

Jason Loo

ENGR 30 Fall 2020

Week 1 Reflective writing: Malware Disruption

While reading about how ISPs are trying to uphold their mission of providing service regardless of what their customers are outputting onto the internet reminded me of how difficult many decisions are in the professional environment and what kind of people are in the world.

Not everyone views ethics equally and at the same weight. In that respect, this is like how Morton Thiokol viewed and weighed the Astronaut's lives against the goal to secure a contract with NASA. In both cases, Rogue and Morton both weigh the possibility of securing a contract or keeping their customers as a higher priority than the high risk of others, which is the elephant in the room in both cases. To elaborate on each of the cases we have here, Rogue clearly 1) does not care about the end users, us, enough to terminate their contract with malicious clients, and 2) care to uphold their integrity of service to anyone no matter what. Number 2 can be good in some cases, but more people are being harmed in this scenario than benefiting. In the case of Morton, management thought that a contract, the lack of evidence, and political pressure were clearly more important than the possibility of something going very wrong during the astronaut's flight and can possibly end their lives. From Morton's view, I understand why they did it, of course I do not condone it. If there was clear, concrete evidence of a part of the rocket failing, then I am sure they would have canceled, however in this case, the information was circumstantial at best, but multiple parties came to that conclusion. While at the 11th hour of the launch, management was erring on the chance that everything goes to plan. Yes it was the duties of the Engineers to halt the flight at all costs, but in the case they were wrong, people would be in just as big of trouble, and with circumstantial evidence, it makes sense that it was a huge risk.

Sometimes luck does work out but in this case it did not and the worst case occurred. In terms of Rogue, many companies are pressuring it to terminate contracts with groups inserting malicious software into the internet, but the problem is also the fact that, in the country they are in, they don't enforce/care about that type of behavior so it is not illegal in that country. Ethics, is a culture, and depending on where you are, some places find some actions colloquial and valid where other places shun the idea.

The engineers at Rogue, though, are still bounded by the code that they should not knowingly cause harm to the public, and their responsibilities and alliance are to help the community. This is a breach in ethics across the board, but because they are not being punished by the government the company resides in, it just goes to show how management perceives users of their service.