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Homework #2: Ch.3 – Networking

Chapter 3

**Edition 7: question 15, page 148**

According to Kantianism, actions are considered moral based on one’s view on the matter with rational and reasonable situations. So, there are two different topics to discuss: “cold calling” and spam (e-mails). Cold calling is the solicitation of business from potential customers who have had no prior contact with the salesperson conducting the call. Cold calling is in some forms more personal, as most of the time, the way they obtain your phone number is from a list, and this list usually has your name on it. Thus, whenever a cold call is made, the person making the call will likely address you by your name (usually Mr. or Mrs. [LAST NAME]), making the cold calls more personal. On the other hand, spam emails usually obtain your email address from companies that you have made online purchases from that you were un-aware of them being able to give out your e-mail address, making spam seem random, and almost creepy in a way. Now, these are just some facts and observations about the two different types of sales practices, but we have defined what each of them are and can start making some conclusions on if they are reasonable, or not, and why cold calls are considered to be an acceptable sales practice and cold calling is not.

Spam is something that is done over the internet and can easily be done using internet bots. These bots are given a list of e-mail addresses and send the same e-mail to all of them very quickly. There are way to unsubscribe from some of these e-mails, but you have to unsubscribe to every single one of them. Cold calling is usually done through a list of phone numbers they are given, and you can be completely removed from the list all together, meaning you only have to remove yourself from the list once or twice. Furthermore, cold calling does not happen that often, maybe once a day, whereas some people receive 50 or more spam e-mails a day (sometimes in the hundreds if you are using your work e-mail), and no one has the time to sit there and unsubscribe from every single spam list, just to be added to another the next day. I think that this is ridiculous as they give people the option to remove themselves from the list, but that is just from one of them. It is quite an inconvenience, especially if you have a work e-mail address, to receive so much spam, not to mention that the spam could have viruses that could potential harm your computer, or steal information. Thus, based on Kantianism, I would say that spam is wrong since it is unreasonable and that is why spam is not considered to be an acceptable sales practice; whereas, cold calling is more or less reasonable, as it is not that inconvenient, and thus it is considered to be an acceptable sales practice.

**Edition 7: question 19, page 148**

Internet censorship is when someone or some group/faction prevents access to certain material on certain websites from the public. Some benefits from internet censorship are that certain websites contain information inappropriate for certain ages. It would be best to not allow children the access to such websites, however that is fairly hard to do. A better example would be the web filtering used by most schools (grade school). These filters prevent access to websites that could would prohibit learning or be considered inappropriate for children attending schools. Based on social contract theory, this is a good thing, as the students will have to give up the websites that help them be distracted from learning so that they can learn everything they need to become productive members of society when they grow up. Especially since most grade schools are public and are paid for by taxes, and most people would not want their taxes going towards kids not learning.

Some harms of internet censorship could be that it will inhibit our right to free speech in some cases. There is also an issues of self censorship which occurs when someone feels almost threatened by their superior to publish certain information, which would lead to the distribution of information that would not be completely accurate, or rather skewed. Considering Social Contract Theory, this would be unethical since this type of harmful censorship is not helping society.

**Edition 7: question 21, page 149**

Whether or not people should be help responsible for their false accusations on their blog or Facebook page should come down to if this action is moral, or not. I think this is an immoral action based on Virtue Theory since a virtuous person would not falsely accuse someone of something, and they certainly would not falsely accuse someone of something through a medium of which thousands or millions of people could see it. We can relate this situation to laws that are already in place; such as, it is illegal to pull the fire alarm or yell, “FIRE” if there is no fire and you knowingly disrupted a crowd when there was no danger. Why should someone be allowed to ruin someone, or a business’ reputation when their accusation is false? That is wrong and should not be allowed. They should be punished because they are essentially telling people lies and it would overall be bad for the community. This is also considered morally wrong base on Rule Utilitarianism.

**Edition 7: question 24, page 149**

Some similarities between the web and the other forms of communication are that they are ways to communicate faster than finding someone in person. Also, the Web is a place to read books and view films, thus the Web helps people learn. Essentially the Web is a place where all other mediums are centralized, for example: physical mail is like e-mail, the telephone system is like Skype, there are ways to read books online as well as watch movies and television, and there are websites for news articles which is similar to the newspaper, as well as much, much more. Based on the fact that the government already regulates all of the other forms of communication and entertainment, then the government should certainly regulate the Web since it is essentially all of these things combined into one. They would not even have to make new laws in order to regulate them, just by showing that these things are already regulated that are not on the web, but when viewed on the web, they are unregulated. This just does not make sense. Based on Kantianism, since there is a contradiction of the government regulating all the individual sources of communication, but not one that contains all of them. A similar example to prove this contradiction is that it should not be legal to murder people as long as you are in a group. If you are a single person murdering someone else it is illegal, and it would be ridiculous if it was legal for that person to murder someone if he was with all of his or her friends. It is still murder either way you look at it, and it is still ways of communicating either way you look at it.

**Edition 7: question 26, page 149**

Bloggers are essentially journalist that never had to get hired or approved. So, unless bloggers want to subjected to the hiring process or the process involved to become a reporter/journalist, then I do not think they deserve the rights of journalist. Based on Kantianism, one could say that there is no reason for bloggers to have the same rights as journalist since they do not have similar repercussions or accolades that reporters have and deal with.

**Edition 7: question 27, page 149**

In my opinion, children should not be given access to certain parts of the internet. It is similar to the rules/guidelines from the ratings of movies (G, PG, PG-13, and R), it is up to the parents to decide what their children are allowed to view. If the parents do not care what their child may or may not see, then there should not be any sort of government intervention to prevent children from going to certain sites, it should be completely the parents’ responsibility. The parents should monitor what their children are doing online and they should take action when their child visits a site they should have gone to. They also should teach their kids what sites are good and what are bad, there are also sometimes parent controls on most electronics these days that allow parents to block certain things. Based on Rule Utilitarianism, if everyone followed this rules, then no one would be affected, unless the child’s parents are not good parents, but that is a different subject. If everyone followed the rules that it is the burden of the parents to decide what their child should and should not see on the internet, not anyone else’s, thus allowing everyone to not worry about what other children are doing and solely focus on their own, allowing them to better raise their kids making the future of society a better place.

**Edition 7: question 40, page 150**

Based on Social Contract Theory, then BART was justified in blocking cell phone service since the use of cellphones to organize protests was causing a large number of protestors in certain areas, which then cause unsafe conditions for BART customers. So, rational people would say that in order to make society better, they had to accept the burden of certain areas having no cell service to keep these areas safe from overcrowding and to prevent potential injuries/deaths. Lawfully, BART has the right to do this since it is their agency running the area.