

Edward Snowden is an experienced computer programmer and privacy activist who worked for the US government in various technical capacities before he leaked classified NSA information in 2013. There is a significant amount of controversy regarding this leak and internet privacy as a whole. The New York Times caters primarily to a fairly liberal audience of a large age range. This article was both in print and online, which means a broader audience was targeted than if only one medium was used. In the article "Edward Snowden: The World Says No to Surveillance", the Snowden relies heavily on his public image and ethical appeals to entice the audience to agree with his opinion. The article uses these strategies somewhat successfully to convince the readers that mass surveillance is an immoral violation of privacy and should be eliminated on a global level.

The strengths of this strategy originate from the author's extreme fame/infamy, especially in the United States. He is widely regarded as the lone hero, standing up to the immoral, faceless government fiends despite the consequences, as well as a myopic computer hacker with no regard for national security or stability in government. He mostly gains credibility from his fame and publicized experience. He loses some, though, because the idea the public has of his identity is that of a person who is inherently biased because of this experience. His experiences qualify him as a relatively credible authority on the subject, more so if the reader is already of a similar political opinion to the author.

- I. Appeals to the audience's values/beliefs, short quotations and examples
 - a) strengths and weakness of this strategy
 - b) explore how the author thinks that appealing to the audience's values/beliefs is effective, other ties between the values he is appealing to and the values that he shares/does not with the audience.
 - c) why/how do these things affect the persuasiveness of the argument, and why do the strengths outdo the weaknesses here?

II. Conclusion

What are the implications of the analysis just presented? What is the significance of the text and its rhetorical strategies on a micro- and macroscopic level?

-Broaden the perspective to that of the text as a part of an ongoing conversation

Working copy link, so people can get peer-review credit and I can rewrite my paper over and over:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1agy70nnbrnOiQgOo77JzpxaF9RcoBZexldXbphM3SzY/e>
[dit](#)

