Write a **one-page** paper using ethical frameworks to discuss the choice between the following scenarios: (1) US should work towards creating an international ban on cyber-attacks, analogous to the Chemical Weapons Convention that outlaws the production and use of chemical weapons. (2) US should strive to become prominent in cyber-attack technology.

Your paper can not be longer than one page not including the references. Organize your thoughts and writing as follows: thesis, argument, and counter-argument, response to counter-argument, conclusion and references. This is not a reflection paper; rather it should give evidence and reasons for your suggested approach.

**Important Notes:**

* Any evidence of plagiarism will result in an automatic zero for this assignment.
* You are limited to ONE PAGE single-spaced or TWO PAGES double-spaced, 12 pt. font, 1 inch margins, not including references. Please write concisely.
* Please observe the correct rules of spelling, grammar, capitalization, punctuation, and sentence structure in your paper. Points will be taken off for grammatical errors.
* Please do not rely exclusively on the textbook.
* Please put your name at the top of your paper.
* Make sure that all your sources are reputable and trustworthy.
* Your paper must be in PDF format.
* All citations should be in IEEE format.

Kantianism:

Should strive for a ban on cyber-attacks. To instead enter an arms-race of sorts would be using the people of the world as a means to the end of cyber-superiority and could be incredibly irresponsible, causing mass destruction in both the cyber and physical space.

Counter-Argument: By banning cyber-attacks the USA would be pushing for a mass removal of autonomy to a certain extent. It is equivalent to enforcing a policy and restriction on everyone, regardless of their history.

Counter-Counter: Under Kantianism a government or higher power is actually able to ethically remove autonomy, but only if it is for the betterment of everyone else. For example, governments outlaw murder, but removing “one’s autonomy to murder” is not unethical, in fact it is ethical. In this way the US’ battle for a cyber-attack free world is ethically right under Kantianism as it isn’t using people as a means to an end, but is instead removing some autonomy of the masses for the betterment of humanity as a whole.

Sources:

2 Book

3 China calling USA “empire of hacking”:

<https://www.scmp.com/tech/policy/article/3106613/china-calls-us-empire-hacking-following-nsa-advisory-accusing-chinese>

1 Law of CyberAttacks (got through WPI on JSTOR)

“The customary international law of countermeasures governs how states may respond to international law violations that do not rise to the level of an armed attack justifying self-defense—including, implicitly, cyber-attacks.”

<https://www-jstor-org.ezpxy-web-p-u01.wpi.edu/stable/23249823?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents>

4 Cyber Attacks and the Beginnings of an International Cyber Treaty

“Any international agreement will necessarily define cyber attack” difficulty in definition

<https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/ncjint39&div=10&id=&page=>

5 Dep of Homeland Security Cyber-Security Page (passing of Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Act)

<https://www.dhs.gov/topic/cybersecurity>