Codes of Ethics and Professional Conduct - Automated Active Response Weaponry

The initial post provided an analysis of the ethical, legal, and social aspects of the scenario and connected them with the relevant principles of the BCS Code of Conduct. The post advanced the argument that Q's shift towards lethal responses conflicts with BCS Code's emphasis on society's best interests. It was also highlighted that the engineers' courageous stance against developing potentially harmful technologies was in alignment with the BCS Code of Conduct (O'Regan, 2022). It's evident that their actions were rooted in a commitment to societal well-being. However, their decision to breach confidentiality agreements led to legal action from the company. This predicament raises the question of whether there should be protective mechanisms for professionals acting ethically, even if it means challenging a company's interests.

Balancing ethical behaviour with legal obligations is indeed challenging. While it is crucial to uphold the law and maintain contractual obligations, there is also a need to foster an environment where ethical actions are encouraged and safeguarded. This might involve creating legal safeguards for professionals who act in the best interests of society and adhere to established ethical guidelines. One potential approach could be the introduction of whistleblower protection laws that encompass situations where professionals reveal ethical concerns that pose potential harm. These laws could offer legal immunity for those who act in good faith to expose misconduct or unethical practices within organizations.

While the engineers' resignation aligns with the BCS Code's focus on maintaining professional skills and acting with honesty and integrity (O'Regan, 2022) The engineers' refusal to work on potentially harmful technologies reflects the BCS Code's principle of enhancing the reputation and quality of the IT profession. The covert meetings and potential creation of lethal systems without public supervision oppose the BCS Code's emphasis on adhering to pertinent regulations (Ribeiro & Varajão, 2022).

The potential misapplication of lethal autonomous systems, infringing on human rights, could trigger legal disputes tied to international law and accountability. Moreover, it may yield societal repercussions such as relinquishing human control, dehumanization,

and erosion of fundamental rights (Kirkham, 2023). If governments or organizations are perceived to exploit lethal autonomous systems for quelling dissent or governing populations, it could incite protests, civil disturbances, and calls for heightened oversight and regulation. Similarly, Q's decision to legally pursue the engineers for their public disclosure could be viewed as an effort to stifle moral concerns and safeguard the company's interests (O'Regan, 2019), potentially tarnishing Q's reputation and intensifying ethical considerations.

References

Kirkham, R. (2023). The Ethical Problems with IT "Experts" in the Legal System. *Computer*, 56(6), pp. 62 - 71.

O'Regan, G. (2019). Ethical, and Professional Aspects of Testing. In: Concise Guide to Software Testing. Cham: Springer, p. 251–270.

O'Regan, G. (2022). Professional Responsibility of Software Engineers. In: Concise Guide to Software Engineering. Cham: Springer, p. 27–39.

Ribeiro, D. & Varajão, J. (2022). Ethical Standards for Information Systems Professionals - 30 years after "A Case for a Unified Code". *AIS Transactions on Replication Research*, 8(1), pp. 1-18.