

Narrative Overview

Reasonable suspicion creates a narrative that students are criminals. Sarah Forman writes in 2011 that when “The Supreme Court... stripped [students] of the full protection afforded by the Fourth Amendment;” it adopted a narrative of “youth criminalization, which... casts school children as dangerous... out-of-control troublemakers.” This perception of kids is a prerequisite to the punitive policies they talk about, because it’s what justifies putting them in schools in the first place. Jason Nance of the Washington University Law Review writes in 2015 that reasonable suspicion has “emboldened school officials to rely on intense surveillance methods to maintain control.” Fortunately, Forman concludes that by instituting probable cause, and giving students the same rights as everyone else, we can change the way we think about school discipline, reversing this narrative.

Social Movements

Spurring social movements. Law professor Douglas NeJaime explains in 2013 that when reforms like probable cause pass and are supported by social movements, it makes those movements seem more legitimate and justifies calls for further progress. Sociology professor Anthony Chen finds in 2004 that empirically, stronger social movements result in 3 times more progressive policies.

AT: SROs

AT: More Reliance

1. They never prove that SROs aren't already being used in most instances in the status-quo. It's not like the schools pay them 40,000 dollars a year to just sit there, if a school has an SRO they are going to use it regardless of the standard.
2. SROs aren't going to be much harder on kids than teachers, because according to Professor Jason Nance in 2013 the status-quo of reasonable suspicion still send students straight to prison for mild offenses due to Zero Tolerance policies.
3. In the status-quo, SROs can use reasonable suspicion when investigating in combination with teachers. Voting affirmative raises that standard, which means SROs can physically do less searches. Since SROs are already used a lot, curtailing the number of searches they can do matters much more.

AT: More Schools Get Them

1. In the status-quo, SROs can use reasonable suspicion when investigating in combination with teachers. Voting affirmative raises that standard, which means SROs can physically do less searches. Since SROs already exist in most schools, curtailing number of searches they can do matters much more than how many there are.
2. SROs are already growing rapidly, as they are the nation's fastest growing law enforcement area. This means A, an increase in SROs doesn't have that big of an impact, as most schools already have them, and the schools that don't soon will, and B you can vote for us on our case turn about the narrative because only voting pro has a chance of breaking the trend. It's try or die.
3. SROs aren't going to be much harder on kids than teachers, because according to Professor Jason Nance in 2013 the status-quo of reasonable suspicion still send students straight to prison for mild offenses due to Zero Tolerance policies.

AT: Fear Lawsuits

1. Teachers can be trained to use probable cause. The Harvard Law Review in 2015 explains that even though teachers currently don't understand how to use probable cause, teaching them to apply the standard would be easy.
2. SROs are expensive. Assistant law professor Jason Nance writes in 2014 that the main barrier to implementing SRO programs is that they are extremely expensive, costing the school system billions of dollars each year. This is a greater cost than the incredibly tiny chance of a lawsuit, so schools won't add more SROs.

AT: Want to Get More Evidence

1. The schools incentive isn't to build a criminal case against students, they just want to help kids learn.
2. SROs don't carry out investigations. The chance that adding an SRO actually leads to that much more evidence is small, so it's really not a huge incentive.

AT: Warrant Requirement:

1. The resolution just says the probable cause standard, which can be applied independently of a warrant requirement. Prefer this interpretation because it's more realistic, as education law professor Jacqueline Stefkovich explains in 1999 that if student searches require probable cause, the "special environment and unique circumstances" of the school would make a warrant unnecessary.
2. School administrators are public officials, which means they can get warrants too.

IMPACT TURN:

SROs won't lead to more arrests, they SROs make kids feel safer and act as a deterrent, leading less contraband to be brought to school in the first place. Matthew Thuriot of the University of Tennessee found in 2009 that on net the presence of an SRO did not predict more arrests, and predicted fewer arrests for weapons charges.

MORE TERMINAL DEFENSE

It's not really possible to increase SROs much more, because Nathan James, Congressional Research Service writes that of the 31% of schools that don't have SROs, 22% can't afford them, and 67% don't have the crime rates to justify adding one. This means SROs can barely increase more than they already have.

AT: PC Expensive

1. Turn this argument because probable cause would actually free up school budgets. Law professor Eve Primus writes that probable cause would be metal detectors and other suspicionless searches illegal. This is important because those measures are incredibly expensive. According to a 1999 USDOJ report, metal detectors can cost up to \$30,000.
2. They can't quantify how expensive probable cause is, which means we have no way of evaluating how much their impacts happen. This is especially important because US News finds in 2015 that funding is down 20% this this year, so they have to prove they decrease funding enough to uniquely trigger their impacts more than the status-quo funding cuts.
3. Schools have many other ways of raising money. Janet Johnson of Forbes reports in 2016 that schools raised \$100 million last year through crowdfunding campaigns. The US Department of Education also provides numerous grants for teacher training. If these programs have the benefits that my opponents are talking about, schools will find a way to fund them.
4. Schools won't need to worry about funding for decriminalizing programs in the future. Alexandria Neason of Slate this year, Hillary Clinton plans to increase funding to end the school to prison pipeline by 2 billion.
5. If the policies my opponents talk about are so good, than why would schools cut funding there instead of cutting programs that are known to be bad. In fact, Erika Hayasaki of LA Times reports in 2004 that nationally more and more schools are choosing to cut SROs instead of other programs. This would actually be a good thing, because SROs criminalize students and increase violence. Professor Denise Gottfredson quantifies in 2011 that after controlling for poverty and prior crime rates, additional SROs increase violence and crime committed by students by 29%.

AT: Training Expensive

Probable cause would not be expensive. The Harvard Law Review reports in 2015 that given the existing ties between law enforcement and schools, it would be easy to train teachers.

AT: Restorative Justice

1. My opponents tell you that currently, schools are accepting high costs in the short term in order to implement restorative justice policies. This same logic applies to probable cause; schools can simply accept short-term high costs.
2. The poorest schools aren't the ones implementing restorative justice; it's in the rich schools who have money to spare so there's no reason it would go away.
3. Molly Leach reports in 2014 that Restorative Justice programs are often funded from a separate budget, meaning that school would not be able to cut funding for them.

AT: Arts Classes

1. All the poor schools have already cut their arts programs. Tyleah Hawkins at the Washington Post writes in 2012 that low income schools have already completely cut their arts programs over the past few decades, with no sign that these arts programs will return. Tim Walker of NEA Today furthers in 2012 that affluent schools make up the vast majority of arts programs. Those rich schools will always have enough money for arts, so they have no impact.

AT: Anonymous Tips

1. Turn, because when students lose trust in the system and in their teachers they are less likely to report things, whether it's anonymous or not. This outweighs their argument because it impacts both anonymous and regular tips.
2. Anonymous tips are infrequent and don't do anything. Professor of law Dale Cecka finds in 2015 that only 1.5% of tips were anonymous and substantiated. Moreover, a study in the Bronx found that in 2 years not a single anonymous report removing a child from danger. The majority of tips are instead random drug accusations that ultimately prove false, increasing the amount of searches on innocent kids, linking directly into our second contention.
3. Affirming doesn't get rid of anonymous tip lines, it just prevents schools from immediately searching someone because of tips. Schools can still conduct investigations to gather evidence to support the tip so that they know if the tip is credible.

AT: Shooting Impact

1. Searches can still happen. According Harvard Law Review, even under probable cause officials can search students at any time if they feel their safety is threatened.
2. Schools can do other things to prevent gun violence like evacuating the school, so it doesn't require searching students.
3. We link into it better, as psychologist Megan Eliota found, in a 2009 study of nearly 300 Public High Schools in Virginia, that, on top of increased reports of bullying, "students who perceived their teachers and other school staff to be supportive were more likely to endorse positive attitudes toward seeking help for... threats of violence."

TERMINAL DEFENSE:

Unverified anonymous tips don't justify searches, even under reasonable suspicion. Law professor Kit Kinports explains in 2014 that the Supreme Court determined in *Florida v. J.L.* that anonymous tips that can't be tested for reliability aren't enough to grant reasonable suspicion for a search.

AT: Catch It Earlier To Solve S2PP

1. This contention concedes that searches go down, which means we are alienating and criminalizing less students. This links into the Johnson card in our 2nd contention Subpoint B, which says that searched students are 4 times more likely to commit crime in the future. This outweighs their contention because 88% of the searches they conduct are on innocent students. That means a majority of the time they are making the problem worse, even if they win their argument.
2. This whole contention assumes students are innately criminal and that we need to step in early to prevent escalation. This proves that the justification for reasonable suspicion relies on the criminalizing narrative I talk about at the top of their case.
3. Catching it earlier is just as bad, because according to professor Jason Nance in 2013 the status-quo of reasonable suspicion still send students straight to prison for mild offenses due to Zero Tolerance policies.
4. They don't tell you how many crimes escalate into worse infractions later. If a kid is smoking weed, there's a pretty good chance they will just keep smoking weed, not start shooting people. So searching later isn't any worse.

AT: Safety/School Violence

1. We link into it better, as psychologist Megan Eliota found, in a 2009 study of nearly 300 Public High Schools in Virginia, that, on top of increased reports of bullying, “students who perceived their teachers and other school staff to be supportive were more likely to endorse positive attitudes toward seeking help for... threats of violence.” This outweighs their link, because it’s really hard to use a search to stop a shooting on the day it’s going to happen, but if you get tipped off beforehand you can actually do something about it.
2. We outweigh b/c we increase violence both in and out of school. This is especially important because the probability of violence in school is exceedingly small. Criminologist Eric Madfis reports in 2015 that the average school can expect a student homicide only once every 6,000 years.

AT: Searches Solve

1. Searches can still happen. According Harvard Law Review, even under probable cause officials can search students at any time if they feel their safety is threatened.
2. Most searches just lead to arrests... sarah mimms of the atlantic in 2014: 2 million, 95%
3. We aren’t searching less guilty students... law professor max minzner 2008: 12%, 88%

AT: Deterrence

1. Deterrence theory is wrong. Law professor Catherine Kim explains in 2012 that empirical evidence doesn’t support the idea that students can be deterred from doing drugs or committing crimes. Students aren’t rational and are convinced they won’t get caught in either world.
2. Students don’t know the exact difference between probable cause and reasonable suspicion, so changing the standard is unlikely to change their behavior.

AT: Metal Detectors

1. Metal detectors don’t protect anyone. Brian Steele of Masslive in 2015 says that they actually create a false sense of security, because they break down often, aren’t used 100% of the time, and are manned by unarmed and untrained guards.
2. Even if they reduce crime inside of school, the problematic environment that labels the kids as criminals causes more crime outside of school, which outweighs b/c so much more violence occurs outside schools, which are actually very very safe.
3. The Mayer evidence indicates that things like metal detectors cause more fights inside schools. And since fights are common and weapons are rare, we have a much bigger impact on the total number of fights. This is important because the Harvard Gazette reports in 2005 that witnessing violence in school is the strongest predictor of the chance kids are violent outside of schools.

AT: Cyberbullying

1. Searches aren't needed. JD at William and Mary College Ross Hoogstraten explains in 2016 that there's no need for school searches to stop cyberbullying because if there's evidence that someone is being bullied, police can just get a warrant and confiscate the perpetrator's electronics.
2. Turn it, because reasonable suspicion undermines students trust in teachers and administrators. This lack of trust is problematic because it prevents students from reporting things like cyber bullying, as Brian Wiseman at University of Nevada finds in 2011 that 90% of students don't tell adults about cyberbullying. We need to restore students trust in the system to make any meaningful change against cyberbullying.

AT: Complacency

1. Their case mentions isolated examples of positive reforms happening, but that does not prove that there is currently a large scale social movement. We would argue that current movements aren't sufficient to address all the problems students are facing, so we are already pretty complacent.
2. Probable cause will actually make movements stronger by legitimizing them and bringing public attention to them. Law professor Douglas NeJaime confirms that social movement actors can use the narrative of important decisions to "explain legitimate social change [...] and justify calls for further development." Major federal policy reform is needed in order to make the progress happening now on the state and local level into a nation-wide movement.

AT: Child Abuse

We control the internal link to child abuse through delinquency. When children are raised in an environment with repeated bad experiences with public officials, they'll be more likely to abuse children in the first place. This outweighs their whole contention because most child abuse goes entirely unreported, even in their world.

AT: Finding Bruises

1. It's super hard to tell based on students behavior whether or not they are being abused. It's unlikely teachers will search kids on this crazy hunch, and they never tell you how much it happens.
2. They don't tell you how many of the abuses that are found in schools are discovered based on searches, versus other signs like children having bruises in plain sight.
3. They don't tell you how often the discovery of child abuse leads to teachers actually reporting the problem. If teachers discovery bruises during a search they might just not think anything of it, especially because young children get bruises from playing around outside all the time.
4. They don't prove anything effective even happens once help is brought in. In some cases getting formal help can make it worse when the abusers find out.

AT: Interviews / Acting on Bruises

1. Interviews aren't searches. The legal definition of a search is something that invades someone's reasonable expectation of privacy. You don't have a reasonable expectation to not get asked a question, especially when no one is forcing the kids to answer.
2. Teachers are legally required to report child abuse. The California Department of Education explains in 2016 that if teachers suspect child abuse, mandatory reporting laws require that they report it to law enforcement. Once law enforcement is investigating, the kids that are willing to talk to an interviewer about their problems would consent to doing so in either world. The kids who don't consent wouldn't comply with the investigation anyways.
3. In status-quo, according to Law Professor Terri Baxter in 2011, reasonable suspicion is the standard for launching investigations both in and out of schools. Since the resolution only requires probable cause in schools, the interviews can still happen at off-campus, like at a students home, at a center, or literally anywhere else.
4. They don't prove anything effective even happens once help is brought in. In some cases getting formal help can make it worse when the abuser finds out.

AT: Searches Find Drug Abuse

1. The only drugs that have physical signs are ones that are injected directly into the bloodstream. This a tiny fraction of all drug use, so they don't have a huge impact.
2. We outweigh with delinquency. The abusive culture of reasonable suspicion turns kids onto oppositional cultures, making them more likely to do drugs in the first place. This outweighs their argument because it affects all kinds of drugs.
3. They never prove how often the discovery of drug abuse actually leads to drug problems getting solved. Most of the time teachers probably ignore the issue, or report it to school administrations which are notoriously bad at actually solving drug issues, are might just suspend the kids instead.
4. If teachers found track marks in a non-probable cause search, they can still send kids to counseling and other forms of rehab, they just can't report to law enforcement which is much worse anyways.

AT: Squo Solves for S2PP/Criminalization

1. The issue of treating students like criminals is getting worse in the status-quo. According to the National Center for Educational Progress in 2015 the level of security in schools has grown substantially since the 90s. This means they aren't solving for how badly we are treating students, it's only getting worse.
2. The number of arrests of students is going down because crime in society has been steadily declining over the last few decades for completely unrelated reasons. For example, changes like the redevelopment of urban centers and the elimination of many mandatory minimum policies have significantly decreased incarceration.
3. We argue that juvenile crime and incarceration would fall faster with the use of probable cause. Even if it's getting better right now, reasonable suspicion is preventing it from getting better faster.

AT: No fear of Suit

Former member of the Department of education Eugene Hickok writes in 2007 that eighty-two percent of teachers and 77 percent of principals say that schools... conduct searches based off of "a desire to avoid legal challenges."

AT: Drug Testing

1. Turn the argument because reasonable suspicion creates an atmosphere of mistrust, which increases drug use. Dan Romer of the Adolescent Communication Institute found in a national study that “students attending school with positive school climates were 15 percent less likely to start smoking cigarettes, and 20 percent less likely to start using marijuana.”
2. The scope of their impact is really small. The National Center for Education Statistics reports in 2015 that only 3 percent of schools use random drug tests of all students. This means that even if you buy their entire argument, reasonable suspicion is only helping in 3% of schools but making the problem worse in the other 97% by creating a bad school environment.
3. Even in schools with drug testing drug use goes up because students are more likely to try to get around the test than quit their substances. A 13 year study of over 2,300 schools from Terry Yvonne in 2013 found that random drug tests in schools barely reduced marijuana use but increased use of illegal and more dangerous drugs which weren't picked up on the test.
4. Turn it again because Christopher Ingraham of Washington Post finds in 2015 that the overly harsh punishments that result from failed drug tests hurt students' academic prospects. Donna Lieberman of The New York Civil Liberties Union quantifies in 2007 that suspended students are three times more likely to drop out of school.
5. Turn it again because drug testing is a resource suck. Ingraham finds that each positive drug test result costs \$3,000. Carlos Cardenas of The Guardian contextualizes the problem in 2015, writing that “valuable resources, such as instructional time, are used to criminalize students instead of to educate them.”
6. Turn it again because false positives harm education. David Heitz writes in 2015 that drug tests and false positives can interrupt children's education, decreasing the time that they can spend in school, which puts them behind and harms their learning.

AT: Deterrence Theory

Deterrence theory is wrong. Law professor Catherine Kim explains in 2012 that empirical evidence doesn't support the idea that students can be deterred from doing drugs or committing crimes by testing and referrals to law enforcement.

AT: Testing Extracurriculars

Christopher Ingraham of Washington Post writes in 2015 that due to the addictive nature of narcotics, students are more likely to quit the basketball or debate team than their drugs if they have to get tested, ultimately hurting their academics.

AT: Securitization

1. Invasive security measures would be made illegal under probable cause. Law professor Eve Primus writes in 2011 that if probable cause were the standard, any general searches would violate the 4th amendment. This makes sense, because the school would not have probable cause to search every student with a metal detector or drug dog.
2. Securitization is already high in the status-quo, and, according to the National Center for Educational Progress in 2015, the problem is only growing. We can't possibly make it that much worse, so you should vote on of us reducing this problematic culture.

IMPACT TURN:

Turn this argument because increased security measures like metal detectors actually make kids feel safer. Professor Marie Tillyer in 2011 conducted a survey of nearly 3,000 students in 58 schools and found that students fear of violence actually decreased when the school had metal detectors. This is important, because many kids bring things like knives or guns to protect themselves, but if they feel the school is safe they won't bring them.

AT: Zero Tolerance

1. Everyone is beginning to realize that zero tolerance is bad, which means they won't be reinstated almost no matter what. Ellen Boylan of the Education Law Center in 2012, "There is an emerging consensus among education policy and school violence experts that zero tolerance policies are not effective in promoting school safety and order." Even the Heritage Foundation published an article stating that zero tolerance policies are a bad idea.
2. Turn it: Now, instead of flipping to zero tolerance, schools flip to restorative justice. Marilyn Armour of the University of Texas writes in 2013 that now in response to fear of school safety, schools implement restorative justice because they realize it's much more effective than zero tolerance.

AT: Pre-2010 Cards

The American Federation of Teachers reports in 2015 that as recently as 2010 people thought zero tolerance was a viable policy, but in the last 5 years the consensus has radically changed, and people are much more concerned with over punishing students.

AT: Media Link

The media doesn't drive zero tolerance policy. Brian Sellers at the University of South Florida finds in 2013 that zero tolerance policies weren't implemented during the school violence panic of the 1970s despite widespread media coverage.

AT: Politics Link

1. They don't prove Republicans oppose the resolution.
2. Republicans won't win votes by opposing zero tolerance reform. The Republican Party doesn't need to solidify their voter base right now, they need minorities to vote for them and that isn't going to happen if they advocating for policies that send minorities to prison.
3. Not all school issues are the same. Even the resolution polarized issues about student privacy, it doesn't mean that'll translate into more awareness about school discipline.
4. If Republicans are going to flip out about the resolution, they would probably also flip out about zero tolerance going away, but clearly they don't care b/c apparently it's just going under the radar.

AT: Overreaction

AT: Schools Risk Averse

1. This is non-unique, because if schools already want safety at any cost. Criminologist Eric Madfis writes that schools number one priority is safety, so any school that thinks something will improve their safety is already implementing it.
2. The internal link is decreased safety, but switching to probable cause wouldn't reduce safety because the Harvard Law Review writes that even under probable cause officers can search whenever they believe there's a threat to safety.

AT: Media Skew

1. This argument is non-unique. Carissimo of the Independent finds in 2015 that there has been a school shooting an average of once a week since Sandy Hook. Fearmongering over school shootings creates much more fear over safety than probable cause ever could, so they no unique impact.
2. Turn the argument because we can reverse the narrative of youth criminalization, which means we can change the media's perspective on the issue.
3. Turn it because Kimberly Twist of UC Berkeley explains in 2013 that empirically, when Courts decide in favor of a policy, it changes national opinion on the background of the new policy and increases the amount of support for these new policies, fundamentally shaping a better narrative in schools.

AT: Higher Evidence Standard

1. This is non-unique. Schools always have an incentive to collect more evidence so they can catch more students. Criminologist Eric Madfis writes that schools number one priority is safety, so any school that thinks something will improve their safety is already implementing it.
 - a. According to a 1999 USDOJ report, metal detectors can cost up to \$30,000 and cameras can cost up to \$8,000. SROs cost almost 40,000 dollars per year. With districts already cash-strapped there is no reason they would be willing to spend this money, instead they'll just search less.
2. The most of the searches of guilty kids meet probable cause already, so there's no need to gather more evidence. Law professor Max Minzner quantifies in 2008 that warrantless searches only turn up evidence of wrongdoing as low as 12% of the time, whereas warranted searches turn up evidence more than 80% of the time, which means they are just getting more accurate.

AT: Funding Cuts

1. The internal link is decreased safety, but switching to probable cause wouldn't reduce safety because the Harvard Law Review writes that even under probable cause officers can search whenever they believe there's a threat to safety.
2. If schools are really so strapped for cash that they fear funding cuts, they aren't going to implement expensive surveillance measures. According to a 1999 USDOJ report, metal detectors can cost up to \$30,000 and cameras can cost up to \$8,000. SROs cost almost 40,000 dollars per year.
3. Since the probable cause standard applies to every school, the government can't threaten to defund every single school at once, they'll probably just modify this policy to adapt to the situation.

Warrant Requirement

The resolution just says the probable cause standard, which can be applied independently of a warrant requirement. Prefer this interpretation because it's more realistic, as education law professor Jacqueline Stefkovich explains in 1999 that if student searches require probable cause, the "special environment and unique circumstances" of the school would make a warrant unnecessary.

AT: RFID Chips

1. These are just pilot programs in a select few schools, so they don't have very much of an impact at all.
2. Turn the argument, because criminalizes of students. David Rosen of AlterNet in 2012 calls "aggressive surveillance" that "assaults... [students'] privacy" and contributes to the trend of schools turning into prisons.
3. Turn the argument again, because it increases suspensions. David Kravets of Wired reports in 2013 that a student was suspended for refusing to wear the chip. It's likely that many more students will refuse in similar fashion because the program is so invasive, and suspensions have a much greater impact on students future lives than one missed day of class.
4. Empirically, attendance doesn't rise, as according to Kravets, attendance stayed the same in both Texas districts that implemented it.
5. Any evidence that shows an increase attendance is likely just noticing a change in reported attendance, and not actual attendance. This is because, as Kravets explains, students who show up to school too late for morning roll call aren't counted as attending, but will be if they step foot on campus at any time with the RFID. This means they aren't actually improving outcomes, they are just letting schools claim more kids are there.

CA TRUST IMPACTS

EDUCATION: Law professor Anne Dupre writes in 1996 that “the trust between student and teacher is "vital, because it evokes student 'motivation to learn ... independently of teacher demands for compliance.' But trust is a "personal bond" that is easily damaged and "may well be impossible to attain if students begin to perceive pedagogical objectives as alien to their own needs.”

BULLYING: The No Bullying Organization in 2016 writes: since “teachers are often one of the top people to whom children are likely to report bullying” to, “the most important thing teachers can do for their students is to build up a sense of trust.”

SCHOOL VIOLENCE: Psychologist Megan Eliota found, in a 2009 study of nearly 300 Public High Schools in Virginia, that, on top of increased reports of bullying, “students who perceived their teachers and other school staff to be supportive were more likely to endorse positive attitudes toward seeking help for... threats of violence.” This is key to stopping school shootings, as Evie Blad of Education Week writes that of the “37 school attacks that occurred between 1974 and 2000... attackers in 31 of those events had told at least one [of their peers] about their plans beforehand.”

Delinquency Weighing

Over more arrests (ZTPs/SROs):

1. Searches can criminalize innocent students by wrongfully searching them, while **[SROs/zero tolerance policies]** can only punish kids who actually did something wrong. This is important because there are far more innocent students than guilty ones, so we affect more people's lives.
2. They only impact to excessively harsh punishments in schools, but most arrests happen outside of school. Since searches make kids more likely to commit crimes in general, they drastically increase the chance that kids get arrested overall.

Over SROs criminalizing:

It's much more criminalizing to be searched by a teacher. When a cop searches someone, that's them doing their job, but when a teacher, who is supposed to be a student's friend and an integral part of their support network, searches a student, that's much more impactful to a kid's sense of alienation.

Over security criminalizing:

1. Individual searches point a finger directly at you and label you as a criminal, while security affects everyone equally.
2. We've been desensitized to security measures because they are everywhere.