

Internet crimes critical thinking example

[Sociology](#), [Ethics](#)



While hacking has been described variously as the act of breaking into computers to obtain restricted information, hacktivism has been defined as the use of computers and associated networks, such as the internet, as a way of holding protests in an endeavor to uphold political intentions. The fundamental difference between hacking and hacktivism is the intention. While hacking could be done to achieve personal goals, hacktivism is associated with political intent. Whether or not hacktivism should be accepted as a moral right to hold protests, just like it is in the physical world, has been a subject of debate for a long time. Even so, the answer to this question depends on the viewpoint from which a person looks at it. If one analyzes it from the point of view that the common public has the right to be informed, then, yes, it should be accepted as a moral right.

A deontological ethicist such as Immanuel Kant will always judge a thing as right or wrong depending on the extent to which such a thing adheres to obligatory factors. As such, a thing is not judged from its outcomes, but from the intent. Additionally, deontological ethicists argue that, for something to be right, it has to be intrinsically good. As such, a deontological ethicist would condemn the idea as being wrong as it does not follow the rules of rightfully acquiring information. Additionally, the intention of hacktivism is to provoke public suspicion. A utilitarian ethicist, such as John Stuart Mill would approve of hacktivism since, in utilitarianism, things are judged as good or immoral depending on the outcomes. Considering that the outcome of hacktivism is a way of informing the general public, utilitarian ethicists would approve of the idea.

In my view, hacktivism should not be accepted as a moral right of protest. As

much as such information as the Wiki leaks information is an exciting way of informing the public, it has so many loopholes. First, information from hacktivism is not reliable as it cannot be substantially verified. The information could be some makeup story since it is usually associated with anonymity. Secondly, the manner in which the information is obtained and distributed amounts to trespass to private property. This may be a source of tension as the idea lacks inherent goodness and has no legal backing.