# Drones Neg – Novice

## Privacy Advantage

### 1NC – Privacy

#### 1. No privacy violations—agencies can self check

Phil Mattingly, 6-19-2013, FBI Uses Drones in Domestic Surveillance, Mueller Says," Bloomberg, https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2013-06-19/fbi-uses-drones-in-domestic-sureillance-mueller-says /Bingham-MB

The Federal Aviation Administration estimates there may be about 10,000 active commercial drones in five years. Bills have been introduced in at least 18 states to limit or regulate such aircraft, according to the National Conference of State Legislatures. The FBI only uses unmanned aerial vehicles when there’s a specific operational need to conduct surveillance on stationary objects, said a U.S. law enforcement official briefed on their use. The bureau must first get FAA approval, said the official, who asked not to be identified discussing internal procedures. Drone Use The FBI used a drone at a hostage standoff in Alabama earlier this year, when Jimmy Lee Dykes, 65, took a five-year-old boy hostage and barricaded himself in an underground bunker. After almost a week, the FBI’s Hostage Rescue Team breached the bunker, killing Dykes and rescuing the child. Leahy, a Vermont Democrat, said during a March hearing on drones that he was ‘‘convinced that the domestic use of drones to conduct surveillance and collect other information will have a broad and significant impact on the everyday lives of millions of Americans going forward.” Senator Rand Paul, a Kentucky Republican, held the Senate floor for almost 13 hours in March over concerns that the U.S. could use armed drones to attack Americans on U.S. soil. Paul, who filibustered the nomination of eventual Central Intelligence Agency Director John Brennan, was told in a letter from Attorney General Eric Holder that the president didn’t have that authority. FBI Guidelines Mueller said the FBI is in “the initial stages” of formulating privacy guidelines related to its drone use. “There are a number of issues related to drones that will need to be debated in the future,” Mueller said. “It’s still in its nascent stages, this debate.” Senator Mark Udall, a Colorado Democrat who has introduced a bill in Congress designed to set regulations and privacy protections for private use of unmanned aerial systems, said he was concerned that the FBI was using drone technology before finalizing privacy guidelines. “Unmanned aerial systems have the potential to more efficiently and effectively perform law enforcement duties, but the American people expect the FBI and other government agencies to first and foremost protect their constitutional rights,” Udall said today in a statement. Border Security Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano said in a June 15 Bloomberg Television interview that the operation of unmanned aircraft makes “our forces on the ground more effective” and that privacy concerns are regularly weighed and addressed by an office embedded within the department. “We are constantly making sure that we are abiding by restrictions and doing what we need to do from a border security perspective without invading

#### 2. Plan doesn’t solve privacy—other alt causes cause same harms

Gregory McNeal, November 2014, is a professor at Pepperdine University School of Law and a contributor to Forbes. He is an expert in law and public policy with a specific focus on security, technology and crime. Drones and Aerial Surveillance: Considerations For Legislators, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Research/Files/Reports/2014/10/drones-aerial-surveillance-legislators/Drones\_Aerial\_Surveillance\_McNeal\_FINAL.pdf?la=en, /Bingham-MB

A marathon is a highly public event, the event is televised, it takes place on streets where there are surveillance cameras and spectators are photographing the event. Moreover, in the states where drones have been banned (unless accompanied by a warrant), the police have not been prohibited from using any other type of surveillance equipment—just drones. This technology-centric approach has done little to protect privacy, but will certainly harm public safety, depriving law enforcement of a tool that they could use to protect people.

#### 3. Even when legal still drones still harm community privacy

**Finn and Wright ’12** (Rachel L. and David, Trilateral Research, London with expertise in Qualitative Social Research, Social Policy is on Research Gate and Analyst with Trilateral Research, “Unmanned aircraft systems: Surveillance, ethics and privacy in civil applications”, Computer Law and Security Review, Volume 28, Issue 2, Pages 184-194, [http://www.sciencedirect.com/s cience/article/pii/](http://www.sciencedirect.com/s%20cience/article/pii/) S0267364912000234, AO)
Lyon argues that **privacy is** also **inadequate to capture all of the** negative effects of surveillance**, since other civil liberties concerns**, in addition to privacy, **are implicated in new technologies of surveillance**.25 For example, **the use of surveillance technologies may inhibit individuals’ freedom of assembly or freedom of expression due to a “chilling effect” that discourages individual participation in social movements or public dissent activities**.26 In relation to profiling via data mining, Schreurs et al. discuss a right of non-discrimination within the framework of the European Convention on Human Rights.27 Such **potential for discrimination is particularly important**; Coleman and McCahill argue that **the use of surveillance technologies often reinforces existing social positions, particularly positions of marginalisation along the lines of race, class, gender, sexuality and age**.28 **Surveillance technologies may impinge upon individuals’ freedom of movement**, in a clear example of Lyon’s notion of social sorting. Such linkages between social position and movement are noted by Graham and Wood29 and Finn and McCahill30, where **digitalised surveillance systems enable a privileged mobility for some individuals** (e.g., the use of iris scanning systems to bypass immigration queues) **while marginalised individuals find their mobility further restricted** (for example, by false positive matches with individuals on “no fly” lists, or where individuals who refuse body scans at airports are prevented from flying31). **This restriction on freedom of movement can disproportionately impact some groups of already marginalised travellers, such as Muslim women, for whom religious restrictions on modesty prevent participation in body scanning systems**.32 In addition to these civil liberties concerns around the negative effects on individuals, Lyon reminds us that, via the International Treaty on Human Rights, individuals also have a right to security.33

#### 4. There is no engrained right to privacy

Gallington 2014 (Daniel J; Uncle Sam's Right to Know The right to privacy has never been unconditional; Oct 20; www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/world-report/2014/10/20/you-have-no-absolute-right-to-privacy-including-in-your-data-encryption; kdf)

Technically, such a capability is not all that difficult – however, the policy and legal aspects of such technologies are the most perplexing. To begin with, do we have the right to keep any information we choose private from everybody, including the government? If we do, then the technologies – and private companies that implemented this principle – would simply be an exercise of that right. However, we don’t have and never have had, even in our unique democratic society, that broad and unconditional right of privacy. Nevertheless, we sometimes forget this, especially in today’s information-focused age with its heightened awareness of individual privacy. Ironically perhaps, but especially in discussions such as these, I’m always reminded of the wisdom of my late mother: One day she and I were watching a report on privacy and so-called government snooping. And my mom said, “I don’t think the government should be listening to anyone’s telephone conversations.” I responded, “OK, mom, but what about terrorists, spies and kidnappers?” She thought about it for a second and said, “Well, those kind of people … for sure." Sounds like my mom and the FBI director, who also was the former deputy attorney general in the George W. Bush administration, are in basic agreement on this issue – as I’m sure most thoughtful people would be.

#### 5. Human Rights Cred is irrelevant — public opinion, global norms, and NGO networks outweigh US policy

Moravcsik 5 (Andrew Moravcsik, Ph.D., Professor of Politics and International Affairs, Princeton University, "The Paradox of U.S. Human Rights Policy," *American Exceptionalism and Human Rights*, 2005, http://www.princeton.edu/~amoravcs/library/paradox.pdf)

It is natural to ask: What are the consequences of U.S. "exemptionalism” and noncompliance? International lawyers and human rights activists regularly issue dire warnings about the ways in which the apparent hypocrisy of the United States encourages foreign governments to violate human rights, ignore international pressure, and undermine international human rights institutions. In Patricia Derian's oft-cited statement before the Senate in I979: "Ratification by the United States significantly will enhance the legitimacy and acceptance of these standards. It will encourage other countries to join those which have already accepted the treaties. And, in countries where human rights generally are not respected, it will aid citizens in raising human rights issues.""' One constantly hears this refrain. Yet there is little empirical reason to accept it. Human rights norms have in fact spread widely without much attention to U.S. domestic policy. In the wake of the "third wave" democratization in Eastern Europe, East Asia, and Latin America, government after government moved ahead toward more active domestic and international human rights policies without attending to U.S. domestic or international practice." The human rights movement has firmly embedded itself in public opinion and NGO networks, in the United States as well as elsewhere, despite the dubious legal status of international norms in the United States. One reads occasional quotations from recalcitrant governments citing American noncompliance in their own defense-most recently Israel and Australia-but there is little evidence that this was more than a redundant justification for policies made on other grounds. Other governments adhere or do not adhere to global norms, comply or do not comply with judgments of tribunals, for reasons that seem to have little to do with U.S. multilateral policy.

#### 6. Democratic peace theory wrong

Mousseau 13

Michael Mousseau, Associate Professor of Poli Sci at University of Central Florida, PhD from Binghamton, International Studies Quarterly, 2013, "The Democratic Peace Unraveled: It’s the Economy", 57, Wiley Library

Model 2 presents new knowledge by adding the control for economic type. To capture the dyadic expectation of peace among contract-intensive nations, the variable Contract-intensive EconomyL (CIEL) indicates the value of impersonal contracts in force per capita of the state with the lower level of CIE in the dyad; a high value of this measure indicates both states have contract-intensive economies. As can be seen, the coefficient for CIEL ()0.80) is negative and highly significant. This corroborates that impersonal economy is a highly robust force for peace. The coefficient for DemocracyL is now at zero. There are no other differences between Models 1 and 2, whose samples are identical, and no prior study corroborating the democratic peace has considered contract-intensive economy. Therefore, the standard econometric inference to be drawn from Model 2 is the nontrivial result that all prior reports of democracy as a force for peace are probably spurious, since this result is predicted and fully accounted for by economic norms theory. CIEL and DemocracyL correlate only in the moderate range of 0.47 (Pearson’s r), so the insignificance of democracy is not likely to be a statistical artifact of multicollinearity. This is corroborated by the variance inflation factor for DemocracyL in Model 2 of 1.85, which is well below the usual rule-of-thumb indicator of multicollinearity of 10 or more. Nor should readers assume most economies: While almost all nations with contract-intensive economies (as indicated with the binary measure for CIE) are democratic (Polity2 > 6) (Singapore is the only long-term exception), more than half—55%—of all democratic nation-years have contract-poor economies. At the dyadic level in this sample, this translates to 80% of democratic dyads (all dyads where DemocracyBinary6 = 1) that have at least one state with a contract-poor economy. In other words, not only does Model 2 show no evidence of causation from democracy to peace (as reported in Mousseau 2009), but it also illustrates that this absence of democratic peace includes the vast majority—80%—of democratic dyad-years over the sample period. Nor is it likely that the causal arrow is reversed—with democracy being the ultimate cause of contract-intensive economy and peace. This is because correlations among independent variables are not calculated in the results of multivariate regressions: Coefficients show only the effect of each variable after the potential effects of the others are kept constant at their mean levels. If it was democracy that caused both impersonal economy and peace, then there would be some variance in DemocracyL remaining, after its partial correlation with CIEL is excluded, that links it directly with peace. The positive direction of the coefficient for DemocracyL informs us that no such direct effect exists (Blalock 1979:473–474). Model 3 tests for the effect of DemocracyL if a control is added for mixed-polity dyads, as suggested by Russett (2010:201). As discussed above, to avoid problems of mathematical endogeneity, I adopt the solution used by Mousseau, Orsun and Ungerer (2013) and measure regime difference as proposed by Werner (2000), drawing on the subcomponents of the Polity2 regime measure. As can be seen, the coefficient for Political Distance (1.00) is positive and significant, corroborating that regime mixed dyads do indeed have more militarized conflict than others. Yet, the inclusion of this term has no effect on the results that concern us here: CIEL ()0.85) is now even more robust, and the coefficient for DemocracyL (0.03) is above zero.7 Model 4 replaces the continuous democracy measure with the standard binary one (Polity2 > 6), as suggested by Russett (2010:201), citing Bayer and Bernhard (2010). As can be observed, the coefficient for CIEL ()0.83) remains negative and highly significant, while DemocracyBinary6 (0.63) is in the positive (wrong) direction. As discussed above, analyses of fatal dispute onsets with the far stricter binary measure for democracy (Polity = 10), put forward by Dafoe (2011) in response to Mousseau (2009), yields perfect prediction (as does the prior binary measure Both States CIE), causing quasi-complete separation and inconclusive results. Therefore, Model 5 reports the results with DemocracyBinary10 in analyses of all militarized conflicts, not just fatal ones. As can be seen, the coefficient for DemocracyBinary10 ()0.41), while negative, is not significant. Model 6 reports the results in analyses of fatal disputes with DemocracyL squared (after adding 10), which implies that the likelihood of conflict decreases more quickly toward the high values of DemocracyL. As can be seen, the coefficient for DemocracyL 2 is at zero, further corroborating that even very high levels of democracy do not appear to cause peace in analyses of fatal disputes, once consideration is given to contractintensive economy. Models 3, 4, and 6, which include Political Distance, were repeated (but unreported to save space) with analyses of all militarized interstate disputes, with the democracy coefficients close to zero in every case. Therefore, the conclusions reached by Mousseau (2009) are corroborated even with the most stringent measures of democracy, consideration of institutional distance, and across all specifications: The democratic peace appears spurious, with contract-intensive economy being the more likely explanation for both democracy and the democratic peace.

### 2NC – No Privacy Violations

#### Not a privacy violation—supreme court rulings on aerial observation prove

Gregory McNeal, November 2014, is a professor at Pepperdine University School of Law and a contributor to Forbes. He is an expert in law and public policy with a specific focus on security, technology and crime. Drones and Aerial Surveillance: Considerations For Legislators, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Research/Files/Reports/2014/10/drones-aerial-surveillance-legislators/Drones\_Aerial\_Surveillance\_McNeal\_FINAL.pdf?la=en, /Bingham-MB

Aerial observations of the curtilage of a home are generally not prohibited by the Fourth Amendment, so long as the government is conducting the surveillance from public navigable airspace, in a non-physically intrusive manner, and the government conduct does not reveal intimate activities traditionally associated with the use of the home. The U.S. Supreme Court addressed the issue of aerial surveillance in a series of cases in the late 1980s: In California v. Ciraolo8 the Supreme Court held, “The Fourth Amendment was not violated by the naked-eye aerial observation of respondent’s backyard.” In Ciraolo, the police received a tip that someone was growing marijuana in the backyard at Ciraolo’s home. A police officer attempted to observe what was growing, but his observations were obscured by a six foot high outer fence and a ten foot high inner fence. The officer, suspicious that the fences might be intended to hide the growth of marijuana, obtained a private plane and flew over the backyard of Ciraolo’s property at an altitude of 1,000 feet. That altitude was within the FAA’s definition of public navigable airspace. The Supreme Court found that this was not a search, and therefore was not prohibited by the Fourth Amendment. In so finding, Chief Justice Burger stated that in erecting a 10 foot fence, Ciraolo manifested “his own subjective intent and desire to maintain privacy as to his unlawful agriculture” but his “intent and desire” did not amount to an expectation of privacy. The Court noted that the fence “might not shield these plants from the eyes of a citizen or a policeman perched on the top of a truck or a two-level bus.”9 Accordingly, “it was not ‘entirely clear’ whether [Ciraolo] maintained a ‘subjective expectation of privacy from all observations of his backyard,’ or only from ground level observations.”10 The Court believed that it was unreasonable for Ciraolo to expect privacy in his backyard when a routine overflight, or an observation “by a power company repair mechanic on a pole overlooking the yard” would reveal exactly what the police discovered in their overflight.11

#### No a violation of privacy

Michael Stokes Paulsen February 2006, Associate Dean Univ of Minnesota, Presidential Powers in Time of War, http://www.law.umn.edu/uploads/wE/aa/wEaa1g7XB6j0QyoOhoFpYw/Presidential\_Powers\_exchange\_Paulsen\_Kitrosser\_Carpenter.pdf

Finally, the Fourth Amendment bars “unreasonable” searches and seizures and does not invariably require warrants. Just as airport metal detectors are deemed “reasonable” (I’ve never been presented with a warrant as I half-strip and empty my pockets), so too the interception of communications of persons in contact with enemy forces, in time of war, is surely not an unreasonable search and seizure.

#### No threshold—violations not widespread

Phil Mattingly, 6-19-2013, FBI Uses Drones in Domestic Surveillance, Mueller Says," Bloomberg, https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2013-06-19/fbi-uses-drones-in-domestic-sureillance-mueller-says /Bingham-MB

June 19 (Bloomberg) -- The FBI uses drones in domestic surveillance operations in a “very, very minimal way,” Director Robert Mueller said. Mueller, in Senate testimony today, acknowledged for the first time that the Federal Bureau of Investigation uses “very few” drones in a limited capacity for surveillance. “It’s very seldom used and generally used in a particular incident when you need the capability,” Mueller said when asked about the bureau’s use of pilotless aircraft with surveillance capabilities. “It is very narrowly focused on particularized cases and particularized needs.” Mueller’s remarks about the FBI’s use of drones -- and the regular use of the vehicles by other law enforcement agencies -- come as lawmakers and civil liberties groups are raising concerns about the reach of the government in the wake of the disclosure of two highly classified National Security Agency surveillance programs. Leaks by former intelligence contractor Edward Snowden to the Washington Post and the U.K.’s Guardian newspaper exposed programs that sweep up telephone call data from millions of U.S. citizens as well as Internet traffic that the Obama administration says involves foreigners based outside the U.S. suspected of plotting terrorist attacks.

### 2NC – Alt Causes

#### Bunch of alt causes to drone surveillance that harm privacy

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

In light of these considerations, what's really at stake in a feature like Facebook's rumored location-tracking app? You might think it is a good idea to willfully hand over your data in exchange for personalized coupons or promotions, or to broadcast your location to friends. But consumption -- perusing a store and buying stuff -- and quiet, alone time are both important parts of how we define ourselves. If how we do that becomes subject to ever-present monitoring it can, if even unconsciously, change our behaviors and self-perception. In this sense, we will be developing an identity that is absent of privacy and subject to surveillance; we must decide if we really want to live in a society that treats every action as a data point to be analyzed and traded like currency. The more we allow for constant tracking, the more difficult it becomes to change the way that technologies are used to encroach on our lives. Privacy is not just something we enjoy. It is something that is necessary for us to: develop who we are; form an identity that is not dictated by the social conditions that directly or indirectly influence our thinking, decisions, and behaviors; and decide what type of society we want to live in. Whether we like it or not constant data collection about everything we do -- like the kind conducted by Facebook and an increasing number of other companies -- shapes and produces our actions. We are different people when under surveillance than we are when enjoying some privacy. And Cohen's argument illuminates how the breathing room provided by privacy is essential to being a complete, fulfilled person.

#### Alt cause — private sector drones violate privacy at a *higher level* than the Federal Governments.

Schlag 13 — Chris Schlag, J.D. (Juris Doctor) from the University Of Pittsburgh School Of Law, additional degrees in Environmental Health and Management from Colorado State and Columbia State University, 2013 (“Journal of Technology Law & Policy,” *University of Pittsburgh* *Journal of Technology Law and Policy*, Available Online via Subscribing Institutions at EBSCOhost, Accessed on 06-21-15)

Domestic drone use is not limited to the public sphere. Many privately owned companies already use or have expressed interest in obtaining drones for security, loss prevention, and other various purposes. For example, Google currently uses drones to obtain map data, build GPS databases, and develop Internet-based street view maps. Multiple commercial media agencies have also tried to acquire drones to collect private information, video images, and pictures of celebrities. Private detective agencies, lawyers, bail bondsman, insurance companies, and media groups such as National Geographic, have all staked a claim in the development of affordable drone technology. This is due to the enhanced imaging capabilities, affordable surveillance options, GPS tracking, and targeting of drones, which would allow for the collection of information useful to these trades in a relatively inconspicuous way. While presently, domestic drone use is seen as inconsequential because the technology is relatively unfamiliar and infrequently used, domestic drone use is projected to drastically increase in upcoming years. The drone industry is currently a $ 6 billion industry and is expected to double in the next 10 years. In February 2012, Congress enacted the FAA Modernization and Reform Act, which specifically calls for the acceleration and integration of drones into United States national airspace by 2015. As a result of the FAA's initiative under the Act and the significant push from federal and state agencies to use drones domestically, the FAA is expected to approve an additional 30,000 licenses for domestic drone operation by 2020.

### 2NC – Still Negative Harms

#### Use of drone surveillance furthers targeting and profiling that causes marginalization

**Finn and Wright ’12** (Rachel L. and David, Trilateral Research, London with expertise in Qualitative Social Research, Social Policy is on Research Gate and Analyst with Trilateral Research, “Unmanned aircraft systems: Surveillance, ethics and privacy in civil applications”, Computer Law and Security Review, Volume 28, Issue 2, Pages 184-194, [http://www.sciencedirect.com/s cience/article/pii/](http://www.sciencedirect.com/s%20cience/article/pii/) S0267364912000234, AO)
In the development of new applications**, UASs could be used for a variety of new policing functions. Drones could be used for safety inspections, perimeter patrols around prisons and thermal imaging to check for cannabis being grown in roof lofts.**88 The **police could use them to capture number plates of speeding drivers.**89 The UK newspaper, The Guardian, has identified other deployments including **“[detecting] theft from cash machines, preventing theft of tractors…railway monitoring, search and rescue… [and] to combat fly-posting, fly-tipping, abandoned vehicles, abnormal loads, waste management**”. 90 Mike Heintz of the UNITE Alliance (which represents major companies such as Boeing, Lockheed Martin and Northrop Grumman) stated that further examples of UAS applications “are limited only by our imagination”. 91 **This overview demonstrates that while UAS devices have been used in a range of applications, it is the same “usual suspects” who are targeted by UAS surveillance.** Eick argues that in Western Europe**, there is “hardly a marginalised group that is not targeted by UAVs”**, and this paper illustrates **that this is common to other countries as well. Large crowd monitoring generally focuses on protesters, “hooligans” and “anti-social” elements. The use of UASs to prevent or detect crime through monitoring spaces or small crowds have been deployed against “bikers”, groups of young people and undocumented migrants, while UASs which support police in incident response have been used against young people and squatters.** Similarly, border surveillance, particularly as used along the US–Mexico border and for maritime surveillance, often have people of colour as their intended targets. As Coleman and McCahill note, surveillance systems often reinforce positions of marginalisation,92 introducing civil liberties concerns regarding discrimination into deployments of UAS devices. Furthermore, **despite the benefits to policing and border surveillance, the use of UAS technology raises safety, ethical and privacy concerns alongside this disproportionate targeting of already marginalised populations.**

### 2NC – No Right to Privacy

#### There is no privacy- protection of such is irrelevant

Farber 14(Hillary B. Farber, Associate Professor of Law, University of Massachusetts School of Law, J.D. Northeastern University School of Law, B.A. University of Michigan, “EYES IN THE SKY: CONSTITUTIONAL AND REGULATORY APPROACHES TO DOMESTIC DRONE DEPLOYMENT”, Syracuse Law Review)//bp

We live in an age where a vast amount of human activity is transacted electronically, leaving a digital footprint of our identity. Emails, texts, and postings on Facebook are primary means of communication. A tremendous amount of commercial activity is transacted over the Internet, whereas cash has become a less common method of payment. We rarely deposit coins in tollbooths anymore, and most toll roads are controlled by electronic payment systems. Closed-circuit televisions and surveillance cameras record us moving about our daily lives. Information that was once kept in our desk drawer or on our hard drive is now stored in a virtual repository called the Cloud. If we allow the Fourth Amendment to be dependent on secrecy, we run the risk that it will become obsolete. Some scholars argue that new technologies that challenge our longstanding reasonable expectation of privacy test reveal that privacy is no longer a legitimate proxy for what the Fourth Amendment protects. n205 Professor Paul Ohm observes that, given how rapidly technology is changing our everyday lives and our notions about what is considered "private," a more appropriate way to understand the purpose of the Fourth Amendment is as a restraint on [\*35] police power. n206 This paradigm shift is a dramatic move away from how we have thought about privacy and its relationship to the Fourth Amendment for over half a century. But it is not without precedent. Prior to Katz, n207 property was considered that which the Fourth Amendment was created to protect. But Katz changed that by replacing privacy for property as a proxy for Fourth Amendment protection. n208 Ohm and others suggest that in this era of rapid technological growth, we substitute power as the proxy for that which the Fourth Amendment was created to restrain. n209 Ohm's proposition makes sense when one considers how new technologies have made it easier - and cheaper - to obtain information. Users willingly relinquish some of their privacy to avail themselves of these new devices. n210 For instance, most smartphones are equipped with tracking software that records the user's location with great precision. n211 Cellular systems update and record location data every few minutes of all phones on their networks. n212 Cell phone companies typically retain this data for a year or longer. n213 In June 2011, more than 322 million wireless devices were in use in the United States. n214 Most users are aware of the phones' tracking capability, yet most opt for the convenience of having their phone with [\*36] them and choose to ignore concerns of being tracked. n215 As Ohm argues, the prevalence of people with phones equipped with this technology may make location data "public" no matter how it is retrieved. n216 As technology has rapidly advanced in the past decade, social norms concerning what is considered private have changed as well. n217 According to a Pew Research study, teens today share more information about themselves than they have in previous years, minimizing the scope of what is considered private. n218 This is likely the result of growing up in an age of handheld devices that allow younger generations to communicate more by texting than talking on the phone or even emailing. n219 With the increasing use of cell phones, marketers [\*37] are turning to practices called behavioral advertising and location-based marketing. Behavioral advertising is the targeting of ads to persons, based on the web pages they visit and the searches they perform. n220 Companies like Google and Amazon save the user data of persons who use their services. n221 Location-based marketing is the targeting of ads to persons based on their physical location. n222 Companies such as AT&T, Verizon, and Foursquare are selling the GPS location data of their users. n223 In 2010, businesses spent $ 42.8 million on location-based marketing. n224 That figure is projected to rise to $ 1.8 billion by 2015. n225 In the past decade, there has been a rise in the use of surveillance in public places, such as malls, parks, schools, streets, and highways. n226 Chicago, for instance, is considered to have the nation's most "extensive and integrated" network of government video surveillance cameras, according to former U.S. Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff. n227 Just in the downtown area, there are over 10,000 publicly and privately owned cameras, making it virtually impossible to avoid being identified and tracked while on a public way in the city. n228 [\*38] Another example of the use of tracking devices is the toll roads equipped with automatic collectors that keep records of the path of travel of those users availing themselves of that convenience. n229 The prevalence of surveillance cameras capturing our images and our movements in public has changed attitudes about what is and should be considered an intrusion on one's expectation of privacy. n230

### 2NC – Democracy Doesn’t Solve War

#### Democracy doesn’t solve war

**Mueller 9**—pol sci prof and IR, Ohio State.Widely-recognized expert on terrorism threats in foreign policy. AB from U Chicago, MA in pol sci from UCLA and PhD in pol sci from UCLA (John, Faulty Correlation, Foolish Consistency, Fatal Consequence: Democracy, Peace, and Theory in the Middle East, 15 June 2007, http://psweb.sbs.ohio-state.edu/faculty/jmueller/KENT2.PDF)

In the last couple of decades there has been aburgeoning and intriguing discussion about the connection between democracy and war aversion.7 Most notable has been the empirical observation that democracies have never, or almost never, gotten into a war with each other. This relationship seems more correlative than causal,however. Like many important ideas over the last few centuries, the idea that war is undesirable and inefficacious and the idea that democracy is a good form of government have largely followed the same trajectory: they were embraced first in northern Europe and North America and then gradually, with a number of traumatic setbacks, became more accepted elsewhere. In this view, the rise of democracy not only is associated with the rise of war aversion, but also with the decline of slavery, religion, capital punishment, and cigarette smoking, and with the growing acceptance of capitalism, scientific methodology, women's rights, environmentalism, abortion, and rock music.8While democracy and war aversion have taken much the sametrajectory, however, they have been substantially out of synchronization with each other: the movement toward democracy began about 200 years ago,but the movement against war really began only about 100 years ago (Mueller 1989, 2004). Critics of the democracy/peace connection often cite examples of wars or near-wars between democracies. Most of these took place before World War I--that is, before war aversion had caught on.9 A necessary, logical connection between democracy and war aversion, accordingly, is far from clear. Thus, it is often asserted that democracies are peaceful because they apply their domestic penchant for peaceful compromise (something, obviously, that broke down in the United States in 1861) to the international arena or because the structure of democracy requires decision-makers to obtain domestic approval.10 But authoritarian regimes must also necessarily develop skills at compromisein order to survive, and they all have domestic constituencies that must be serviced such as the church, the landed gentry, potential urban rioters, the nomenklatura, the aristocracy, party members, the military, prominent business interests, the police or secret police, lenders of money to the exchequer, potential rivals for the throne, the sullen peasantry.11 Since World War I, the democracies in the developed world have been in the lead in rejecting war as a methodology. Some proponents of the democracy-peace connection suggest that this is because the democratic norm of non-violent conflict resolution has been externalized to the international arena. However,developed democracies have not necessarily adopted a pacifist approach, particularly after a version of that approach failed so spectacularly to prevent World War II from being forced upon them. In addition, they were willing actively to subvertor to threatenand sometimes apply military force when threats appeared to loom during the Cold War contest. At times this approach was used even against regimes that had some democratic credentials such as in Iran in 1953, Guatemala in 1954, Chile in 1973, and perhaps Nicaragua in the 1980s (Rosato 2003, 590-91). And, they have also sometimes used military force in their intermittent efforts to police the post-Cold War world (Mueller 2004, chs. 7, 8). It is true that they have warred little or not at all against each other--and, since there were few democracies outside the developed world until the last quarter of the twentieth century, it is this statistical regularity that most prominently informs the supposed connection between democracy and peace. However, thedeveloped democracies hardly needed democracy to decide that war among them was a bad idea.12 In addition, they also adopted a live-and-let-live approach toward a huge number of dictatorships and other non-democracies that did not seem threatening during the Cold War--in fact, they often aided and embraced such regimes if they seemed to be on the right side in the conflict with Communism. Moreover, the supposed penchant for peaceful compromise of democracies has not always served them well when confronted with civil war situations, particularly ones involving secessionist demands. The process broke down into civil warfare in democratic Switzerland in 1847 and savagely so in the United States in 1861. Democracies have also fought a considerable number of wars to retain colonial possessions--six by France alone since World War II--and these, as James Fearon and David Laitin suggest, can in many respects be considered essentially to be civil wars (2003, 76). To be sure, democracies have often managed to deal with colonial problems peacefully, mostly by letting the colonies go. But authoritarian governments have also done so: the Soviet Union, for example, withdrew from his empire in Eastern Europe and then dissolved itself, all almost entirely without violence. Thus, while democracy and war aversion have often been promoted by the same advocates, the relationship does not seem to be a causal one. And when the two trends are substantially out of step today, democracies will fight one another. Thus, it is not at all clear that telling the elected hawks in the Jordanian parliament that Israel is a democracy will dampen their hostility in the slightest. And various warlike sentiments could be found in the elected parliaments in the former Yugoslavia in the early 1990s or in India and then-democratic Pakistan when these two countries engaged in armed conflict in 1999. If Argentina had been a democracy in 1982 when it seized the Falkland Islands (a very popular undertaking), it is unlikely that British opposition to the venture would have been much less severe. "The important consideration," observes Miriam Fendius Elman after surveying the literature on the subject, does not seem to be "whether a country is democratic or not, but whether its ruling coalition is committed to peaceful methods of conflict resolution." As she further points out, the countries of Latin America and most of Africa have engaged in very few international wars even without the benefit of being democratic (for a century before its 1982 adventure, Argentina, for example, fought none at all) (1997, 484, 496). (Interestingly, although there has also been scarcely any warfare between Latin American states for over 100 years or among Arab ones or European ones for more that 50--in all cases whether democratic or not--this impressive phenomenon has inspired remarkably few calls for worldwide Arab colonialism or for the systematic transplant of remaining warlike states to Latin America or Europe.) And, of course, the long peace enjoyed by developed countries since World War II includes not only the one that has prevailed between democracies, but also the even more important one between the authoritarian east and the democratic west. Even if there is some connection, whether causal or atmospheric, between democracy and peace, it cannot explain this latter phenomenon. Democracy and the democratic peace become mystiques: the role of philosophers and divines Democracy has been a matter of debate for several millennia as philosophers and divines have speculated about what it is, what it might become, and what it ought to be. Associated with these speculations has been a tendency to emboss the grubby gimmick with something of a mystique. Of particular interest for present purposes is the fanciful notion that democracy does not simply express and aggregate preferences, but actually somehow creates (or should create) them. In addition, the (rough) correlation between democracy and war aversion has also been elevated into a causal relationship.

### 2NC – Human Rights Law Fails

#### Practical constraints – like budgets – thump compliance in the countries that matter for their impact

Posner 14 (Eric Posner, a professor at the University of Chicago Law School, “Have Human Rights Treaties Failed?” New York Times, 12-28-2014, http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2014/12/28/have-human-rights-treaties-failed)

Human Rights Treaties Are Expensive to Follow I confess I do sympathize with the Chinese government though I do not think China needs development aid. As a result of the economic reforms pursued by the Chinese government since 1981, more than 600 million people have been raised from terrible poverty to a decent middle-income existence. This was one of the greatest humanitarian achievements of all time. The Chinese government also denied political rights to its citizens, and did not hide the reason. It feared political unrest — of the sort that killed and impoverished hundreds of millions of Chinese in civil war and social turmoil through most of the 20th century, and made China vulnerable to exploitation and military invasion from foreign countries. This is not to say that the China model is right for us or for any other country. But it is too easy for people in the West to argue that China should have reformed the economy and introduced democracy, religious freedom, free speech, fair trials and all the rest. Just how much do we understand political and social conditions in China? While it is possible, even likely, that Chinese government officials suppress political freedoms to protect their power, we in the West just don’t know whether the introduction of political freedoms — and if so, which ones, and how much, and over what period of time — would benefit the Chinese or hurt them. What is true for China is also true for countless other countries, especially the poorest ones, which also can’t afford most of the rights in the human rights treaties. Americans seem to think that rights are cheap, just a matter of the government doing the right thing. This is wrong. The right to a fair trial, for example, requires that a complex institutional infrastructure be in place — staffed by honest, well-paid, well-trained lawyers, judges, police officers, administrators and prison guards, who possess a sophisticated understanding of the law, moral norms and social conditions. In most developing countries, bureaucracies and courts are corrupt, slow and ineffectual. Cleaning them up means raising salaries, training people and enforcing anti-corruption laws — all at great cost that most countries can’t afford. The human rights treaties do not recognize that rights are expensive, both financially and politically; that different types of rights are easier to respect in different types of countries; and, therefore, that the right course of action that each government should follow differs radically. While many human rights scholars argue that for this reason we should only demand that governments respect certain “basic” rights that all can afford, it turns out that those basic rights are impossible to identify, which is why the human rights treaties guarantee hundreds of rights rather than just a few. The release of the Senate committee report on C.I.A. torture should remind us how difficult it is, even for a rich country with strong liberal traditions, to respect rights. Torture violates the law in this country, and yet it happened anyway, at a massive scale. Foreign countries will reasonably ask: If Americans both hate torture and can’t stop government officials from using it, how can we?

#### You don’t solve the people who matter for your impact

Neumeyer 5 (Eric Neumeyer, London School of Economics and Political Science, “Do international human rights treaties improve respect for human rights?” Journal of Conflict Resolution, 49(6), 2005, http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/612/1/JournalofConflictResolution\_49(6).pdf)

Do international human rights treaties improve respect for human rights? Our quantitative analysis suggests that the answer is more complex than a simple yes or no. On the one hand, in the absence of civil society and/or in pure autocracies, human rights treaty ratification often makes no difference and can even make things worse. This provides some tentative evidence for Hathaway’s (2002a) argument on how such countries can exploit the ‘expressive role’ of treaty ratification without any change for the better. Like her, we also found that treaty ratification often becomes more beneficial to human rights the more democratic the country is. In addition, we also find evidence that ratification is more beneficial the stronger a country’s civil society, that is the more its citizens participate in international NGOs. This provides evidence in favor of liberal theories and the theory of transnational human rights advocacy networks. We found only few cases, in which treaty ratification has unconditionally beneficial effects on human rights. In most cases, for treaty ratification to work there must be conditions for domestic groups, parties and individuals and for civil society to persuade, convince and perhaps pressure governments into translating the formal promise of better human rights protection into actual reality. Hafner-Burton and Tsutsui (2005) are right in suggesting a positive role for civil society strength on human rights, but it is the interaction with treaty ratification that often matters.

#### IHRL fails – overreaching and ambiguity – AND foreign aid solves

Posner 14 (Eric Posner, a professor at the University of Chicago Law School, “Have Human Rights Treaties Failed?” New York Times, 12-28-2014, http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2014/12/28/have-human-rights-treaties-failed)

Human Rights Law Is Too Ambitious and Ambiguous While the vast majority of countries have ratified nearly all the major human rights treaties, rights violations remain common. Political repression exists around the world, and not just in China and Russia. In many developing countries, the criminal justice system works poorly, and the police frequently resort to extrajudicial methods like using torture to extract confessions. Age-old blights like child labor, the subjugation of women, religious persecution and even slavery are amazingly common. Even in the United States, torture has been used against suspected terrorists, police brutality flourishes and convicted criminals often receive extraordinarily harsh punishments. Many people argue that the solution to these problems is to strengthen human rights law. They argue that we need more treaties, with stricter obligations and better-funded, more powerful international institutions. But my view is the opposite. Human rights law is too ambitious — even utopian — and too ambiguous: it overwhelms states with obligations they can’t possibly keep and provides no method for evaluating whether governments act reasonably or not. The law doesn’t do much; we should face that fact and move on. This doesn’t mean that we shouldn’t care when governments abuse their citizens. But more focused and pragmatic interventions, including relying heavily on foreign aid for economic development, rather than coercion or shaming, is the better way to go.

## Agriculture Advantage

### 1NC – Agriculture

#### 1. FAA regulations solve- safe drone use inevitable

Whitlock ’15 (Craig Whitlock, Washington Post, “FAA rules might allow thousands of business drones”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/faa-releases-proposed-rules-for-domestic-drone-use/2015/02/15/6787bdce-b51b-11e4-a200-c008a01a6692_story.html>, February 15, 2015)

Thousands of businesses could receive clearance to fly drones two years from now under proposed rules that the Federal Aviation Administration unveiled Sunday, a landmark step that will make automated flight more commonplace in the nation’s skies. Meanwhile, the White House on Sunday issued presidential directive that will require federal agencies for the first time to publicly disclose where they fly drones in the United States and what they do with the torrents of data collected from aerial surveillance. Together, the FAA regulations and the White House order provide some basic rules of the sky that will govern who can fly drones in the United States and under what conditions, while attempting to prevent aviation disasters and unrestrained government surveillance. The FAA’s draft rules would make it relatively simple for real estate agents, aerial photographers, police departments, farmers and anyone else to fly small drones for work purposes. Operators would need to pass a written proficiency test, register the drone and pay about $200 in fees — but would not have to obtain a regular pilot’s license or demonstrate their flying skills. The long-awaited regulations — the FAA had been drawing them up for several years — are expected to lead to a revolution in commercial aviation. But they must first undergo a lengthy period of public review and comment that is projected to take at least until early 2017. Once the rules are finalized, the FAA estimates that more than 7,000 businesses will obtain drone permits within three years. Drone crashes during House committee hearing(1:15) Colin Quinn of 3D Robotics led a demonstration of a drone in flight during a House Science subcommittee meeting on unmanned aircrafts. (AP) “We’re putting forward what we believe to be the safest possible approach at the moment, but of course we look forward to hearing back from the public,” Transportation Secretary Anthony Foxx told reporters Sunday on a conference call. The proposed regulations carry some significant limitations. Businesses would be allowed to fly drones only during daylight hours. And drones would have to remain within eyesight of the operator or observers posted on the ground. The drones could fly no more than 100 mph and would have to stay below an altitude of 500 feet to avoid the risk of colliding with other aircraft. They would also be prohibited from flying over bystanders not directly involved in their operation. As a result, companies would not be permitted to fly drones over long distances. That would effectively preclude companies such as pizza makers, Amazon.com and newspaper companies from delivering goods to customers’ doorsteps via drone (Amazon’s chief executive, Jeffrey P. Bezos, also owns The Washington Post). The rules, however, are expected to be modified and loosened over the coming decade as drone technology advances. Unlike with regular aircraft, the FAA would not require drone operators or manufacturers to certify in advance that the drones are safe to fly. Michael Huerta, head of the FAA, said such a requirement is unnecessary because small drones “pose the least amount of risk to our airspace.” The regulations would apply only to drones weighing 55 pounds or less. The FAA is still drafting rules for larger drones, and those are expected to take several more years to sort out. In addition, FAA officials said they are considering a separate set of rules for “micro-drones” that weigh less than 4.4 pounds. Under those rules, operators would not have to pass any kind of test; they would only have to submit a written statement to the FAA promising that they were familiar with basic aviation safety measures. The proposed FAA rules for small drones would not apply to people who fly drones for fun or for recreational purposes. Small hobby drones have become hugely popular in the United States, but under a law passed by Congress in 2012, the FAA is largely prohibited from regulating them as long as they do not interfere with air traffic. Congress also ordered the FAA to integrate drones into the national airspace by September 2015. Bogged down by staff shortages and a slow-moving regulatory structure, however, the FAA has been slow to keep up with rapid technological advances in the drone industry and has missed several deadlines to introduce regulations. Until now, the FAA has relied on an interim patchwork of guidelines. Businesses are prohibited from flying drones without special approval. Recreational drone flights are allowed as long as the aircraft stay below 400 feet and five miles away from an airport. The military and other government agencies need a certificate to fly in civilian airspace. The guidelines, however, have been routinely ignored by drone enthusiasts. Pilots across the United States have reported a surge in near-collisions with small unlicensed drones, presenting a major threat to aviation safety. Huerta, the FAA administrator, said the agency’s gradual approach to adopting regulations, despite pressure from the drone industry to move faster, was designed to enhance safety. “We need to do this in a staged way that ensures the highest levels of safety, because that’s what people expect,” he told reporters. When asked how the FAA would verify that drone pilots get a license and do not flout safety restrictions, Huerta said the agency relies on public education campaigns but also has enforcement tools, such as the power to levy fines, at its disposal. “What we want to do is ensure that anyone who is flying in a careless or reckless manner that would be endangering the public or other users of the airspace, that we take appropriate enforcement action,” he said. In reality, FAA officials have acknowledged that it is extremely difficult to police the skies or crack down on rogue drone pilots. Most drones are too small to appear on radar. And even when they are spotted near airports or intruding into congested airspace, it is hard to chase them, much less to track down whoever is flying them by remote control. Although the proposed regulations announced Sunday are tailored for commercial drones, they are expected to trigger a huge expansion in drone use by government agencies, such as police and fire departments. Under current rules, agencies must go through a cumbersome application process to win FAA approval to fly drones, determined on a case-by-case basis. The new regulations would lift many of those obstacles. Law enforcement agencies could fly their own drones to conduct surveillance or could hire a contractor to do so. The FAA and the White House had intended to unveil their drone rules later this month. But an official document highlighting some of the proposed regulations was inadvertently posted on a federal Web site Friday night, prompting the Obama administration to announce the changes in the middle of a holiday weekend. While the FAA rules are designed to exploit the economic potential of drones without jeopardizing aviation safety, the order issued Sunday by President Obama is intended to safeguard personal privacy and require the federal government to be more forthcoming about when and where it uses drones to conduct surveillance. All federal agencies, for example, would have to disclose where they conduct drone operations within the United States, as well as their policies for storing and protecting personal information collected from surveillance flights. Agencies would also have to issue an annual report detailing the types of missions they flew in the previous year. The order will have a large impact on the Defense Department and law enforcement agencies such as the FBI and the Department of Homeland Security, which uses drones to patrol the nation’s borders. The FBI has been especially secretive about its drone operations, even ducking lawmakers’ queries about how many it has and how often they are used. “It is a very big deal and a very positive step,” said Lisa Ellman, a former Justice Department official who helped prepare the presidential order and works on drone issues as a lawyer in private practice. The agencies, she said, “understand that even with all the benefits of drones, the American public has concerns — concerns about privacy and concerns about accountability.” In addition, Obama directed the Commerce Department to work with companies and the drone industry to develop a voluntary code of conduct for the private sector regarding surveillance and privacy protections.

#### 2. Tech won’t solve agriculture

Bunge ’14 (Jacob Bunge, WSJ, “Big Data Comes to the Farm, Sowing Mistrust”, <http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052702304450904579369283869192124>, February 25, 2014)

Big agricultural companies say the next revolution on the farm will come from feeding data gathered by tractors and other machinery into computers that tell farmers how to increase their output of crops like corn and soybeans. Monsanto Co., DuPont Co. and other companies are racing to roll out "prescriptive planting" technology to farmers across the U.S. who know from years of experience that tiny adjustments in planting depth or the distance between crop rows can make a big difference in revenue at harvest time. Some farmers are leery about the new technology. They worry their data might be sold to commodities traders, wind up in the hands of rival farmers or give more leverage to giant seed companies that are among the most enthusiastic sellers of data-driven planting advice. The companies vow not to misuse the information. CIO JOURNAL. For Small Farmers, Big Data Adds Modern Problems to Ancient Ones "There's a lot of value to that information," says Brooks Hurst, 46 years old, who works 6,000 acres with his father and brothers near Tarkio, Mo. "I'm afraid, as farmers, we are not going to be the ones reaping the benefit." Many tractors and combines already are guided by Global Positioning System satellites that plant ever-straighter rows while farmers, freed from steering, monitor progress on iPads and other tablet computers now common in tractor cabs. The same machinery collects data on crops and soil. But many farmers have haphazardly managed the information, scattered in piles of paperwork in their offices or stored on thumb drives clattering in pickup-truck ashtrays. The data often were turned over by hand for piecemeal analysis. Sellers of prescriptive-planting technology want to accelerate, streamline and combine all those data with their highly detailed records on historic weather patterns, topography and crop performance. Algorithms and human experts crunch all the data and can zap advice directly to farmers and their machines. Supporters say the push could be as important as the development of mechanized tractors in the first half of the 20th century and the rise of genetically modified seeds in the 1990s. The world's biggest seed company, Monsanto, estimates that data-driven planting advice to farmers could increase world-wide crop production by about $20 billion a year, or about one-third the value of last year's U.S. corn crop. The technology could help improve the average corn harvest to more than 200 bushels an acre from the current 160 bushels, companies say. Such a gain would generate an extra $182 an acre in revenue for farmers, based on recent prices. Iowa corn farmers got about $759 an acre last year. So far, farmers who use prescriptive planting have seen yields climb by a more modest five to 10 bushels an acre, the companies say. The gains are likely to accelerate as companies gather information from more farmers. Monsanto has been testing a technology-powered planting service called FieldScripts with farmers since 2010 and is starting to pitch it this year in Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota and Indiana, four of the biggest corn-producing states. Farmers pay the company $10 an acre. ENLARGE ENLARGE No one knows how much is being spent to develop and market high-tech planting services, but 20% of Monsanto's projected growth in per-share earnings by 2018 could come from FieldScripts and other technology-fueled improvements, estimates Michael Cox, co-director of investment research at securities firm Piper Jaffray Cos. "I see it as another potential transformation of the company," says Robert Fraley, chief technology officer for Monsanto, based in St. Louis. He helped develop Monsanto's first genetically modified seeds in the early 1980s. In November, Monsanto paid $930 million to acquire Climate Corp., a weather-data-mining company in San Francisco launched by former Google Inc. executives. Agricultural cooperative Land O'Lakes Inc. bought satellite-imaging specialist Geosys in December for an undisclosed amount. DuPont announced earlier this month a collaboration with a weather-and-market analysis firm, DTN/The Progressive Farmer, to provide real-time climate and market information to DuPont's data-services users. Late last year, Deere & Co. agreed to beam data from the Moline, Ill., company's green tractors, combines and other machinery to computer servers where DuPont and Dow Chemical Co. can formulate specialized seed-planting recommendations. "When a farmer buys a combine or buys a tractor, they've got all these ways to collect information," says DuPont marketing manager Joe Foresman. The Wilmington, Del., company's Pioneer unit has been sifting through farm-level data for about a decade, but now "this space is starting to mature." DuPont and Monsanto are excited about their data-driven services, partly because they can be rolled out to farmers much faster than new seeds, which often must endure a decade of development and regulatory review. Many farmers who have tried prescriptive planting are enthusiastic about the results. David Nelson, a farmer near Fort Dodge, Iowa, who began testing FieldScripts about three years ago, says it recognized nutrients in soil on a patch of land previously used as a cattle feedlot. The conclusion was based on fertilizer maps and soil samples gathered by Mr. Nelson, 39. Monsanto's system said the land could support denser rows of corn, and FieldScripts helped Mr. Nelson increase his corn harvest last year by 8 to 12 bushels an acre above the 10-year average of 190 bushels. The increase brought Mr. Nelson an additional $34 to $51 an acre. "We're pushing every acre to its maximum potential," Mr. Nelson adds. Other farmers are reluctant. The American Farm Bureau Federation, a trade group for farmers, has warned members that seed companies touting higher crop yields from prescriptive planting have a vested interest in persuading farmers to plant more. The trade group also says the services might steer farmers to buy certain seeds, sprays and equipment for their land. Jerry Demmer, a 61-year-old corn and soybean farmer near Albert Lea, Minn., is thinking about trying a data-analysis service but has "tossed and turned" over who will control the information. "It's our data," Mr. Demmer says, but "I'm not sure how we're going to protect that." One reason that suspicions run deep among some farmers: a surge in seed prices as the biggest companies piled up more market share during the past 15 years, largely through takeovers. Monsanto and DuPont sell about 70% of all corn seed in the U.S. Last year, farmers paid about $118 an acre for corn seed, up 166% from the inflation-adjusted cost of $45 an acre in 2005, according to estimates from Purdue University. Companies say the higher prices reflect the benefits of using their genetically modified seeds, including bigger crops and resistance to insects and weed-killing sprays that have helped reduce the usage of harsh pesticides. Mr. Fraley, the technology chief at Monsanto, says it also decides annual seed prices based on seed supplies and commodities prices. Data gathered by FieldScripts aren't likely to be "a particularly big" factor in pricing decisions, he says. "We'll price our seed the way we've always priced our seed." Mr. Foresman of DuPont says the company doesn't use data it collects from farmers to help set seed prices. Battles with seed makers over who controls the seeds produced by genetically modified crops make some farmers even more wary about sharing information with the companies. In 2012, DuPont hired Agro Protection USA Inc., an intellectual-property-protection firm staffed largely by retired law-enforcement officers, to watch for signs of farmers who are saving second-generation seeds. Saving the seeds violates licensing agreements farmers sign when they buy seeds. Monsanto has filed lawsuits against nearly 150 U.S. farmers since 1997 for replanting seeds that contain the company's proprietary characteristics. Last year, the company won a U.S. Supreme Court victory in a case against an Indiana farmer who was 75 years old at the time. The most-worried farmers fear that somehow rivals could use the data to their own advantage. For example, if nearby farmers saw crop-yield information, it might spur unwanted competition to rent farmland, pushing land costs higher. Other farmers fret that Wall Street traders could use the data to make bets on futures contracts. If such bets push futures-contract prices lower early in the growing season, it might squeeze the profits farmers otherwise could lock in for their crops by selling futures.

#### 3. Population growth alone swamps the internal link – so does ag slowdown – USDA forecast, 70-100% increase in demand by 2050

Johnson ‘13 – writer for the Council on Foreign Relations (Toni, 01/16, “Food Price Volatility and Insecurity,” http://www.cfr.org/food-security/food-price-volatility-insecurity/p16662)

The Global Food Market Just fifteen food crops make up 90 percent of the world's energy intake, according to the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), with rice, maize (corn), and wheat comprising two-thirds of that number. The world grows more grains (PDF)--also known as cereals--than any other crop type. Much of the global increase in food prices stems from staple grains, which in some countries can represent more than half of calorie intake. According to the World Bank, due to an incredibly dry summer in the United States and Europe, global corn and soybean prices reached all-time highs in July 2012, while wheat soared to prices comparable to 2011 peaks. Because grains also represent a major food source for livestock, higher grain prices have contributed to higher dairy and meat prices. The USDA predicts that domestically, prices will continue to rise in 2013 at a rate of 3 to 4 percent. A June 2011 report to G20 agriculture ministers from ten major NGOs, including the World Trade Organization, the World Bank, and the UN World Food Program, noted that by 2050, food demand (PDF) will have increased by between 70 percent and 100 percent to meet a projected population growth of at least 2.5 billion additional people. "This alone is sufficient to exert pressure on commodity prices," the report said. Growth in agriculture production is largely expected to come from increased crop yields and will primarily be located in developing countries, according to a 2009 UN report (PDF). Experts say there is plenty of opportunity to improve farming techniques in the developing world. Meeting projected demand will require increasing cereal production by an additional one billion tons, up from more than two billion tons currently, and more than doubling meat production from current levels. However, according to a 2011 report by the OECD, annual growth in agriculture production (PDF) in the next decade is forecast to be a third less than the annual growth in the previous decade. The report estimates that a 5 percent increase or decrease in harvest yield in major grains can lead to as much as a 25 percent difference in price. Food Price Volatility According to the FAO, price volatility has been extremely rare in agricultural markets, but the global food system is becoming increasingly vulnerable to it. The 2011 NGO report argued that "volatility becomes an issue for concern and for possible policy response when it induces risk-adverse behavior that leads to inefficient investment decisions and when it creates problems that are beyond the capacity of producers, consumers, or nations to cope."

#### 4. No impact to species loss

Ridder ‘8 (Ben Ridder, Phd School of Geography and Environmental Studies, University of Tasmania, “Questioning the ecosystem services argument for biodiversity conservation” Biodiversity and conservation yr:2008 vol:17 iss:4 pg:781, 2008)

\*ES = environmental services

The low resilience assumption Advocates of the conservation of biodiversity tend not to acknowledge the distinction between resilient and sensitive ES. This ‘low resilience assumption’ gives rise to, and is reinforced by the almost ubiquitous claim within the conservation literature that ES depend on biodiversity. An extreme example of this claim is made by the Ehrlichs in Extinction. They state that “all [ecosystem services] will be threatened if the rate of extinctions continues to increase” then observe that attempts to artificially replicate natural processes “are no more than partially successful in most cases. Nature nearly always does it better. When society sacrifices natural services for some other gain… it must pay the costs of substitution” (Ehrlich and Ehrlich 1982, pp. 95–96). This assertion—that the only alternative to protecting every species is a world in which all ES have been substituted by artificial alternatives—is an extreme example of the ‘low resilience assumption’. Paul Ehrlich revisits this flawed logic in 1997 i nhis response (with four co-authors) to doubts expressed by Mark Sagoff regarding economic arguments for species conservation (Ehrlich et al. 1997, p. 101). The claim that ES depend on biodiversity is also notably present in the controversial Issues in Ecology paper on biodiversity and ecosystem functioning (Naeem et al. 1999) that sparked the debate mentioned in the introduction. This appears to reflect a general tendency among authors in this field (e.g., Hector et al. 2001; Lawler et al. 2002; Lyons et al. 2005). Although such authors may not actually articulate the low resilience assumption, presenting such claims in the absence of any clarification indicates its influence. That the low resilience assumption is largely false is apparent in the number of examples of species extinctions that have not brought about catastrophic ecosystem collapse and decline in ES, and in the generally limited ecosystem influence of species on the cusp of extinction. These issues have been raised by numerous authors, although given the absence of systematic attempts to verify propositions of this sort, the evidence assembled is usually anecdotal and we are forced to trust that an unbiased account of the situation has been presented. Fortunately a number of highly respected people have discussed this topic, not least being the prominent conservation biologist David Ehrenfeld. In 1978 he described the ‘conservation dilemma’, which “arises on the increasingly frequent occasions when we encounter a threatened part of Nature but can find no rational reason for keeping it” (Ehrenfeld 1981, p. 177). He continued with the following observation: Have there been permanent and significant ‘resource’ effects of the extinction, in the wild, of John Bartram’s great discovery, the beautiful tree Franklinia alatamaha, which had almost vanished from the earth when Bartram first set eyes upon it? Or a thousand species of tiny beetles that we never knew existed before or after their probable extermination? Can we even be certain than the eastern forests of the United States suffer the loss of their passenger pigeons and chestnuts in some tangible way that affects their vitality or permanence, their value to us? (p. 192) Later, at the first conference on biodiversity, Ehrenfeld (1988) reflected that most species “do not seem to have any conventional value at all” and that the rarest species are “the ones least likely to be missed… by no stretch of the imagination can we make them out to be vital cogs in the ecological machine” (p. 215). The appearance of comments within the environmental literature that are consistent with Ehrenfeld’s—and from authors whose academic standing is also worthy of respect—is uncommon but not unheard of (e.g., Tudge 1989; Ghilarov 1996; Sagoff 1997; Slobodkin 2001; Western 2001). The low resilience assumption is also undermined by the overwhelming tendency for the protection of specific endangered species to be justified by moral or aesthetic arguments, or a basic appeal to the necessity of conserving biodiversity, rather than by emphasising the actual ES these species provide or might be able to provide humanity. Often the only services that can be promoted in this regard relate to the ‘scientific’ or ‘cultural’ value of conserving a particular species, and the tourism revenue that might be associated with its continued existence. The preservation of such services is of an entirely different order compared with the collapse of human civilization predicted by the more pessimistic environmental authors**.** The popularity of the low resilience assumption is in part explained by the increased rhetorical force of arguments that highlight connections between the conservation of biodiversity, human survival and economic profit. However, it needs to be acknowledged by those who employ this approach that a number of negative implications are associated with any use of economic arguments to justify the conservation of biodiversity.

#### 5. Food shortages won’t cause war

Allouche 11, research Fellow – water supply and sanitation @ Institute for Development Studies, frmr professor – MIT (Jeremy, “The sustainability and resilience of global water and food systems: Political analysis of the interplay between security, resource scarcity, political systems and global trade,” Food Policy, Vol. 36 Supplement 1, p. S3-S8, January)

The question of resource scarcity has led to many debates on whether scarcity (whether of food or water) will lead to conflict and war. The underlining reasoning behind most of these discourses over food and water wars comes from the Malthusian belief that there is an imbalance between the economic availability of natural resources and population growth since while food production grows linearly, population increases exponentially. Following this reasoning, neo-Malthusians claim that finite natural resources place a strict limit on the growth of human population and aggregate consumption; if these limits are exceeded, social breakdown, conflict and wars result. Nonetheless, it seems that most empirical studies do not support any of these neo-Malthusian arguments. Technological change and greater inputs of capital have dramatically increased labour productivity in agriculture. More generally, the neo-Malthusian view has suffered because during the last two centuries humankind has breached many resource barriers that seemed unchallengeable. Lessons from history: alarmist scenarios, resource wars and international relations In a so-called age of uncertainty, a number of alarmist scenarios have linked the increasing use of water resources and food insecurity with wars. The idea of water wars (perhaps more than food wars) is a dominant discourse in the media (see for example Smith, 2009), NGOs (International Alert, 2007) and within international organizations (UNEP, 2007). In 2007, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon declared that ‘water scarcity threatens economic and social gains and is a potent fuel for wars and conflict’ (Lewis, 2007). Of course, this type of discourse has an instrumental purpose; security and conflict are here used for raising water/food as key policy priorities at the international level. In the Middle East, presidents, prime ministers and foreign ministers have also used this bellicose rhetoric. Boutrous Boutros-Gali said; ‘the next war in the Middle East will be over water, not politics’ (Boutros Boutros-Gali in Butts, 1997, p. 65). The question is not whether the sharing of transboundary water sparks political tension and alarmist declaration, but rather to what extent water has been a principal factor in international conflicts. The evidence seems quite weak. Whether by president Sadat in Egypt or King Hussein in Jordan, none of these declarations have been followed up by military action. The governance of transboundary water has gained increased attention these last decades. This has a direct impact on the global food system as water allocation agreements determine the amount of water that can used for irrigated agriculture. The likelihood of conflicts over water is an important parameter to consider in assessing the stability, sustainability and resilience of global food systems. None of the various and extensive databases on the causes of war show water as a casus belli. Using the International Crisis Behavior (ICB) data set and supplementary data from the University of Alabama on water conflicts, Hewitt, Wolf and Hammer found only seven disputes where water seems to have been at least a partial cause for conflict (Wolf, 1998, p. 251). In fact, about 80% of the incidents relating to water were limited purely to governmental rhetoric intended for the electorate (Otchet, 2001, p. 18). As shown in The Basins At Risk (BAR) water event database, more than two-thirds of over 1800 water-related ‘events’ fall on the ‘cooperative’ scale (Yoffe et al., 2003). Indeed, if one takes into account a much longer period, the following figures clearly demonstrate this argument. According to studies by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), organized political bodies signed between the year 805 and 1984 more than 3600 water-related treaties, and approximately 300 treaties dealing with water management or allocations in international basins have been negotiated since 1945 (FAO, 1978 and FAO, 1984). The fear around water wars have been driven by a Malthusian outlook which equates scarcity with violence, conflict and war. There is however no direct correlation between water scarcity and transboundary conflict. Most specialists now tend to agree that the major issue is not scarcity per se but rather the allocation of water resources between the different riparian states (see for example Allouche, 2005, Allouche, 2007 and [Rouyer, 2000] ). Water rich countries have been involved in a number of disputes with other relatively water rich countries (see for example India/Pakistan or Brazil/Argentina). The perception of each state’s estimated water needs really constitutes the core issue in transboundary water relations. Indeed, whether this scarcity exists or not in reality, perceptions of the amount of available water shapes people’s attitude towards the environment (Ohlsson, 1999). In fact, some water experts have argued that scarcity drives the process of co-operation among riparians (Dinar and Dinar, 2005 and Brochmann and Gleditsch, 2006). In terms of international relations, the threat of water wars due to increasing scarcity does not make much sense in the light of the recent historical record. Overall, the water war rationale expects conflict to occur over water, and appears to suggest that violence is a viable means of securing national water supplies, an argument which is highly contestable. The debates over the likely impacts of climate change have again popularised the idea of water wars. The argument runs that climate change will precipitate worsening ecological conditions contributing to resource scarcities, social breakdown, institutional failure, mass migrations and in turn cause greater political instability and conflict (Brauch, 2002 and Pervis and Busby, 2004). In a report for the US Department of Defense, Schwartz and Randall (2003) speculate about the consequences of a worst-case climate change scenario arguing that water shortages will lead to aggressive wars (Schwartz and Randall, 2003, p. 15). Despite growing concern that climate change will lead to instability and violent conflict, the evidence base to substantiate the connections is thin ( [Barnett and Adger, 2007] and Kevane and Gray, 2008).

### 2NC – Drones Inevitable

#### Drone integration inevitable—FAA

Gregory McNeal, November 2014, is a professor at Pepperdine University School of Law and a contributor to Forbes. He is an expert in law and public policy with a specific focus on security, technology and crime. Drones and Aerial Surveillance: Considerations For Legislators, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Research/Files/Reports/2014/10/drones-aerial-surveillance-legislators/Drones\_Aerial\_Surveillance\_McNeal\_FINAL.pdf?la=en, /Bingham-MB

The domestic use of drones by law enforcement is a popular topic following passage of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012. The act directed that the FAA must integrate unmanned aircraft systems—drones—into the national airspace by September of 2015. A number of organizations have expressed concern over the possibility that thousands of drones will be crowding the skies, some armed with sophisticated cameras. The ACLU, for example, has been quite vocal in its criticism releasing a report that sets out their concerns over the prospect of intrusive aerial surveillance without proper safeguards. While a robust public debate over the use of domestic drones is warranted, the conclusion that widespread privacy violations are imminent is premature. While the FAA Modernization and Reform Act seeks the integration of unmanned aircraft into U.S. airspace by September 30, 2015, most of the provisions dealing with unmanned aircraft create a broad framework under which the FAA can explore the uses and feasibility of integration of this new technology. The key sections of the law direct the Secretary of Transportation and the Administrator of the FAA to draft plans, standards, and rules to ensure that drone integration proceeds in a safe and legal manner. In short, this is a public process where civil liberties and privacy groups will no doubt have a voice in crafting rules, and that voice seems to be at least as effective as the industry association’s voice. What is left out of the process is what state and local governments will do with the technology, and that is the primary focus of this paper.

#### Only a question of when, not if

Dylan Love, 12-16-2013, A Look At Our Inevitable Drone-Filled Future," Business Insider, http://www.businessinsider.com/how-drones-will-be-used-in-the-future-2013-12, Accessed: 5-31-2015, /Bingham-MB

Forget for a moment the dramatic news clips you've seen of Predator drones taking off to bomb battlefields. Yes, they are drones – unmanned vehicles that can fly without human assistance – but they only represent a narrow slice of what drones are all about. There is a huge potential for how private, commercial drone use can change our lives. When we're talking about commercial drones, we're generally talking about a small, GPS-enabled remote control airplanes or helicopters with really advanced autopilot that can handle all aspects of a flight, from takeoff to landing. For such a straightforward idea, it has huge implications that could shake up a number of industries. But American regulators obviously want to make sure that drones can be employed safely. Consider this quick thought experiment. It's some indeterminate amount of time in the future and seeing a commercial drone is as commonplace as seeing a UPS truck today. Farmers use them to more quickly and efficiently dust their crops. Search and rescue missions rely on them to get to vantage points that an unaided human never could. The pizza delivery man is a trained and licensed professional drone pilot who works from home. And all of this happens with the government's blessing. In this hypothetical world, it's no longer unusual to look up to the sky and see it riddled with unmanned aircraft going about their business. In fact, a sky full of drones is the new normal. What would that world be like, practically? Amazon got the general population interested in drones with the announcement that it has been experimenting with "octocopters," unmanned drones that will supposedly be able to deliver an item to your house within 30 minutes of ordering it. "Amazon Prime Air," as it's being called, won't be deployed for customers anytime soon. But people seem to love the idea. Here's the 60 Minutes video that got everyone's attention. Zookal, an Australian company that sells textbooks, recently partnered with Flirtey, a drone company, to facilitate speedy delivery of textbooks to customers who order them. Zookal CEO Ahmed Haider told us that the Amazon drones behaving as demonstrated in the video is only "an eventuality, however with the current legislation in America its just a matter of when rather than if."

### 2NC – Plan Not Key

#### Drone’s already used effectively in agriculture-their use exists outside of current FAA bans

Dillow 14 (Clay Dillow, writer at Fortune. “Despite FAA dithering, a drone economy sprouts on the farm.” September 16, 2014. http://fortune.com/2014/09/16/despite-faa-dithering-a-drone-economy-sprouts-on-the-farm/

Down in the lower 48, the drone economy is developing more rapidly—albeit quietly, and in an altogether different industry than energy. Farmers and agronomists eager to make precision agriculture even more precise are developing and deploying a range of new UAS technologies—some off-the-shelf, some homegrown—to boost yields, battle common crop ailments, and drive overall farm efficiency. Growers and researchers are able to fly their drones without violating the FAA’s near-outright ban on commercial drone use. In doing so, they are fast becoming the first in the U.S. to realize the economic potential of the drone economy yet to come.¶ Drones on the farm¶ Robert Blair, the proprietor of Three Canyon Farms in north-central Idaho, has owned and operated various small unmanned aircraft since 2006, when he first saw an ad for a farm-focused UAS in an agriculture magazine. To Blair, the benefits of capturing on-demand overhead imagery of his fields were immediately apparent. Even gathering only the most rudimentary data—such as photos—Blair can glean a good deal of information from a single pass over his fields and reduce the crop damage he might inflict using a more conventional method.¶ “I’d have to go out and scout my fields anyhow,” Blair says, “but this allows us to obtain information during periods when you would not be able to physically go into the fields—such as after a rainstorm when it’s too muddy or when the crop is at a certain maturity when you would damage it by driving a four-wheeler out there. A UAV is easy to deploy and that info is back in your hands as soon as it lands.”¶ The on-demand aspect of a drone is particularly useful. Satellite imagery that is days or weeks old isn’t useful after a big storm or during a particularly dry spell. Hiring a conventional aircraft is expensive and often requires several days of lead time. “We just had a storm yesterday,” Blair says. “And I want information today.”¶ Several research institutions are hacking together new kinds of UAS from a range of off-the-shelf aircraft components and sensors in an attempt to beam new kinds of on-demand information from field to farmer. Researchers are custom-building drones that can deliver new kinds of data to growers, which they can then use to identify a range of agricultural problems.¶ Dennis Bowman, an agronomist with the University of Illinois Extension, has experimented with both the camera-equipped Parrot AR Drone (a recreational model available online for less than $200) and a Phantom quad-rotor (a slightly more sophisticated recreational drone manufactured by Hong Kong-based DJI). He has since constructed his own hexacopter drone from parts available online, equipping his creation with a custom-modified Canon Powershot camera that shoots imagery using infrared (IR) light. “For some of those things that would seem very daunting, I’ve found YouTube videos for every step of the process,” he says. “It’s kind of amazing.”¶ Capturing conventional aerial imagery can help farmers identify problem areas for closer inspection, but capturing infrared imagery begins to expose drone-driven agriculture’s real potential: the ability to acutely diagnose problems in a precise location. “When you apply herbicide at the wrong rate, pest problems, weed problems—these are the things you’ll see,” Bowman says. Which in turn help a farmer make better crop management decisions.¶ For decades, the term “precision agriculture” was used for agricultural practices that used GPS and other geospatial technologies to observe and manage variability in crops. Drones offer a more acute way to do that—and combined with data analytics technologies, could actually diagnose problems and recommend crop management strategies that farmers can consult.¶ For example, the Utah Water Research Lab at Utah State University recently struck a deal with a major California grape-growing operation to use drones to collect data on how much water the company is losing through evaporation versus plant transpiration. The information is consequential as water scarcity becomes an increasingly pressing issue along parts of the West Coast. Thanks to tools developed by the Utah Water Research Lab team, it’s not all the collaboration will produce.¶ “What we want to be able to do is to fly one day and within 24 hours deliver to the manager of the farm a daily schedule for the next seven days recommending how much water he needs to put down each individual drip lateral,” says Mac McKee, director of the Utah Water Research Lab. “We could tell them how much water to give to each individual grape vine, but they can’t respond at that level of detail. Right now they can’t even respond at the drip lateral because they lack the information to differentiate from one to another. We’ll be able to give them that detailed information.¶ “At the same time we’ll be able to tell them how much nitrogen fertilizer should be contained in that irrigation water. We’ll be able to give them a schedule for when we think they need to trim the grape leaves out of the vine canopy to provide optimum sunshine. And a whole series of other things.”¶ In other words, drones will soon be feeding growers more high-resolution data than they’ll know what to do with. It’s not some distant future: Pending FAA approval, the Utah State team will commence the California flights before the end of the year.

#### Ag drones poised to take off-new FAA regulations enable surplus revenue for both farmers and drone businesses

Dillow 14 (Clay Dillow, writer at Fortune. “Why 2015 is the year agriculture drones take off.” May 18th, 2015. http://fortune.com/2015/05/18/drone-agriculture/

With the debut of the Federal Aviation Administration’s Section 333 exemption (which permits companies to fly drones commercially on a case-by-case basis) in November that’s poised to change, particularly in the United States. For the first time agriculture drones will legally be able to gather widespread data across an entire growing season, allowing companies to test their business models and technologies together for the first time—and ideally make a profit in the process.¶ “This is the first year we’ll actually be able to see, by the time the growing season is over, the impact on the farmer and the impact of the quality of the grapes,” says David Baeza, whose precision agriculture startup Vine Rangers uses drones and ground robots to gather data on vineyard crops.We’re really excited about that.”¶ Before the F.A.A. began offering permits for commercial drones, companies like Vine Rangers couldn’t charge farming operations for their services, which meant they were often relegated to working with farms (often smaller independent ones) on exploratory pilot programs.¶ The shift in regulatory policy will now allow Vine Rangers and other certified firms—many of which are in the startup phase—to assist both large and small farming operations with water and disease management, and charge for the services. They’ll also be able to use drones to help with better planting and crop rotation strategies, and provide a higher degree of all-around knowledge of how crops are progressing day-to-day in different parts of a given field.¶ This boost in crop intelligence should make farms more efficient and help smaller operations compete with their more well-heeled Big Agriculture competitors. More importantly, companies can now test their business models and develop new revenue streams, as well as attract new investment.¶ “We can actually move companies from pilot program to paid,” Baeza says about revenue possibilities that now exist for companies like his. The startup currently has two clients–both vineyards–in California’s Central Valley and working to expand its operations to other wine growing regions. “The biggest part about getting paid is obviously bringing in revenue,” he says. “But now we can test the parameters of the business model as well.”¶ Revenue will be key for drone agriculture startups—most of which currently focus on smaller specialty crops like grapes and avocados over row crops like corn or other grains–as they prepare their businesses as and aim to grab market share in a space analysts expect to grow exponentially in the years ahead. A widely-cited drone report released by the Association for Unmanned Vehicle Systems International predicts that the legalization of commercial drones will create more than $80 billion in economic impact (such as revenue, job creation) between 2015 and 2025, and that precision agriculture will provide the biggest piece of that growth.

### 2NC – Alt Causes to Food

#### Tons of alt causes to food prices – extreme weather, long-term supply/demand crunch, population growth, speculative “futures” investing, disease, less available land, feedstock competition from the biofuels industry, warming

Wall ‘13 – personal finance reporter for the Daily and Sunday Telegraph and Telegraph.co.uk, citing Baring Asset Management (Emma, 03/02, “As the price of food rises, is there profit to be made?” http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/personalfinance/investing/9902374/As-the-price-of-food-rises-is-there-profit-to-be-made.html)

Noticed the price of sugar lately? Potatoes? Fresh fruit? A weak pound, US drought and one of the wettest years on record for Britain have all contributed to the cost of your shopping basket soaring. When sterling falls, your money buys fewer of the commodities that need to be imported. In fact, the recent sharp falls probably haven't had their full impact in yet. But the story of rising food prices is about much more than currency swings. And it provides tempting possibilities for investors. Extreme weather in 2012 led to sharp price rises in the likes of corn, wheat and soya beans, and these prices look likely to remain elevated for the next six months, according to Baring Asset Management. There is also a long-term crunch between supply and demand. In fact, food production must increase by at least 70pc by 2050 to meet global demand. According to the United Nations, the world's population is forecast to increase from 7 billion to 9.3 billion over the next 40 years, and to meet this demand investment in food production is needed. The Ecclesiastical Investment Management Amity Insight report Hungry Planet warned that our current food supply is just not sustainable in the medium to long term, and can only be solved through extensive investment in global agriculture, which will help increase crop yields. Neville White, socially responsible investment analyst at Ecclesiastical, said: "Increased food production will have to be achieved with less land, water and people. Investing in companies with a focus on mechanisation, crop production and fertilisation that aim to increase food production can not only have a real impact on food but can also ensure that investors profit with principles." There are two ways to invest in food: you can buy commodities through trading on the future price of a grain or crop and/or buying an exchange-traded fund. Or you can buy shares in agriculture and food-production related companies. Sarasin AgriSar invests in the entire supply chain, from grain to supermarkets. This means that although you may miss out on large upsurges in the soft commodities market, growth should be smoother. Henry Boucher, manager of the AgriSar fund, said that holding food-related shares was a more ethical way of investing – handing your money to companies in the chain reduces their capital cost and helps them invest to improve food supply. "Some speculators invest in food itself, which takes supply out of the market [if they store it for later sale at higher prices]," said Mr Boucher. "Commodity traders invest directly in corn, pork bellies, wheat and sugar. We're more interested in finding companies that help improve global productivity." He cites investments like Japan's Kubota, which makes small rice transplanters, or Indian company Syngenta, whose fertiliser and seed pre-mix is designed to improve productivity by up to four times. "Both make products for the small farmer – they can be used on land as little as one acre," he said. "This is not about mass-farming but helping the small businesses left in the Asian countryside." Speculative "futures" investing in food markets can also be more volatile. Futures are short-term punts – one bad crop season, due to disease or extreme weather, may mean significant losses. Agriculture-related shares are held for longer and are less affected by natural disasters. Jonathan Blake, manager of the Baring Global Agriculture fund, said last year's weather had enhanced the investment appeal of those companies providing the likes of seeds, herbicides and fertilisers, which will enable farmers to maximise their crop output. "It will take time to address the shortfalls caused by the severe weather events of 2012, from droughts in America to washout conditions in the UK and Europe," said Mr Blake. "We do, however, expect crop prices to come down later in 2013, providing we have a year of 'normal' weather, as significantly improved output will allow inventory levels to begin to be rebuilt." The Baring fund has a sizeable proportion of listed fertiliser, herbicide and seed producers. "Crop production, through the continuous cycle of planting, growing and harvesting, robs the soil of nutrients," said Mr Blake. "As a result, these nutrients need replenishing through the application of fertilisers. Additionally, for many farmers these nutrients are highly affordable given the current high prices farmers are able to get for their crops." Schroders Climate Change manager Simon Webber also likes investing in companies that offer productivity solutions which will help bring down the price of food through use of their products to increase farming production. He also invests in Syngenta and US company Trimble Navigation, which provides solutions for levelling fields. It is not just population growth that provides investment opportunities in the food sector, but the change in global diets. As disposable incomes swell in emerging markets, diets tend to become more Westernised. The AgriSar fund invests in Asian supermarket chain Dairy Farm, whose revenues have risen as the expanding middle classes change their dietary and shopping habits. "Incomes in China are increasing at 10pc a year," said Mr Boucher. "People are no longer going to the market daily but visit a supermarket once a week, where they will be buying more meat, dairy products and imported vegetables." Mr Webber said that on top of the global demand for more agricultural produce are the effects on supply, where available productive land is in decline, yield growth is reducing and there is a growing competition from the biofuel industry for feedstock. "Climate change acts as a threat multiplier to the sector on top of the dual impacts of increased demand and decreased supply, presenting various investment opportunities. The sectors that will benefit from this are companies involved in agricultural production as well as food retailers, whose share price will increase as food prices inflate."

#### Alt cause- skyrocketing bee deaths

Wines ‘13 (Michael, NYT staff writer, "Mystery Malady Kills More Bees, Heightening Worry on Farms," www.nytimes.com/2013/03/29/science/earth/soaring-bee-deaths-in-2012-sound-alarm-on-malady.html?pagewanted=all&\_r=0, March 28, 2013)

A mysterious malady that has been killing honeybees en masse for several years appears to have expanded drastically in the last year, commercial beekeepers say, wiping out 40 percent or even 50 percent of the hives needed to pollinate many of the nation’s fruits and vegetables. A conclusive explanation so far has escaped scientists studying the ailment, colony collapse disorder, since it first surfaced around 2005. But beekeepers and some researchers say there is growing evidence that a powerful new class of pesticides known as neonicotinoids, incorporated into the plants themselves, could be an important factor. The pesticide industry disputes that. But its representatives also say they are open to further studies to clarify what, if anything, is happening. “They looked so healthy last spring,” said Bill Dahle, 50, who owns Big Sky Honey in Fairview, Mont. “We were so proud of them. Then, about the first of September, they started to fall on their face, to die like crazy. We’ve been doing this 30 years, and we’ve never experienced this kind of loss before.” In a show of concern, the Environmental Protection Agency recently sent its acting assistant administrator for chemical safety and two top chemical experts here, to the San Joaquin Valley of California, for discussions. In the valley, where 1.6 million hives of bees just finished pollinating an endless expanse of almond groves, commercial beekeepers who only recently were losing a third of their bees to the disorder say the past year has brought far greater losses. The federal Agriculture Department is to issue its own assessment in May. But in an interview, the research leader at its Beltsville, Md., bee research laboratory, Jeff Pettis, said he was confident that the death rate would be “much higher than it’s ever been.” Following a now-familiar pattern, bee deaths rose swiftly last autumn and dwindled as operators moved colonies to faraway farms for the pollination season. Beekeepers say the latest string of deaths has dealt them a heavy blow. Bret Adee, who is an owner, with his father and brother, of Adee Honey Farms of South Dakota, the nation’s largest beekeeper, described mounting losses. “We lost 42 percent over the winter. But by the time we came around to pollinate almonds, it was a 55 percent loss,” he said in an interview here this week. “They looked beautiful in October,” Mr. Adee said, “and in December, they started falling apart, when it got cold.” Mr. Dahle said he had planned to bring 13,000 beehives from Montana — 31 tractor-trailers full — to work the California almond groves. But by the start of pollination last month, only 3,000 healthy hives remained. Annual bee losses of 5 percent to 10 percent once were the norm for beekeepers. But after colony collapse disorder surfaced around 2005, the losses approached one-third of all bees, despite beekeepers’ best efforts to ensure their health. Nor is the impact limited to beekeepers. The Agriculture Department says a quarter of the American diet, from apples to cherries to watermelons to onions, depends on pollination by honeybees. Fewer bees means smaller harvests and higher food prices. Almonds are a bellwether. Eighty percent of the nation’s almonds grow here, and 80 percent of those are exported, a multibillion-dollar crop crucial to California agriculture. Pollinating up to 800,000 acres, with at least two hives per acre, takes as many as two-thirds of all commercial hives.

#### Double bind – either no food scarcity, or there are tons of alt causes

Adeline 13 – food preservation specialist (02/17, “Food Storage: The Solution to Food Shortage,” http://beforeitsnews.com/survival/2013/02/food-storage-the-solution-to-food-shortage-2462712.html)

We humans need food for proper nutrition. In times of crisis, access to a stable food supply is the key to continued survival. In the presence of natural disasters, human conflicts, climate change, and overpopulation, the threat of food shortages and total famine is not as far-fetched as it seems. Preparing long-term food supplies can buffer the effects of these potential catastrophes. The Anatomy of a Catastrophe Many people think that food shortages may be a thing of the past. Thanks to the marvels of modern technology and scientific farming methods, we have a constant and abundant supply of food. It is difficult to imagine how a food shortage can happen – but it is still a possibility. During ancient times, humans hunted and gathered for food. Then a revolution occurred and changed the course of history: we learned how to cultivate the soil, plant crops, and domesticate animals for a stable source of food. Eventually, modern technology has improved farming and fishing techniques, that food production has now become large-scale. People now depend on hard-working farmers and fishermen for their everyday supply of food. But what happens when the harvests are poor? The farmer will keep his produce to feed his own family first – other people are left without food. Such scenario is still possible today because there are man-made disasters and natural calamities that threaten the world’s food supply. For example, a hurricane rages across the country and floods several states. Our access to food is restricted because travel is nearly impossible. To add to that, business establishments like groceries and supermarkets are probably closed down due to the flood as well as a power outage. Some might argue that this is not a real food shortage scenario because the problem is merely logistics: there is food; it is just that we have no access to it. It is true that natural calamities and wars cause a food shortage only temporarily. However, recent studies show that at present, we consume more than we produce. The UN warns that grain reserves are progressively getting lower because of droughts and crop failures in major food producing countries. The famine in Africa may possibly be felt in other parts of the world. This is an emergency situation that requires us to prepare beforehand. We must have a supply of food and water for us to survive.

### 2NC – No Biodiversity Impact

#### No impact to environment- Niche construction solves

Ridley 14, Matt, visiting professor at Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory in New York, He has been a scientist, a journalist, and a national newspaper columnist, and is the chairman of the International Centre for Life, in Newcastle, England, “The World's Resources Aren't Running Out: Ecologists worry that the world's resources come in fixed amounts that will run out, but we have broken through such limits again and again,” April 25th, http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702304279904579517862612287156?mg=reno64-wsj&url=http%3A%2F%2Fonline.wsj.com%2Farticle%2FSB10001424052702304279904579517862612287156.html

How many times have you heard that we humans are "using up" the world's resources, "running out" of oil, "reaching the limits" of the atmosphere's capacity to cope with pollution or "approaching the carrying capacity" of the land's ability to support a greater population? The assumption behind all such statements is that there is a fixed amount of stuff—metals, oil, clean air, land—and that we risk exhausting it through our consumption. "We are using 50% more resources than the Earth can sustainably produce, and unless we change course, that number will grow fast—by 2030, even two planets will not be enough," says Jim Leape, director general of the World Wide Fund for Nature International (formerly the World Wildlife Fund). But here's a peculiar feature of human history: We burst through such limits again and again. After all, as a Saudi oil minister once said, the Stone Age didn't end for lack of stone. Ecologists call this "niche construction"—that people (and indeed some other animals) can create new opportunities for themselves by making their habitats more productive in some way. Agriculture is the classic example of niche construction: We stopped relying on nature's bounty and substituted an artificial and much larger bounty. Economists call the same phenomenon innovation. What frustrates them about ecologists is the latter's tendency to think in terms of static limits. Ecologists can't seem to see that when whale oil starts to run out, petroleum is discovered, or that when farm yields flatten, fertilizer comes along, or that when glass fiber is invented, demand for copper falls. That frustration is heartily reciprocated. Ecologists think that economists espouse a sort of superstitious magic called "markets" or "prices" to avoid confronting the reality of limits to growth. The easiest way to raise a cheer in a conference of ecologists is to make a rude joke about economists. I have lived among both tribes. I studied various forms of ecology in an academic setting for seven years and then worked at the Economist magazine for eight years. When I was an ecologist (in the academic sense of the word, not the political one, though I also had antinuclear stickers on my car), I very much espoused the carrying-capacity viewpoint—that there were limits to growth. I nowadays lean to the view that there are no limits because we can invent new ways of doing more with less. This disagreement goes to the heart of many current political issues and explains much about why people disagree about environmental policy. In the climate debate, for example, pessimists see a limit to the atmosphere's capacity to cope with extra carbon dioxide without rapid warming. So a continuing increase in emissions if economic growth continues will eventually accelerate warming to dangerous rates. But optimists see economic growth leading to technological change that would result in the use of lower-carbon energy. That would allow warming to level off long before it does much harm. It is striking, for example, that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's recent forecast that temperatures would rise by 3.7 to 4.8 degrees Celsius compared with preindustrial levels by 2100 was based on several assumptions: little technological change, an end to the 50-year fall in population growth rates, a tripling (only) of per capita income and not much improvement in the energy efficiency of the economy. Basically, that would mean a world much like today's but with lots more people burning lots more coal and oil, leading to an increase in emissions. Most economists expect a five- or tenfold increase in income, huge changes in technology and an end to population growth by 2100: not so many more people needing much less carbon. In 1679, Antonie van Leeuwenhoek, the great Dutch microscopist, estimated that the planet could hold 13.4 billion people, a number that most demographers think we may never reach. Since then, estimates have bounced around between 1 billion and 100 billion, with no sign of converging on an agreed figure. Economists point out that we keep improving the productivity of each acre of land by applying fertilizer, mechanization, pesticides and irrigation. Further innovation is bound to shift the ceiling upward. Jesse Ausubel at Rockefeller University calculates that the amount of land required to grow a given quantity of food has fallen by 65% over the past 50 years, world-wide. Ecologists object that these innovations rely on nonrenewable resources, such as oil and gas, or renewable ones that are being used up faster than they are replenished, such as aquifers. So current yields cannot be maintained, let alone improved. In his recent book "The View from Lazy Point," the ecologist Carl Safina estimates that if everybody had the living standards of Americans, we would need 2.5 Earths because the world's agricultural land just couldn't grow enough food for more than 2.5 billion people at that level of consumption. Harvard emeritus professor E.O. Wilson, one of ecology's patriarchs, reckoned that only if we all turned vegetarian could the world's farms grow enough food to support 10 billion people. Economists respond by saying that since large parts of the world, especially in Africa, have yet to gain access to fertilizer and modern farming techniques, there is no reason to think that the global land requirements for a given amount of food will cease shrinking any time soon. Indeed, Mr. Ausubel, together with his colleagues Iddo Wernick and Paul Waggoner, came to the startling conclusion that, even with generous assumptions about population growth and growing affluence leading to greater demand for meat and other luxuries, and with ungenerous assumptions about future global yield improvements, we will need less farmland in 2050 than we needed in 2000. (So long, that is, as we don't grow more biofuels on land that could be growing food.) But surely intensification of yields depends on inputs that may run out? Take water, a commodity that limits the production of food in many places. Estimates made in the 1960s and 1970s of water demand by the year 2000 proved grossly overestimated: The world used half as much water as experts had projected 30 years before. The reason was greater economy in the use of water by new irrigation techniques. Some countries, such as Israel and Cyprus, have cut water use for irrigation through the use of drip irrigation. Combine these improvements with solar-driven desalination of seawater world-wide, and it is highly unlikely that fresh water will limit human population. The best-selling book "Limits to Growth," published in 1972 by the Club of Rome (an influential global think tank), argued that we would have bumped our heads against all sorts of ceilings by now, running short of various metals, fuels, minerals and space. Why did it not happen? In a word, technology: better mining techniques, more frugal use of materials, and if scarcity causes price increases, substitution by cheaper material. We use 100 times thinner gold plating on computer connectors than we did 40 years ago. The steel content of cars and buildings keeps on falling. Until about 10 years ago, it was reasonable to expect that natural gas might run out in a few short decades and oil soon thereafter. If that were to happen, agricultural yields would plummet, and the world would be faced with a stark dilemma: Plow up all the remaining rain forest to grow food, or starve. But thanks to fracking and the shale revolution, peak oil and gas have been postponed. They will run out one day, but only in the sense that you will run out of Atlantic Ocean one day if you take a rowboat west out of a harbor in Ireland. Just as you are likely to stop rowing long before you bump into Newfoundland, so we may well find cheap substitutes for fossil fuels long before they run out. The economist and metals dealer Tim Worstall gives the example of tellurium, a key ingredient of some kinds of solar panels. Tellurium is one of the rarest elements in the Earth's crust—one atom per billion. Will it soon run out? Mr. Worstall estimates that there are 120 million tons of it, or a million years' supply altogether. It is sufficiently concentrated in the residues from refining copper ores, called copper slimes, to be worth extracting for a very long time to come. One day, it will also be recycled as old solar panels get cannibalized to make new ones. Or take phosphorus, an element vital to agricultural fertility. The richest phosphate mines, such as on the island of Nauru in the South Pacific, are all but exhausted. Does that mean the world is running out? No: There are extensive lower grade deposits, and if we get desperate, all the phosphorus atoms put into the ground over past centuries still exist, especially in the mud of estuaries. It's just a matter of concentrating them again. In 1972, the ecologist Paul Ehrlich of Stanford University came up with a simple formula called IPAT, which stated that the impact of humankind was equal to population multiplied by affluence multiplied again by technology. In other words, the damage done to Earth increases the more people there are, the richer they get and the more technology they have. Many ecologists still subscribe to this doctrine, which has attained the status of holy writ in ecology. But the past 40 years haven't been kind to it. In many respects, greater affluence and new technology have led to less human impact on the planet, not more. Richer people with new technologies tend not to collect firewood and bushmeat from natural forests; instead, they use electricity and farmed chicken—both of which need much less land. In 2006, Mr. Ausubel calculated that no country with a GDP per head greater than $4,600 has a falling stock of forest (in density as well as in acreage). Haiti is 98% deforested and literally brown on satellite images, compared with its green, well-forested neighbor, the Dominican Republic. The difference stems from Haiti's poverty, which causes it to rely on charcoal for domestic and industrial energy, whereas the Dominican Republic is wealthy enough to use fossil fuels, subsidizing propane gas for cooking fuel specifically so that people won't cut down forests. Part of the problem is that the word "consumption" means different things to the two tribes. Ecologists use it to mean "the act of using up a resource"; economists mean "the purchase of goods and services by the public" (both definitions taken from the Oxford dictionary). But in what sense is water, tellurium or phosphorus "used up" when products made with them are bought by the public? They still exist in the objects themselves or in the environment. Water returns to the environment through sewage and can be reused. Phosphorus gets recycled through compost. Tellurium is in solar panels, which can be recycled. As the economist Thomas Sowell wrote in his 1980 book "Knowledge and Decisions," "Although we speak loosely of 'production,' man neither creates nor destroys matter, but only transforms it." Given that innovation—or "niche construction"—causes ever more productivity**,** how do ecologists justify the claim that we are already overdrawn at the planetary bank and would need at least another planet to sustain the lifestyles of 10 billion people at U.S. standards of living? Examine the calculations done by a group called the Global Footprint Network—a think tank founded by Mathis Wackernagel in Oakland, Calif., and supported by more than 70 international environmental organizations—and it becomes clear. The group assumes that the fossil fuels burned in the pursuit of higher yields must be offset in the future by tree planting on a scale that could soak up the emitted carbon dioxide. A widely used measure of "ecological footprint" simply assumes that 54% of the acreage we need should be devoted to "carbon uptake." But what if tree planting wasn't the only way to soak up carbon dioxide? Or if trees grew faster when irrigated and fertilized so you needed fewer of them? Or if we cut emissions, as the U.S. has recently done by substituting gas for coal in electricity generation? Or if we tolerated some increase in emissions (which are measurably increasing crop yields, by the way)? Any of these factors could wipe out a huge chunk of the deemed ecological overdraft and put us back in planetary credit. Helmut Haberl of Klagenfurt University in Austria is a rare example of an ecologist who takes economics seriously. He points out that his fellow ecologists have been using "human appropriation of net primary production"—that is, the percentage of the world's green vegetation eaten or prevented from growing by us and our domestic animals—as an indicator of ecological limits to growth. Some ecologists had begun to argue that we were using half or more of all the greenery on the planet. This is wrong, says Dr. Haberl, for several reasons. First, the amount appropriated is still fairly low: About 14.2% is eaten by us and our animals, and an additional 9.6% is prevented from growing by goats and buildings, according to his estimates. Second, most economic growth happens without any greater use of biomass. Indeed, human appropriation usually declines as a country industrializes and the harvest grows—as a result of agricultural intensification rather than through plowing more land. Finally, human activities actually increase the production of green vegetation in natural ecosystems. Fertilizer taken up by crops is carried into forests and rivers by wild birds and animals, where it boosts yields of wild vegetation too (sometimes too much, causing algal blooms in water). In places like the Nile delta, wild ecosystems are more productive than they would be without human intervention, despite the fact that much of the land is used for growing human food.

#### Species adapt and migrate

Ian Thompson et al., Canadian Forest Service, Brendan Mackey, The Australian National University, The Fenner School of Environment and Society, College of Medicine, Biology and Environment, Steven McNulty, USDA Forest Service, Alex Mosseler, Canadian Forest Service, 2009, Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity “Forest Resilience, Biodiversity, and Climate Change” Convention on Biological Diversity

 While resilience can be attributed to many levels of organization of biodiversity, the genetic composition of species is the most fundamental. Molecular genet- ic diversity within a species, species diversity within a forested community, and community or ecosystem diversity across a landscape and bioregion represent expressions of biological diversity at different scales. The basis of all expressions of biological diversity is the genotypic variation found in populations. The individuals that comprise populations at each level of ecological organization are subject to natural se- lection and contribute to the adaptive capacity or re- silience of tree species and forest ecosystems (Mull- er-Starck et al. 2005). Diversity at each of these levels has fostered natural (and artificial) regeneration of forest ecosystems and facilitated their adaptation to dramatic climate changes that occurred during the quaternary period (review by: DeHayes et al. 2000); this diversity must be maintained in the face of antici- pated changes from anthropogenic climate warming. Genetic diversity (e.g., additive genetic variance) within a species is important because it is the basis for the natural selection of genotypes within popu- lations and species as they respond or adapt to en- vironmental changes (Fisher 1930, Pitelka 1988, Pease et al. 1989, Burger and Lynch 1995, Burdon and Thrall, 2001, Etterson 2004, Reusch et al. 2005, Schaberg et al. 2008). The potential for evolutionary change has been demonstrated in numerous long- term programmes based on artificial selection (Fal- coner 1989), and genetic strategies for reforestation in the presence of rapid climate change must focus on maintaining species diversity and genetic diversi- ty within species (Ledig and Kitzmiller 1992). In the face of rapid environmental change, it is important to understand that the genetic diversity and adap- tive capacity of forested ecosystems depends largely on in situ genetic variation within each population of a species (Bradshaw 1991). Populations exposed to a rate of environmental change exceeding the rate at which populations can adapt, or disperse, may be doomed to extinction (Lynch and Lande 1993, Burger and Lynch 1995). Genetic diversity deter- mines the range of fundamental eco-physiological tolerances of a species. It governs inter-specific competitive interactions, which, together with dispersal mechanisms, constitute the fundamental de- terminants of potential species responses to change (Pease et al. 1989, Halpin 1997). In the past, plants have responded to dramatic changes in climate both through adaptation and migration (Davis and Shaw 2001). The capacity for long-distance migration of plants by seed dispersal is particularly important in the event of rapid environmental change. Most, and probably all, species are capable of long-distance seed disper- sal, despite morphological dispersal syndromes that would indicate morphological adaptations primarily for short-distance dispersal (Cwyner and MacDon- ald 1986, Higgins et al. 2003). Assessments of mean migration rates found no significant differences be- tween wind and animal dispersed plants (Wilkinson 1997, Higgins et al. 2003). Long-distance migration can also be strongly influenced by habitat suitabil- ity (Higgins and Richardson 1999) suggesting that rapid migration may become more frequent and vis- ible with rapid changes in habitat suitability under scenarios of rapid climate change. The discrepancy between estimated and observed migration rates during re-colonization of northern temperate forests following the retreat of glaciers can be accounted for by the underestimation of long-distance disper- sal rates and events (Brunet and von Oheimb 1998, Clark 1998, Cain et al. 1998, 2000). Nevertheless, concerns persist that potential migration and ad- aptation rates of many tree species may not be able to keep pace with projected global warming (Davis 1989, Huntley 1991, Dyer 1995, Collingham et al. 1996, Malcolm et al. 2002). However, these models refer to fundamental niches and generally ignore the ecological interactions that also govern species dis- tributions.

#### New species displace losses

**Biello 14**, David, associate editor for Scientific American, “Biodiversity Survives Extinctions for Now,” 4/20, http://www.scientificamerican.com/podcast/episode/biodiversity-survives-extinctions-for-now1/

A meta-analysis of ecosystems finds that species losses in any given place do not yet translate to large changes in the number of different species in that place. David Biello reports We are living during what seem to be the opening stages of the sixth mass extinction in our planet's 4.5 billion year history. Species of birds, fish, mammals and plants are disappearing at speeds rarely experienced, thanks in large part to human activities: pollution, climate change, habitat destruction and other damage. But extinction apparently does not mean less biodiversity—at least not yet. A new look at ecosystems from the poles to the tropics shows that losses in the number of species in any given place do not yet translate to large changes in the overall number of different species there. The study is in the journal Science. [Maria Dornelas et al, Assemblage Time Series Reveal Biodiversity Change but Not Systematic Loss] The researchers analyzed 100 surveys that followed more than 35,000 different species over various lengths of time. These long-term studies found that the number of different species in, say, a coral reef remains relatively constant. Because the loss of a species, either locally or entirely, is often balanced by the arrival of a new species. The meta-analysis showed that 40 percent of places had more species present, 40 percent had less and 20 percent were unchanged. In other words, the ecosystems of the current Anthropocene era are transformed, but just as diverse—so far anyway. We are living in a world of novel ecosystems.

### 2NC – No Food Wars

#### Resource wars are self-defeating

Bennett and Nordstrom 2K (D Scott and Timothy, Department of political science at Penn State, The Journal of Conflict Resolution, 44:1, “Foreign policy substitutability and internal economic problems in enduring rivalries”, ProQuest, 2000)

Conflict settlement is also a distinct route to dealing with internal problems that leaders in rivalries may pursue when faced with internal problems. Military competition between states requires large amounts of resources, and rivals require even more attention. Leaders may choose to negotiate a settlement that ends a rivalry to free up important resources that may be reallocated to the domestic economy. In a "guns versus butter" world of economic trade-offs, when a state can no longer afford to pay the expenses associated with competition in a rivalry, it is quite rational for leaders to reduce costs by ending a rivalry. This gain (a peace dividend) could be achieved at any time by ending a rivalry. However, such a gain is likely to be most important and attractive to leaders when internal conditions are bad and the leader is seeking ways to alleviate active problems. Support for policy change away from continued rivalry is more likely to develop when the economic situation sours and elites and masses are looking for ways to improve a worsening situation. It is at these times that the pressure to cut military investment will be greatest and that state leaders will be forced to recognize the difficulty of continuing to pay for a rivalry. Among other things, this argument also encompasses the view that the cold war ended because the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics could no longer compete economically with the United States.

#### No resource wars – peaceful resolutions, substitutes, and innovation

Itell 13, Jeffrey, senior wikistrat analyst, this report summarizes a 14-day crowd-sourced simulation in which over 85 analysts from around the world collaboratively explored scenario pathways countering the conventional wisdom that resource scarcities in the future will lead to “resource wars., “Countering Conventional Wisdom: the Coming Resource Wars,” October, http://wikistrat.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/the\_coming\_resource\_wars-Final-Report.pdf

Politicians can also employ policies that have long proven to be effective under similar economic systems to keep resources flowing. Such is the case with rubber production in southern Thailand, in which falling prices and overproduction have led to political protest and violence. The Thai government’s judicious employment of agriculture price and production controls, proven to work in Europe and the U.S. and already employed for rice in Thailand, could limit turmoil and maintain production by providing equitable subsidies to all agricultural producers, thereby reducing equity concerns between the haves (the rice farmers) and have-nots (almost all other farmers). It has been demonstrated that government assistance to manage agricultural risk can lead to higher production, greater wealth and more agricultural stability, factors that would benefit Thailand’s farmers as well as the entire country’s economy and food stability situation. Finally, the United States faces huge infrastructure demands, including refitting its energy infrastructure for renewable energy. Much of this infrastructure could be funded through U.S. corporate profits. However, U.S. tax laws have resulted in U.S. corporations keeping $1.7 trillion dollars in profits offshore because marginal U.S. corporate tax rates are among the highest in the world. A deal that reduces these tax rates in return for set-aside investments in solar conversion could be a win-win for American corporations and American citizens. Sometimes an emerging technology (plus some smart organizational changes) is all that is necessary to unleash a win-win outcome and avoid a scarcity situation. Consider China: With one-fifth of the world’s population to feed, China is buying up agricultural land in Africa and elsewhere, leading to concerns over who will eat or starve in fallow years. Yet this might prove to be a false concern, as Chinese meat and dairy practices are so weak and technology is improving so rapidly that China will soon be able to increase production over demand on its own land. Chinese meat and dairy consumption will also be aided by the emergence of in vitro technologies, which produce meat and dairy products in laboratories rather than farms. The uranium market also lends itself to a win-win solution. Shortages in uranium production lead many to worry that producers and processors will hoard uranium, which could result in proxy wars and trade by criminal networks. In 2007, the Nuclear Energy Authority estimated that at then-current prices, untapped uranium resources consisted of about 5.5 million tons in known deposits and an additional 10.5 million tons in likely deposits, enough to supply reactors sufficient fuel for 100 years —provided demand did not increase. (At higher prices, known uranium deposits would likely be larger since untapped areas could be explored economically.) Several ongoing technological and mechanistic processes could suppress fuel demand even as demand for nuclear power increases, thus making conflict less likely. New nuclear energy technologies require less fuel and recycle used fuel. Higher demand would lead to higher prices, leading to the cost-effective exploitation of new sources of uranium. Alternatively, the ascent of renewable energy, especially solar, would reduce global demand for uranium fuel. As these examples indicate, there are many ways to address resources shortages in a complex, dynamic economy other than simply looking for more resources. Existing resources can be used more efficiently; substitute products can be found; new technologies can re-popularize obsolete resources (consider the absence of panic over whale oil). The interplay of pricing and the ingenuity under-laying technological process has time and again proven resource scaremongers wrong. Some resource issues present themselves as zero-sum problems. To the extent one side wins, the other side must lose. By their nature, zero-sum resource issues often do not lend themselves to easy political resolutions. Losers must rely on technological advancements or economic forces to make do with available resources. For example, Japan (and most other technologically advanced countries) can defend itself against China’s near-monopoly of rare earth elements – which are essential for many high tech products – by developing substitute materials. Continued Chinese hoarding would also push up the marginal cost of using rare earth elements, making exploitation of other known sources more economically viable. Similarly, potential U.S. hoarding of phosphates (important for fertilizer) extracted in the Western Sahara would lead to the development of synthetic fertilizer and make phosphate recycling economically feasible. Asian countries may find it difficult to fully power their rapid urbanization, especially if neighboring countries are unwilling to share hydroelectric power at reasonable prices; but new technologies such as power grids and wireless transmission could ensure that supply outpaces demand. Even water supply issues that do not lend themselves to easy political resolution – such as in the Sea of Galilee in Israel and with the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers among Turkey, Syria and Iraq –water conservation, recycling and desalination will help “losers” meet some of their water needs. A political solution, sometimes, is the only way to resolve a zero-sum resource conflict. The post-World War II international system offers countries a variety of dispute resolution mechanisms to forestall conflict, starting with the U.N. Security Council but often residing at technical agencies such as the International Atomic Energy Agency, for example, for dispute resolution and monitoring. International treaties and regional organizations such as ASEAN provide mechanisms for dispute resolution and, sometimes, interested stakeholders can provide ad hoc dispute resolution services as well. Water issues typify this type of resource problem. The headwaters for some of India’s important rivers lie within Chinese-controlled Tibet. Likewise, Armenia’s headwaters (important for hydroelectric generation) lie in hostile countries like Azerbaijan. India and Armenia are not likely to receive what either considers fair water allocations but, because of the importance of other regional political issues, third-party mediation can help both India and Armenia obtain more water than they might normally expect. For example, while India will continue to press its claims against China, likely seeking U.N. mediation, it can simultaneously mitigate the effects of China’s water diversion by introducing an economical desalination and aqueduct system to funnel water from its coasts to its inland provinces. The World Bank and other lending institutions would likely support India’s effort. Armenia may find itself in a tougher bind, although its ally Russia could help decrease its reliance on water resources for energy by reducing tariffs on natural gas. In the long run, Armenia could leverage a settlement over Nagorno-Karabakh in return for normalized relations with Turkey and Azerbaijan that would include cooperative use of collective water resources for power. Such a scenario seems unlikely now, but a disruption of regional geopolitics could make such an agreement feasible, especially if Armenia’s power situation becomes desperate. The allocation of scarce helium supplies is another example of a zero-sum problem. Poorly thought-out U.S. helium reserve policies have led to frivolous waste on this nonrenewable and hard-to-extract resource. However, changes to U.S. policy on the use and price of helium, if adopted soon, can provide enough helium to meet supply until technology invents substitutes. Similarly, enforceable fishing regulations may never return Mediterranean tuna stocks to a level that meets the burgeoning middle class demand but they can prevent collapse and restore stocks to levels that can assure reasonable supply, albeit at higher prices. Efficacious regulatory structures are also needed to assure an adequate supply of recreational beachfront for middle class consumers and low-altitude airspace (up to 500 meters) for solar and wind arrays. Although it is likely to take many more decades to convince naysayers that earth has escaped the Malthusian Trap, this Wikistrat simulation indicates that political and technological ingenuity can ameliorate virtually any type of potential resource scarcity. Fears over resource scarcity are often caused by political disputes that make it impossible to develop known resources (such as gas off the coasts of Cyprus, Japan and the Spratly Islands), even when pricing would indicate that such development is warranted. These situations are perhaps the easiest to resolve, since all sides can stand to benefit from a solution. Determining how much each side wins is the lone sticking point. In addition, technological advances can often make political disputes moot. By the time Africa and China settle their issues over agricultural land purchases, agro-industrial scientists may be growing enough food in their laboratories to feed the world. Technology can also transform the zero-sum resource conflicts of today into the win-win situations of tomorrow. Continued Chinese hoarding of rare earth elements would likely result in technological innovation making the Chinese practice counterproductive, just like butter shortages repeatedly gave rise to improved versions of margarine. Even in the worst-case scenarios where political leaders have to confront true scarcity, technological progress, higher prices leading to more production, recycling, efficiencies, substitute products and better policies can all lead to increased resource supplies, albeit at higher prices. Unresolved political conflict could lead to spot resource shortages around the globe, but in a hyperconnected world that responds quickly to technological advances and price signals and values conflict resolution, the dystopian future foretold in Soylent Green will remain in the realm of science fiction.

## Solvency

### 1NC – Solvency

#### 1. Congress and states regulations solve- they’re inevitable

Fox ’13 (Fox News, “Lawmakers eye regulating domestic surveillance drones”, <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/05/19/congress-eyes-regulating-drones/>, May 19, 2013)

April 27, 2012: Seattle Police officer Reuben Omelanchuk is at the controls of the department's new, small radio-controlled Draganflyer X6 drone with a camera attached, in Seattle. (AP) Amid growing concern over the use of drones by police and government officials for surveillance, a bipartisan group of lawmakers is pushing to limit the use of unmanned surveillance "eyes in the sky" aircraft. Rep. James Sensenbrenner, R-Wis., along with Rep. Zoe Lofgren, D-Calif., and Rep. Ted Poe, R-Texas, is sponsoring legislation that would codify due process protections for Americans in cases involving drones and make flying armed drones in the U.S. sky illegal. Sensenbrenner believes it is necessary to develop new standards to address the privacy issues associated with use of drones — which can be as small as a bird and as large as a plane. "Every advancement in crime fighting technology, from wiretaps to DNA, has resulted in courts carving out the Constitutional limits within which the police operate," Sensenbrenner said at a House Judiciary subcommittee hearing Friday on the issues surrounding drones. The subcommittee heard from experts who were divided on what actions Congress should take to address the new technology. But the four witnesses all agreed that drones raised new, often unprecedented questions about domestic surveillance. "Current law has yet to catch up to this new technology," said Chris Calabrese, legislative counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union. Calabrese said he supported immediate regulation of the drone industry and said his biggest concern was the overuse of drones by police and government officials for surveillance. But Calabrese said he doesn't want to hinder the growth of drones with the power to do good, including helping find missing persons, assisting firefighters and addressing other emergencies. Tracey Maclin, a professor with the Boston University School of Law, said the issues raised by drones haven't been addressed by courts before because the technology goes beyond what humans had been capable of through aerial surveillance. Past court rulings, "were premised on naked-eye observations — simple visual observations from a public place," he said. Rep. Cedric Richmond, D-La., said he wanted to know when drone technology will advance to the point where Congress will have to act on the issue. He said he was concerned about the effect on privacy. "At what point do you think it's going to get to a point where we have to say what a reasonable expectation of privacy is?" Richmond said. Republicans expressed similar concerns. "It seems to me that Congress needs to set the standard, rather than wait and let the courts set the standard," Poe said. "Technology is great — as long as it's used the right and proper way," Rep. Jason Chaffetz, R-Utah, said at Friday's hearing. Some experts urged caution. Gregory McNeal, an associate law professor at Pepperdine University, said writing laws to cover drones will be difficult because the technology continues to improve and Congress could think it's addressing key issues, only to have new ones emerge. He compared drones to the privacy concerns raised by development of the Internet in the 1990s. Regulating then, he said, could have stymied the rapid growth of the Internet and wouldn't have addressed today's Internet privacy issues. If Congress feels compelled to act, McNeal said, it should think in terms broader than a "drone policy" and set standards for surveillance or realistic expectations of privacy. "A technology-centered approach to privacy is the wrong approach," he said. But the ACLU's Calabrese said Congress should work quickly. "This can't be adequately addressed by existing law," he said. "Manned aircraft are expensive to purchase. Drones' low cost and flexibility erode that natural limit. They can appear in windows, all for much less than the cost of a plane or a helicopter." A future with domestic drones may be inevitable. While civilian drone use is currently limited to government agencies and some public universities, a law passed by Congress last year requires the Federal Aviation Administration to allow widespread drone flights in the U.S. by 2015. According to FAA estimates, as many as 7,500 civilian drones could be in use within five years. Congress isn't alone in seeking to address the issues: Since January, drone-related legislation has been introduced in more than 30 states, largely in response to privacy concerns.

#### 2. Requiring warrants in the instance of drones is non-sense

McNeal 2014 (Gregory [prof at Pepperdine University]; Drones and Aerial surveillance: Considerations for Legislators; Nov; www.brookings.edu/research/reports2/2014/11/drones-and-aerial-surveillance; kdf)

Legislators should reject calls for a blanket requirement that all drone use be accompanied by a warrant. If legislators forgo the property rights approach detailed in Part A. above, they should eschew proposals that require warrants for the use of drones. Such prohibitions are overbroad and ill-advised.[50] Legislation that requires warrants for drones treats the information from a drone differently than information gathered from a manned aircraft, differently than that gathered by a police officer in a patrol car, or even from an officer on foot patrol. Under current Fourth Amendment jurisprudence, police are not required to shield their eyes from wrongdoing until they have a warrant. Why impose such a requirement on the collection of information by drones? Much of the anti-drone activists efforts are aimed at the threat of persistent and pervasive surveillance of the population by the government, an understandable fear. But what is an unreasonable fear, and should not work its way into legislation, is a ban on ordinary aerial observations that are only controversial because they take place with a remote controlled helicopter rather than a manned one. If anybody in a Cessna can see the pollution pouring from a factory, or if the police flying in a helicopter can see a cartel’s drug operations or human trafficking ring --- and such observations can be admitted as evidence in a criminal trial, shouldn’t citizens and the police be able to make the same observations and expect that the evidence won’t be excluded merely because it is collected with a remote control aircraft? For example, imagine a police officer was on patrol in her patrol car. While driving, she witnesses the car in front of her strike a pedestrian and speed off. Until witnessing the crime she did not have probable cause (the predicate level of suspicion for a warrant), or even reasonable suspicion (the predicate level of suspicion for a brief investigatory stop) to believe the vehicle in front of her would be involved in a crime. Let’s further assume that her dash camera recorded the entire incident. Nonetheless, that dashcam video may be used as evidence against the driver in a subsequent criminal proceeding. However, under broadly worded proposals that have been introduced in many state legislatures and the U.S. Congress, the same piece of evidence if gathered by a drone would be inadmissible in court because police did not have a warrant. Consider another example. Police receive an anonymous tip that someone is growing marijuana in their backyard. A police officer attempts to view the backyard from the ground but his view is blocked by a 10 foot tall fence. The officer next decides to fly a commercially available remote controlled helicopter[51] over the backyard and from a vantage point that does not violate FAA regulations observes marijuana plants growing in the yard. This observation would be unlawful under proposals that require a warrant for observations from a drone. However, these facts are nearly identical to the facts in the Supreme Court’s 1986 California v. Ciraolo[52] decision which upheld aerial surveillance (discussed above). The only difference is that in Ciraolo, the officer flew over the backyard in an airplane, rather than using a drone. In fact, in Ciraolo the Court noted that not only would observation of the marijuana plants from the air (as described above) be lawful, police officers peering over the fence from the top of a police truck would also be behaving lawfully, and by extension, observation of the marijuana plants by police from the third floor of a neighboring home would also be lawful. But under proposals requiring a warrant for observations by a drone, this evidence would be inadmissible. The examples above raise questions about what public policy goals are advanced by the suppression of evidence of a crime when documented by a drone, when the same evidence if recorded by a dashcam, observed from an airplane, or viewed from a neighboring home would be admissible in court. Such examples highlight the requiring warrants for evidence gathered by drones, when other methods of gathering the same evidence would not require a warrant.

### 2NC – States Solve

#### States solves drone surveillance restrictions

David L. Hudson Jr., 2-1-2015, How should states regulate drones and aerial surveillance?," No Publication, http://www.abajournal.com/mobile/mag\_article/how\_should\_states\_regulate\_drones\_and\_aerial\_surveillance, Accessed: 5-24-2015, /Bingham-MB

While the federal government uses these unmanned aerial vehicles for military purposes, states are increasingly turning to drones for law enforcement as a means of enhancing surveillance and gathering data. However, many worry that the increased use of drones domestically portends poorly for those who care about privacy and the Fourth Amendment freedom from search and seizure. “Domestic drones will devastate the Fourth Amendment unless there are some really strict guidelines,” warns John Whitehead, president of the Rutherford Institute, a Charlottesville, Virginia-based nonprofit legal group. “Information collected by a drone should not be used as evidence by a court of law,” adds Whitehead, who wrote about the technology in his 2013 book, A Government of Wolves: The Emerging American Police State. States are taking notice and considering regulation. According to the National Conference of State Legislators, more than 20 states have passed laws related to drones. Some limit law enforcement’s use of drones or other unmanned aircraft. For example, in Idaho, a law signed in 2013 provides that, except for emergencies “for safety, search-and-rescue or controlled substance investigations,” no person or agency may use a drone to conduct surveillance of private property without a warrant. Tennessee has a similar law known as the Freedom from Unwarranted Surveillance Act. The law allows aggrieved individuals the right to sue law enforcement agencies in civil court for violations. It also provides that “no data collected on an individual, home or areas other than the target that justified deployment may be used, copied or disclosed for any purpose,” and that such data must be deleted within 24 hours of collection. “The legislation doesn’t eliminate the use of drones,” says Austin, Texas-based attorney Gerry Morris, co-chair of the National Association of Criminal Defense Attorneys’ Fourth Amendment Committee. They “require some sort of showing of probable cause. This is something that is constantly overlooked. Just because government officials are required to go get a warrant doesn’t mean they won’t be able to use the drones. It just means that they are required to follow the Constitution when they use them.” However, in California, Gov. Jerry Brown vetoed a measure in September that would have required law enforcement to obtain a warrant for the vast majority of uses of drones. Brown claimed the bill, AB 1327, would put greater standards on law enforcement than those required by the U.S. and state constitutions. “AB 1327 would have been the first law in California to regulate drones,” says constitutional law expert Erwin Chemerinsky, dean of the University of California at Irvine School of Law. “Drones may be a very valuable tool for investigation in some cases. Under AB 1327, the police still could use drones if they demonstrated to a judge that there was probable cause. I strongly favored AB 1327 and was very disappointed when Gov. Brown vetoed it.” On the other hand, states have passed laws related to drones that fund the technology or encourage the development of testing sites. For example, the North Dakota legislature passed a law funding a drone test site. Legal experts believe that at some point courts will need to address the constitutionality of these measures and of law enforcement’s use of the technology. “I do think more legislation is needed,” Morris says. “I don’t think the court opinions at this point have caught up with the technology. Legislators have to address the issue and get out in front of it.” On the federal level, the 2012 Federal Aviation Administration Modernization and Reform Act governs the rules regulating drones’ domestic use. “The FAA has the responsibility of drafting a set of rules for integrating unmanned aircraft systems into the airspace,” says Joseph Vacek, a lawyer and aviation professor at the University of North Dakota. “It has taken more time than expected because there has been no industry consensus. I predict that by 2016 we will have the rules in place.” One question that may arise from drone regulation is the difference between state and federal privacy protection. For example, the New Mexico Court of Appeals interpreted the state constitution as more protective of privacy than the U.S. Constitution. “It would be better for states to legislate in this area,” says Vacek. “Perhaps we will have a conflict that could eventually wind up before the U.S. Supreme Court. Current Supreme Court law says surveillance from the public airspace is OK. But the court could provide a different answer with respect to drones.”

#### States can regulate drone surveillance without a warrant

Robert Holly, 3-21-2014, States restrict drone use because of privacy concerns," Investigate Midwest, http://investigatemidwest.org/2014/03/21/states-restrict-drone-use-because-of-privacy-concerns/, Accessed: 5-27-2015, /Bingham-MB

Citing privacy concerns, legislators throughout the country are increasingly passing laws to restrict the use of domestic drones over private land. For more information on drone use, see the series: "Sunshine Week" At least nine states have officially enacted some form of legislation that bans nonconsensual domestic drone use over private property, found an analysis by the American Civil Liberties Union, a network of more than 500,000 members who monitor First Amendment and privacy rights. “We believe that we need a system of rules to ensure that we can enjoy the benefits of drones and technology without becoming a surveillance society in which everyone’s movements are monitored, tracked, recorded and scrutinized by the authorities,” said Allie Bohm, an advocacy and policy strategist for the American Civil Liberties Union. “We believe that drones should be prohibited from indiscriminate mass surveillance.” In the states with drone-restriction policies in place, drone pilots surveying land and capturing images need to first gain consent from the owners of the land they are flying over. Likewise, law enforcement authorities need to first secure a warrant.. This year, at least 34 additional states have also introduced similar policies that aim to limit domestic drone use.

#### Empirically states can regulate drone use and privacy issues—multiple states prove

Michael Berry, 9-25-2014, State legislation governing private drone use," Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/volokh-conspiracy/wp/2014/09/25/state-legislation-governing-private-drone-use/, Accessed: 5-25-2015, /Bingham-MB

With many people, including journalists, photographers and filmmakers, clamoring to fly drones, and in the absence of FAA regulations, states have begun to address the issue. Nearly all states have considered drone legislation over the past few years. More than a dozen states have passed laws substantively regulating drones, with most of these laws addressing the use of drones by government agencies and focusing primarily on law enforcement use. Several states also have enacted laws regulating private drone use. Theses states have taken varying approaches, have articulated permissible uses, created new causes of action and established new crimes. Two states have sought to regulate private use of drones by addressing where they can fly. Last year, Oregon enacted a law that allows property owners to sue a drone operator if (1) a drone has flown less than 400 feet above the owner’s property at least once, (2) the property owner has told the drone operator that he/she does not consent to the drone flying over his/her property, and (3) the operator then flies the drone less than 400 feet above the property again. If these three conditions are met, the property owner can seek injunctive relief, “treble damages for any injury to the person or the property,” and attorney fees if the amount of damages is under $10,000. Tennessee also seeks to restrict drones from flying over private property, but has done so in a different way. It has amended its criminal trespass statute to make it a crime for drones to fly over private property below navigable airspace. In contrast to these two states’ focus on drone flight, most states that have enacted laws on private drone use have sought to limit who, when and where drones film and photograph. Texas has enacted the most detailed of these laws. Its drone law — called the Texas Privacy Act— explicitly authorizes drones to capture images in certain circumstances. For instance, it permits owners and operators of pipelines to use drones for inspections and university professors to use them for “scholarly research.” The Texas law also allows drones to capture images of people on “public real property,” of people “on real property that is within 25 miles of the United States border,” and “with the consent of the individual who owns or lawfully occupies the real property captured in the image.” In addition to these permissible uses, the law prohibits certain conduct — specifically, using a drone to capture images of people or privately owned property “with the intent to conduct surveillance on the individual or property.” The law, however, does not define “surveillance.” Texas deems this conduct a misdemeanor and provides a defense if the alleged offender destroyed the image as soon as he or she realizes it was captured and has not disclosed it to anyone else. The law also makes it a misdemeanor to possess, disclose, distribute, or otherwise use an image after capturing it in violation of the law. In addition, Texas law gives owners and tenants of private property the right to file suit to enjoin an “imminent violation” of the criminal provisions and to seek civil penalties and attorney’s fees. The civil penalties include statutory damages of up to $5,000 for “all images captured in a single episode” and up to $10,000 for the disclosure or “use” of “any images captured in a single episode.” An owner and tenant also can recover actual damages if he or she can show that the images were disclosed or distributed with “malice.” Tennessee has enacted a statute that follows the Texas model. It also has enacted a statute that prohibits the use of drones to conduct surveillance of people hunting or fishing without their consent. Illinois has passed a similar law, making it a crime to use a drone to interfere with hunting and fishing. Idaho’s law sweeps more broadly. It bars people from using drones “to photograph or otherwise record an individual, without such individual’s written consent, for the purpose of publishing or otherwise publicly disseminating such photograph or recording.” The law, which would undoubtedly face constitutional challenges if enforced, allows a person to file suit and recover either $1,000 in statutory damages or “actual and general damages,” whichever is greater, plus attorney fees and “other litigation costs reasonably incurred.” North Carolina, likewise, prohibits using a drone to “photograph an individual, without the individual’s consent, for the purpose of publishing or otherwise publicly disseminating the photograph.” But, unlike Idaho, the Tar Heel state provides an exception for “newsgathering, newsworthy events, or events or places to which the general public is invited.” North Carolina, taking a page from Texas’s statute, also prohibits people from using drones to “conduct surveillance” of people, dwelling, and private property without the person or property owner’s consent. If any of these provisions are violated, the person or property owner can sue, seeking actual damages, statutory damages ($5,000 per photograph or video disseminated), costs and fees, as well as injunctive relief. Finally, Wisconsin has passed a criminal law to deal with private drone use. Its law would punish anyone who uses a drone “with the intent to photograph, record, or otherwise observe another individual in a place or location where the person has a reasonable expectation of privacy.” In Wisconsin, that crime is a misdemeanor. With many people, including journalists, photographers and filmmakers, clamoring to fly drones, and in the absence of FAA regulations, states have begun to address the issue. Nearly all states have considered drone legislation over the past few years. More than a dozen states have passed laws substantively regulating drones, with most of these laws addressing the use of drones by government agencies and focusing primarily on law enforcement use.

### 2NC – No Solvency

#### No solvency—warrants aren’t key

Rushin 11(Stephen, Ph.D in Jurisprudence and Social Policy, Assistant Professor at The University of Alabama’s School of Law, *THE JUDICIAL RESPONSE TO MASS POLICE SURVEILLANCE*, University of Illinois Journal of Law, Technology & Policy, Vol. 2011, No. 2, pg. 282-283, 2011)

Law enforcement technology has become ubiquitous in the urban landscape. Closed circuit surveillance cameras indiscriminately record individuals’ physical movements.1 Facial recognition software compares images of passing pedestrians with extensive databases of suspected criminals.2 Red light cameras capture photographs of traffic violations. The National Security Agency (NSA) logs phone calls made by millions of citizens across the country in hopes of identifying suspected terrorist activity.3 And automatic license plate recognition (ALPR) systems, already in use in various jurisdictions across the country, digitally read and record the license plates of passing automobiles into expansive databases.4 Indeed, we live today in an increasingly digitally efficient investigative state—a state where law enforcement can both observe and record information about our whereabouts in an unprecedentedly efficient manner. The retention of surveillance data raises many serious constitutional concerns. But Fourth Amendment doctrine on search and seizures reflects outdated assumptions about the once-limited capabilities of public surveillance technologies and is, therefore, ill-equipped to deal with the challenges posed by the digitally efficient investigative state. The existing Fourth Amendment doctrine on surveillance technologies focuses primarily on three issues: (1) whether a person had a subjective expectation of privacy; (2) the socially objective reasonableness of that expectation of privacy; and (3) the relative intrusiveness of the supposed privacy violation.5 The Supreme Court has also drawn a distinction between presumptively constitutional technologies that merely improve the efficiency of legitimate law enforcement, like digital tracking devices, and unconstitutional technologies that give law enforcement an intrusive extrasensory ability, like heat sensors.6 Under this framework, the warrantless use of most surveillance technologies and the collection of personal data fits comfortably within constitutional doctrine—after all, a person does not have an objectively reasonable expectation to privacy when driving her car or walking on a public sidewalk. The recording of a person’s movements in public is not especially intrusive and certainly does not provide police with any intrusive, extrasensory abilities beyond mere observation. A recent Seventh Circuit case engaged in just this type of analysis when it found that the warrantless use of global position system (GPS) surveillance by law enforcement did not violate the Fourth Amendment.7 There, Judge Posner and the Seventh Circuit concluded that GPS monitoring of a single suspect without a warrant does not amount to “wholesale surveillance.” 8

#### Police abuse, not privacy concerns, are the real issue – the CP resolves them

Reid 2014 (Melanie [Associate Professor of Law, Lincoln Memorial University-Duncan School of Law]; GROUNDING DRONES: BIG BROTHER'S TOOL BOX NEEDS REGULATION NOT ELIMINATION; 20 Rich. J.L. & Tech. 9; kdf)

VI. THE REAL FEAR BEHIND DRONE USE: GOVERNMENT ABUSE P77 If privacy is not the real concern behind drone use, perhaps it is the fear of law enforcement abuse. If law enforcement uses drone technology to target particular areas of the community and randomly "search for crime," is there another way to keep law enforcement in check than to say drone use automatically triggers the Fourth Amendment and requires a warrant? General crime monitoring has never been considered an acceptable practice by the Court. n242 Drones should be used only for investigations of specific targets, not merely to "look for crime." Citizens of the United States do not want to become citizens of the next Soviet Union where agents and drones randomly patrol for criminal or anti-state activity. Citizens fear that regular drone flights might inadvertently collect data from a whole range of individuals unrelated to a specific investigation. P78 The answer lies not in requiring a warrant or a particular exception to the warrant requirement, but in requiring law enforcement to seek a court order similar to that required for a pen register under 18 U.S.C § 2703. n243 To obtain such a court order, law enforcement officials would need to demonstrate specific and articulable facts indicating that the data is relevant to an ongoing criminal investigation. This would prevent law enforcement from using drones to randomly search for crime in a particular area. The order would specify the identity, if known, of the person who is the subject of the criminal investigation and whom law enforcement would like to surveil and describe the particularized need for the information that can be gathered with the drone. n244 P79 The order also should contain language requiring law enforcement to discard any information collected by the drone that is not relevant to the scope of the investigation within twenty-four to forty-eighty hours. This requirement would alleviate any concerns that the government would collect this information for other nefarious purposes in the future. Being that it is a court order, this requirement would have teeth as long as magistrates signing these orders follow up and demand that law enforcement demonstrate that they in fact have complied with the order and destroyed any irrelevant information. If a law enforcement officer fails to comply, a variety of sanctions could be used to demand compliance. Sanctions even as severe as jail time would cause any law enforcement agent to comply fully. P80 The court order also should include a penalty for disclosing to unauthorized persons data obtained from a drone, thereby limiting exposure of the information to government personnel working on the particular case, similar to grand jury secrecy requirements under the Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e). n245 Under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e)(7), "[a] knowing violation of Rule 6 . . . may be punished as a contempt of court." n246 Moreover, if the drone is flown outside the FAA regulated navigable airspace and views activity not within the public's vantage point, penalties should also be in place to punish those individuals in violation of strict flight guidelines provided in the court order. Punishing individual agents with contempt of court holds both law enforcement and judges accountable and likely will serve as a more effective means to prevent government abuse than requiring warrants prior to drone flights. P81 The requirement of a court order similar to that found pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2703 eliminates the charade of fitting drone use within the Fourth Amendment context. Instead, it mandates a standard similar to that required for any information the government requests via a court order, such as a request for a pen register. n247 While the Supreme Court deemed a pen register to be outside the Fourth Amendment, Congress later passed 18 U.S.C. § 2703 to provide some protections against governmental abuse. n248 Drone use does not give rise to privacy issues; it gives rise to concerns of government abuse and should follow the pen register precedent. n249 P82 The U.S. Constitution contains no express right to privacy, but the Fourth Amendment provides certain guarantees for the privacy of the person and possessions. n250 The "liberty" guarantee of the Fourteenth Amendment has been broadly interpreted to guarantee a fairly broad right of privacy and privacy issues. n251 The Court can address the possible infringement on these undefined privacy issues by focusing on the legality of drone surveillance through the prism of "reasonable" use. If law enforcement utilizes the drone to collect data that is relevant to a particular, ongoing investigation, then the drone use is reasonable. n252 The greater the intrusiveness of the investigatory tool, the greater the possibility that tool will move into the "search" category of the Fourth Amendment, at which point the tool becomes unreasonable without a warrant. n253 Therefore, a drone that hovers around bedroom windows and takes photographs of the lady of the house taking her daily sauna would be intrusive and unreasonable and would constitute a "search" under the Fourth Amendment (as would a drone with thermal imaging or x-ray capabilities), and a warrant is required. However, if the lady of the house chooses to walk outside and tend to her garden in her front yard, she must come to terms with the fact that prying eyes may be watching--whether it be realtors, Hollywood filmmakers, or law enforcement. The tool used in public areas is reasonable and can be utilized without a warrant. It would be reasonable for any of these actors to come across the gardener in the process of conducting their own drone projects. If law enforcement requested the utilization of a drone via a § 2703 court order to assist them in the surveillance of a real-time drug transaction and happen upon the lady of the house tending her marijuana garden, then it would be reasonable for the government to use that evidence against her in a criminal prosecution. n254 Language in the court order should allow for the subsequent use of this type of information. Once outside, the lady of the house takes the risk that her actions will be seen; our zones of privacy where a warrant is required have traditionally been reserved for our indoor activities. P83 Our right to privacy stems from our desire to be free from governmental interference in our daily lives. In the Fourth Amendment context, we have a right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures and a right to be free from governmental abuse. However, these protections do not extend to any limitation on law enforcement's use of drone surveillance in public areas for a specific purpose. There is no realistic expectation of privacy when a drone passes over one's house or car or observes our activity in public. We gave up the luxury of privacy in public places long ago. P84 Drone use by law enforcement must be limited but not unduly subjected to Fourth Amendment scrutiny, as drones should not constitute a "search." To limit the temptation to use drones to "look for crime," law enforcement could be subject to the court order process prior to utilizing a drone in an investigation. P85 In my opinion, in the following scenarios drone use by law enforcement might fall closer towards a "search" under the Fourth Amendment and a warrant would most likely be required: (1) The drone is flown outside FAA navigable airspace for aircraft and helicopters (below 400 feet); (2) The drone collects information emanating from within the home (similar to thermal imaging or infrared sensors that detect movement); (3) Law enforcement uses highly sophisticated technology that is not commercially available (e.g., automated license plate readers or facial recognition technology); (4) The drone hovers around a particular area which may constitute a long-term sustained monitoring as mentioned in Jones, and a reasonable expectation of privacy is triggered; or (5) The drone hovers and creates an undue amount of wind, noise, dust, or threat of injury that could constitute a "trespass." P86 Fourth Amendment cases invoking the Katz or Jones doctrines all touch upon the nature of the technology used (does it permit the government to "see" what would otherwise be invisible to the naked eye, even in daylight, from a lawful vantage point) and the nature of the place being observed (is it an open field, the curtilage of a home, commercial property as in Dow Chemical, or the interior of a home?). n255 The more a drone operates outside of FAA guidelines and the more a drone causes undue dust, noise, and wind, the more the drone operation will constitute a trespass and the Fourth Amendment is triggered. The more a drone uses highly sophisticated technology not available for public use or collects information from inside the home, the more the drone operation will constitute a "search" under the Fourth Amendment as citizens will have a reasonable expectation of privacy in the area and activities being observed. P87 Therefore, drones that fly within FAA navigable airspace, observing private property below that can be seen by the public in an aircraft, and using commercially available cameras or enhanced sensory technology, would fall outside Fourth Amendment protections and should be regulated via court order as previously suggested.