not days on a tractor. Members of the Kansas Ag Research and Technology Association got an upclose look at the work that is being done at Kansas State University by agronomy professor Kevin Price, who is working closely with Deon van der Merwe, head of the toxicology section at the K-State Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory. UAVs can help monitor crop conditions Van der Merwe is a remote-controlled aircraft enthusiast who is excited about the prospect of using UAVs, commonly referred to as drones, to detect blue-green algae blooms in bodies of water. Price brought two aircraft to the KARTA conference, a flying wing by RiteWingRC called the Zephyr II and a DJI S800 Spreading Wings hexacopter. Price said the promise of using the aircraft to do remote sensing to monitor crop condition, detect diseases and map fields for variable rate application of nutrients or pinpoint areas for fungicide or pesticide application, is huge. Aerial sensing with the hexacopter, for example, can provide mapping of an entire section of land at 1-inch resolution in about 18 minutes – a task that would take hours if not days on a tractor. You can read more about the K-State Unmanned Aerial Vehicle program in the March, 2013 Kansas Farmer magazine. Find it online at the Farm Progress website. Click on Magazine Online and go to Page 21. The entire AUVSI report on the economic prospects of unmanned vehicles can be found here.

#### Status quo agriculture is unsustainable- precision is key to prevent collapse

**Watrous 5-23**-13 [Graciela, researcher at the Jonikas Lab at Princeton University’s Department of Plant Biology, “The Promise of Precision Agriculture,” <http://www.stanforddaily.com/2013/05/23/the-promise-of-precision-agriculture/>]

No matter where it is practiced in the world, agriculture relies heavily on water and soil quality. We are in the process of exhausting both.¶ The collapse of water and soil quality takes many forms globally: over-fertilization in Asia, nutrient depletion in American soil, exorbitant draining from the Ogallala aquifer in the western US and high salinity of water in Africa. Climate change is surely exacerbating this problem, shifting weight in the ever-precarious balancing act between what man does and what man can sustain. As most people know, the United States suffered a severe drought this past year that may end up costing this country more taxpayer dollars than any other natural disaster in the history of America. More of these sorts of events are on their way.¶ Around the globe, climate change will upset traditional forms of agriculture. For example, increasing temperatures will affect developing nations in which the majority of agriculture is rain-fed. Adaptation to a more sporadic and extreme weather system will almost certainly be necessary. CGIAR, for instance, released a 2012 study stating that agriculture was responsible for 30 percent of greenhouse gas emissions, most of which comes from developed nations.¶ In order to combat these changes, agriculture (especially in developed nations) should bring itself up to date technologically, taking advantage of the internet and advancements in weather-tracking technology and positioning monitors. Luckily, this form of agriculture already exists: it’s called “precision agriculture.”¶ Precision agriculture is the use of modern technology to create a more efficient and site-specific form of agriculture. It aims to optimize farm inputs, improve efficiency and reduce pollution destructive to the environment. Technologies traditionally used in this form of agriculture include GPS, GIS and Variable Rate Treatment (VRT).¶ This technology takes several forms and serves many different purposes. Most improve efficiency and therefore have the potential to reduce the use of exhaustible resources and greenhouse gas emissions. Forms of precision agriculture technology can communicate when and which fields need to be watered and when they don’t, as well as when fields need to be fertilized or not. It can categorize soil with a level of detail that allows a farmer to plant certain crops in certain areas that, given this new information, he knows will grow well there. These technologies can monitor crop yields and space the seeds efficiently in fields to grow as much food per acre as possible for a given plant. All this can lead to less water and pesticide use, which, in turn, can reduce things like the hypoxic zone in the Gulf of Mexico.¶ In 2006, 45 percent of corn and soy acres in the US used yield monitors, which are often the first form of precision technology that farmers adopt. A USDA-initiated study showed that corn and soy yields were significantly higher for farmers that adopted this technology and that, overall, these same farmers had reduced fuel costs and use for these acres. The United States uses almost all of its available arable land for crop production, and the rest of the world is increasingly doing the same. Forest is being converted to cropland to meet food demand and that demand will only increase as the world population grows to over 9 billion people in the next 40 years. While it is true that out current agricultural system produces enough food to feed the people of the planet, and that hunger is in many ways a distribution issue, that doesn’t mean we shouldn’t be concerned with using land area as efficiently as possible, which precision agriculture can help us do.¶ But of course there are some costs to implementing this technology, both in the U.S. and abroad. The first is that capital costs are high. The technology, given that it is all relatively new, can be extremely expensive and does not necessarily pay itself off right away. For technologies that monitor input-to-output ratios, it may take years for the machines to collect enough data before a farmer can change his practices to more efficient ones.¶ Furthermore, these technologies are not always the most user-friendly, and it may be hard for farmers to understand the implications of the data. Implementing this technology can only be part of the answer; it can only reduce greenhouse gas emissions by so much and it can only save so much of these limited resources. While precision agriculture should be part of the answer, it does not solve these problems completely.¶ No matter the strength of the sustainable agricultural movement in the U.S., which often advocates for a more localized agriculture system, it is likely that large-scale, industrial farming will continue to make up the majority of agriculture in this country. Given that fact, I think it’s important that we make this system as sustainable as possible. Precision agriculture seems to be on the right track.

#### Precision agriculture is make-or-break for farming

**Gonzalez ’13** [Sarah, associated editor for AgriPulse, cum laude graduate in journalism with a biology minor from Iowa State University, “Data analysis, biotech are key in agriculture's future sustainability,” <http://www.agri-pulse.com/ag-issues-biotech-future-22613.asp>]

In fact, the entire agriculture industry is currently moving into a “data-centric” era, said David Nicholson, head of Bayer's Research and Development, during the forum. ¶ Using the information gained from technology in a way that helps agriculture achieve the required 70 percent increase in productivity is the key to success or failure, he said. Precision agriculture, in particular, is the focus of this data-driven era allowing the farmer to know what to grow and where to grow it for the best results.¶ “When we think of the farmer of the future we see a grower as CEO,” said David Hollinrake, Bayer's Vice President of Agriculture Commercial Operations Marketing, adding that farming will increasingly become a business investment instead of a lifestyle or family choice. “We want to be able to participate as an enabler of using data as precision tools.”

#### US ag key to prevent extinction

Lugar 2K (Richard Lugar, US Senator from Indiana, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and a member and former chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, 2000)

In a world confronted by global terrorism, turmoil in the Middle East, burgeoning nuclear threats and other crises, it is easy to lose sight of the long-range challenges. But we do so at our peril. One of the most daunting of them is meeting the world’s need for food and energy in this century. At stake is not only preventing starvation and saving the environment, but also world peace and security. History tells us that states may go to war over access to resources, and that poverty and famine have often bred fanaticism and terrorism. Working to feed the world will minimize factors that contribute to global instability and the proliferation of [WMDs] weapons of mass destruction. With the world population expected to grow from 6 billion people today to 9 billion by mid-century, the demand for affordable food will increase well beyond current international production levels. People in rapidly developing nations will have the means greatly to improve their standard of living and caloric intake. Inevitably, that means eating more meat. This will raise demand for feed grain at the same time that the growing world population will need vastly more basic food to eat. Complicating a solution to this problem is a dynamic that must be better understood in the West: developing countries often use limited arable land to expand cities to house their growing populations. As good land disappears, people destroy timber resources and even rainforests as they try to create more arable land to feed themselves. The long-term environmental consequences could be disastrous for the entire globe. Productivity revolution To meet the expected demand for food over the next 50 years, we in the United States will have to grow roughly three times more food on the land we have. That’s a tall order. My farm in Marion County, Indiana, for example, yields on average 8.3 to 8.6 tonnes of corn per hectare – typical for a farm in central Indiana. To triple our production by 2050, we will have to produce an annual average of 25 tonnes per hectare. Can we possibly boost output that much? Well, it’s been done before. Advances in the use of fertilizer and water, improved machinery and better tilling techniques combined to generate a threefold increase in yields since 1935 – on our farm back then, my dad produced 2.8 to 3 tonnes per hectare. Much US agriculture has seen similar increases. But of course there is no guarantee that we can achieve those results again. Given the urgency of expanding food production to meet world demand, we must invest much more in scientific research and target that money toward projects that promise to have significant national and global impact. For the United States, that will mean a major shift in the way we conduct and fund agricultural science. Fundamental research will generate the innovations that will be necessary to feed the world. The United States can take a leading position in a productivity revolution. And our success at increasing food production may play a decisive humanitarian role in the survival of billions of people and the health of our planet.

#### US key to global supplies- causes starvation, wars, and extinction

Klare ‘12 (Michael, Hampshire College security studies professor, defense correspondent of The Nation magazine, serves on the boards of directors of Human Rights Watch, and the Arms Control Association, “As Food Prices Rise, Dangers of Social Unrest Seem Imminent,” August 9, 2012)

The Great Drought of 2012 has yet to come to an end, but we already know that its consequences will be severe. With more than one-half of America’s counties designated as drought disaster areas, the 2012 harvest of corn, soybeans, and other food staples is guaranteed to fall far short of predictions. This, in turn, will boost food prices domestically and abroad, causing increased misery for farmers and low-income Americans and far greater hardship for poor people in countries that rely on imported U.S. grains. This, however, is just the beginning of the likely consequences: If history is any guide, rising food prices of this sort will also lead to widespread social unrest and violent conflict. Food—affordable food—is essential to human survival and well-being. Take that away, and people become anxious, desperate, and angry. In the United States, food represents only about 13 percent of the average household budget, a relatively small share, so a boost in food prices in 2013 will probably not prove overly taxing for most middle—and upper-income families. It could, however, produce considerable hardship for poor and unemployed Americans with limited resources. “You are talking about a real bite out of family budgets,” commented Ernie Gross, an agricultural economist at Omaha’s Creighton University. This could add to the discontent already evident in depressed and high-unemployment areas, perhaps prompting an intensified backlash against incumbent politicians and other forms of dissent and unrest. It is in the international arena, however, that the Great Drought is likely to have its most devastating effects. Because so many nations depend on grain imports from the U.S. to supplement their own harvests, and because intense drought and floods are damaging crops elsewhere as well, food supplies are expected to shrink and prices to rise across the planet. “What happens to the U.S. supply has immense impact around the world,” says Robert Thompson, a food expert at the Chicago Council on Global Affairs. As the crops most affected by the drought, corn and soybeans, disappear from world markets, he noted, the price of all grains, including wheat, is likely to soar, causing immense hardship to those who already have trouble affording enough food to feed their families. The Hunger Games, 2007-2011 What happens next is, of course, impossible to predict, but if the recent past is any guide, it could turn ugly. In 2007-2008, when rice, corn, and wheat experienced prices hikes of 100 percent or more, sharply higher prices—especially for bread—sparked “food riots” in more than two dozen countries, including Bangladesh, Cameroon, Egypt, Haiti, Indonesia, Senegal, and Yemen. In Haiti, the rioting became so violent and public confidence in the government’s ability to address the problem dropped so precipitously that the Haitian Senate voted to oust the country’s prime minister, Jacques-Édouard Alexis. In other countries, angry protestors clashed with army and police forces, leaving scores dead. Those price increases of 2007-2008 were largely attributed to the soaring cost of oil, which made food production more expensive. (Oil’s use is widespread in farming operations, irrigation, food delivery, and pesticide manufacture.) At the same time, increasing amounts of cropland worldwide were being diverted from food crops to the cultivation of plants used in making biofuels. The next price spike in 2010-11 was, however, closely associated with climate change. An intense drought gripped much of eastern Russia during the summer of 2010, reducing the wheat harvest in that breadbasket region by one-fifth and prompting Moscow to ban all wheat exports. Drought also hurt China’s grain harvest, while intense flooding destroyed much of Australia’s wheat crop. Together with other extreme-weather-related effects, these disasters sent wheat prices soaring by more than 50 percent and the price of most food staples by 32 percent. Once again, a surge in food prices resulted in widespread social unrest, this time concentrated in North Africa and the Middle East. The earliest protests arose over the cost of staples in Algeria and then Tunisia, where—no coincidence—the precipitating event was a young food vendor, Mohamed Bouazizi, setting himself on fire to protest government harassment. Anger over rising food and fuel prices combined with long-simmering resentments about government repression and corruption sparked what became known as the Arab Spring. The rising cost of basic staples, especially a loaf of bread, was also a cause of unrest in Egypt, Jordan, and Sudan. Other factors, notably anger at entrenched autocratic regimes, may have proved more powerful in those places, but as the author of Tropic of Chaos, Christian Parenti, wrote, “The initial trouble was traceable, at least in part, to the price of that loaf of bread.” As for the current drought, analysts are already warning of instability in Africa, where corn is a major staple, and of increased popular unrest in China, where food prices are expected to rise at a time of growing hardship for that country’s vast pool of low-income, migratory workers and poor peasants. Higher food prices in the U.S. and China could also lead to reduced consumer spending on other goods, further contributing to the slowdown in the global economy and producing yet more worldwide misery, with unpredictable social consequences. The Hunger Games, 2012-? If this was just one bad harvest, occurring in only one country, the world would undoubtedly absorb the ensuing hardship and expect to bounce back in the years to come. Unfortunately, it’s becoming evident that the Great Drought of 2012 is not a one-off event in a single heartland nation, but rather an inevitable consequence of global warming which is only going to intensify. As a result, we can expect not just more bad years of extreme heat, but worse years, hotter and more often, and not just in the United States, but globally for the indefinite future. Until recently, most scientists were reluctant to blame particular storms or droughts on global warming. Now, however, a growing number of scientists believe that such links can be demonstrated in certain cases. In one recent study focused on extreme weather events in 2011, for instance, climate specialists at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and Great Britain’s National Weather Service concluded that human-induced climate change has made intense heat waves of the kind experienced in Texas in 2011 more likely than ever before. Published in the Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, it reported that global warming had ensured that the incidence of that Texas heat wave was 20 times more likely than it would have been in 1960; similarly, abnormally warm temperatures like those experienced in Britain last November were said to be 62 times as likely because of global warming. It is still too early to apply the methodology used by these scientists to calculating the effect of global warming on the heat waves of 2012, which are proving to be far more severe, but we can assume the level of correlation will be high. And what can we expect in the future, as the warming gains momentum? When we think about climate change (if we think about it at all), we envision rising temperatures, prolonged droughts, freakish storms, hellish wildfires, and rising sea levels. Among other things, this will result in damaged infrastructure and diminished food supplies. These are, of course, manifestations of warming in the physical world, not the social world we all inhabit and rely on for so many aspects of our daily well-being and survival. The purely physical effects of climate change will, no doubt, prove catastrophic. But the social effects including, somewhere down the line, food riots, mass starvation, state collapse, mass migrations, and conflicts of every sort, up to and including full-scale war, could prove even more disruptive and deadly. In her immensely successful young-adult novel, The Hunger Games (and the movie that followed), Suzanne Collins riveted millions with a portrait of a dystopian, resource-scarce, post-apocalyptic future where once-rebellious “districts” in an impoverished North America must supply two teenagers each year for a series of televised gladiatorial games that end in death for all but one of the youthful contestants. These “hunger games” are intended as recompense for the damage inflicted on the victorious capitol of Panem by the rebellious districts during an insurrection. Without specifically mentioning global warming, Collins makes it clear that climate change was significantly responsible for the hunger that shadows the North American continent in this future era. Hence, as the gladiatorial contestants are about to be selected, the mayor of District 12’s principal city describes “the disasters, the droughts, the storms, the fires, the encroaching seas that swallowed up so much of the land [and] the brutal war for what little sustenance remained.” In this, Collins was prescient, even if her specific vision of the violence on which such a world might be organized is fantasy. While we may never see her version of those hunger games, do not doubt that some version of them will come into existence—that, in fact, hunger wars of many sorts will fill our future. These could include any combination or permutation of the deadly riots that led to the 2008 collapse of Haiti’s government, the pitched battles between massed protesters and security forces that engulfed parts of Cairo as the Arab Spring developed, the ethnic struggles over disputed croplands and water sources that have made Darfur a recurring headline of horror in our world, or the inequitable distribution of agricultural land that continues to fuel the insurgency of the Maoist-inspired Naxalites of India. Combine such conflicts with another likelihood: that persistent drought and hunger will force millions of people to abandon their traditional lands and flee to the squalor of shantytowns and expanding slums surrounding large cities, sparking hostility from those already living there. One such eruption, with grisly results, occurred in Johannesburg’s shantytowns in 2008 when desperately poor and hungry migrants from Malawi and Zimbabwe were set upon, beaten, and in some cases burned to death by poor South Africans. One terrified Zimbabwean, cowering in a police station from the raging mobs, said she fled her country because “there is no work and no food.” And count on something else: millions more in the coming decades, pressed by disasters ranging from drought and flood to rising sea levels, will try to migrate to other countries, provoking even greater hostility. And that hardly begins to exhaust the possibilities that lie in our hunger-games future. At this point, the focus is understandably on the immediate consequences of the still ongoing Great Drought: dying crops, shrunken harvests, and rising food prices. But keep an eye out for the social and political effects that undoubtedly won’t begin to show up here or globally until later this year or 2013. Better than any academic study, these will offer us a hint of what we can expect in the coming decades from a hunger-games world of rising temperatures, persistent droughts, recurring food shortages, and billions of famished, desperate people.

### 2AC AT “No Biodiversity Impact”

#### Biodiversity collapse causes extinction

Young ‘10 (PhD coastal marine ecology, 10 [Ruth, “Biodiversity: what it is and why it’s important”, February 9th, <http://www.talkingnature.com/2010/02/biodiversity/biodiversity-what-and-why/>]

Different species within ecosystems fill particular roles, they all have a function, they all have a niche. They interact with each other and the physical environment to provide ecosystem services that are vital for our survival. For example plant species convert carbon dioxide (CO2) from the atmosphere and energy from the sun into useful things such as food, medicines and timber. Pollination carried out by insects such as bees enables the [production of ⅓ of our food crops](http://www.talkingnature.com/2010/01/biodiversity/bees-pollination/%22%20%5Ct%20%22_self%22%20%5Co%20%22Pollination%20a%20diverse%20ecosystem%20service). Diverse mangrove and coral reef ecosystems provide a wide variety of habitats that are essential for many fishery species. To make it simpler for economists to comprehend the magnitude of services offered by biodiversity, a team of researchers estimated their value – it amounted to $US33 trillion per year. “By protecting biodiversity we maintain ecosystem services” Certain species play a “keystone” role in maintaining ecosystem services. Similar to the removal of a keystone from an arch, the removal of these species can result in the collapse of an ecosystem and the subsequent removal of ecosystem services. The most well known example of this occurred during the 19th century when sea otters were almost hunted to extinction by fur traders along the west coast of the USA. This led to a population explosion in the sea otters’ main source of prey, sea urchins. Because the urchins graze on kelp their booming population decimated the underwater kelp forests. This loss of habitat led to declines in local fish populations. Sea otters are a keystone species once hunted for their fur (Image: Mike Baird) Eventually a treaty protecting sea otters allowed the numbers of otters to increase which inturn controlled the urchin population, leading to the recovery of the kelp forests and fish stocks. In other cases, ecosystem services are maintained by entire functional groups, such as apex predators (See [Jeremy Hance’s post at Mongabay)](http://news.mongabay.com/2010/0202-hance_toppredators.html). During the last 35 years, over fishing of large shark species along the US Atlantic coast has led to a population explosion of skates and rays. These skates and rays eat bay scallops and their out of control population has led to the closure of a century long scallop fishery. These are just two examples demonstrating how biodiversity can maintain the services that ecosystems provide for us, such as fisheries. One could argue that to maintain ecosystem services we don’t need to protect biodiversity but rather, we only need to protect the species and functional groups that fill thekeystone roles. However, there are a *couple of problems with this idea*. First of all, for most ecosystems we don’t know which species are the keystones! Ecosystems *are so complex* that we are still discovering which species play vital roles in maintaining them. In some cases its *groups of species* not just one species that are *vital for the ecosystem*. Second, even if we did complete the enormous task of identifying and protecting all keystone species, what back-up plan would we have if an unforseen event (e.g. pollution or disease) led to the demise of these ‘keystone’ species? Would there be another species to save the day and take over this role? Classifying some species as ‘keystone’ implies that the others are not important. This may lead to the non-keystone species being considered ecologically worthless and subsequently over-exploited. Sometimes we may not even know which species are likely to fill the keystone roles. An example of this was discovered on Australia’s Great Barrier Reef. This research examined what would happen to a coral reef if it were over-fished. The “over-fishing” was simulated by fencing off coral bommies thereby excluding and removing fish from them for three years. By the end of the experiment, the reefs had changed from a coral to an algae dominated ecosystem – the coral became overgrown with algae. When the time came to remove the fences the researchers expected herbivorous species of fish like the parrot fish (Scarus spp.) to eat the algae and enable the reef to switch back to a coral dominated ecosystem. But, surprisingly, the shift back to coral was driven by a supposed ‘unimportant’ species – the bat fish (Platax pinnatus). The bat fish was previously thought to feed on invertebrates – small crabs and shrimp, but when offered a big patch of algae it turned into a hungry herbivore – a cow of the sea – grazing the algae in no time. So a fish previously thought to be ‘unimportant’ is actually a keystone species in the recovery of coral reefs overgrown by algae! *Who knows how many other species are out there with unknown ecosystem roles!* In some cases it’s easy to see who the keystone species are but in many ecosystems seemingly unimportant or redundant species are also capable of changing niches and maintaining ecosystems. The more biodiverse an ecosystem is, the more likely these species will be present and the more resilient an ecosystem is to future impacts. Presently we’re only scratching the surface of understanding the full importance of biodiversity and how it helps maintain ecosystem function. The scope of this task is immense. In the meantime*,* a wise insurance policy for maintaining ecosystem services would be to conserve biodiversity. In doing so, we increase the chance of maintaining our ecosystem services in the event of future impacts such as disease, invasive species and of course, climate change. This is the international year of biodiversity – a time to recognize that biodiversity makes our survival on this planet possible and that our protection of biodiversity maintains this service.

#### Ecosystem collapse causes extinction

**Coyne and Hoekstra ‘7** [Jerry and Hopi, professor in the Department of Ecology and Evolution at the University of Chicago and Associate Professor in the Department of Organismic and Evolutionary Biology at Harvard University, “The Greatest Dying,” 9/24, <http://www.truthout.org/article/jerry-coyne-and-hopi-e-hoekstra-the-greatest-dying>]

But it isn't just the destruction of the rainforests that should trouble us. Healthy ecosystems the world over provide hidden services like waste disposal, nutrient cycling, soil formation, water purification, and oxygen production. Such services are best rendered by ecosystems that are diverse. Yet, through both intention and accident, humans have introduced exotic species that turn biodiversity into monoculture. Fast-growing zebra mussels, for example, have outcompeted more than 15 species of native mussels in North America's Great Lakes and have damaged harbors and water-treatment plants. Native prairies are becoming dominated by single species (often genetically homogenous) of corn or wheat. Thanks to these developments, soils will erode and become unproductive - which, along with temperature change, will diminish agricultural yields. Meanwhile, with increased pollution and runoff, as well as reduced forest cover, ecosystems will no longer be able to purify water; and a shortage of clean water spells disaster. In many ways, oceans are the most vulnerable areas of all. As overfishing eliminates major predators, while polluted and warming waters kill off phytoplankton, the intricate aquatic food web could collapse from both sides. Fish, on which so many humans depend, will be a fond memory. As phytoplankton vanish, so does the ability of the oceans to absorb carbon dioxide and produce oxygen. (Half of the oxygen we breathe is made by phytoplankton, with the rest coming from land plants.) Species extinction is also imperiling coral reefs - a major problem since these reefs have far more than recreational value: They provide tremendous amounts of food for human populations and buffer coastlines against erosion. In fact, the global value of "hidden" services provided by ecosystems - those services, like waste disposal, that aren't bought and sold in the marketplace - has been estimated to be as much as $50 trillion per year, roughly equal to the gross domestic product of all countries combined. And that doesn't include tangible goods like fish and timber. Life as we know it would be impossible if ecosystems collapsed. Yet that is where we're heading if species extinction continues at its current pace. Extinction also has a huge impact on medicine. Who really cares if, say, a worm in the remote swamps of French Guiana goes extinct? Well, those who suffer from cardiovascular disease. The recent discovery of a rare South American leech has led to the isolation of a powerful enzyme that, unlike other anticoagulants, not only prevents blood from clotting but also dissolves existing clots. And it's not just this one species of worm: Its wriggly relatives have evolved other biomedically valuable proteins, including antistatin (a potential anticancer agent), decorsin and ornatin (platelet aggregation inhibitors), and hirudin (another anticoagulant). Plants, too, are pharmaceutical gold mines. The bark of trees, for example, has given us quinine (the first cure for malaria), taxol (a drug highly effective against ovarian and breast cancer), and aspirin. More than a quarter of the medicines on our pharmacy shelves were originally derived from plants. The sap of the Madagascar periwinkle contains more than 70 useful alkaloids, including vincristine, a powerful anticancer drug that saved the life of one of our friends. Of the roughly 250,000 plant species on Earth, fewer than 5 percent have been screened for pharmaceutical properties. Who knows what life-saving drugs remain to be discovered? Given current extinction rates, it's estimated that we're losing one valuable drug every two years. Our arguments so far have tacitly assumed that species are worth saving only in proportion to their economic value and their effects on our quality of life, an attitude that is strongly ingrained, especially in Americans. That is why conservationists always base their case on an economic calculus. But we biologists know in our hearts that there are deeper and equally compelling reasons to worry about the loss of biodiversity: namely, simple morality and intellectual values that transcend pecuniary interests. What, for example, gives us the right to destroy other creatures? And what could be more thrilling than looking around us, seeing that we are surrounded by our evolutionary cousins, and realizing that we all got here by the same simple process of natural selection? To biologists, and potentially everyone else, apprehending the genetic kinship and common origin of all species is a spiritual experience - not necessarily religious, but spiritual nonetheless, for it stirs the soul. But, whether or not one is moved by such concerns, it is certain that our future is bleak if we do nothing to stem this sixth extinction. We are creating a world in which exotic diseases flourish but natural medicinal cures are lost; a world in which carbon waste accumulates while food sources dwindle; a world of sweltering heat, failing crops, and impure water. In the end, we must accept the possibility that we ourselves are not immune to extinction. Or, if we survive, perhaps only a few of us will remain, scratching out a grubby existence on a devastated planet. Global warming will seem like a secondary problem when humanity finally faces the consequences of what we have done to nature: not just another Great Dying, but perhaps the greatest dying of them all.

#### US ecosystems are globally important- unparalleled biodiverse regions

**NatureServe ‘2** [NatureServe is a non-profit organization dedicated to providing the scientific knowledge that forms the basis for effective conservation action “States of the Union: Ranking America’s Biodiversity,” April 2002, http://www.natureserve.org/library/stateofunions.pdf]

Pride in place is a powerful impulse. And with its dazzling array of wild species and natural habitats, America has much to be proud of. Indeed, to find world-class biodiversity we need not look to foreign shores—it is right here in our own backyard. But while the concept of biodiversity has global connotations, conservation is a quintessentially local activity. To place conservation efforts in context, States of the Union: Ranking America’s Biodiversity offers new information on state patterns of biological wealth and risk—where our wild plants and animals are found, and how they are faring. Each of America’s 50 states maintains an important part of the nation’s biological heritage. Taking best advantage of conservation opportunities, however, requires an understanding of the varying roles each state can play. States of the Union offers a striking picture of the “state of the states,” based on an analysis of more than 21,000 plant and animal species. Providing new insights into the scale of the nation’s conservation challenges and opportunities, these analyses find that in one out of every four states, more than ten percent of native species are at risk. Our rankings of the 50 states and the District of Columbia focus on several key biological characteristics: diversity of species; levels of rarity and risk; distinctiveness of the flora and fauna, termed endemism; and number of species already lost to extinction. The top-ranking states for these measures are: RANK DIVERSITY RISK ENDEMISM EXTINCTIONS 1 California Hawaii California Hawaii 2 Texas California Hawaii Alabama 3 Arizona Nevada Texas California 4 New Mexico Alabama Florida Texas 5 Alabama Utah Utah Georgia Four states in particular emerge from these analyses as having exceptional levels of biodiversity—California, Hawaii, Texas, and Alabama. Looking at specific groups of plants and animals, however, reveals some surprising nuances. For instance, while freshwater fishes are most diverse in the rain-drenched southeastern United States, Arizona—a state more commonly associated with cacti—leads the nation in proportion of at-risk fish species. The condition of nature in America reflects an interplay between natural history and human history. And it is the breadth and intensity of this interaction that tends to define a geography of risk for wild species. As States of the Union demonstrates, each state has a vital role to play in sustaining America’s plants and animals for future generations. But for the many U.S. species that are at risk of extinction, time is running out. With sufficient knowledge, resources, and commitment, the nation’s remarkable biodiversity can be safeguarded, leading to a more perfect union. State of the States State of the States The United States harbors a dazzling variety of life. From Maine’s Great North Woods to California’s giant redwoods, and from Hawaii’s tropical peaks to the Florida Everglades’ “river of grass,” the 50 states feature an unparalleled spectrum of wild places and wild species. While efforts to protect America’s natural treasures began in earnest more than 130 years ago with the establishment of Yellowstone National Park, the pace of environmental change over recent decades has sparked a renewed commitment to conserving our remaining natural lands and waters. As a nation we have also achieved a deeper understanding of the complexity and fragility of our ecosystems, and for the wild species they sustain. Even the term biodiversity, which celebrates a scientifically inclusive view of life on Earth, was coined within the past two decades. This improved understanding is proving essential for increasing the effectiveness of conservation efforts and for targeting actions towards areas of greatest ecological significance. Although the concept of biodiversity has global connotations, conservation is a quintessentially local activity. To place these conservation efforts in context, States of the Union: Ranking America’s Biodiversity offers new information on state patterns of biological wealth and risk—where our wild plants and animals are found, and how they are faring. We rank the 50 states and the District of Columbia based on analyses of several key species measures: diversity, risk, endemism, and extinctions. This newly updated information from NatureServe’s scientific databases offers a striking picture of the state of the states. Riches in Our Backyard Riches in Our Backyard Two years ago NatureServe and The Nature Conservancy published a comprehensive assessment of the condition of America’s biological riches in the book Precious Heritage: The Status of Biodiversity in the United States. 1 This critically acclaimed volume documented the full breadth and complexity of life in America, and considered what will be needed to protect these living resources into the future. Key findings from that study include: • Scientist have documented more than 200,000 species from the United States, representing more than 10% of formally described species worldwide. • The United States is a global center of diversity for many groups of organisms, especially those that rely on aquatic systems such as salamanders, freshwater mussels, and freshwater turtles. • About one-third of species in the best-known groups of plants and animals are at risk, and more than 500 U.S. species are already extinct or are missing. • Habitat destruction and degradation are the leading threats to U.S. biodiversity, followed by the spread of harmful alien species. Wild plants and animals are not distributed uniformly across the landscape, but rather concentrations of species are found in certain regions, termed biodiversity hotspots. Nonetheless, important species and ecosystems are found across the country, and each state has a crucial role to play in efforts to protect the nation’s rich biological heritage. By considering the distribution and condition of more than 21,000 plant and animal species—2,200 more than were included in our previous analyses—States of the Union provides new insights into the scale of the nation’s conservation challenges and opportunities.

### 2AC AT “No Food Wars”

#### Food wars go nuclear

Brown ‘9 [Lester R., United States environmental analyst, founder of the Worldwatch Institute, and founder and president of the Earth Policy Institute, a nonprofit research organization based in Washington, D.C., recipient of 26 honorary degrees and a MacArthur Fellowship, Brown has been described by the Washington Post as "one of the world's most influential thinkers,” has been the recipient of many prizes and awards, including, the 1987 United Nations Environment Prize, the 1989 World Wide Fund for Nature Gold Medal, and the 1994 Blue Planet Prize for his "contributions to solving global environmental problems,” “Can Food Shortages Bring Down Civilization?” Scientific American, May]

The biggest threat to global stability is the potential for food crises in poor countries to cause government collapse. Those crises are brought on by ever worsening environmental degradation One of the toughest things for people to do is to anticipate sudden change. Typically we project the future by extrapolating from trends in the past. Much of the time this approach works well. But sometimes it fails spectacularly, and people are simply blindsided by events such as today's economic crisis. For most of us, the idea that civilization itself could disintegrate probably seems preposterous. Who would not find it hard to think seriously about such a complete departure from what we expect of ordinary life? What evidence could make us heed a warning so dire--and how would we go about responding to it? We are so inured to a long list of highly unlikely catastrophes that we are virtually programmed to dismiss them all with a wave of the hand: Sure, our civilization might devolve into chaos--and Earth might collide with an asteroid, too! For many years I have studied global agricultural, population, environmental and economic trends and their interactions. The combined effects of those trends and the political tensions they generate point to the breakdown of governments and societies. Yet I, too, have resisted the idea that food shortages could bring down not only individual governments but also our global civilization. I can no longer ignore that risk. Our continuing failure to deal with the environmental declines that are undermining the world food economy--most important, falling water tables, eroding soils and rising temperatures--forces me to conclude that such a collapse is possible. The Problem of Failed States Even a cursory look at the vital signs of our current world order lends unwelcome support to my conclusion. And those of us in the environmental field are well into our third decade of charting trends of environmental decline without seeing any significant effort to reverse a single one. In six of the past nine years world grain production has fallen short of consumption, forcing a steady drawdown in stocks. When the 2008 harvest began, world carryover stocks of grain (the amount in the bin when the new harvest begins) were at 62 days of consumption, a near record low. In response, world grain prices in the spring and summer of last year climbed to the highest level ever. As demand for food rises faster than supplies are growing, the resulting food-price inflation puts severe stress on the governments of countries already teetering on the edge of chaos. Unable to buy grain or grow their own, hungry people take to the streets. Indeed, even before the steep climb in grain prices in 2008, the number of failing states was expanding [see sidebar at left]. Many of their problem's stem from a failure to slow the growth of their populations. But if the food situation continues to deteriorate, entire nations will break down at an ever increasing rate. We have entered a new era in geopolitics. In the 20th century the main threat to international security was superpower conflict; today it is failing states. It is not the concentration of power but its absence that puts us at risk. States fail when national governments can no longer provide personal security, food security and basic social services such as education and health care. They often lose control of part or all of their territory. When governments lose their monopoly on power, law and order begin to disintegrate. After a point, countries can become so dangerous that food relief workers are no longer safe and their programs are halted; in Somalia and Afghanistan, deteriorating conditions have already put such programs in jeopardy. Failing states are of international concern because they are a source of terrorists, drugs, weapons and refugees, threatening political stability everywhere. Somalia, number one on the 2008 list of failing states, has become a base for piracy. Iraq, number five, is a hotbed for terrorist training. Afghanistan, number seven, is the world's leading supplier of heroin. Following the massive genocide of 1994 in Rwanda, refugees from that troubled state, thousands of armed soldiers among them, helped to destabilize neighboring Democratic Republic of the Congo (number six). Our global civilization depends on a functioning network of politically healthy nation-states to control the spread of infectious disease, to manage the international monetary system, to control international terrorism and to reach scores of other common goals. If the system for controlling infectious diseases--such as polio, SARS or avian flu--breaks down, humanity will be in trouble. Once states fail, no one assumes responsibility for their debt to outside lenders. If enough states disintegrate, their fall will threaten the stability of global civilization itself.

#### Best studies prove food war goes nuclear

Gary Kleyn, 25 May 2012, WA State Director at Australian Christians, Research Manager at Future Directions International “International Conflict Triggers and Potential Conflict Points Resulting from Food and Water Insecurity,” http://www.futuredirections.org.au/files/Workshop\_Report\_-\_Intl\_Conflict\_Triggers\_-\_May\_25.pdf

A study by the International Peace Research Institute indicates that where food security is an issue, it is more likely to result in some form of conflict. Darfur, Rwanda, Eritrea and the Balkans experienced such wars. Governments, especially in developed countries, are increasingly aware of this phenomenon. **The UK Ministry of Defence, the CIA**, the US Center for Strategic and International Studies ¶ and the Oslo Peace Research Institute, **all identify famine as a** potential **trigger for conflicts and** possibly even **nuclear war**.