**Answer Question:**

1. **KEYWORDS [Components]**
2. **RELATIONSHIPS [The order of the Components]**
3. **FORMAT OF ARGUMENTATION**

* **At least 1 Unethical => unethical**

**At least 1 Cannot be determined => Cannot be determined**

**All ethical => ethical**

* **definitions, example, explain, conclusion**

**Mission Stuff to consider:**

**Plausible Deniability**

**Secrecy**

**How info is retrieved by other sources (eg the cartographer)**

**Perspectives:**

**Big Data (Privacy and Confidentiality)**

more information -> more informed decisions -> better outcomes.

**AI**

Hackers vs Developers

**Tips:**

1. **if a policy is unethical but in some components it is ethical, instead of concluding "ethical", conclude with "Therefore, this component is fulfilled" (Accountableness) / "Does not need other rules to evaluate" (Consequentialism), “Unclear under this component” (Rights), “Defer judgement until the evaluation of the other components” (for primary components), “while it is ethical under this component, the policy needs to be tested against the previous/preceding component” (rights)**
2. **Link the situation back to the definition, give example, explain a bit, judgement**
3. **Be sure on who is the key target audience of the policy. (eg the Social contract qn bet seatbelts for all passengers vs attendants to reject passengers)**

## Deontology

**Universality**: In considering Universality, we need to determine if the rules can be applied universally to everyone.

**Rationality**: Under the condition of Rationality, we need to evaluate if the policy is non-emotional, and can be reasoned from logic.

**Means-Or-Ends**: The discussion about Means-Or-Ends requires the consideration for whether the policy treats people as a means to an end or ends in themselves

**Keywords**

* Universality: apply to all, general enoughto include all possible situations*,* universally understandable
* Rationality: emotional as inferred from …*,* reasonable as it do not seem to be in conflict*,* logical as it …,
* Means-Or-Ends: who are the ends and who are the means, how they themselves are affected, ulterior motive and ultimate aim,

### Universality

**Keywords**

In considering Universality, we need to determine if the rules can be applied universally to everyone.

**Keywords, Relationships, Format of Argumentation**

* In considering Universality, we need to determine if the rules can universally apply to everyone. **For example**, can this policy **apply to** **every one of** **The Pawnbroker's Linux-based systems**? This **seems to be the case**. Therefore, with regards to Universality, this policy is ethical.
* In considering Universality, we need to determine if the rules can universally apply to everyone. **For example**, can this policy **apply to** **all businesses providing financial-related services**? This **seems to be the case**. Therefore, with regards to Universality, this policy is ethical.
* In considering Universality, we need to determine if the rules can universally apply to everyone. For example, can this policy apply to everyone posting on Facebook? This seems to be the case. Therefore, with regards to Universality, this policy is ethical.

### Rationality

**Keywords**

Under the condition of Rationality, we need to evaluate if the policy is non-emotional, and can be reasoned from logic.

**Keywords, Relationships, Format of Argumentation**

* Under the condition of Rationality, we need to evaluate if this policy is non-emotional, and can be reasoned from logic. **For example, is it logical to** **obfuscate or encrypt** the information in the systems to **prevent hacking**? It would **seem logical** to do so, especially since most obfuscation and encryption techniques **only adversely affect unauthorized attackers**, they **do not prevent authorized users from using the system normally**. Therefore, this policy does seem to **pass the Rationality test**, and is therefore ethical.
* Under the condition of Rationality, we need to evaluate if this policy is non-emotional, and can be reasoned from logic. **For example, is it logical to** **ban the use of PDF with embedded links** to **prevent spoofing attacks**? It would seem that **although this is a non-emotional policy, it does not seem to be logical**, since there are **many other ways to do spoofing**, and since the **use of PDF is very prevalent among the industry**, it will be **difficult to police** the use of embedded links within PDFs. Therefore, this **policy does not seem to pass the Rationality test**, and is therefore not ethical.
* Under the condition of Rationality, we need to evaluate if this policy is non-emotional, and can be reasoned from logic. For example, is it logical for Facebook to remove explicit attempts to mock victims and mark them as cruel implicit attempts? It would seem that this policy is rather emotional due to its need to highlight "cruel and insensitive", although it does seem logical to do so to prevent people from harm. If reworded without the "cruel and insensitive", this policy would be ethical. However, as it stands, this policy does not seem to pass the Rationality test because it is emotionally written, and is therefore not ethical under Deontology.

### Means-Or-Ends

**Keywords**

The discussion about Means-Or-Ends requires the consideration for whether the policy treats people as a means to an end or ends in themselves

**Keywords, Relationships, Format of Argumentation**

* The discussion about Means-Or-Ends requires consideration for whether the policy treats people as means to an end or ends in themselves. **In this case**, since utilizing obfuscation and encryption serves to **benefit** **authorized users** due to an **increase in security**, the ultimate aim of this is to have a beneficial effect on authorized users by **making the system less risky to rely on,** which therefore suggests that authorized users are the **ends and not the means**. There **does not seem to be an ulterior motive** to this, therefore, this policy is ethical under Deontology.
* The discussion about Means-Or-Ends requires consideration for whether the policy treats people as means to an end or ends in themselves. **In this case**, **banning the use of embedded links within PDFs** **seems to be an ulterior motive** to achieve the **ends of increased security**, but this is **achieved by preventing people from using such as feature**, so this **method treats people as the means to the end**, which is **unethical** under Deontology.
* The discussion about Means-Or-Ends requires consideration for whether the policy treats people as means to an end or ends in themselves. For example, removing offending posts seems to regard people as an end so that they will not feel targeted based on their vulnerabilities. However, an ulterior motive could also be that Facebook wants users to continue using its product, and they may stop using it if they feel targeted. This means that making people feel better is a means to the end of Facebook wanting people to continue using its service. Therefore, the user is treated as a means of getting to that end, because the ulterior motive seems to be to make people continue using the service, so this policy is not ethical under Deontology.

## Utilitarianism

**Aggregate-Utility**: Aggregated-Utility is about considering the net benefits (which means an increase in utility) or damages (which is a decrease in utility).

Definition (above), current policy, how it affect the target audience and others. pros (faster for ppl to treat the injured person), cons (the guy has to bring medical info with him everywhere, might be a hindrance in some instances), weigh (net benefit/damages?) using subject matter (eg Big Data), conclusion (ethical/unethical)

**Accountableness**: Accountableness is about the ability of the policy to account for all affected stakeholders within the target community.

Definition of component, are all target communities clear?, link to subject matter (eg Big Data - having to collect more info), how it affects the stakeholders (benefit decision-making), effects (make better decisions, less burden to others, benefit other stakeholders too). conclusion (ethical/unethical)

**Consequentialism:** Consequentialism is about whether only the consequences are taken into account regardless of all other factors.

Definition (above), what are the consequences, what are judged by the policy / what does the policy take into account / does it take into account other factors (eg no need to take into account other concepts such as duty or virtue), conclusion (ethical/unethical)

**Keywords (Utilitarianism: Secondary and Tertiary components link to Primary Component)**

* Aggregate-Utility: confers mostly benefits with few damages as for example …, … better outcomes as compared to …, damages to … may be …. but benefits …, net increase in utility due to the policy is evident, …
* Accountableness: all affected stakeholders are accounted for, directly affects [stakeholder]… because …, … less of a burden to others [stakeholder] … , benefiting others [stakeholders] ,… requirement is met (if the over is unethical/cannot be det)
* Consequentialism: consequences are easy to account for …, … only final benefits to all are used to judge …, no need take into account other concepts such as duty or virtue, inherent biases or prejudices embedded in the policy
* conflicts with the Primary component of Natural-Rights, the policy can be considered unethical overall, …

### Aggregate-Utility

**Keywords**

Aggregated-Utility is about considering the net benefits (which means an increase in utility) or damages (which is a decrease in utility).

**Keywords**, **Relationships, Format of Argumentation**

* Aggregated-Utility is about considering the net benefits (which means an increase in utility) or damages (which is a decrease in utility). In this case, many of the commands mentioned in this policy are **fundamental for any work done** within Linux. If these commands are disabled, while it may **prevent potential unauthorized hacking incidents from happening**, thereby **potentially benefiting security**, it will definitely be **disruptive** for **authorized users** how need to perform work in the system, such as **system administrators**, thereby definitely **damaging productivity**. Therefore, from this **standpoint of potential benefit verses definite damage**, it is clear that there is no Aggregated-Utility, and therefore this policy is not ethical under Utilitarianism.
* Aggregated-Utility is about considering the net benefits (which means an increase in utility) or damages (which is a decrease in utility). In this case, it is **difficult to measure the aggregate utility** because there is **insufficient information given**. For example, if a **user** only uses a **small number of apps or services**, then it would seem **possible to have a different password for each**. However, if the **user** has a **large number of apps or services**, then it becomes much **more difficult to abide by this policy**, not just because the user has to remember a large amount of information, but also because there is an **upper-bound to the number of possible password combinations**, especially if there are limits such as a character limit or character-set limit (eg. only alpha-numeric characters). Therefore, from this standpoint, it is **unclear** if there really is Aggregated-Utility in this case.
* Aggregated-Utility is about considering the net benefits (which means an increase in utility) or damages (which is a decrease in utility). In this case, it is possible to quantify utility in relative terms. By disciplining students who have engaged in misconduct, this produces a benefit as it serves as a deterrent against future cases of misconduct, not just from the perpetrator, but also as an example to the community and other would-be offenders, thus preventing them from becoming actual offenders. While there may be damages to the perpetrator and associates, the overall impact on the rest of society and the community is positive, as cheating, deceptive fabrication, plagiarism and violation of IP and copyright will have profound negative impacts to all members of society if left to fester unchecked, as members in the community will start to lose confidence in their society and their own lives, which in turn will lead to a regression to anarchy, chaos and great uncertainty of the future. Therefore, from this standpoint, it is clear if there really is Aggregated-Utility in this case.

### Accountableness

**Keywords**

Accountableness is about the ability of the policy to account for all affected stakeholders within the target community.

**Keywords**, **Relationships, Format of Argumentation**

* Accountableness is about the ability of the policy to account for all affected stakeholders within the target community. For example, in this case, **while some** stakeholders in the community can be **easily accounted for**, such as **The Pawnbroker** and **potential hackers**, there may be **other stakeholders unaccounted for**, such as the **system administrators** working for The Pawnbroker, and The Pawnbroker's **customers**, **and more**. Therefore, this **accountableness requirement is not met**.
* Accountableness is about the ability of the policy to account for all affected stakeholders within the target community. In this case, it is **clear** that the **main stakeholders in the community can be easily accounted for**, as they are the **users of an organization's IT systems**. However, there could be **people who depend on these users for service and support**, and that part of the **population is less well defined**. Therefore, this accountableness **requirement is not met**.
* Accountableness is about the ability of the policy to account for all affected stakeholders within the target community. In this case, it is clear that the community can be easily accounted for, as all members of society are impacted by this policy, even those who are not currently part of NUS, because the effects of this policy will ripple out to the rest of society. For example, when students graduate, they will bring their values and skills into the workforce, which will have profound impact on the country's economy, and by extension, the world. Therefore, this accountability requirement is met.

### Consequentialism

**Keywords**

Consequentialism is about whether only the consequences are taken into account regardless of all other factors.

**Keywords**, **Relationships, Format of Argumentation**

* Consequentialism is about whether only the consequences are taken into account regardless of all other factors. In this policy, it is clear that the consequences are that **navigation and traversal** within the directory system will be **prevented**, as well editing of files, and this will **stop hackers from being able to perform those actions**, **regardless of the duties or rights of others**. Therefore, under Utilitarianism, this component is fulfilled.
* Consequentialism is about whether only the consequences are taken into account regardless of all other factors. In this case, even the **consequences of this policy are unknown** because it is **difficult to quantify the effects** to the **users** and **people who depend on these users**, hence, consequentialism in this case is **not well defined**.
* Consequentialism is about whether only the consequences are taken into account regardless of all other factors. In this case, the consequences of this policy can be predicted and extrapolated quite easily and logically, and it is clear that this policy does not take into account factors such as a student's political, economic, social, or technological background in rendering disciplinary action. Therefore, this policy is ethical under Utilitarianism.

## Rights

**Natural Rights:** Natural-Rights refers to the fundamental rights of humans to life and property that they create or obtain by mixing their labor with natural resources, and as long as they did not obtain these items through stealing, killing, deceiving, or coercing other human beings, they should have the rights to do whatever they wish to their life and property.

Created asset himself, has rights to it. If others gave asset to him, also has rights to it. How did he put in his labour? Is the natural-right of others being respected, ie to say the user has the agreement of the owner to use the work? Conclusion (is it clear his property is from him alone?)

**Negative-Rights:** Negative-Rightsrefers to the rights to freedom, liberty, and to act without interference.

Should he have the freedom to do whatever he wants with his property? Does he have those freedoms or is it partial? What is the freedom/liberty he is exercising? Conclusion

**Positive-Rights:** Positive-Rightsrefers to the obligations that can be imposed on others to force them to do or stop them from doing something.

What are the obligations for the party, if any? (eg chef’s obligation is to cook, cartographer is to make maps) to whom are those obligations directed towards (eg the diner, the map collector etc)? or maybe obligations not to do things? (eg secret info should not be retrieved because the intent of the original owner to make the info secret is to hide it away from the public so that it cannot be retrieved. Taking that info is infringing the obligation imposed by the owner of that info)

**Keywords (Most important is Natural-Rights. Negative & Positive can be evaluated against each other)**

* Natural-Rights: … own labour created the [object] which belongs to him thus have Natural-Rights to the property, can decide what to do with it, did not steal, kill, deceive or coerce anyone in order to obtain [object], might not have the Natural-Rights to own, cannot claim to have created
* Negative-Rights: … freedom to do [action] …, as long as he is humanly able to do so …,
* Positive-Rights: what the obligations to /are, what the item is for -> issue with item -> issue with item use -> obligation of creator to make sure item is not faulty since that is the purpose of the item to begin with, does not own the right to [object] and an obligation not to use it, negative repercussions … expect that if they buy it they own it, as long as [they] choose to proceed with the transaction [they] willingly accepting the obligation,

### Natural-Rights

**Keywords**

Natural-Rights refers to the fundamental rights of humans to life and property that they create or obtain by mixing their labor with natural resources, and as long as they did not obtain these items through stealing, killing, deceiving, or coercing other human beings, they should have the rights to do whatever they wish to their life and property.

**Keywords, Relationships, Format of Argumentation**

* Natural-Rights refers to the fundamental rights of humans to life and property that they create or obtain by mixing their labor with natural resources. For example, **in this case**, **investigators** **have the right to** create a honeypot and use it to obtain whatever information they need for their investigation, **as long as they do not steal, kill, deceive or coerce anyone to get that information.** Unfortunately, a honeypot relies on deception to gather information. This means that it **violates the rights of other** human beings who **encounter the honeypot unknowingly**. Therefore, this policy is ethical under Natural-Rights, as it **prevents such violation** from happening.
* Natural-Rights refers to the fundamental rights of humans to life and property that they create or obtain by mixing their labor with natural resources. **In this case**, **merchants** **have the right to** **decide whether or not to do transactions via e-payments**, since that choice can be **considered** the **merchant's** **property**, and the **merchant** **did not steal, kill, deceive or coerce anyone to obtain that right**. Therefore, this policy is **unethical** under Natural-Rights because it **infringes** on this right.
* Natural-Rights refers to the fundamental rights of humans to life and property that they create or obtain by mixing their labor with natural resources. In this case, Instagram has the right to decide whether or not to filter and reduce the visibility of some accounts, since all actions that occur on Instagram are considered part of Instagram's property, and Instagram did not steal, kill, deceive or coerce anyone to obtain that right. Therefore, this policy is ethical under Natural-Rights.

### Negative-Rights

**Keywords**

Negative-Rightsrefers to the rights to freedom, liberty, and to act without interference.

**Keywords, Relationships, Format of Argumentation**

* Negative-Rights refers to the rights to freedom, liberty, and to act without interference. **In this case**, **investigators** **have the righ**t to do whatever they need to **catch** the **hackers**, as long as there are **no Positive Rights to oppose them**. Therefore, we **need to examine the next component before making a judgement** on this.
* Negative-Rights refers to the rights to freedom, liberty, and to act without interference. **In this case**, **merchants** **have the freedom to** choose whatever **payment methods** they wish, and there is **nothing stopping them from exercising their right to do so**. Furthermore, **students** **have the right to** decide whether or not to **purchase** from these merchants **using the payment options** available through the merchant. Therefore, under Negative-Rights, this policy is **unethical**, because it **infringes on these rights**.
* Negative-Rights refers to the rights to freedom, liberty, and to act without interference. In this case, Instagram has the freedom to filter and reduce visibility of any piece of content on their site, and there is nothing stopping them from exercising their right to do so. Therefore, under Negative-Rights, this policy is ethical.

### Positive-Rights

**Keywords**

Positive-Rightsrefers to the obligations that can be imposed on others to force them to do or stop them from doing something.

**Keywords, Relationships, Format of Argumentation**

* Positive-Rights refers to the obligations that can be imposed on others to force them to do or stop them from doing something. **In this policy**, it is **unclear what obligations** the **investigators** have to the **people in the honeypot**. However, as **anyone could have entered the honeypot**, it will be rather **difficult to say that the investigators have no obligations whatsoever**, since **basic human rights still should be protected** which is a **default obligation for all human beings**. Therefore, this policy is ethical under Rights.
* Positive-Rights refers to the obligations that can be imposed on others to force them to do or stop them from doing something. **In this case**, **it would seem** that **merchants** **do not have an obligation to** **customers** to **provide certain types of payment options**, just as **customers** **do not have an obligation** to **transact with the merchant** if the customer is not satisfied with the merchant's products or services. Therefore, **this policy violates these rights**, and it is **unethical under Positive-Rights to force** the **merchant and the student to transact in a certain way** when there are **other options available**.
* Positive-Rights refers to the obligations that can be imposed on others to force them to do or stop them from doing something. In this case, it makes it clear that Instagram has no obligations to its users, especially since it is providing the service free-of-charge to users. This is ethical under Positive-Rights if users seek to use Instagram services on their own accord, therefore Instagram is not violating any Positive-Rights, and therefore this policy is ethical.

## Contributing to Society

**Virtuous-Activity:** AVirtuous-Activitycan only be said to be virtuous if the work is done well (ie honestly / responsibly / creatively).

Definition, does the policy compel the target audience to achieve this goal?, how does it do it?, does it necessarily mean that the a/m points are met? (eg tailor takes on challenging requests to increase skill. Increase skill does not mean work is done in the a/m manner), conclusion

**Communal-Benefit:** Communal-Benefitrequires that actions must be beneficial to others in the community besides the person performing the action.

How does the action affect others, what do they gain? (eg increased confidence from being able to rely on the target’s services?), how? (knowing the target audience is honour-bound etc), conclusion

**General-Agreement:** General-Agreementis about whether or not most people in the community will agree that the action is a good activity.

Who are the other ppl?, how are they affected?,

**Keywords**

* Virtuous-Activity: … to be well done, at expense of…, focus on… not having to waste resources…, definition for "well" cannot be determined, … compels [stakeholder] to do his work …,
* Communal-Benefit: benefit others in the community other than …, benefit from the confidence of being able to rely…, honor-bound to do…, waste produced outweigh…, potentially harming others in the community, argument that long term … vs short term … discriminate …, concretely and negatively impacted, better allocating resource while preventing wasting resources…
* General-Agreement: result in good activities being practiced, worry less…, community as a whole larger number of people would be negatively impacted than the number of positively impacted people…, very unlikely to get a consensus in the community regarding…, little clarity… significance of contribution…, increase the general confidence in …,

### Virtuous-Activity

**Keywords**

AVirtuous-Activitycan only be said to be virtuous if the work is done well (ie honestly / responsibly / creatively).

**Keywords, Relationships, Format of Argumentation**

* Since a Virtuous-Activity can only be said to be virtuous if the work is done well (eg. honestly / responsibly / creatively), it is unclear that this policy does **compel** **Linux users** to achieve this goal. In this case, **mandating** **Linux distros to include restrictions** on the **use of certain apps** **says nothing about using Linux honestly, responsibly or creatively**. Therefore, it is **unclear** what this policy **hopes to achieve when examined under Contributing to Society**.
* Since a Virtuous-Activity can only be said to be virtuous if the work is done well (eg. honestly / responsibly / creatively), it is clear that this policy does **compel** **businesses** to be more responsible and honest. For example, **mandating** the use of multi-FA forces the **businesses** to engineer their services **more responsibly and honestly**, because these approaches will make their products **more secure against hacking threats**. Therefore, it is clear that this **component has been fulfilled** under Contributing to Society.
* Since a Virtuous-Activity can only be said to be virtuous if the work is done well (eg. honestly / responsibly / creatively), it is clear that this policy may encourage people to behave creatively but irresponsibly. For example, it is a simple matter to post someone's private information via a proxy channel, such as posting it on Youtube before sharing the Youtube video on Twitter. Therefore, it is unclear if this component fulfills the requirement of Contributing to Society.

### Communal-Benefit

**Keywords**

Communal-Benefitrequires that actions must be beneficial to others in the community besides the person performing the action.

**Keywords, Relationships, Format of Argumentation**

* Communal-Benefit requires that actions must be beneficial to others in the community besides the person performing the action. In this case, the policy will **benefit the community** by **reducing the risk** of **getting hacked** via such **mass-scanning apps**. Therefore, this **component is fulfilled** in the policy.
* Communal-Benefit requires that actions must be beneficial to others in the community besides the person performing the action. In this case, this policy will **increase** the overall **security of the system**, thereby **benefiting** not just the **businesses**, but the **customers** as well. Therefore, this **component is fulfilled** in the policy.
* Communal-Benefit requires that actions must be beneficial to others in the community besides the person performing the action. In this case, this policy of not treating information as private if it has been reported elsewhere is not beneficial to the community as it makes it very easy for bad actors to continue doxxing actions against other people. Therefore, this component is not fulfilled in the policy.

### General-Agreement

**Keywords**

General-Agreementis about whether or not most people in the community will agree that the action is a good activity.

**Keywords, Relationships, Format of Argumentation**

* General-Agreement is about whether or not most people in the community will agree that the action is a good activity. It is **unclear** that **most people in the community will agree** that **this policy will result in good activities being practiced**. In this case, while there may be **hackers** utilitzing such mass-scanning apps for **malicious uses**, there may also be many **users** using them for **legitimate uses**, such as in their business operations or in school. Therefore, it is **difficult to say** that this policy is **ethical or not under Contributing to Society.**
* General-Agreement is about whether or not most people in the community will agree that the action is a good activity. It is clear that **most people in the community** will **agree** that this policy will **result in good activities being practiced**. In this case, since this policy will increase **cyber-security**, which will lead to a **reduction** in **hacking cases**, which will in turn lead to less **financial losses due to hacking**, **most in the community would agree that this is a good policy to have**. Therefore, it is easy to say that this policy is ethical under Contributing to Society.
* General-Agreement is about whether or not most people in the community will agree that the action is a good activity. It is clear that most people in the community will disagree that this policy will result in good activities being practiced. For example, since it is rather easy for bad actors to circumvent user protections and continue their harressment activities, most people will agree that this policy is not effective, and in fact seems to only protect the company's liability. Therefore, it is easy to say that this policy is unethical under Contributing to Society.

## Social Contract

**State-Of-Nature**: A State-Of-Nature is defined as a state that is undesirable and can be improved upon.

Definition, what is the current undersirable situation? How will the policy address it, if at all? Conclusion

**Cooperation**: Under the requirement of Cooperation, a Social Contract requires people to be rational and reasonable when cooperating, tolerating and abiding by rules that all accept, even those that they do not like, so as to benefit from the Social Contract.

Definition, will the parties be rational/tolerant/abide by the rules? Why/why not? (focus on benefits for them against cost), does it get the parties out of the state-of-nature? conclusion

**Fair-play**: Fair-play requires that rules must be fair (unbiased) for all, whilst accounting for their PEST (Political-Economic-Social-Technological) situation.

Does the rule appear fair under typical Political-Economic-Social-Technological situation? Why/why not? Example to elaborate, thus is it fair for all (conclusion)?

**Keywords(If not SON then policy is unethical already. This part will have diff degrees of effect for each component)**

* State-Of-Nature: State-Of-Nature does/does-not exist for the main party, undesirable for …, accepting a Social Contract may be able to improve the situation and lift stakeholders out of this State-Of-Nature, if they do not agree then they should not …, elevate [stakeholder] out of State-Of-Nature by …,
* Cooperation: difficult to assume that all parties in the community are rational etc …, unreasonable because …, not all stakeholders will benefit… cooperation may not be possible, may not like … but is rational and reasonable enough to tolerate the rule and abide by it in order to benefit from the Social Contract and leave the State-Of-Nature, since all parties in this Social Contract can be rational, reasonable and cooperative …
* Fair-play: The rule in the policy does/does not appear to be fair for all, assuming a typical passenger's Political-Economic-Social-Technological situation, special-needs individuals, policy considered a rule(?) thus unbiased against all ppl of the group, biased towards…, same rule can be applied to all in an unbiased manner

### State-Of-Nature

**Keywords**

A State-Of-Nature is defined as a state that is undesirable and can be improved upon.

**Keywords, Relationships, Format of Argumentation**

* A State-Of-Nature is defined as a state that is undesirable and can be improved upon. **In this case**, being at **high risk of getting hacked** is **undesirable** and the **situation can be improved** by using a **firewall** to block **unused ports**, thereby **reducing the level of risk**. Hence **there is a State-Of-Nature**.
* A State-Of-Nature is defined as a state that is undesirable and can be improved upon. **In this case**, the **lack of security** due to the **ease of compromising a person's access items** (such as keys or access cards) or the **ease of finding out what one knows** (such as a password) **leads to a situation that is possibly insecure**, which **creates a State-Of-Nature that is clearly undesirable and should be improved.**
* A State-Of-Nature is defined as a state that is undesirable and can be improved upon. In this case, the undesirable state is when problematic content exists, of which the use of Machine Learning can reduce by removing the content before it is viewed, thereby elevating Youtube out of that State-Of-Nature. Therefore, a State-Of-Nature clearly exists, and this component is fulfilled.

### Cooperation

**Keywords**

Under the requirement of Cooperation, a Social Contract requires people to be rational and reasonable when cooperating, tolerating and abiding by rules that all accept, even those that they do not like, so as to benefit from the Social Contract.

**Keywords, Relationships, Format of Argumentation**

* Under the requirement of Cooperation, a Social Contract requires people to be rational and reasonable when cooperating, tolerating and abiding by rules that all accept, even those that they do not like, so as to benefit from the Social Contract. **In this case**, to **get the benefit** of having a **lower risk of getting hacked**, users of the Pawnbroker's systems **must be rational and reasonable enough to accept the possible inconveniences** that come with **extra restrictions**, **even if the users may not like such inconveniences**. Therefore, this policy is ethical under this component.
* Under the requirement of Cooperation, a Social Contract requires people to be rational and reasonable when cooperating, tolerating and abiding by rules that all accept, even those that they do not like, so as to benefit from the Social Contract. **In this case**, to **get the benefit** of the **biometric security**, **one must be rational and reasonable enough to accept** the need to **allow the collection and storage and use of certain personal biometric information**, such as fingerprint, or retina scan, or voice identification, **even if** the customer **may not like** to share such information. Therefore, this **policy is ethical under this component**.
* Under the requirement of Cooperation, a Social Contract requires people to be rational and reasonable when cooperating, tolerating and abiding by rules that all accept, even those that they do not like, so as to benefit from the Social Contract. In this case, to get the benefit of using Youtube, users must be rational and reasonable enough to accept that content may be removed by Youtube through Machine Learning, even if the customer may not trust or like Machine Learning. Therefore, this policy is ethical under this component.

### Fair-Play

**Keywords**

Fair-play requires that rules must be fair (unbiased) for all, whilst accounting for their PEST (Political-Economic-Social-Technological) situation.

**Keywords, Relationships, Format of Argumentation**

* Fair-play requires that rules must be fair (unbiased) for all, whilst accounting for their PEST (Political-Economic-Social-Technological) situation. **In this case**, the **rules in this policy are fair for all** since **firewalls** nowadays can be **obtained for very low cost (free!),** and **configuring** such a system is **considerably easy for properly-trained IT personnel**. Therefore, this policy is ethical under Social Contract.
* Fair-play requires that rules must be fair (unbiased) for all, whilst accounting for their PEST (Political-Economic-Social-Technological) situation. **In this case**, the **rules in this policy are fair for all** who **seek to gain access to the facilities**, as one must **fulfil a certain security requirement to be able to access such places**, and **providing biometric information** **imposes no added expense** on the **person seeking access**, since the biometric information defines what the person already is. Therefore, this policy is ethical under Social Contract.
* Fair-play requires that rules must be fair (unbiased) for all, whilst accounting for their PEST (Political-Economic-Social-Technological) situation. In this case, the rules in this policy are fair for all who seek to use Youtube's services, especially since there are many alternatives to Youtube should the user not accept this policy. Therefore, this policy is ethical under Social Contract.