

Rate the speaker on each point: E-excellent G-good A-average F-fair P-poor

INTRODUCTION

Gained attention and interest E G A F P
 Introduced topic clearly E G A F P
 Related topic to audience E G A F P
 Established credibility E G A F P
 Previewed body of speech E G A F P

BODY

Main points clear E G A F P
 Main points fully supported E G A F P
 Organization well planned E G A F P
 Language accurate E G A F P
 Language clear E G A F P
 Language appropriate E G A F P
 Connectives effective E G A F P

CONCLUSION

Prepared audience for ending E G A F P
 Reinforced central idea E G A F P
 Vivid ending E G A F P

DELIVERY

Began speech without rushing E G A F P
 Maintained strong eye contact E G A F P
 Avoided distracting mannerisms E G A F P
 Articulated words clearly E G A F P
 Used pauses effectively E G A F P
 Used vocal variety to add impact E G A F P
 Prepared visual aids well E G A F P
 Presented visual aids well E G A F P
 Communicated enthusiasm for topic E G A F P
 Departed from lectern without rushing E G A F P

OVERALL EVALUATION

Met assignment E G A F P
 Topic challenging E G A F P
 Specific purpose well chosen E G A F P
 Message adapted to audience E G A F P
 Speech completed within time limit E G A F P
 Held interest of audience E G A F P

What did the speaker do most effectively? He explained the importance and relevance
that this topic has on our societies, since there are many different
potential threats. How hard is to combat cyberattacks in our
very technology oriented environment.

What should the speaker pay special attention to next time?

-> Change the Tone at some point.

-> Improve eye-contact

General Comments:

Very interesting topic. Without Government surveillance

-> We would not be able to live without that feeling
of public safety and stability.

-> I think that Mr. Obama's speech was not the best one,
-reused words like: -him- -you know-

Merits of Government Surveillance

General Purpose- To persuade

Specific Purpose- To persuade my audience that the benefits of government surveillance are more than the associated risks.

Central Idea- Privacy is an idea that is used to oppose government surveillance but this concept is flawed as sacrifices have to be made to achieve security objectives.

Introduction

Society faces emerging threats as terrorists and other criminals seek new ways of carrying out attacks against us. We understand that the government can develop various strategies against potential threats, but it is simply not possible to address all threats at all times. ~~This is due to~~ *It would be impossible for* personnel restrictions since an officer ~~cannot~~ *to* be assigned to each one of us. An effective method

of preventing threats is through government surveillance programs. The main benefits of government surveillance are that they ^①improve security, ^②do not intend to infringe on constitutional rights, and ^③deter potential threats without directly affecting innocent people. *safety is end result that requires sacrifices related to privacy*

Main Point 1: Government surveillance is necessary because its primary focus is on safety of the American people. *improve security*

A. Government surveillance today carries the tag of being a process through which the administration violates constitutional rights. The focus of government surveillance is

focus on safety of the American people

your points do not match points in paper.

not on violation of constitutional rights as most of us might choose to believe. The focus is almost entirely on safety. The effective methods through which the government can gather intelligence to protect its citizens are through interrogation and surveillance. The article by Lyon ^{which article} explains that surveillance is a by-product of intelligence gathering that is not easily avoidable. According to Slobogin, ^{who is this?} we should understand that for the government to collect enough information to protect ^{them}, ^{who} communication networks will be monitored. The argument should therefore move away from a direct comparison of national security against civil liberties. It is possible ^{who says this?} for national security to also protect civil liberties according to Slobogin. These two components can exist together as citizens can be safe and still have their rights protected.

- B. The realization that safety and civil liberties can co-exist highlights how the misconceptions ^{about} concerning government surveillance (should be eliminated) ^{this is a} point that Lyon makes in defense of surveillance. Since the main disadvantage associated with government surveillance is that it violates constitutional rights, ^{we} find that it has little justification. The main focus of surveillance is safety and detection of potential offenders. Slobogin states that it is not reasonable to assume that a government can introduce an intelligence gathering program with the sole aim of spying on us. More could be done to ensure that surveillance is conducted within the legal frameworks defined by the constitution. However, it is important to understand that monitoring of communication networks may require government agencies to access personal devices and content. Slobogin reminds us of this as he explains why surveillance needs to cover personal devices. It does not necessarily mean that the

MP2?

aren't you focusing on safety in

MP1?

government has negative intentions when it seeks access to our communication networks.

C. It is important to understand that we do not live in an idealistic world. Lyon suggests that in an ideal world, the government would detect and identify potential offenders and then develop surveillance programs intended for specific targets. A government that adopts an idealistic approach to the threats of the modern world will leave its citizens exposed to major threats. This is particularly the case when considering emerging terror threats. Potential terrorists are being recruited online and self-radicalized individuals are increasingly dependent on the internet and mobile networks for material that advances their extremist beliefs, according to Madden and Rainie. It is therefore critical ^{for} that the government ^{to use} uses surveillance to address these threats before ^{we} the people become victims. The question ^{we} you should ask ^{ourselves} yourself at this point is whether ^{we} you would want ^{our} your government to use strategies that may have worked in earlier decades.

The fact that ^{the} primary focus is on safety and not spying leads to another reason why people support government surveillance; if you are innocent, ^{we} surveillance should not matter.

Main Point 2: If a person is innocent and has nothing to hide, there should not be a reason to oppose government surveillance programs that aim to protect its citizens.

A. The main beneficiaries of government surveillance programs are those of us with no connections to terrorist organizations or any crime in general. Those who oppose surveillance should consider why it should matter to them that the government is monitoring communication and movements. The article by Lyon states that the

MP2. Surveillance does not infringe on constitutional rights.

government does this monitoring for the good of the country and the safety of all its citizens. Those of us with ill intentions against other people are more likely to have reasons for opposition of government surveillance. If you have no intention to harm another person, it should not matter that communication and movements may be monitored.

B. It should also not matter that the government may be conducting surveillance because no person can truly know when they are being monitored. Stoycheff presents the point that while the government may be able to monitor text messages, calls and emails, it does not necessarily mean that the government is performing these actions. The government largely conducts passive surveillance unless there are specific individuals who may pose risks to the safety of the people. Passive surveillance means that the government may only define certain words, phrases and actions that should be earmarked for further monitoring if a person uses or does those things. This is covered in the article by Madden and Rainie. For instance, a person may state in an email conversation that they aim to carry out an attack. Madden and Rainie also point out how this kind of conversation will get the attention of government agencies tasked with monitoring communication for such information. It is a further illustration that we should not necessarily be bothered that the government is conducting surveillance. If you do not plan to harm others, you should simply go about your daily lives as normal.

C. It may appear to be an extreme approach to intelligence gathering, but surveillance is necessary in this age of technology. However, we should understand that it is simply the easiest way of detecting threats to society. We should note that there are other forms of surveillance that exist. People who do not pay their taxes as required are considered

Where is
info on
Constitutional
rights?

criminals. The government detects and apprehends these individuals through monitoring of employment histories and tax records, according to Slobogin. The lesson from this example is that government surveillance is a necessity for optimal welfare of the society. Is it reasonable to accept that employers, tax regulators and mobile service providers keep track of our activities but find it difficult to understand why the government does similar?

Since government surveillance is a feature that exists in multiple areas of modern society, we can conclude that privacy is worth sacrificing for safety.

Surveillance does not affect innocent people & it deters potential threats
Main Point 3: Safety is an end-result that requires sacrifices related to privacy.

A. Every one of us desires privacy as we do not want to have our affairs known to every other person in the greater community. We should consider whether losing part of our privacy harms anyone else. If I was to ask you to choose between improved safety and lower privacy or improved privacy and lower safety, an overwhelming majority of you would choose the first option. This shows how privacy is a necessary trade-off for increased safety. Lyon states that it is better for the government to access something personal and potentially embarrassing in our communication networks, than for it to fail to detect planned crimes because they wanted to assure the public of privacy.

B. For those who strongly oppose government surveillance because it involves access to personal communication networks, you should understand that government is not the only guilty party. In this era of technology, we sign in to numerous social networks and other websites. The service providers we use also have our details easily accessible by their personnel. Stoycheff explains that the amount of personal information we have online allows many companies to monitor our activities for

marketing purposes. It means that even without the government monitoring our communication networks, our privacy is never guaranteed in this era of heavy technology usage. This is a counterargument against the idea that if government surveillance was to stop, people would have the privacy they desire.

C. Privacy is a factor that people should be ready to sacrifice for improved security. If the NSA, DHS or FBI among other security agencies did not exist, how would the government monitor what goes on in the country? These agencies may monitor your personal communication networks or not; no person can ever be sure on a given day that their privacy was compromised to an unreasonable extent. This point is argued by Slobogin as he explains how rare it is for a person to notice when their personal communication is being monitored. The purpose of these agencies is to make the country safer and to protect us from harm. Madden and Rainie state that the agencies conduct surveillance regularly as threats emerge on a daily basis. If the government did not conduct surveillance programs, it would be very difficult to provide us with the security we seek. For most of us, we are not affected on a daily basis by government surveillance. This highlights the need for surveillance as it allows the government to achieve its security objectives and does not readily affect most people.

Conclusion

Government surveillance is now a strategy that the federal government uses as an effective tool to use against potential threats. The main argument that supporters of surveillance programs use is the improvement of safety while opponents of government point to potential violation of privacy as the main reason why government should not be allowed to monitor its citizens. This paper argues in favor of government surveillance using three points. The first is

this is not a paper

the surveillance programs are focused on safety first, not spying. Government develops these monitoring strategies with the primary aim of detecting potential threats and not to gain access to personal information of citizens. The second point is that innocent people should not be concerned with surveillance programs as innocent people do not need to be concerned about how the government identifies threats. The third point is that the world is not an idealistic place, it is not a perfect environment where people are not required to make sacrifices to get what they want. For guarantees of safety, people have to sacrifice some privacy. These points support the call for government surveillance to be allowed to continue. Citizens give their government the task of keeping them safe and in this modern day of technological use, surveillance is the most effective method of preventing and responding to detected threats.

these
don't
match
up
Context
confusing

Grade B

Points are not organized. Your introduction
does not match content of paper.

Works Cited

1. Lyon, David. The Snowden stakes: challenges for understanding surveillance today. *Surveillance & Society* 13.2 (2015): 139.
2. Madden, Mary, and Lee Rainie. *Americans' attitudes about privacy, security and surveillance*. Pew Research Center, 2015.
3. Slobogin, Christopher. *Privacy at risk: The new government surveillance and the fourth amendment*. University of Chicago Press, 2008.