The debate between safety and security in regards to drone surveillance is rooted in compromise.  One cannot completely dedicate the blossoming technology to ensure security, nor can one completely ignore the engineering that can greatly intrude on privacy in daily life.  Though points can be argued for each side, only clear answer is- both. Legally, legislations and rules regarding drone-use can involve loopholes, inane restrictions, or unfair guidelines.  Ideally, the U.S. government would be able to research and carefully craft a plan that would encourage the “sweet spot” that would most encourage freedoms and privacy, yet galvanize security.  The question of private citizens operating and spying with non-affiliated drones seems clear- it should not be allowed or condoned.  However, the idea that companies will try to steal/trade secrets must be taken into consideration.  Mainly, drone surveillance by anyone other than the government or law enforcement sectors should require a written and/or verbal agreement that certifies knowledge of inherent privacy concerns.

Despite any laws requiring standard forms, the government must be restricted with the customary checks and balances to use drones only when necessary.  Why take high resolution video on a domestic city if there are no high profile criminals?  By implementing a system in which the deployment of armed reconnaissance drones is based only on true need eliminates the idea that the people are needlessly being watched.  More often than not, security measures that impede privacy are put in place without a specific cause.  With a warrant-like process, permission for government-mandated drone-spying should be granted only with judicial officials outside of a private or secret system.

After obstacles are put in place for government spying and strikes, the right to privacy must be more protected when dealing with private drones.  To be fair, the military and law enforcement branches have defined objectives, and companies will surely have self-serving intent.  By limiting the area of influence of drones and defining property (as in where owned air space ends), people will not have to deal with quadrocopters swooping over their pools and houses.  Enforcing such rules or boundaries could be made easy with a regulation piece of hardware to deactivate a drone if it crosses a privately protected boundary.  Specifically showing where you cannot record video and pictures would make any privacy concerns defined and violators clearly prosecuted.

Drone security and safety can be limited on the private scale, yet ultimately, the government representatives would decide how to limit such power.  While officials should have quick response to crisis, some form of governing control must muffle the gorged beast that is our military.  Privacy and safety can be balanced with a few simple precautions such as increased requirements for drone deployment, regulation hardware in all drones, and laws against breaking barriers.  Combined with written agreements and open information, the personal space one should be granted mentally and physically can be protected while the benefits of surveillance are “reaped.”
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