With the invention of the computer, the definition of privacy has changed. For example, the government no longer needs a warrant to search and/or observe people and places that they once did need one for. Based on a literal interpretation of the Fourth Amendment, it is *not* a violation of the Fourth Amendment for the government to use GPS location data on a cell phone to track my location, but it is wrong for them to record my activities using sophisticated drone technology.

The government is at liberty to obtain geographical information from GPS systems. Wireless phone companies install GPS capabilities in their smart phones, and can access your location at any time. By signing a contract, customers recognize that their phone can be tracked at any time unless they choose to disable location services. Because customers have a choice as to whether or not they enable location services, the government is not violating the Fourth Amendment when they use this public information to their advantage. Therefore, it is not a breach of privacy when the government utilizes public location data on a user’s cell phone to track where they are.

If the government wants to use a drone to survey a suspect on his or her private property, a warrant should be required. The Oxford Dictionary states that privacy is “the state or condition of being observed or disturbed by other people”. According to this definition, people’s privacy is *violated* when they are unable to go to the bathroom, sleep, change clothes, and shower without being observed by others. The Fourth Amendment to the Constitution protects peoples’ right for privacy in their home. If the government obtains a warrant, it is immoral to spy on others without their knowledge and, therefore, the suspect should be informed of the surveillance. Only in extreme circumstances, such as flight risks, should a person *not* be informed of the government’s monitoring. A person with strong connections with other countries, with great wealth, and/ or with a history of running from law-enforcement would be highly-likely to run if they knew they were being observed. So, while there are extenuating circumstances in which a highly volatile suspect should not be notified of drone surveillance, the government should do everything it can to preserve our freedom.

The government has a great deal of power now that technology has progressed over the last several decades. They have the option to use their power in a positive way to protect us or they can use it negatively and, in turn, take away some of our freedom. The government is validated in utilizing the GPS location data on a suspect’s phone to track him or her. However, the government takes advantage of its power when they use drones to spy on citizens in their own homes, where they should feel safe and secure. After all, isn’t America founded on freedom?