Because terrorism threatens the United States as a whole, I affirm: Resolved: The United States ought to prioritize the pursuit of national security objectives above the digital privacy of its citizens.

**Definitions:**

Ought- used to express obligation  
(Merriam Webster: <<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought>>)

**Kapaida, Henderson, Fielding, Kotz.** (1 Department of Computer Science, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 03755, USA, 2 School of Computer Science, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, KY16 9SX, UKOriginal at Virtual Walls: Protecting Digital Privacy in Pervasive Environments)   
**"Digital privacy is the confidentiality of digital footprints**, where we define a digital footprint as contextual information derived from raw sensor readings. **By confidentiality, we mean only authorized users should be able to access footprints as defined by the user's privacy policy.** We believe that the term "digital footprints" is more intuitive to lay users than "context", since digital footprints evoke a sense of a digital trail that a user may leave in the virtual world. We feel that users will be more motivated to protect the privacy of their "digital footprints" rather than their context".

**Macmillian -** Macmillan Publishers Limited 2009–2013  
Pursuit- [the](http://www.macmillandictionary.com/us/search/american/direct/?q=the) [process](http://www.macmillandictionary.com/us/search/american/direct/?q=process) [of](http://www.macmillandictionary.com/us/search/american/direct/?q=of) [trying](http://www.macmillandictionary.com/us/search/american/direct/?q=trying) [to](http://www.macmillandictionary.com/us/search/american/direct/?q=to) [achieve](http://www.macmillandictionary.com/us/search/american/direct/?q=achieve) [something](http://www.macmillandictionary.com/us/search/american/direct/?q=something)

(**The White House: Washington**, **National Security Strategy** May **2010** <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/rss_viewer/national_security_strategy.pdf>>)

Just as our national security strategy is focused on renewing our leadership for the long term, it is also facilitating immediate action on top priorities. **This Administration has no greater responsibility than the safety and security of the American people. And there is no greater threat** to the American peoplethan weapons of mass destruction, particularly **the danger posed by** the pursuit of nuclear weapons **by violent extremists** and their proliferation to additional states**.**

My **value** for this round is **government legitimacy** because any action conducted by the state must meet its obligations for the better of the people. In order to do so, the social contract must be upheld.  
C: The US government has an obligation to the security of its citizens.

**Chandler** May **2011** (Jennifer, “Privacy Versus National Security; Clarifying the Trade-Off”, Section II-A: AWM)

W: The social contract was the means by which **people voluntarily [surrender]** a certain measure **[some] of their individual freedom in exchange for the security and protection provided by a legitimate political authority.** According to these views, **security is a primary obligation** of the state **since that is what individuals have contracted for in submitting to state authority.**

I: A legitimate government must ensure security, thus security holds a significantly high priority.  
TI: If the social contract is not upheld, in which the government fails to keep security of the nation, society will fall into a powerless order of chaos. Thus,  
C: My **standard** for this round is **maintaining governmental power** because only with it can we avoid the “state of nature.”

**Peter, Fabienne**, ("Political Legitimacy", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy(Summer 2010 Edition) First published Thu Apr 29**, 2010*,*** Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL =<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2010/entries/legitimacy/>.Political legitimacy is a virtue of political institutions and of the decisions—about laws, policies, and candidates for political office—made within them.>)

W: **[Hobbes writes:] In the State of Nature**, which is purely hypothetical according to Hobbes, **men are naturally and exclusively self-interested**, they are more or less equal to one another,(even the strongest man can be killed in his sleep), **there are limited resources, and yet there is no power able to force men to cooperate.** Given these conditions in the State of Nature, Hobbes concludes that the State of Nature would be unbearably brutal. In the State of Nature, every person is always in fear of losing his life to another. They have no capacity to ensure the long-term satisfaction of their needs or desires. No long-term or complex cooperation is possible because the State of Nature can be aptly described as a state of utter distrust. Given Hobbes’ reasonable assumption that most people want first and foremost to avoid their own deaths, **he concludes that the State of Nature is the worst possible situation** in which men can find themselves. **It is the state of perpetual and unavoidable war.** The situation is not, however, hopeless. Because men are reasonable, they can see their way out of such a state by recognizing the laws of nature, which show them the means by which to escape the State of Nature and create a civil society**.** The first and most important law of nature commands that each man be willing to pursue peace when others are willing to do the same, all the while retaining the right to continue to pursue war when others do not pursue peace. **Being reasonable,** and recognizing the rationality of this basic precept of reason, **men can** be expected to **construct a Social Contract that will afford them a life other than that** available to them **in the State of Nature.**

Additionally, the state must prioritize the security in the use of its power to ensure survival.

W: **Forsyth** (James Wood Jr., The Past as Prologue: Realist Thought and the Future of American Security Policy*,* 104)

No matter how good their intentions, national security policymakers must bear in mind that in the absence of world government, states must provide for their own protection. To do so means marshaling their power or the power of friends and allies who will support and defend them.

However, such self-help actions, even when taken for purely defensive purposes, will appear threatening to others, who will be forced to respond in kind. This interstate phenomenon is commonly called the “security dilemma,” and it adequately explains why arms races occur and why some wars begin.10 **Because the potential for violence in the international system is so great, states must prioritize their interests.** Interests come in many forms.11

Peace, prosperity, and freedom are good examples, and **while peace, prosperity, and freedom might be in the interest of *most* states, survival is the sole interest of *all* states.**12 **The means to ensure survival is power.**

I: We must turn to a higher authority through government, for it is the only thing that stands between the people and the State of Nature.  
TI: If the neg fails to uphold the social contract, humanity would be in chaos and warfare. Thus, you must affirm to maintain power in order to keep the state secure.

C1)In the real world, societal security must come first before any other values are met.

1. In perspective of the community, security measures will ultimately save more lives.

**Chandler** May **2011** (Jennifer, “Privacy Versus National Security; Clarifying the Trade-Off”, Section II-A: AWM)

W:**The term “security theatre” refers to the adoption of** useless or nearly useless **security measures in order to provide the reassuring appearance of a response to perceived risks.** However, security theatre is not necessarily useless or irrational when the harmful consequences of public fear are taken into account.

**The losses associated with terrorism can be divided into two categories. First, a terrorist attack takes a direct toll in lives**, damage to property, disruption of normal life, and immediate remediation efforts**. Second, there are several types of** indirect harm that arise because of the effect of the **attack on the minds of the members of a society**. These indirect losses flow from the fear created by the initial attack **and may produce a level of casualties comparable to the initial attack.** It appears that **for approximately one year after September 11** in the United States, **there was a reduction in air travel, an increase in highway travel, and a[n]** concomitant **increase in highway traffic fatalities.**52 **Gigerenzer estimates that an extra 1,595 people died on the highways trying to avoid the risk of flying during the year after September 11.**53 He notes that **this number is six times greater than the total number of airplane passengers who perished on September 11.**54

I: If people are frightened, then the government wouldn’t be able to hold power over their safety.  
TI: If the government loses power and becomes unable to pursue methods to minimize these threats, it is not fulfilling its obligations of protecting the people. You must look to the affirmative in order to prevent the fall of social contract into the state of nature.

1. Response to terrorist threats justifies the government’s role in security.

**Chandler** May **2011** (Jennifer, “Privacy Versus National Security; Clarifying the Trade-Off”, Section II-A: AWM)  
  
In times of perceived breakdown in order and security, the social and psychological pressures to react in some way are very powerful. Jeremy Waldron suggests that this **psychological reaction largely explains the willingness to trade liberty for [a]** an apparently **security-enhancing measure.**45 Whenattacked, **people want their government to inflict reprisals** and they are less interested in their effectiveness than that “something striking and unusual is being done.”46 **There is also a tendency for a society to display increased solidarity and patriotism following an external attack.** The so-called “rally effect” refers to the sudden and substantial increase in public trust in and approval for political leaders after a dramatic international event.47 **The September 11 rally effect was the largest of all recorded rally effects in the United States, producing the highest ever recorded approval rating for any U.S. president**, and it lasted longer than any other recorded rally effect.48

I: The surge of patriotism ultimately contributes to the willingness to sacrifice individual liberties to government power.

TI: Not only does the government now appeal to the people, it gains support in security measures that allow it to meet its obligations. With more supremacy comes more legitimacy.

C2) Government surveillance allows the government to prevent terrorist attacks.

1. Electronic surveillance deters terrorism.

**Schneier**  (*Beyond Fear*, (n. 2).), privacy versus national security: clarifying the trade-off133)

W:**Different observational regimes cumulatively provide a wealth of information that can** be combined and **scrutinized to learn about the** activities, movements and finances of a **suspect**. **It is this** retrospective **dimension Surveillance** as a Response to Terrorist Threats181 **that is currently the strength of the surveillant assemblage.** Given sufficient time, the authorities can reconstruct a good deal, but by no means all, of the actions of particular individuals by reading the informational tea leaves that they trail behind them as they go about their daily lives.

Advocates also suggest that surveillance might deter future attacks.The assumption is that **individuals are not apt to attack people or places where surveillance is integrated** into a security apparatus **for fear of being caught.** Deterrence, however, might not have much bearing on truly committed terrorists — the group invoked to justify recent surveillance enhancements.

Deterrence seems to work best when the potential criminal fears capture, detention and prosecution**.** Such concerns are less relevant to someone willing or eager to die for their cause. The third justification for anti-terrorist surveillance is that it holds out the possibility for real-time intervention to thwart or capture terrorists. Following this logic, a surveillance system would be able to monitor and/or identify suspicious individuals in real-time, giving security officials the opportunity to intervene prior to an attack. The assumption appears to be that terrorists look and act so transparently suspicious that intensified monitoring will single them out for investigation and capture.

I: Deterrence is significant because it utilizes the government’s power to stop a large majority of potential terrorists from committing the act.

TI: This proves that the measures taken by the government will ultimately lead to achievement of security pursuits, thus maintaining power over the people’s security.

1. NSA surveillance programs are effective in reducing terrorism.

Joe **Gould13** [Reporter - Army Times; Associate Editor - Inside Washington Publishers; Freelance Reporter - New York Daily News], “4-star: Surveillance programs foiled 54 plots,” Jul. 2, 2013 - 06:12PM,

The director of the **N**ational **S**ecurity **A**gency said the government’s **surveillance programs have thwarted 54 terrorist plots[.]** worldwide, including one directed at New York City’s subways.¶ Army Gen. Keith Alexander said the two recently disclosed programs — **one** that gathers **[gathered] U.S. phone records and another** designed to **track[ed] the use of U.S.-based Internet servers** by foreigners **with possible links to terrorism** — were conducted legally.¶ “I think it’s something to be proud: **We have defended the nation 54 times** — and our allies — **and** we **have ensured the protection of our civil liberties and privacy**, **and oversight by all three branches of the government**,” Alexander said June 28 at an Armed Forces Communications and Electronics Association cybersecurity conference in Baltimore.¶ Alexander said the programs were the result of efforts to legally “connect the dots” at homeand abroad after Sept. 11, 2001, and that they were created with “exceptional oversight by all three branches of government.” Citing **a Senate intelligence committee report**, he **said no government official had ever** **willfully used the program to circumvent the law.**¶ Intelligence officials last week disclosed some details on two thwarted attacks — one targeting the New York subway system, one to bomb a Danish newspaper office that had published cartoon depictions of Prophet Muhammad.¶ Sean Joyce, deputy director of the FBI, offered additional details on two other foiled plots, including one targeting Wall Street in congressional testimony last month.¶ Of the 54, 12 involved material support to terrorism and 50 led to arrests or detentions**.** Twenty-five involved Europe, 11 involved Asia, five in Africa and 13 “had a homeland nexus.”¶ Under the law, Alexander said, the government collects, from commercial Internet service providers, metadata that is kept in a “virtual lockbox” and can only be retrieved with “reasonable, articulable suspicion,” and only when there is “a foreign nexus or association with al-Qaida or other foreign terrorist organization.” The government did so less than 300 times in 2012.¶

Tom **Gjelten13** [Covers a wide variety of global security and economic issues for NPR News; National Security correspondent],¶ “The Case For Surveillance: Keeping Up With Terrorist Tactics,” NPR News, ¶ June 15, 2013 5:25 AM,

Since public revelations that the **N**ational **S**ecurity **A**gency **is collecting telephone records and reviewing Internet communications in the U.S.** and abroad, officials have been making the case that **the programs are vital [and use]**. They argue that the **tactics [that] match the new ways terrorists are planning and communicating.**¶ There was a time when America's enemies conspired face-to-face, or communicated through couriers, or by leaving messages for each other somewhere. But in the digital age, that has changed.¶ FBI Director Robert Mueller made that point back in 2008, as Congress considered whether to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.¶ "In this day and age, our ability to gain intelligence on the plans, the plots of those who wish to attack us is dependent on us obtaining information relating to cellphones, Internet, email, [and] wire transfers, all of these areas," he said.¶ If all the action was in that electronic space five years ago, it's even more so today, as intelligence and security officials constantly point out.¶ Speaking in February, the NSA's general counsel, Rajesh De, threw out some figures on the explosive growth in communication data.¶ "More data crosses the Internet every second today than existed on the Internet 20 years ago. Global mobile traffic grew 70 percent last year alone," he said.¶ Officials say these trends highlight the challenge facing spy agencies: **With so much communication now taking place in the digital world, intelligence officers have to be able to follow that communication**.¶ James Bamford, the author of several books on the NSA, says spies used to focus on getting human sources inside an organization — agents who could report on what people in the organization were saying and doing. But human sources no longer matter so much, Bamford says. Intelligence officers use new approaches because their adversaries are interacting in new ways.¶"During the day, they're on cellphones, or they're on email, or they're on social-networking sites. **By intercepting that information, you develop patterns and look at who these people might be involved with**," he says.¶ To justify the NSA's collection of telephone records and its selective monitoring of online communication overseas, U.S. officials cite these "revolutionary" changes in the information space. John Negroponte was the director of National Intelligence when wiretapping programs were expanded during the Bush administration. He defends the NSA's new emphasis.¶ "I'd say it's a testament to how surveillance methods have kept up with the geometric progression of these communication methods," he says.¶ Congressional critics of the expanded surveillance operations say they're not convinced that these programs have really proved their value in fighting terrorism. They ask whether other types of intelligence gathering might be just as effective.¶ Negroponte, who served as U.S. ambassador to Iraq, says no one method is sufficient. He recalls how **in 2006, the combination of different intelligence sources led the U.S.** military **to the head of al-Qaida in Iraq, Abu Musab al-Zarqawi**.¶ "I believe **his phone number was detected through** human **intelligence.** Somebody gave us his phone number. **Then, that phone number was monitored** through signals intelligence. **And then his movements were tracked by geo-spatial intelligence** — drones and so forth," he says. "So it's actually the integration of these different methodologies that actually give you the best results."¶ The expanded use of telephone and Internet surveillance is in part an adaptation to the information revolution. The NSA, the CIA and other agencies will defend these programs vigorously on that basis, despite concerns that Americans' privacy has been put at risk.¶ But that's not the whole story: It's also clear that the **programs are popular** in the spy business simply **because they're convenient and efficient**. They make intelligence gathering easier.

I: As you can see, maintaining power will lead to greater government legitimacy because power enforces the social contract to function.  
TI: If the negative cannot maintain power, it cannot uphold security, thus it fails to meet the social contract, and people will fall into a barbaric state of nature. The affirmative wins the round if it is proven that the greatest number of people is protected under the government’s power. Thus, you must affirm.