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Case 1: Web Site Accessibility

1. The 1990 Americans With Disabilities Act follows deontological theories, and Unitarianism. This ruling could be considered a very positive right, as it includes others who might not have been able to access the sites before.
2. There should be no clear “line” as it could very well change for whatever situation is at hand, for example should a video game have to adhere to this for the blind? It should be up to the companies to come up where the “line” should be, not an overbearing government afraid of who gets offended.
3. If it were the State Elections Board, yes, it should be accessible. They are still human beings with sound mind, so they should have access to something like this.
4. Yes, it’s relatively easy to translate documents now that we have features such as Google Translate. The companies should definitely include the translations into their site.

Case 2: Data Collection

1. Fitbit and their collaborators could use the data to monitor their user’s health, and then they could be used to map out the common path used by GPS.
2. Natural Rights (30) and Deontological theories (29). These could both be implemented to preserve privacy, provided through our natural rights all through logic and common sense.
3. The Fitbit’s GPS tracking could be misused, and this is a very dangerous misuse as it violates a user’s privacy. Also the health monitoring could be hacked and tampered with which could be a violation of their privacy and could also be detrimental to their health.

Case 3: Security Cameras

1. Avoid harm, do not discriminate, respect others privacy, and respect new laws and ideas that are being formed.
2. Really the only concern I can see about releasing unedited footage could be that it could compromise someone’s identity that did not want their privacy being breached.

Case 4: Intellectual Property

1. The company owns the program, usually employers will require you to sign a contract signing over your intellectual property to them.
2. I think it depends, if you are just redesigning a few things then no, it is not permissible. If you are just taking a few methods and then putting them in something completely different, yes, but give credit where it is due.
3. No, from a non-consequentialist perspective this would probably be considered morally wrong. So, they wouldn’t do it.
4. The opt-out approach for natural rights ensures that a user’s natural right to privacy is protected.
5. The non-consequential principle supports a few fair use doctrines of programs that I own.

Case 5: Open Source in a Corporate Environment

1. Bob must be honest and trustworthy, use care when changing the code, maintain a high standard for his conduct, and know the existing rules he has pertaining his professional work.
2. From my understanding a GNU Public License encourages modification and redistribution, so really it would just be a moral issue on whether or not he wants to give credit.
3. If it is a creative commons license, it just can’t be commercially sold.
4. Bob should check which licensing the open source program has and then either way he should give due credit, if it’s a creative commons license it should not be sold.
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