

Rhetorical Analysis

The academic paper titled "Now You See Me; Now You Still Do; Facial Recognition Technology and the Growing Lack of Privacy," which was published in the *Boston University Journal of Science and Technology Law* effectively employs the rhetoric triangle to convey its message and raise awareness, about the advantages, ethical considerations and legal complexities of Facial Recognition Technology (FRT). However Naker Sharon and Dov Greenbaum primarily focus on establishing credibility and using arguments to engage their readers. It is crucial to analyze the structure of the article and how ethos and pathos are employed in order to thoroughly assess its use of rhetoric.

In order for an audience to be receptive to a writers message they must perceive them as credible within their field. A reputable writer is well known. Has established credibility in some capacity. Sharon and Greenbaum establish their credibility through means. Firstly, they reference individuals such as Senator Al Franken, who serves as chairperson of the Senate Judiciary subcommittee on Technology and law. Additionally, by being published in a journal like this one, the authors are qualified to discuss this topic. Furthermore they also cite works, from institutions and sources. In order to capture a readers attention credibility is important. It becomes meaningless if the main message isn't effectively communicated.

Authors primarily convey their point through logic and reasoning also known as logos. Naker and Dov argue that Facial Recognition Technology (FRT) is advancing and they emphasize the need for government assistance in regulating and maintaining it. This raises questions about the handling of data. The authors highlight factors that make FRT risky such as the potential for data breaches leading to harm. However they also acknowledge the benefits of

facial recognition technology. Consequently, they occupy a middle ground by suggesting that FRT should continue to be used but with additional regulations and protective measures in place.

Naker and Dov further employ arguments supported by data analytics and statistics. They back up their thesis by presenting numbers, percentages and other relevant data. For instance they refer to documents from San Diego County in 2011 where 25% of the 20,600 instances of facial recognition technology usage resulted in a match, with records. This demonstrates to readers that law enforcement cannot confirm the accuracy of FRT.

The Boston Marathon Bombing occurred 15th of April 2013. This incident entailed two explosions which took place at the finishing point of the marathon killing several people with a high number of injuries. The authors use this event as an illustration for the limited value FRT brings. Even with the surveillance camera footage, FRT was not able to name the perpetrators thereby showing a significant difference between their performance on paper and effectiveness in reality. The deployment of FRT faced a lot of challenges at this scenario given the need to achieve precise identification of the suspects while on an emergency mission where no room for errors exists. This underlines the fact that research in FRT usage is not moving quickly enough to assist police work, whereby it points out that there is a huge gap between the current abilities of an FRT and those required by police services. This narrative presents the Boston Marathon Bombings as a case study demonstrating failures of FRT systems and stressing out on urgency of innovation.

An underlying factor of why the authors can convey their message so well is how the article is structured. The report is categorized into several passages. Upon opening, readers are instantaneously welcomed to the rapid spread of FRT, its benefits, and its complications. In the next section, Sharon and Greenbaum detail the moral and ethical issues imposed by using FRT.

However, it is structured so that an individual with no expertise in the field could understand the magnitude of the situation. A reader with little understanding of the topic could retain and understand the weaknesses and benefits of FRT afterward. Then, the authors detail their worries and ethics in the following sections: The compromise FRT creates for one's privacy and liberty against the benefits it brings to society. They highlight legal issues and talk about the Fourth Amendment and the potential infringement Facial Recognition Technology poses. In addition, there are also global implications as they suggest European Laws and their potential upside.

This is further supported by real cases such as *Lidset v. Illinois*, *Kyllo v. United States*, and *California v. Ciraolo*. These cases illustrate the legal aspects of facial recognition technology and its purpose in society and serve as rhetorical tools to strengthen ethos and logos.

The BBC news article "US police forces using controversial facial recognition technology" is the second artifact I will evaluate rhetorically. It recounts the story of Andrew Conlin, a man whose innocence was proven thanks to facial recognition technology. The brief BBC film does an outstanding job of presenting numbers and statistics. Everything from how they set up each scene to the music they selected to use to how they phrase things—evokes a specific mood that compels you to act.

The quality of storytelling in the video is fantastic. They give narrative and first-person accounts to tell us in detail about Andrew's ordeals and then take our minds further to the larger picture and implications. The first-person accounts stress the general public impact these face recon structures have in terms of individual interests and individual right to privacy.

The video episode goes beyond the approach of educating viewers. It raises questions about the impact of advancements on law enforcement thanks to its human touch. Through Andrews's experiences the video delves into the topic of apprehending criminals while

respecting rights. In addition, it is not aimed at tech geeks or enthusiasts; it speaks to anyone of the implications facial recognition technology will have on safety and privacy. Its purpose is to educate everyone, on their level of understanding about how this technology intertwines with our lives and what that means for society, as a whole.

In addition to this comprehension, the video also aims to raise an issue. The issue revolves around recognition; how do we strike a balance between security and privacy? It prompts individuals to contemplate the extent to which technology should govern us without compromising our individuality. It encourages us to reconsider the way we live our lives knowing that every action and interaction could potentially be exposed to others impinging upon our right to self determination.

The video creates a sense of urgency that really makes you think and motivates you to take action. One tweet mentions how quickly we're getting accustomed, to facial recognition technology and it raises the need for a conversation about its use not just in catching criminals but also in places like malls and streets. Its concerning to realize that our faces may be scanned and stored without our consent, which is a problem.

The tone of the narrator, in the video is incredibly captivating, instantly grabbing the viewers attention. They use a voice that makes everything feel fresh and happening in the moment as if we're witnessing it firsthand. Of telling us information the narrator presents a "what if?" scenario encouraging us to consider the potential implications of facial recognition technology on our rights and privacy. Rather than merely stating facts the video goes a step further by demonstrating and providing visual evidence of the consequences of facial recognition technology. It includes images, videos and real-life examples that effectively engage our interest in this topic. These visuals do a job of breaking down technological aspects making them more

comprehensible for the average person. They don't just put on a show; we can actually see it in action ourselves and retain it in our memory.

In the end the video I watched had a technique that drew me in and taught me about facial recognition technology. It wasn't an information dump; it felt like a captivating story. The use of metaphors made these complex topics relatable and easier to understand. The narrators voice was also well suited for the matter. They made it accessible, without sounding like a lecture.

Additionally the visuals perfectly complemented the narration making sure we not heard but also saw what was being explained. Together all these elements did more than hold my attention; they sparked debates as we pondered over how this technology could impact our lives. Such videos provide us with information that we can engage with and genuinely affect our thoughts.

Both the academic paper and this BBC News video offer insights, into facial recognition technology (FRT).The paper presents its arguments convincingly and logically stressing the importance of regulation. Conversely the video engages our emotions, with narratives and visual proof emphasizing the urgency of addressing facial recognition technology (FRT). Together they underscore the equilibrium between advancement and individual privacy sparking conversations, among people. This blend of techniques not only informs us but also inspires us to work towards a future where technology supports fairness and human respect.

Works Cited

- Naker, Sharon, and Dov Greenbaum. "Now You See Me: Now You Still Do: Facial Recognition Technology and the Growing Lack of Privacy." *Boston University Journal of Science and Technology Law*, vol. 23, no. 1, Winter 2017, pp. 88-122. *HeinOnline*, <https://heinonline.org/HOL/P?h=hein.journals/jstl23&i=96>.
- BBC News. "US Police Forces Using Controversial Facial Recognition Technology - BBC News." *YouTube*, 20 Apr. 2023, www.youtube.com/watch?v=uGeRTmDdqUI.