Strong args that are valid sound and free of logical fallacies

Ethical theories

**Consequence based**

**Act Utilitarianism** - A given action is ethically acceptable if the consequences of the action result in the greatest good for the greatest number of persons.

-Construct a table with stakeholders in first column, positive utility (benefits) in second column, and negative utility (costs) in third column. Assess benefits and costs relative to each stakeholder, assigning a weight between 1 and 5 to each

**Rule Utilitarianism** - A given action is ethically acceptable if it is derived from a rule that, when applied generally, yields the greatest good to the greatest number of persons

-Identify a rule and assess whether, in general case, it yields the greatest good to the greatest number. Apply rule to specific situation to determine ethically acceptability of an act.

**Duty-based**

**Rule Deontology**

1. Act so as to treat people as rational beings--ends in themselves, not merely as a means to an end.

2. Act according to universal rules that apply to all human beings.

Apply two imperatives on left to situation in order to determine ethical acceptability of a given course of action

**Act Deontology**

Adhere to prima facie duties such as honesty, benevolence, and justice. Prioritize duties on situation-by-situation basis.

Determine prima facie duties in given situation. Weigh importance of each duty relative to situation to determine proper course of action.

**Contract-based**

We have a “**social contract**” in order to establish and maintain social order. For our own good and the good of society, we are motivated to act according to established social and legal contracts. Rights-based contract theories emphasize natural rights that all humans have, including the right to property and freedom.

When evaluating a situation, consider the contracts and natural rights that are in play. Determine course of action so as to adhere to those contracts, and so as to preserve those natural rights.

**Character-based**

**Virtue ethics**

Focus on the development of strong moral character, which gives rise to certain virtues such as justice and honesty; people of strong moral character act accordingly, without need to follow rules.

In a given situation, ask “What kind of person should I be if I am to be a moral person?” A moral person will be naturally disposed to “d
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**Nissenbaums framework**

Norms of appropriateness: Is a given type of info appropriate to divulge within a particular context? • Norms of distribution: Can info be divulged within or across contexts? • Contextual integrity maintained when both norms are respected.

. De George’s criteria for whistleblowing

There are two guidelines: 1. To be “morally permitted” to blow the whistle, these three conditions must hold: – Product will do “serious and considerable harm” to public – Engineers have reported the “serious threat” to immediate supervisor – Engineers have “exhausted internal procedures and possibilities”

2. To be “morally obligated” to blow whistle, these two additional conditions must hold: – Engineers have “accessible, documented evidence that would convince a reasonable, impartial observer” – Engineers have “good reasons to believe that by going public the necessary changes will be brought about” You MUST address both guidelines.

Copyrights, patents, trade secrets, trademarks—know what these IP protections are, how to obtain them, and how they differ

**Fair use doctrine**

U.S. Copyright: Doctrine of Fair Use

1. What is the purpose and nature of the use (commercial vs. nonprofit vs. educational)? ◊ Commercial less likely to be fair use

2. What is the nature of the copyrighted work? ◊ Creative and published work less likely to be fair use

3. How much of the copyrighted work is used? ◊ The more used, the less likely it’s fair use

4. What is the impact of the use on the potential market for or value of the copyrighted work? ◊ Uses that reduce sales less likely to be fair; out-of-print material more likely to be fair

**Seven step process for analyzing argument strength**

Convert to standard form -> is argument valid? -> yes -> is argument sound? -> Make overall assessment

Convert to standard form -> is argument valid? -> No -> is argument inductive or fallacious? -> Are premises true in real world? -> Make overall assessment