

The advancement of technology in this day and age has allowed for many countless innovations and has also built upon our lives, making many factors of living much more efficient and digitized. Although these technologies have significantly changed our lives for the better, have also made several aspects of our lives much worse. Cyberwarfare, a term that sounds like something from a distant future, or perhaps even a matrix movie, is a thing of the present, in our current society. With today's advancements, wars can be waged in a matter of seconds from opposite sides of the planet. With cyberwarfare, location is truly a non-factor. Malware and worms are the main ways these wars can start. Specifically examining the conflict between Israel and Iran, there have been many cyberattacks and retaliations from both of these countries. With each attack, much more impactful than before, these two countries seem to have been enveloped in a cyberwar, in which they attack each by targeting critical infrastructure. In this Case Analysis, I will argue that consequentialism shows us that the cyberwar between Israel and Iran is in fact not just because both of these countries are continuously putting out more suffering in life than promoting good.

When discussing the topic of war, no one can truly identify a part of it as just, or fair or even ethical. These clear lines become blurred, especially with the acts that lead up to the war and ultimately cause them to happen. In terms of cyberwarfare, many aspects of the war can be even harder categorized due to the way these wars operate. There typically aren't human casualties or physical harm to civilians who are roped into cyberwars, but I believe that this distinction between traditional war and cyberwar is definitely becoming less and less apparent. The attacks that have ensued between Iran and Israel are slowly beginning to rid cyberwar of that distinction from traditional war. Michael Boylan discusses in his work *Can There Be A Just Cyber War?* about how the way we used to think about war should change because now, the entire game is flipped on its head. Boylan describes how wars would usually start with an oppressive state, that would usually seek to obtain resources, land, or strategic advantage over the other country, and thus would commit acts that target a country's sovereignty and or territorial integrity. With cyber attacks aimed at electric grids, power plants, and airports, there can be wide-range effects that not only affect the military (combatants) but also civilians (non-combatants). Cyberwars are extremely unjust when you consider factors like people in the military willingly putting themselves on the line to fight and protect their countries, while civilians are starting to be more affected by these wars than the people that actually pledged an oath for their country. When considering the ethics of consequentialism, it would definitely seem that with the way these attacks and events are disrupting more and more civilian lives, than those who pledged to protect, suffering is immensely promoted, than happiness to all. A perfect example of this was Iran's attack on an Israeli hospital, Hillel Yaffe, where hospital staff was forced to work manually rather than depending on the technology that could've greatly assisted them. This level and severity of attacks are truly what makes me fear for the future of wars. As these wars now see the lives of civilians as expendable, something the people in power can trample all over to reach their goals. The argument that traditional wars cause a lot more

suffering than cyber warfare could be made, especially since most cyberwars are without human casualties, but we must also recognize that the people who fight in these wars are people who had a choice. Civilian bystanders who are affected by cyberwarfare had no say in their involvement in said warfare, and with there being more ways civilians can be affected due to an extensive amount of our daily lives and daily tasks being digitized, take our electric grids, stock markets, major road services, and even our water systems. Cyberwarfare has the opportunity to cause suffering and chaos much grander than ever before, and there truly is nothing just or ethical about it.

Mariarosaria Taddeo's *An Analysis For A Just Cyberwarfare* solidifies the point made about the distinction between cyberwarfare and traditional warfare. In her work, *An Analysis For A Just Cyberwarfare*, Taddeo defines traditional war as "a violent and sanguinary phenomenon, declared by states and their official leaders and waged by military forces" (Taddeo 5). Taddeo also goes on to contrast the meaning of cyberwarfare to contrast that of traditional warfare by stating that cyberwarfare is "[the warfare grounded on certain] uses of ICTs within an offensive or defensive military strategy endorsed by a state and aiming at the immediate disruption or control of the enemy's resources, and which is waged within the informational environment, with agents and targets ranging both on the physical and non-physical domains and whose level of violence may vary upon circumstances" (Taddeo 3). With these definitions, Taddeo clearly explains the difference between these two types of warfare, with how they're relatively orchestrated and carried out. This distinction she makes sets a perfect plan for her topic going forward that we cannot use the same basis and notions we have around traditional warfare to apply to cyberwarfare. Taddeo hits on a point used to justify cyberwarfare, which is that there is "more good than harm", compared to traditional warfare. Although I can see where this point would make sense, especially since most cyberwarfare tends to not have many or any casualties, I do have to point out that casualties shouldn't be the only merit to consider that something is more ethical, especially in this case. Just because people didn't die or physically get hurt due to a cyberattack waged by another state, doesn't mean there isn't collateral damage that is experienced by civilians. Consider a mother who needs to feed and protect her child, but she is not able to because her country, Iran, was hit by a cyberattack that resulted in her not being able to get to work to make money for her child. Another scenario that is also likely to have happened is families losing their loved ones due to an attack at an Israeli hospital, Hillel Yaffe. All these events have the opportunity to create so much suffering, even if cyberwarfare is seen as a better option than traditional warfare. Although these scenarios aren't usually considered in the grand scheme of warfare, especially cyberwarfare, these scenario cause just as much suffering as a traditional war, which perhaps could've misplaced the family or even worse. All of these factors must be considered when dealing with both traditional as well as cyberwarfare. I will not deny that traditional warfare can lead to many losses of life and many destructions of property, but I also believe that the possibility for all of these things to happen due to cyberwarfare is very

apparent. People tend to see cyberwarfare as a much more toned-down version of traditional war, but the thing is, it really shouldn't be, especially with the amount of suffering they can both cause, thus making both of this warfare unethical by the standards of the consequentialism, due to the amount of suffering they both cause.

When considering the consequences of cyberwarfare and traditional warfare, both of these have the potential to cause immeasurable suffering to both civilians and military forces. The argument that cyberwarfare is less violent and has more negative consequences isn't necessarily valid because of how easily things can escalate in any type of warfare. When considering the ethics of the war between Iran and Israel, it can be stated that the war between them is in fact not just, especially when viewing their war through the lens of consequentialism, an ethics tool that explains that actions are only ethical if they bring about the most amount of happiness and wrong if they bring about more suffering. Both of these nations are causing more pain and suffering to each other, as well as themselves due to their continued cyberattacks aimed at one another, so the war between them is not an ethical one.