Nathaniel Welch

Peer Review 2: Dirk Cummings

2/28/11

Dirk's Paper covered the ethics of the Stuxnet virus and it's use in military engagements. Almost all of his arguments involve comparing Stuxnet to nuclear weapons. His fact section involves a detailed history of the nuclear weapon program, followed by a brief introduction to Stuxnet. His arguments focus on SE Code sections 1.03, 2.00 and 6.06.

I really liked Dirk's paper. It felt well thought out and his arguments seemed strong. My biggest issue though was that Dirk constantly threw out names which had absolutely no meaning to me. I've always been taught that when you quote someone in your paper you need to introduce them and explain why they are a valid source. For example, "Mike Lezowski, a renowned product manager from Xerox, said..." is a lot more informative for the reader compared to "Lezowski once said...". I think these introductions and statements of validity would bring a lot of strength to Dirk's already powerful paper.

Another issue with Dirk's paper was his grammar and word choice. I don't think it was exceptionally bad, because the paper was definitely still readable, but I believe the paper needs a few read throughs to catch a miscellaneous selection of missing punctuation, spell-check errors, and incomplete sentences. I tired to catch what I could, but I feel like it needs more help.

I loved Dirk's proper use of Latex. This was by far the best laid out paper I've seen so far. It made the paper a pleasure to read when the quotes were done correctly and everything looked nice.

Arguments:

Public Good:

Dirk's public good argument was solid. The only thing that bothered me about it, is he makes the reader assume a lot and imagine what if scenarios. If these assumptions are true, then his argument is valid, but they aren't assumptions I would have made on my own, so I little more background as to why I should be making these assumptions would be nice.

Best Interests:

I think this argument is a bit of a stretch, mainly because of how Dirk chops up section 2.00. I don't think what his version of 2.00 says means the same thing as the original 2.00, which somewhat weakens his entire section.

Obey the Law

This is pretty straight forward, works great.

Virtual vs. Kinetic Warfare

It's interesting, this seems like the section that Dirk really cared about. I almost feel like it should be earlier in the paper. It was well written, but it seemed to be lacking in facts, and was more based on statements by Dirk. The statements make sense, but I would love more facts and sources.

Citations:

      All of Dirk's citations that I visited checked out. None of them had annotations though, so beyond their appropriate use in the paper, it was hard to know what information was there versus what he claimed was there. But that aside, The citations that I checked were indeed used properly in his paper and properly cited.

Good luck Dirk. This seems like a solid paper and I look forward to the final product.