Most people few the cyberwar between Iran and Israel as the future of modern warfare. The articles by NBC news and Middle East monitor describe the ongoing conflicts and its effects on war as a whole as well as innocent civilians, making it apparent that as time passes the attacks become more persistent and intense. With the future of warfare likely to mirror Iran and Israel’s conflicts, there are various concerns about the ethicality of cyber warfare. Although most believe that cyber warfare is a better alternative, as it seems to largely avoid bloodshed, one can make the argument that cyber warfare may have more destructive consequences then traditional warfare, with the articles making examples of how cyber-attacks can affect innocent citizens when factors such as their critical infrastructure is involved. [In this case study I will argue that utilitarianism shows us that the cyber war between Israel and Iran and the concept of an “all cyber war” is not ethical because it increases the overall amount of devastation among both countries. thesis statement works but this is your third use of utilitarianism] gives a sense about the territory but try to fill out specifics of the Israeli/Iranian conflict a little more

 In the paper “Can there be a Just Cyber War?” by Michael Boylan, Boylan discusses the ethics of cyberwarfare and questions if it possible for such a war to be ethical. The author begins the article with a plethora of questions, including “What would happen if Heathrow’s air traffic control system suddenly went down?” and “What would be the loss of civilian life as the scores of circling airplanes carrying hundreds of passengers each began to run into each other?”. Boylan makes the conclusion that “because so much of modern life in the west is computer driven and maintained, an attack against this cyber infrastructure can have regional and international effects”. Off the bat of the paper the author addresses the possibility of large quantities of human life being lost through cyber warfare with his question relating to the air traffic control system. Although most lay claim to the lack of bloodshed caused by cyber warfare it is evident that it can still claim the lives of thousands of civilians. Boylan later points out that the “pivotal differences that cyber warfare poses from the traditional paradigm is attribution”. The author argues that it is easy to determine who does what to whom when it involves physical events rather than attacks carried out online. The essay addresses the possibility of hackers from countries not only having the ability to stay anonymous but also the ability to make it appear as if a third unsuspected country was the source of the attack. The main point the author makes against cyber warfare is the likelihood of “bellum omnium contra omnes- a war of all against all”. With cyber warfare giving companies the ability to possibly escape accountability from launching acts of war against each other, this would most likely ultimately lead to the doomsday model of all against all, causing a complete lack of peace and trust around the world. Gives a sense of what Boylan up to but try to nail down core concept more cleanly

Then be sure to use concept to directly analyze the case

The concept of utilitarianism shows us that moral decisions should be made based entirely on how much good or bad is produced from the decision. Whatever decision leads to the most “good” in the world is the proper ethical decision. Now although it is hard to see how much good can come out of two different types of war, it almost seems as if traditional physical battle would lead to less overall harm than cyber warfare. Traditional warfare forces countries to take accountability for their attacks, which helps to prevent the case of war of all against all. Traditional war also primarily puts the lives of voluntary soldiers at risk however cyber warfare will usually target civilian lives instead of soldier lives, one can argue that the loss being primarily of civilian lives is worse than the loss of army soldier lives, as soldiers volunteer to fight for their country and usually prematurely accept that their lives are at risk, however when civilian lives are the primary target, it can be considered to be less ethical. Although the overall amount of bloodshed is lessened in cyberwarfare as opposed to traditional warfare, it does have the possibility of affecting more lives, as such it could technically make traditional warfare more ethical. This works at a general level but you need to also bring the assessment around to the specifics of the Israel/Iran conflict

Mariarosaria Taddeo addresses the possibility of how to make cyber warfare ethical in the essay “An Analysis for a Just Cyber Warfare (JWT)”. Taddeo addresses the common misbelief that cyberwarfare is completely nonviolent, stating that “At first glance, CW (Cyber warfare) seems to avoid bloodshed and human commitment” and later states “A more attentive analysis unveils that CW should be feared as much as traditional warfare as it can lead to highly violent and destructive consequences, which could be dangerous for both the military forces ad civil society.” This quote supports Taddeo’s stance that cyber warfare has the capability of being just as violent as traditional war.

Taddeo applies the principles of Just War Theory to cyber warfare to help to attempt to create the possibility for an ethically acceptable cyber war. The first principle the author uses is the principle of “war as a last resort”. War as a last resort is prescribed as “A state may resort to war only if it has exhausted all plausible, peaceful alternatives to resolve the conflict in question, in particular diplomatic negotiations.”. Because of cyber war having the potential to not cause any “physical” harm countries may be quicker to launch cyber-attacks on each other as opposed to traditional warfare attacks. The author uses the example of a state launching a cyber-attack on another state’s informational infrastructure to resolve tense relations between the two, although said attack would be bloodless and possibly help to avoid a traditional war later along the line it would still be an act of war according to JWT and as such would be technically unethical. Although one could make the argument that it would be better to launch said cyber-attack to avoid the possibility of a traditional war, with the way cyber-attacks have become more and more intense, the rebuttal can be made that acts of cyber warfare need to be avoided just as much as traditional war.

The second principle of Just War Theory is known as the principle of ‘more good than harm’, stating that “before declaring war a state must consider the universal goods expected to follow from the decision to wage war, against the universal evils expected to result”. This works but try to be a little sharper in presentation. Also, you need to follow the presentation with a thorough analysis of the case

This principal ties directly into the concept of utilitarianism which can also be used to argue against the waging of cyber warfare. Overall, as cyberwarfare continues to grow more and more advanced, the attacks become just as dangerous as traditional war. For example, the author exemplifies that “the consequences of a cyber-attack targeting a military aerial control system causing an aircraft to crash”. A plethora of cyber-attacks can also involve a country’s critical infrastructure, which can lead to civilian’s food, water, and economy being compromised, which can lead to a higher number of citizens having their health compromised through the effects of cyberwar. One can make the argument that the cyber warfare doesn’t produce any more good in the world than regular warfare, combining this with the issue of countries being able to escape accountability from launching cyber-attacks on one another makes the concept of an “all cyber war” largely unethical. As well, this mainly keeps things at a general level. You need to show how this applies to the case as well. Make more direct use of the ideas of the tool to support

 At first glance it seems that cyber warfare is clearly more ethical than traditional war because of its lack of requiring bloodshed. However, the more one analyses the concept of cyber war, it seems to be just as dangerous as traditional war. As always, the most ethical tactic to employ is to avoid any and all warfare at all costs, however, most accept that war is almost unavoidable. Although cyber warfare is likely to continue to be implemented into the concept of war, a complete cyber war should be avoided to avoid the possibility of an all against all war. Although it’s possible for cyber war to have less casualties than traditional war it still also has the possibility of having just as many or more with attacking parties being able to pin blame on a group or country that had nothing to do with the attack. The amount of variability that comes with an all cyberwar keeps it from being ethical, especially considering the world doesn’t know what long-term effect cyber war may have. This works to summarize things, but be sure to rework in light of your revisions.

Please revise and resubmit

You need to use a different tool since this is your third use of utilitarianism

Your presentations of Boylan and Taddeo work overall but try to sharpen the concepts a little more

You must use these concepts to directly analyze the cyberconflict. Show how they illuminate what is going on with Israel and Iran

With your assessments, be sure that you connect over to the specifics of the conflict, drawing more on the richness of the tool