

Danciu Valeriu Georgian – PEIIT Project Reverse Engineering of the ACM Code of Ethics

	ACM 1966	ACM 1972	ACM 1992	ACM 2018
<p>Q1. Would you be willing for everyone to be permitted to use this version of the ACM Code of Ethics as defined by the Guidelines for Professional Conduct in Information Processing in 1966? Explain</p>	<p>I can agree that this version of ACM (1966 is a ACM Code of Ethics) good one for the year when it has been created because it corellate with the tehnology in that curent time.</p>	<p>The technology has been evolve a little bit within six years since the 1966 version so it cant be the best ideea to use it in 1977 . We can say for example that with have esential new rules like DR1.3.3 from 1972 that is an essential one that protect the confidetiality information about employers.</p>	<p>In 1992 the technology was on the verge of growth. New rules were esentially needed for people to sustain a good harmony in the world of technology . The employee – trust rules were more important . The value of copyright and personal information was a weak point for the 1966 version.</p>	<p>The version from 1966 its a lot deprecated and i can be agree with no shape of form to be use in 2018 . The word live everyday based on technology and i just think that , the version from 1966 is to incomplet and weak for the needs from 2018.</p>
<p>Q2. Does this solution treat people as ends rather than as means only? Does it treat people as persons or as products? Are all professional relations in this version described as winwin scenarios? Explain.</p>	<p>In that time (1966) . The corporations werent so evolved and created based on technology . So the employees data werent that affected by the rules of the ACM. The people haved been trated right. WAS JUST THE BEGINING.</p>	<p>With little steps (1972), the ACM is evolving and the people know that in the feature will be an radical change but their rights were the same as in 1966. They are trated in a normal condition.</p>	<p>Here we can see that a lot of change happend. New rules that manipulate the data of the employee by the corporations with the pretext that the people are safe but they are an open book for the employers .</p>	<p>The ACM from 2018 is used today with the scope to protect the data of the people from the outside world (not corporations world) I can say that today , the peoples data is almost a product. Facebook/Twitter/Inst agram use the data of people that are using it to increase the income and the trafic of their applications. I cant say anything more about this but beeing a very bad thing.</p>
<p>Q3. Are the Guidelines for Professional Conduct in Information Processing from 1966 in accord with what is natural? Explain.</p>	<p>I think ACM was just fine for that time because there wasn't too much to expose to the world tought technology.</p>	<p>Is not in accord with the needs of the people because there is a little change.</p>	<p>For the level of the technology in it cant be in any form in accord with the needs of the people nor for the corporations.</p>	<p>The Guidelines for Professional Conduct in Information Processing from 1966 is too weak for the needs of the people , for their privacy , for the stability of the firms and it cant be in accord with what is natural.</p>
<p>Q4. Are the Guidelines for Professional Conduct</p>	<p>For that period of time the ACM is</p>	<p>For 1972 is pretty balanced too in</p>	<p>It cant be balanced but nor excessive too</p>	<p>The ACM is very unbalanced .</p>

in Information Processing from 1966 balanced or excessive? Explain.	pretty balanced and not excessive.	conformity with the technology in the period of time.	because the technology hasn't grow that much for the IT corporation to use abusive the data of the people.	In present the corporations and the firms abuse the data of the people in a very excessive way , not like in the past ,with the scope to sell their products and make a lot of money. Its just my opinion.
Q5. Will it produce the greatest good for the overall public society if all members and computer professionals would guide their behavior based on this version of the ACM Code of Ethics?	The limitations imposed by it were not excessive at all compared to the level of technology.	The ACM from 72' was ideal for that period of time but the technology wasn't that evolved for the ACM to limit the flow of information . So i think it wasn't a bad idea.	In 1992 the information was more light for the public to see. It was a very productive period for the growth of technology.	I think that today , the information is very limited for his potential. The ACM limit the information of important specific documents to flow. Today the information means power and money and very little , usefull for develop new important technology or cures.
GRADES	1 The ACM is too weak for the possibilities from today's technology.	2 The ACM is weak also like the one from 66 but i can give one more point because is focused more on the people's rights.	4 I think is the most echilibrate ACM version in his period of time because it is focused in the same time on the human rights and firms rights.	4 It is a very complex and modern version . It is equally related to today's technology. I cant give an max grade just because it defends the interests of corporations more than those of people and i cant accept that.

Fictitious test-case.

Eliot is working on a wellpaid cybersecurity company named LexCorp as a database administrator. Max is an new Software Developer that is working at LexCorp but also is a old high school classmate of Eliot's who made fun of him in front of girls and friends.

At LexCorp all the employees are communicating through a local application named LexCommunicationSystem that save all the accounts and are managed by the database administrator (Eliot) .

One day Eliot try to use the password of Max's account to his gmail account and match it thus he penetrates into Max's intimacy and privacy breaking some major rules of the ACM like

1.3 Be honest and trustworthy ,1.6 Respect privacy or 2.8 Access computing and communication resources only when authorized or when compelled by the public good.