For this section we have read and discussed ““Ethical Dilemmas in Cyberspace” by Martha

Finnemore AND “Introduction” by Duncan B. Hollis and Tim Maurer, “Promoting Economic

Prosperity” by Daniel J. Weitzner & “Does FB Use Personal Information? “by Jose Gonzalez

Cabanas, Angel Cuevas, Aritiz Arrate, & Ruben Cuevas, “Toward a Human Centric Approach to

Cybersecurity” by Ronald J. Deibert,“What if cyberspace were for fighting?” Duncan B. Hollis

and Jens David Ohlin, “Breaking the Cyber-Security Dilemma: Aligning Security Needs and

Removing Vulnerabilities” by Myriam Dunn Cavelty, “Doxing: a conceptual analysis” by David

M. Douglas and “Data collection, counterterrorism and the right to privacy” by Isaac Taylor

While most of this paper is structured the same way as the third paper, there is one additional component you need

to include that I’ll cover later in this instruction sheet: an objection/response section.

For this final paper there are three possible prompts:

Option One: You have read several articles regarding the question of what cyberspace ought to be used for: human

development, security, economic prosperity.

Write a paper using the elements below that explains your position on how you believe we should address this

question .

Option Two: You have read articles in this section that have examined the challenges of privacy in the cyberspace.

Write a paper using the elements below that explains your position on this topic.

Option Three: Write a paper using the elements below that explains your position on any of the other ideas or

controversies raised in the articles.

ELEMENT ONE: PRESENTATION OF SALIENT ARGUMENTS

This final paper will require you to present at least four arguments, using at least three

of the articles. You may divide this up however you like, e.g., two arguments from two of them, and one from the third

or three from one article and one each from the remaining articles, etc. As was the case before you may choose

whatever arguments you like, so long as you present arguments and not simply a recitation of facts. Obviously, you’ll

need to provide the structure of the argument (how the premises lead to the conclusion), but you will also need to

include:

any salient factual information the author employs or refers to,

any moral principles or theories (either explicitly or implicitly) the author is relying upon

to support their position

the explanation of any technical concepts or ideas

ELEMENT TWO: CRITIQUE

Once you have laid out these arguments you must then critique at least two of them. As I have explained in class by

critique I mean you can

Attack: explain how the argument fails

Modify: explain how the argument is heading in the right direction or could be effective if it were tweaked or altered or

adjusted.

Extended: explain how the argument is right on track and show how there are important ramifications that logically

flow from accepting the argument.

Remember that in doing this you are essentially presenting arguments of your own. This means you are presenting

conclusions which are supported by reasons, justifications. You are not simply providing your gut reaction or off the

cuff opinions.

ELEMENT THREE: PRESENTATION OF YOUR OWN POSITION

When engaging in ethical reflection on a moral dilemma it is essential to be able to

articulate various positions in a fair, complete, and accurate manner and then be able to identify and explain the

strengths and weaknesses of those positions. However, this alone is not enough. For you to engage in true ethical

reflection you need to ask yourself what you believe is the correct position on the topic and then defend your view

with clearly expressed, well- constructed arguments. There is no set number of arguments you have to present but

you need to allot yourself roughly 2 ½ pages to develop a substantive defense of your views. Remember that

presenting your position is not the same thing as simply stating the conclusion of your position. So, saying

“Nations need to be able to control their borders” is the conclusion of an argument, not an argument. If someone said

that to you, your natural response should be “Okay, but WHY?” If they said back, “Well, cause I think so.” that would

obviously not be enough. There are basically two options. You either agree with what one or more of the folks have

said or you don’t.

AGREE WITH SOMEONE(s) POSITION:

4/30/2021 Order 343849601

https://admin.writerbay.com/orders\_available?subcom=detailed&id=343849601 2/3

Again, when I say agree with someone I don’t simply mean agree with their conclusion. That’s the smallest part of

the whole equation. I’m saying you might agree with their reasons “WHY” you also accept their conclusion. The

premises together with the conclusion, i.e., the argument.However, it is not adequate for this assignment for you to

simply restate someone else’s arguments, their reasons why. The point is that if you’re agreeing with an author’s

position on a topic you need to add to it in ways that the author has not hitherto done. You can’t just say “Yep, she’s

right.” If you think that someone’s arguments are the best arguments about this topic then you need to:

EXTEND THE ARGUMENT(s): This is what we talked about in the critique section. You

can lay out for the reader the ways in which this particular argument you’re agreeing with has ramifications that the

original author did not bring up but which are important for the reader to see. Perhaps the argument(s) the author

presents has implications

for a deeper understanding of the concept of democracy OR maybe there are benefits it provides us regarding

freedom or the economy which the author has not considered OR or perhaps the author has relied entirely on a

utilitarian argument and you can

supplement it with a social contract analysis OR… In any case, the idea of extending an argument is that there are

more insights to be gained from the author’s position that she didn’t present in her article.

MODIFY THE ARGUMENT(s):

This is another one we talked about in the critique section. You may agree with the

author’s argument but believe that their argument needs to be tweaked. As opposed to the “extended” version, in

this case you think the author made a mistake somewhere along the way and you’re going to correct it. Perhaps one

of the premises is faulty, but you believe it could be replaced with a different premise that does a better job of leading

to the conclusion. Perhaps the author is missing a crucial idea or concept that would help strengthen the argument.

DEFEND THE ARGUMENT(s):

In this case you think the author has completely done a great job but you can see how

someone would raise a serious objection(s) to the argument. It’s vulnerable to an attack, but you can also see how to

defend the author’s argument from that attack. In this case you’d lay out the attack in a complete and clear manner

so that the reader can easily understand the potential problem for the author’s argument. Then you critique the

attack, show how it fails.The key to this approach is not just the critique but that you need to set it up properly.

You need to show that the only problem with the author’s argument is X and that if X is

eliminated, then that will eliminate the only barrier to all intelligent, ethical people accepting the author’s position.

PRESENT AN ORIGINAL TAKE ON THE PROBLEM

As I said above, you will either agree that one or more author has adequately captured

the key argument(s) regarding the topic or you will think they all missed it. It’s one or the other. If you think that no

one has adequately captured what we really should be thinking about or doing regarding the matter, then you

disagree with everyone.

This takes us back to the critique section where we discussed the “attack” option.

Remember, if you’re disagreeing with an author’s position you’re doing more than simply disagreeing with the

conclusion. To say, “Wietzner thinks we should reestablish net neutrality and I think he’s wrong.” is not enough.

That’s merely stating that the two of you reach different conclusions. You need to show why the argument is

inadequate, why it fails. However, for this third assignment simply showing why his argument is inadequate is also

not enough. To demonstrate someone is wrong is not enough to show what should be done. It only tells us what we

shouldn’t do or think.

You need to explain what we should do or think.

You can do this in any number of ways:

You can identify a different ethical concept that is relevant to the topic but which none

of the authors have used in their work. You then show how that concept provides us with the proper insight into how

we ought to think about the topic of immigration.

You can provide a different interpretation of an ethical concept which one or more of

the authors use and show that with this alternative interpretation of the concept you can provide us with the proper

insights into how we ought to think about the topic of immigration.You can show how all of them have been

depending upon a particular concept, ethical or not, and that they’ve all been mistaken in their views that the topic of

immigration depends upon this topic. Once you’ve shown the reader why that concept should be eliminated from the

discussion, the answer is revealed.

You can show that all of them have misinterpreted the relevance of some key factual

matter for the argument(s). So, they might all agree on some facts about the topic but they have all misinterpreted

what we should think about those facts. Once you have shown the proper way to interpret those facts the solution is

revealed.

OBJECTION & RESPONSE SECTION

In any substantive work of ethical reflection, the author needs to carefully consider the

potential weaknesses of their own position. Just as you critiqued the arguments of others you need to be selfreflective and do it to yourself as well. So, all the same techniques we covered in the second part about critique
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applies here as well. You need to craft a substantive, plausible objection to your own solution, one that you could

imagine your smartest opponent has thought up. It must be fully developed; we’re not talking two or three sentences

here. Review the section on critique, particularly “attack” from the earlier papers. Once you have written this

objection, you then need to write a response to it that explains why that critique is not strong enough to cause you to

change your solution. After all, if the objection was strong enough then you would change your mind and construct a

different solution. Again, this response has to be more than two or three sentences, it needs to be substantive, clear,

and well developed that a reader can easily understand your views on the matter. You may have more than one

response back to the objection section and that’s fine.

FINAL REMARKS

Keep in mind, you have now received three detailed commentaries from me on your

papers as well as in class lectures on what makes a good paper. You need to build on this for your final paper. In

other words, if I have said on past papers that you need to be more careful in proofreading your paper or that you

need to develop positions more fully or more clearly, and you fail to do so in this one, then you lose more points. The

idea is to take what you have learned and improve your work. That means taking the suggestions and

recommendations you’ve been given seriously.

Formatting and technical specifications

10 pages (minimum, it can be longer)

Pages must be numbered

Double spaced

Proper citation method (you could use MLA, Chicago, Turabian, APA, so long as you are

consistent) when you quote from the articles

Sources Page listing the articles you used

A Cover Page which includes:

your name,
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