



Privacy Breach: Say 'No' To Digital Driver's Licenses

You are normally obligated to show your driver's license upon request by police. However, if your license is digital on your smart phone, your entire phone may be searched without a warrant, breaching your 4th Amendment protections. □ TN Editor

For years the push to replace physical drivers licenses with digital drivers licenses has relied one one thing; privacy.

But all of the “fake news” the public has been fed about their privacy is about to come “crashing” down, literally.

A Nevada bill if passed would allow police to search everyone's smartphones.

Nevada bill [AB200](#) allows police to search the phones of everyone involved in a car crash.

“An act relating to motor vehicles; authorizing a peace officer at the scene of a traffic crash to use technology to determine if a driver was using a handheld wireless communications device at the time of the crash; requiring the suspension of the driver's license of a

driver who refuses a request by a peace officer to use such technology; providing penalties; and providing other matters properly.”

Does anyone still believe that once a cop uses a [CellBrite](#) to spy on your phone or discovers your smartphone’s unique MAC address that they will not track you in the future? If retail stores can track [customers MAC address’s](#) without a warrant don’t you think police will too.

Motorists give up their rights by driving in Nevada

The bill states that motorists give up their rights simply by driving in Nevada.

“Section 1 further provides that any person who operates a vehicle in this State is deemed to have given consent to the use of an investigate technology device on the handheld wireless communications device when requested by a peace officer at the scene of a crash. If a person refuses such a request, the peace officer is required to seize the driver’s license or permit of the person and issue an order suspending the license or permit for 90 days.”

What does this mean?

If you are granted [the privilege to drive](#) by the government you agree to give up your Fourth Amendment right against being [searched without probable cause](#). Do you still think America is the land of the free?

[Gemalto](#) got one thing right, digital drivers licenses are a “Utopia” for police and governments.

According to Merriam Webster, Utopia is [“an imaginary place; a place of ideal perfection especially in laws and government.”](#)

If you think U.S. police will respect motorists rights and only search your phone for just your drivers license information you are living in an imaginary place.

Defenders of digital licenses will say Nevada’s police are only trying to

determine if a phone was being used prior to the accident and that is it.

“When using an investigative technology device on a handheld wireless communications device pursuant to this section, a peace officer may access and view only evidence of use of the handheld wireless communications device which violates NRS 484B.165 and shall not intentionally access or view any other content on the handheld wireless communications device.”

But I say [horse pucky](#), would you willingly hand your phone to a stranger and let them walk away with it for 5-10 minutes? Would you trust a complete stranger (police officer) not to search your smartphone?

Trusting law enforcement with your phone is a horrible idea as an [article](#) in the Huffington Post warns.

“By unlocking the license, phone owners could expose their data to whoever is checking it, Chad Marlow, a senior counsel at the American Civil Liberties Union in New York said. And, he added, while an officer normally would need a warrant to search a phone, in the real world, drivers who don’t know the law could be pressured into handing over the phone, allowing access to everything from contacts to text messages.”

House Bill 200 goes on to explain that if you refuse to hand your smartphone to [‘Officer Friendly’](#) your privilege to drive will be suspended and good luck trying to get a temporary drivers license.

“The scope of the hearing conducted pursuant to subsection 6 must be limited to whether the person refused the request of the peace officer to use an investigative technology device on the handheld wireless communications device in the possession of the person at the time of the crash pursuant to this section. Upon an affirmative finding on this issue, the Department shall affirm the order of suspension.”

If you are given a choice between handing over your phone or losing your license and getting a ticket, what would you do?

That is not much of a choice is it?

Being coerced into giving a government employee your personal information means law enforcement has essentially been turned into the TSA. In the coming years we can expect every state to pass laws allowing police to search motorists smartphones.

Do we really need anymore proof that storing our drivers license and personal life on a smartphone is a terrible idea?

[Read full story here...](#)



CPAC: Google Mulls ‘Steering’ The Conservative Movement

At Google, technocrat skills of social engineering are focused on nudging the conservative movement to be more accepting and positive toward its policies. In this case, CPAC is a logical place to start. □ TN Editor

Google's senior director of U.S. public policy, Adam Kovacevich appeared to describe the Conservative Political Action Conference (CPAC) as a "sideshow Circus," in a leaked audio recording in which he also argued that Google should remain a sponsor of the conference to "steer" the conservative movement "away from nationalistic and incendiary comments."

The comments came to light in leaked audio files allegedly of a company-wide meeting at Google, part of which is now exclusively reported by Breitbart News. Another part of the transcript was [released last Friday on](#) while further snippets [revealing Google's funding of establishment conservative think-tanks](#) were published by the left-leaning tech magazine *Wired* in December.

The alleged meeting took place in the wake of Google's sponsorship of CPAC in 2018, which triggered an internal rebellion from left-wing employees of the tech giant. Breitbart News exclusively reported on the revolt at the time, in which [radical left-wingers inside Google accused CPAC of "ethno-nationalism" and "hate."](#)

Google has not denied the authenticity of the leaked material.

In the clips, the transcripts of which are posted in full below, Kovacevich portrayed CPAC as a conference with a "dual identity," one being a "premier gathering" that features a "whole swath of conservatives," including "national security conservatives, economic conservatives, libertarians, the Log Cabin Republicans, deficit hawks, small government advocates."

In the audio clip, the other side of CPAC was described in disparaging terms by Kovacevich as featuring a "sideshow circus-like element" which "CPAC organizers have intentionally cultivated sometimes, inviting outrageous figures that say incendiary and offensive things, I think in order to draw more attention and controversy to the conference."

"I want to be clear that we don't agree with those things, right?" continued Kovacevich. "We abhor and rebuke the offensive things that are said at the conference. Those things obviously don't align with Google's values and our approach."

“And I think it’s challenging for us to reconcile those two identities of CPAC.”

In another audio clip of the same conversation provided to Breitbart News, Kovacevich appeared to describe the importance of reaching out to conservatives in order to counter conservative media, including Breitbart News. Kovacevich warned of “growing negative attention from the conservative media which is influential among those same Republicans who control government.” He went on to accuse conservative media of “pushing the storyline that Google is biased against conservatives.”

“And of course we aim to build products for everyone but if that notion becomes accepted among conservative and Republican policymakers, that could be harmful to our mission of building products for everyone.”

The full transcript follows below:

Yeah, it’s a great question Greg. I appreciate the question. I think one of the big themes – I think picking up on your question – that I saw in some internal listservs and one of the Dory questions focused on the question of the other speakers, right? What are we saying in terms of sponsoring a conference where you have sort of incendiary speakers, right, and I think it’s a very valid question, one we’ve talked a lot about here. I think, to be candid, one of the challenges we face with CPAC is that the conference itself has a kind of a dual identity. So on the one hand, it’s really the premier gathering of sort of big-tent conservatives. Especially in non-presidential years it sort of in some ways takes the place of the annual Republican National Convention. You have a whole swath of conservatives: national security conservatives, economic conservatives, libertarians, the Log Cabin Republicans, deficit hawks, small government advocates who attend the conference. The conference is attended by about 10,000 people. And so one of the other things is that the Republican Party and I think conservatism, in general, is also going through a lot of internal debates about what it should be, right, what should be sort of the position of the party. And I think that’s one that we should be involved in because we, I think, want

probably — the majority of Googlers would want to steer conservatives and Republicans more towards a message of liberty and freedom and away from the more sort of nationalistic incendiary comments, nativist comments and things like that. But it has been a very valuable place for us to reach a lot of the people and the big tent of conservatism.

On the other hand, and sort of to get to the point of the dual identity, in recent years with CPAC there has also been this kind of sideshow circus-like element, right, that I think the CPAC organizers have intentionally cultivated sometimes, inviting outrageous figures that say incendiary and offensive things, I think in order to draw more attention and controversy to the conference. I want to be clear that we don't agree with those things, right? We abhor and rebuke the offensive things that are said at the conference. Those things obviously don't align with Google's values and our approach. And I think that it's challenging for us to reconcile those two identities of CPAC. I think one of the things that — we also face this question in other areas, by the way. So in the realm of sort of politics, there's always going to — there's often going to be someone at some event we sponsor who will say something we don't agree with. Last year, a group that we support, the New America Foundation, had your guys's, one of your Senators, Elizabeth Warren. She spoke, and she called for the breakup of Google at that [laughter] conference, right? The conference of an organization we support. Obviously we don't support that position.

[Read full story here...](#)



Cattle And Sheep Now Herded By ‘Barking’ Drones

The idea of automated agriculture is gaining ground with various types of drone devices. The only element left to replace is the actual farmer/rancher, but that day drawing closer. □ TN Editor

Robots aren't just stealing human jobs, they're after man's best friend too - now there's a drone that can bark like a sheep dog.

The latest drone developments come as more farmers have started [using the technology for work on the farm in recent years.](#)

Drone specialist from Christchurch-based DJI Ferntech, Adam Kerr, said the uptake in drones for agricultural uses had now made the National Agricultural Fieldays in Hamilton one of the biggest events in the company's calendar.

“The past two years have seen farmers embrace drone technology to help with those jobs that are dirty, dangerous or just plain dull,” he said.

Corey Lambeth, a shepherd on a North Canterbury sheep and beef farm near Rotherham, said his drone had made work such as moving stock and checking water and feed levels more efficient.

“Winter time it’s ideal for flying it sitting at home on a cold day I don’t want to go outside, so I fly my drone round, have a look make sure all my stock are behind the wire.

“Also when we’re lambing we can fly it round, it’s ideal with the [camera] zoom, going right in, looking at it [the drone monitor], not even disturbing the ewes,” Mr Lambeth said.

The latest drone model, the \$3500 DJI Mavic Enterprise, can record sounds and play them over a speaker – allowing a dog’s bark, or other noises, to be loudly projected across a paddock.

Mr Lambeth said this feature helped move stock along faster during mustering while stressing the animals less than a dog could.

Cows could sometimes become protective of their calves and try to lunge at farm dogs when they got too close, he said.

“That’s the one thing I’ve noticed when you’re moving cows and calves that the old cows stand-up to the dogs, but with the drones, they’ve never done that,” he said.

Mr Lambeth said while some farmers might consider it lazy, a drone could save them time and money.

His employer, fourth generation farmer Ben Crossley, bought a drone after seeing how Mr Lambeth was using his for day-to-day work on the farm.

Mr Crossley said while some farmers struggled with the new technology, it was important to keep up.

“Just trying to get efficiencies too, to just save time, it can sometimes take half a day to find a water leak, whereas with a drone you can zip around and have it done in an hour at the longest,” he said.

“I used to go an see my grandfather every night, he lived on the farm, and he used to even struggle with cellphones, so yeah, a drone would be a shock for him,” Mr Crossley said.

While drones were a new part of the farming tool-kit, Mr Lambeth said technology could sometimes let you down, especially in trying weather conditions.

[Read full story here...](#)