3. I think that if you're convicted of anything, you basically lose the right to privacy. For instance, if you're sent to jail, the authorities monitor you want they'd like you to believe is 24/7, anywhere you go. Certain crimes like embezzlement or drug sales, if not all federal crimes (I'm not 100% sure), end up with a search and/or an audit and a seizure of the offending property as evidence or whatever the term they use is. Being a suspect of a crime should hold the same, since the government can audit you and pull up your records, as well as you (usually) admitting everything to your attorney anyway in an attempt to prove your innocence, or find a detail that will lessen your sentence. However the real question is what happens before you're a convict, before you're a suspect, when all they see is another Average Joe walking down the street. Well, security cameras on buildings and traffic cameras can already paint a pretty good picture of where Average Joe (that's his name now, for this exam) wanders throughout the day. Cell phone towers can triangulate your position anytime your phone is on the network, and they'll tell the gov't who called who and for how long fairly easily. I don't see this as a problem. I think the government should have every right to, should I call a known terrorist, look at my digital activity and make sure I'm not a terrorist too (or if I am, then watch me). By that I mean see who I sent emails/calls/texts to, who I met on the street when, search history, what I buy instead of just what store I went to, etc. The communication stuff. Admittedly, physically mailed letters would be tricky to legislate but ethically I think they should be subject too. But don't hack my hard drive and read my word documents or code files. 1) Its my intellectual property so it's illegal to do anything with it if they do take it, and 2) there's no point. Even if I write exactly how I'll murder everyone on the east coast in a word document, and the gov't can't see it, the point is moot because how would I actually do it without purchasing from a weapon store or materials to make one, or travelling around and actually committing the deed, all of which I'm ok with the gov't watching me like a hawk for them, knowing that making weapons isn't illegal (mostly, but that's not this topic), just using them on other people is. Now, sure, collect who I talk to and who I buy from all you want, but I believe they should still have some sort of probable cause to get a warrant to actually open any of those communications/receipts. Like if I buy gunpowder, metal, and suddenly stop talking to someone, ok, flag me and get a warrant. Or payment from a company stops around the time I buy from a gun shop (or if I buy it when I'm in debt or something) ok, sure, flag warrant and search digitally. I say let the gov't survey, because the gov't doesn't care. Go ahead and set up your algorithms and such to flag suspicious activity and correlations, because it would only flag a fraction of a fraction of all the inter-human communication and travel for gov't agent review anyway, and only a fraction of the flagged stuff would warrant any action to be taken at all. So let them look, they won't care anyway.

4. First of all, let's not assume the internet is the only media that's full of crap data, even if it is unregulated, cough cough biased newspapers and TV documentaries, cough. I believe the internet as a tool of free speech in the democratic process has both promoted and eroded democracy from different sides of the same coin called 'speed of information', and it should not be promoted through taxpayer dollars. Before humans leaned to ride horses, they walked. The democratic process was possible, but opinions and information could only travel at the speed of a cross-country runner, and thus the radius of which democracy could be successful was limited because if the info had to travel too far, it took too long and didn't matter at that point. With the taming of horses the messengers could travel faster, and with the invention of cars the speed and range of an effective democratic process grew. Trains vastly increased the range and telephone/telegram lines let info travel from one end of the country to the other in seconds. The internet essentially let the information travel almost instantly, but also persist for far longer than newspapers would allow. This definitely promoted democracy in a big way because anyone could, in essence, read any town's newspaper or hear anyone's opinion. However, that speed became an inherent problem. When information travelled more slowly, people had time to stop and think "wait, really?" and check the facts of the information instead of just accepting the story. The internet has made gaining information from others so fast that people jest accept whatever questionable facts are posted online and hardly ever try to check the truthfulness of what is written. Finally, I do not believe there needs to be any sort of assistance to provide the internet to those that can't. People frequently can't afford cars, yet nobody is trying to hand out free cars or any other kind of assistance, even though cars make it a lot easier to get to your place of polling to participate in the democratic process. If we can't assist in a way that lets people participate, how can we condone wasting resources on giving people computers and internet when you can't vote or do any official democratic changes online?