When evaluating government surveillance through a utilitarian lens, the central question is whether the benefits, such as preventing violence and saving lives, outweigh the harms, like privacy violations and a chilling effect on free expression. According to Mitov, utilitarianism emphasizes maximizing overall benefits while minimizing harm, a principle that applies to assessing the ethical implications of surveillance technologies (Ref-f156724). However, Sætra highlights the complex relationship between privacy and security, noting that excessive pursuit of security can diminish the value of privacy and liberty (Ref-f156724). This complexity suggests that while surveillance may enhance safety, it can also lead to unintended negative consequences, such as reduced freedom of assembly and expression. Therefore, the ethical justification for surveillance must consider whether it genuinely maximizes happiness for all stakeholders, balancing security needs with the preservation of fundamental rights.