

Table of Contents

Introduction2

Lecture 1 – Introduction to Ethics.....3

 Embellishing a CV for a Dream Job3

 Using ChatGPT instead of having to learn ethics3

Lecture 2 – Conventional morality and conflicts of interest4

 Torn between competing loyalties4

 Torn between loyalty to the company and self-interest (loyalty to oneself)5

 The perils of blind loyalty6

Lecture 3 Rejecting ethical relativism - Cybercrime7

 Hacktivism7

 Using ransomware as a form of moving up in life.....8

 An example not related to cybercrime – Culturally-accepted bribery.....8

Lecture 4 – Utilitarianism I – hacking9

 Robin Hood hacking9

 Are there limits to using people to maximize utility? 10

Lecture 5 – Utilitarianism II – Dark patterns 11

 When dark patterns maximize utility 11

 Using dark patterns in a fitness app 12

Lecture 6 – Kantian Ethics I – Property rights 13

 The Leaked Algorithm 13

 The Stolen Code..... 13

Lecture 7 – Kant II – open source 14

 The Misused Open Source Code 14

 The Exclusive Feature 15

目录引言.2

讲座1 – 伦理学导论.3

 为理想工作美化简历.3

 使用ChatGPT代替学习伦理学.3

讲座2 – 传统道德与利益冲突.4

 在相互冲突的忠诚之间挣扎.4

 在对公司忠诚与个人利益（对自身的忠诚）之间挣扎.5

 Th盲目忠诚的危险.6

讲座3 拒绝道德相对主义 - 网络犯罪.7

 Hac激进主义.7

 使用勒索软件作为改善生活境况的一种方式.8

 一个与网络犯罪无关的例子——文化上可接受的贿赂.8

第4讲 – 功利主义一 – 黑客行为.9

 罗宾汉式黑客行为.9

 是否存在将人用作最大化效用手段的限制？.10

第5讲 – 功利主义二 – 恶意设计模式.11

 当恶意设计模式实现效用最大化时.11

 在健身应用中使用恶意设计模式.12

讲座6 – 康德伦理学I – 财产权.13

 The Lea ked Algorithm.13

 The Stolen C ode.13

讲座7 – 康德II – 开源.14

 被滥用的开源代码.14

 专属功能.15

Introduction

This list of case studies was prepared with the assistance of OpenAI’s ChatGPT. Adequate prompts were provided to aim to get studies that operate like genuine moral dilemmas rather than problems with obvious solutions - reasonable people will not immediately know what to do, and may possibly get it wrong, and/or find it difficult to justify their choice. The obtained case studies were manually edited to produce interesting dilemmas and better suit the goals of the course.

In your answers, make sure that you don’t just use your raw intuition to deal with the moral issues. Show your knowledge of the theories and concepts taught in the course by engaging explicitly with them and showing that you can apply them to an actual case to solve the problem.

Note: this list may be slightly edited during the term, and new cases may be added. **You are not required to read these case studies before each tutorial/lab**, but you may wish to do so. Your lab instructor will tell you about their requirements and they may differ from these instructions. They may give you slightly different case studies and/or additional ones. If you came up with an interesting case study that constitutes a genuine moral dilemma, don’t hesitate to email it to the instructor/lab instructor, who may add to this list (this term or for the following terms).

Vasco

引言

本案例研究列表是在OpenAI的ChatGPT协助下整理而成。我们提供了适当的提示，旨在获取类似于真实道德困境的研究案例，而非具有明显解决方案的问题——合理的人不会立即知道该如何应对，甚至可能判断错误，和/或难以为其选择提供充分理由。所获得的案例经过人工编辑，以生成更具吸引力的道德困境，并更好地契合课程目标。

在你的回答中，务必不要仅凭直觉来处理道德问题。应明确运用课程中讲授的理论与概念，并展示你能够将这些理论应用于实际案例以解决问题的能力。

注意：此列表可能在学期期间略有修改，并可能添加新案例。**你无需在每次研讨课/实验课前阅读这些案例研究**，但你可以自行选择提前阅读。你的实验课教师会说明具体要求，这些要求可能与此处说明不同。他们可能会提供略有不同的案例和/或额外的案例。如果你构思出一个构成真正道德困境的有趣案例，欢迎随时通过电子邮件发送给授课教师或实验课教师，他们可能会将其加入此列表（本学期或后续学期）。

瓦斯科

Lecture 1 – Introduction to Ethics

Embellishing a CV for a Dream Job

Context: Alex, a recent computer science graduate, is applying for a competitive AI research position at a prestigious tech company. He has strong technical skills, but his work experience is minimal, limited to a few short internships and freelance projects. The company’s job description explicitly states the need for two years of professional experience in machine learning, which Alex does not fully meet. Desperate to land the job, Alex considers inflating his resume by exaggerating his role in a previous project, claiming he led a machine learning initiative when, in reality, he was just a supporting team member.

Ethical Dilemma: Alex knows the company may not verify every detail, and his technical skills could allow him to excel in the role if given a chance. The job would change his career trajectory and offer financial stability, something he badly needs. However, he also knows that exaggerating his experience is dishonest and could harm his reputation if discovered. Torn between honesty and the fear of missing out on a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity, Alex faces a tough decision.

Questions for Discussion:

1. Is it ever justifiable to exaggerate qualifications if you believe you can perform the job well? Don’t just say what you think is expected of you. Produce an argument for what you believe is right, and explain why.
2. What are the potential consequences for Alex if his dishonesty is discovered after he is hired?
3. How should Alex weigh his personal needs against the ethical implications of lying on his CV? How much do you think personal needs should be weighed in an ethical decision?
4. Are there alternative ways Alex could demonstrate his skills and potential without resorting to dishonesty?

Using ChatGPT instead of having to learn ethics

Context: Jordan is a university student who has been overwhelmed with multiple commitments, including part-time work and extracurricular activities. Faced with a tight deadline for an important assignment in his ethics course, Jordan decides to use ChatGPT

第1讲——伦理学导论

为梦想工作美化简历

背景：亚历克斯是一名刚毕业的计算机专业学生，正在申请一家知名科技公司的竞争性人工智能研究职位。他具备扎实的技术能力，但工作经验很少，仅限于几次短期实习和一些自由职业项目。该公司在职位描述中明确要求具备两年专业

在机器学习方面的经验，而亚历克斯并不完全符合。为了 desperate 地获得这份工作，亚历克斯考虑夸大简历内容，将自己在之前项目中的角色加以美化，声称曾领导过一个机器学习项目，而实际上他只是团队中的辅助成员。

道德困境：亚历克斯知道公司可能不会核实每一个细节，而且如果获得机会，他的技术能力足以让他胜任该职位。这份工作将改变他的职业轨迹，并带来急需的经济稳定。然而，他也清楚夸大经历是不诚实的行为，一旦被发现可能会损害自己的声誉。

在诚实与错失千载难逢机会的恐惧之间挣扎，亚历克斯面临一个艰难的抉择。

讨论问题：

1. 如果你相信自己能够胜任工作，夸大资历是否合理？不要只是说出你认为别人期望你说的话。请提出一个支持你所认为正确的立场的论据，并解释原因。
2. 如果亚历克斯在被录用后其不诚实行为被发现，可能会面临什么后果？
3. 亚历克斯应如何权衡自己的个人需求与简历造假的伦理影响？你认为在道德决策中，个人需求应占多大分量？
4. 亚历克斯是否有其他方式可以展示自己的技能和潜力，而不必 resort to 不诚实手段？

使用 ChatGPT 而不是去学习伦理

背景：Jordan 是一名大学生，被兼职工作和课外活动等多重任务压得喘不过气来。面对伦理学课程一项重要作业的紧迫截止日期，Jordan 决定使用 ChatGPT

to generate the bulk of his paper. Although Jordan is permitted to use AI tools for assistance, he chooses not to disclose this fact in his submission. He assumes that completing the assignment quickly will allow him to manage his busy schedule more effectively. He knows that he will have to know the material later (for his final exam), but he thinks that’s a problem he can deal with later, when he’s less stressed.

Ethical Dilemma: Jordan’s use of ChatGPT to write his assignment, while technically allowed, results in practical and ethical issues. By not disclosing his use of the tool, Jordan misses out on a valuable learning opportunity. His professor, an expert in her field, could have provided personalized feedback and insights that would have enhanced Jordan’s understanding of the course material. Additionally, Jordan’s choice to bypass direct engagement with the learning process could be seen as disloyal to classmates who use ChatGPT appropriately by citing it and integrating it into their own work, demonstrating genuine effort and academic integrity. Was Jordan right in acting as he did?

Questions for Discussion:

1. How does Jordan’s choice to use ChatGPT without disclosure affect his educational experience? What are the potential learning opportunities he might miss out on by not engaging more deeply with the course material?
2. What are the ethical implications of not disclosing the use of AI tools in academic assignments, even if it is allowed by the instructor?
3. How might Jordan’s decision be perceived by classmates who use ChatGPT properly, including acknowledging its use in their work? What implications does this have for academic integrity and fairness?
4. What if Jordan says he’s “clever” by getting ahead of other classmates with less effort? Is he right?

Lecture 2 – Conventional morality and conflicts of interest

Torn between competing loyalties

Context: Sarah is a data scientist at a successful tech firm that develops AI tools for financial services. Over the past year, Sarah has been closely involved in a cutting-edge project using AI to predict market trends—a project that is still confidential. One day, her best friend, Lisa, who runs a start-up in a similar field, approaches Sarah for advice. Lisa’s company is struggling, and she desperately needs insights to help her business survive. Sarah knows she has valuable information that could help Lisa, and she wants to support

来生成论文的大部分内容。尽管 Jordan 被允许使用 AI 工具提供帮助，但他选择在提交作业时不予披露这一事实。他认为快速完成作业能更有效地应对繁忙的日程安排。他知道以后（期末考试时）必须掌握这些知识，但他认为那是以后的问题，等自己不那么紧张时再处理也不迟。

道德困境： 尽管乔丹使用ChatGPT撰写作业在技术上是被允许的，但这引发了实际和道德层面的问题。由于他未披露对该工具的使用，错失了一次宝贵的学习机会。他的教授是该领域的专家，本可以提供个性化的反馈和见解，从而加深乔丹对课程内容的理解。此外，乔丹选择绕过直接参与学习过程的行为，可能被视为对其同学的不公——那些同学恰当地使用ChatGPT，通过引用并将其融入自身工作中，展现了真正的努力和学术诚信。乔丹这样做是否正确？

讨论问题：

1. 乔丹选择使用ChatGPT而不予披露，这如何影响了他的教育体验？如果他没有更深入地参与课程内容的学习，可能会错过哪些潜在的学习机会？
2. 即使教师允许，在学术作业中不披露使用AI工具的行为存在哪些伦理影响？
3. 乔丹的决定会如何被那些正确使用ChatGPT（包括在作业中注明其使用）的同学看待？这对学术诚信和公平性有何影响？
4. 如果乔丹说自己通过更少的努力领先其他同学，因而显得“聪明”，这种说法对吗？

讲座2——传统道德与利益冲突

在相互冲突的忠诚之间挣扎

背景： Sarah 是一家成功科技公司的数据科学家，该公司开发用于金融服务的人工智能工具。在过去一年中，Sarah 深度参与了一个使用人工智能预测市场趋势的前沿项目——该项目目前仍处于保密阶段。一天，她的好朋友 Lisa 向她寻求建议。Lisa 在一个类似领域经营一家初创公司，但公司正面临困境，急需一些见解来帮助其业务生存下去。Sarah 知道自己掌握着对 Lisa 非常有价值的信息，并且她也希望支持

her friend, who has always been there for her. However, sharing this information, even casually, could unintentionally give Lisa’s start-up a competitive edge against her own employer.

Ethical Dilemma: Sarah’s contract doesn’t explicitly prohibit casual sharing of insights with friends, and there’s no clear legal breach involved unless Lisa uses the information directly against Sarah’s employer. However, Sarah feels a deep sense of loyalty to her company and knows that even the smallest leak of insider knowledge could harm their market position. At the same time, the personal bond with Lisa and her friend’s genuine struggle make Sarah feel morally compelled to help. She faces a difficult choice: remain loyal to her company and withhold valuable advice, or help her friend in a way that might indirectly betray her employer’s trust.

Questions for Discussion:

1. Should Sarah prioritize her loyalty to her friend over her moral duty to her employer, especially when no explicit legal boundaries are being crossed?
2. How should Sarah weigh her personal relationships against the potential impact of sharing sensitive information?
3. Are there alternative ways Sarah could support her friend without compromising her moral obligations to her employer?
4. What are the broader implications of Sarah’s decision for professional trust and personal integrity?

Torn between loyalty to the company and self-interest (loyalty to oneself)

Context: John is a software engineer at a mid-sized tech company that specializes in developing AI-driven healthcare solutions. Recently, John has been working on a personal side project in his spare time—an AI tool that helps patients manage chronic conditions more effectively. The side project started as a hobby, but it’s gaining traction, and John sees the potential for it to become a profitable business. However, John’s employment contract includes a clause that states employees must not engage in any work that competes with the company’s interests, and his side project is somewhat related to his employer’s main product line.

Ethical Dilemma: John believes his project doesn’t directly compete with his employer because it targets a different market segment. However, as the project grows, the line between his job and his side work blurs, and he starts to use some of his company’s

这位一直支持自己的朋友。然而，分享这些信息，即使只是随意提及，也可能无意中让 Lisa 的初创公司在竞争中对自己的雇主形成优势。

道德困境： 萨拉的合同并未明确禁止与朋友随意分享见解，而且除非丽莎直接利用这些信息损害萨拉的雇主利益，否则并不涉及明显的违法行为。然而，萨拉对公司怀有强烈的忠诚感，她知道即使是泄露最微小的内部信息，也可能损害公司的市场地位。与此同时，她与丽莎之间的个人情谊以及朋友真实的困境又让她在道义上感到必须提供帮助。她面临一个艰难的选择：是忠于公司而 withholding 宝贵建议，还是以可能间接背叛雇主信任的方式帮助朋友。

讨论问题：

1. 当没有明确违反法律界限时，萨拉是否应将对朋友的忠诚置于对雇主的道德责任之上？
2. 萨拉应如何权衡个人关系与分享敏感信息可能带来的影响？
3. 是否存在其他方式让萨拉可以在不违背其对雇主道德义务的前提下支持朋友？
4. 萨拉的決定对职业信任和个人诚信有何更广泛的影响？

在对公司忠诚与个人利益（对自身的忠诚）之间挣扎

背景： 约翰是一家专注于开发人工智能驱动医疗保健解决方案的中型科技公司的软件工程师。最近，约翰一直在业余时间从事一个个人副业项目——一款帮助患者更有效地管理慢性病的人工智能工具。这个副业项目最初只是一个爱好，但现在正逐渐获得关注，约翰也看到了它发展为盈利性业务的潜力。然而，约翰的雇佣合同中有一项条款规定，员工不得从事任何与公司利益相竞争的工作，而他的副业项目在某种程度上与雇主的主要产品线相关。

道德困境： 约翰认为他的项目并不直接与雇主竞争，因为它面向的是不同的市场细分。然而，随着项目的扩大，他工作职责与副业之间的界限变得模糊，并开始使用公司的一些

resources, such as software licenses and occasional work hours, to advance his project. John feels torn because he’s passionate about his side project and sees it as an opportunity to make a meaningful impact, but he also suspects that he may be violating his duty of loyalty and potentially harming his employer’s interests.

Questions for Discussion:

1. Is John justified in pursuing his side project, given its potential benefits to society and his personal career growth?
2. Should John disclose his project to his employer, even though it might lead to conflict or force him to give it up?
3. How should John balance his passion for innovation with his contractual and ethical obligations to his employer?
4. What are the potential consequences for John and his employer if the conflict of interest is discovered?

The perils of blind loyalty

Context: Emma is a project manager at a tech company specializing in AI-driven marketing solutions. Her boss, Michael, has been her mentor for years, guiding her career and advocating for her promotions. Thanks to Michael’s support, Emma has advanced rapidly within the company, and she feels a deep sense of gratitude and loyalty toward him. Recently, Michael has been under pressure to deliver results, and he has started cutting corners, pushing the team to exaggerate the performance metrics of their latest AI tool in presentations to potential investors.

Ethical Dilemma: One day, Michael asks Emma to help prepare data that inflates the tool’s capabilities, making it seem more accurate and effective than it truly is. Michael frames it as a temporary measure to secure funding, assuring Emma that they’ll correct the data once the company’s situation stabilizes. Emma is uncomfortable with this and the action could lead to serious consequences if discovered, but she also feels immense pressure to support Michael, who has always been there for her. She worries that refusing might damage their relationship and stall her career. Torn between her loyalty to her mentor and her commitment to honesty, Emma faces a challenging decision.

Questions for Discussion:

1. Should Emma prioritize her loyalty to Michael, considering all he has done for her, or uphold her other ethical standards?

资源，例如软件许可证和偶尔的工作时间，来推进自己的项目。约翰感到内心矛盾，因为他对自己的副业充满热情，并认为这是产生有意义影响的机会，但他也怀疑自己可能违背了忠诚义务，并有可能损害雇主的利益。

讨论问题：

1. 考虑到约翰的副业项目可能对社会及其个人职业发展带来益处，他坚持推进该项目是否合理？
2. 约翰是否应向雇主披露他的项目，即使这可能导致冲突或被迫放弃该项目？
3. 约翰应如何在创新热情与对雇主的合同义务及道德责任之间取得平衡？
4. 如果利益冲突被发现，约翰及其雇主可能面临哪些后果？

盲目的忠诚之风险

背景： Emma 是一家专注于人工智能驱动营销解决方案的科技公司的项目经理。她的上司 Michael 多年来一直是她的导师，指导她的职业发展，并为她争取晋升机会。在 Michael 的支持下，Emma 在公司内迅速晋升，她对 Michael 怀有深深的感激和忠诚之情。最近，Michael 面临着交付成果的压力，开始走捷径，要求团队在向潜在投资者展示其最新 AI 工具时夸大其性能指标。

道德困境： 一天，迈克尔请求艾玛协助准备一些数据，夸大该工具的能力，使其看起来比实际更准确、更有效。迈克尔将其描述为一种临时措施，以确保获得资金支持，并向艾玛保证，一旦公司状况稳定下来，他们就会纠正这些数据。艾玛对此感到不安，因为这种行为一旦被发现可能会导致严重后果，但她也承受着巨大的压力去支持一直帮助她的迈克尔。她担心拒绝会损害他们的关系，并阻碍自己的职业发展。在对导师的忠诚与对诚实的坚守之间，艾玛面临着一个艰难的抉择。

讨论问题：

1. Emma 是否应该优先考虑她对 Michael 的忠诚（鉴于他为她所做的一切），还是应坚持自己的其他道德标准？

- 2. How should Emma handle the conflict between her personal gratitude and professional integrity?
- 3. What are the potential consequences for Emma, Michael, and the company if she complies with his request?
- 4. Are there ways Emma can address the situation without compromising her values or damaging her relationship with her boss?

Lecture 3 Rejecting ethical relativism - Cybercrime

Hacktivism

Context: K is a skilled cybersecurity expert from a country where hacktivism is viewed as an acceptable form of activism against perceived injustices. In his home culture, hacking into systems to protest against corrupt or oppressive entities is seen as a heroic act rather than a wrongdoing. Now working for a Canadian tech company, K reconnects with old friends who are planning an aggressive cyberattack against a large corporation they consider guilty of environmental harm.

Ethical Dilemma: K’s friends believe that the hack will reveal the corporation’s environmental violations and bring about positive change. They view this action as a moral obligation, in line with their shared cultural values. K feels a strong connection to his friends and their cause, but he is aware that participating in the hack would violate the ethical standards of his current workplace and that hacking is considered unethical in Canada. He faces a conflict between his loyalty to his cultural background and his adherence to the ethical norms of his current environment.

Questions for Discussion:

- 1. Should K support his friends' actions based on his cultural values, even if they conflict with the ethical standards of his workplace?
- 2. How can you determine whether hacking is moral in this case? Keep in mind that if you think that hacking could be moral in some particular cases but not in others, this doesn’t show that you are a moral/cultural relativist, since objectivists can be sensitive to context (e.g. how much damage to the environment is being done?) and still deny that it’s culture that defines what is right (an example of this moral relativism would be: K is from country X, and in X hacking is fine, so hacking must be ethical for K).

- 2. 艾玛应如何处理个人感激之情与职业操守之间的冲突?
- 3. 如果艾玛服从迈克尔的要求，她本人、迈克尔以及公司可能面临哪些后果?
- 4. 艾玛是否有办法在不违背自身价值观或损害与上司关系的前提下应对这一情况?

讲座3 拒绝道德相对主义——网络犯罪

黑客行动主义

背景: K 是一名技术娴熟的网络安全专家，来自一个将黑客行动主义视为反对不公正现象的可接受抗议形式的国家。在他的本土文化中，入侵系统以抗议腐败或压迫性机构被视为英雄行为，而非错误之举。如今，K 在一家加拿大科技公司工作，他重新联系上了老朋友，这些人正计划对一家被认为对环境造成危害的大型企业发动猛烈的网络攻击。

道德困境: K的朋友们认为，这次黑客行为将揭露该公司的环境违法行为，并带来积极的改变。他们视此行动为一种道德义务，符合他们共同的文化价值观。K对自己的朋友及其事业有强烈的归属感，但他也意识到参与黑客攻击会违反当前工作单位的道德标准，且在加拿大黑客行为被视为不道德。他面临着忠于自身文化背景与遵守当前环境伦理规范之间的冲突。

讨论问题:

- 1. 即使与工作场所的道德标准相冲突，K 是否应根据自己的文化价值观支持朋友的行为?
- 2. 你该如何判断在此情况下黑客行为是否符合道德？请记住，如果你认为在某些特定情况下黑客行为可能是道德的，而在其他情况下则不然，这并不表明你是一个道德/文化相对主义者，因为客观主义者也可以对具体情境保持敏感（例如，对环境造成的损害程度有多大？），但仍否认文化决定了什么是正确的（道德相对主义的一个例子是：K 来自国家 X，而在 X 国黑客行为是可以接受的，因此对 K 来说黑客行为必然是合乎道德的）。

3. What are the broader implications of accepting or normalizing such actions under the guise of cultural relativism?

Using ransomware as a form of moving up in life

Context: Maya is a data analyst for a global tech company. She grew up in a poor country where getting rich is almost impossible through one’s own merits. Wealth is acquired through inheritance or theft. In this country, holding data for ransom is viewed as a clever strategic maneuver. These acts are seen as justified - as simply a way to leverage one’s knowledge to move up in life. Maya discovers that a group of her friends from her home country is involved in a scheme to hold sensitive company data for ransom. Their goal is to extract a large sum of money, which they plan to distribute among themselves and use for personal enrichment.

Ethical Dilemma: Maya is conflicted between her cultural upbringing, where such practices are seen as acceptable and a form of economic empowerment, and the ethical standards of her current environment, which view holding data for ransom as a serious breach of trust and integrity. Maya must decide whether to support her friends’ scheme, which aligns with her cultural values but contradicts the ethical norms of her workplace, or to reject the practice and uphold principles of data integrity and professional conduct.

Questions for Discussion:

- 1. Should Maya support her friends’ ransom scheme based on her cultural perspective, even though it conflicts with the ethical standards of her workplace and current norms?
- 2. How can she reconcile her cultural values with the ethical expectations of her current environment? Should she change values every time she moves?
- 3. Should we judge Maya, although she is from another culture? Why or why not?

An example not related to cybercrime – Culturally-accepted bribery

Context: Daniel is an AI consultant working for a global tech firm that is expanding into new international markets. He is sent to negotiate a major contract in a country where it is customary for businesspeople to give “gifts” to government officials to secure deals—a practice that, in this context, is considered normal and not legally punishable. Daniel’s company, however, has a strict anti-bribery policy and operates in countries where such actions would be considered corruption. Local colleagues assure Daniel

3. 以文化相对主义为名接受或使此类行为正常化，会产生哪些更广泛的影响？

利用勒索软件作为改变生活境遇的手段

背景：Maya 是一家全球科技公司的数据分析师。她成长于一个贫穷的国家，在那里，个人几乎无法通过自身努力致富。财富只能通过继承或窃取获得。在这个国家，以扣留数据作为勒索手段被视为一种聪明的战略举措。这种行为被认为是正当的——只是利用自己的知识来提升社会地位的一种方式。Maya 发现，她家乡的一群朋友正参与一项计划，意图扣押公司敏感数据以勒索赎金。他们的目标是获取一大笔钱，然后在彼此之间分赃，用于个人享乐。

道德困境：玛雅在自身文化背景与当前环境的伦理标准之间感到矛盾。在她的文化中，此类做法被视为可接受，甚至是一种经济赋权的形式；而她所处的当前环境则认为扣留数据以索取赎金严重违背了信任与诚信原则。玛雅必须决定，是支持朋友的计划——这符合她的文化价值观，却违背职场伦理规范——还是拒绝这一行为，以维护数据完整性和职业操守。

讨论问题：

- 1. 尽管玛雅的文化视角支持其朋友的勒索计划，但这与她 workplace 的伦理标准和当前规范相冲突，她是否仍应予以支持？
- 2. 她应如何调和自身的文化价值观与当前环境的伦理期望？每次搬家或换环境时，她都需要改变自己的价值观吗？
- 3. 尽管玛雅来自另一种文化，我们是否应该评判她？为什么？

一个与网络犯罪无关的例子——文化上可接受的贿赂

背景：丹尼尔是一家全球科技公司的AI顾问，该公司正在拓展进入新的国际市场。他被派往一个国家去谈判一份重要合同，在该国，商人向政府官员赠送“礼物”以确保交易成功是惯例——一种在此背景下被视为正常且不受法律惩罚的行为。然而，丹尼尔的公司有严格的反贿赂政策，并在将此类行为视为腐败的国家运营。当地同事向丹尼尔保证

that this is just “how things are done” and that without a gift (and note that government officials expect expensive gifts), his company will almost certainly lose the contract.

Ethical Dilemma: Daniel is torn. On one hand, he understands that refusing to participate in what is locally seen as an acceptable and expected practice could damage his company’s prospects and undermine months of work. On the other hand, participating would directly violate his company’s ethical guidelines. Daniel is faced with the challenge of navigating conflicting moral norms: the local cultural acceptance of gift-giving as a harmless gesture and his company’s view of it as unethical bribery.

Questions for Discussion:

1. Is bribery wrong in your view, or does it depend on whether the culture is OK with it?
2. Should Daniel conform to local practices if they conflict with his company’s ethical standards?
3. Does moral relativism solve or complicate ethical decision-making in international business?
4. What are the risks of Daniel adopting a “when in Rome” mentality in this situation?
5. How can Daniel respect cultural differences without compromising ethical principles that may be objective rather than relative to a country?

Lecture 4 – Utilitarianism I – hacking

Robin Hood hacking

Context: Anna is a cybersecurity expert working for a tech firm that develops software to protect financial institutions from cyberattacks. During her work, Anna uncovers a severe vulnerability in the software of a small regional bank. This vulnerability could easily be exploited to drain the accounts of its wealthiest clients, who are known for using their wealth to influence politics in ways that perpetuate inequality and harm vulnerable communities. Anna knows that if these wealthy individuals lost a significant amount of money, it could weaken their influence and lead to a broader distribution of resources that could benefit many people in her community.

Ethical Dilemma: Driven by the idea of maximizing overall well-being, Anna considers hacking into the bank herself to exploit this vulnerability, knowing she could redirect the funds to charities, community projects, and struggling families. She reasons that the positive impact on many lives would outweigh the harm done to a few wealthy individuals,

并被告知这只是“当地的行事方式”，如果不送礼（请注意，政府官员期望收到昂贵的礼物），他的公司几乎肯定会失去这份合同。

道德困境：丹尼尔内心挣扎。一方面，他明白拒绝参与在当地被视为可接受且理所当然的做法，可能会损害公司的前景，并破坏数月来的努力成果；另一方面，参与其中将直接违反公司道德准则。丹尼尔面临的是如何应对相互冲突的道德规范这一难题：当地文化认为送礼是一种无害的友好表示，而他的公司则视之为不道德的贿赂行为。

讨论问题：

1. 在你看来，贿赂是否错误，还是取决于文化是否接受？
2. 如果当地做法与公司的道德标准相冲突，丹尼尔是否仍应遵从？
3. 道德相对主义是解决了还是加剧了国际商务中伦理决策的复杂性？
4. 在这种情况下，丹尼尔采取“入乡随俗”的态度会带来哪些风险？
5. 丹尼尔如何在不牺牲可能具有客观性而非因国家而异的道德原则的前提下尊重文化差异？

讲座4 – 功利主义I – 黑客行为

罗宾汉式黑客行为

背景：安娜是一名网络安全专家，受雇于一家为金融机构开发防御网络攻击软件的科技公司。在工作期间，安娜发现了一家小型地区性银行软件中的严重安全漏洞。该漏洞很容易被利用，从而清空该银行最富有客户账户中的资金。这些富有的客户以利用其财富影响政治而闻名，他们的行为加剧了不平等并对弱势群体造成伤害。安娜知道，如果这些富有人士损失大量金钱，可能会削弱他们的影响力，并促使资源更广泛地分配，从而使其所在社区的许多人受益。

道德困境：出于最大化整体福祉的想法，安娜考虑亲自入侵银行，利用这一漏洞，将资金转移到慈善机构、社区项目和困难家庭。她认为，此举对许多人带来的积极影响将超过对少数富裕个人造成的伤害，

who would still have enough to live comfortably. From a utilitarian perspective, her actions could result in the greatest good for the greatest number, as the stolen money would significantly improve the lives of those in need.

However, Anna’s actions would involve theft, deception, and violation of professional and legal standards. She would be betraying the trust placed in her as a cybersecurity professional and could cause severe financial and emotional distress to the affected individuals. There’s also the risk that her actions could destabilize the bank, harming innocent employees and smaller account holders who are unaware of the bank’s clientele. Moreover, even though the direct harm seems minor compared to the benefits, Anna’s conduct undermines the principles of trust and integrity that are essential to her role and the broader financial system.

Questions for Discussion:

1. Should Anna proceed with her plan, knowing that it would maximize overall happiness, or should she refrain due to the unethical nature of her actions? How does this situation challenge the utilitarian idea that the ends justify the means?
2. What are the ethical problems with Anna's approach, even if the outcomes are highly beneficial? Can the deliberate act of theft and deception ever be morally justified by the positive results it achieves?
3. How does Anna’s potential betrayal of professional trust factor into the moral assessment of her actions? Is there a moral duty to uphold certain principles regardless of the potential positive outcomes?
4. Does Anna's case highlight a flaw in relying solely on outcome-based reasoning when making ethical decisions? What are the risks of justifying unethical actions solely based on their consequences?

Are there limits to using people to maximize utility?

Context: David, a data scientist at an insurance company, discovers a way to improve the company’s risk models by using unapproved data from public sources like social media, location tracking, and health apps. This unauthorized data use would save the company millions, lower premiums for millions of customers, and increase industry efficiency—maximizing overall utility.

However, individuals whose data is used have not consented. One such person is Sarah, a single mother whose social media posts reveal stress and health struggles. The data also

而这些人仍将有足够的财富过上舒适的生活。从功利主义的角度来看，她的行为可能为最多数人带来最大幸福，因为被盗的资金将显著改善那些需要帮助者的生活。

然而，安娜的行为将涉及盗窃、欺骗以及违反职业和法律规范。她将辜负人们作为网络安全专业人员对她所赋予的信任，并可能给受影响的个人带来严重的经济和情感困扰。此外，她的行为还可能导致银行陷入不稳定，从而伤害对该银行客户群毫不知情的无辜员工和小额账户持有人。更重要的是，尽管与带来的好处相比直接伤害看似轻微，但安娜的行为破坏了对其职责以及整个金融体系至关重要的信任与诚信原则。

讨论问题：

1. 安娜是否应该在明知能够实现整体幸福最大化的情况下实施她的计划？还是应因其行为本身的不道德性而放弃？这种情况如何挑战了功利主义“目的证明手段正当”的观点？
2. 即使结果非常有益，安娜的做法存在哪些伦理问题？通过积极的结果能否在道德上合理化蓄意的盗窃和欺骗行为？
3. 安娜可能背叛职业信任这一行为，如何影响对其行动的道德评价？无论潜在结果多么积极，是否存在必须坚持某些原则的道德义务？
4. 安娜的案例是否凸显了在做出伦理决策时单纯依赖结果导向推理的缺陷？仅基于后果来为不道德行为辩护存在哪些风险？

最大化效用是否存在利用他人的界限？

背景： 某保险公司的数据科学家大卫发现，通过使用来自社交媒体、位置追踪和健康应用等公共来源的未经批准的数据，可以改进公司的风险模型。这种未经授权的数据使用将为公司节省数百万资金，降低数百万客户的保费，并提高行业效率——从而实现整体效用的最大化。

然而，其数据被使用的个人并未同意。其中一人就是莎拉，一位单身母亲，她的社交媒体帖子透露出压力和健康问题。这些数据还

tracks her late-night commutes, which the algorithm flags as high-risk, causing her insurance premiums to spike. Sarah is unaware that her personal information is being exploited, and she now faces higher costs that strain her already tight budget.

Ethical Dilemma: Although David’s plan benefits the company and millions of policyholders, it comes at the expense of individuals like Sarah, who are harmed without their consent.

Discussion Questions:

- 1. Does the overall benefit justify the personal harm to individuals like Sarah?
- 2. How does the focus on maximizing utility overlook issues of consent and privacy?
- 3. Are there ethical limits to using data for the greater good?

Lecture 5 – Utilitarianism II – Dark patterns

When dark patterns maximize utility

Context: Emily is a UX designer at a popular online retail company. Her team is tasked with increasing sales and reducing returns. To achieve this, Emily designs several dark patterns on the website: misleading buttons that make it hard to opt out of upsells, auto-enrolled subscriptions that are difficult to cancel, and a checkout process that hides the final total until the very last step. These tactics significantly boost the company's revenue, reduce return rates, and improve quarterly results. The company can reinvest the profits into better services, lower prices for loyal customers, and improved employee benefits, creating broad positive impacts.

However, these dark patterns manipulate users into spending more than they intended, committing to unwanted subscriptions, and feeling frustrated by the shopping experience. One such customer, Alex, a college student on a tight budget, ends up unknowingly enrolled in a monthly subscription he can’t easily cancel. His limited funds mean he has to cut back on essentials to afford the unexpected charges.

Ethical Dilemma: While Emily’s design choices greatly benefit the company and its loyal customers, they exploit users like Alex, who are misled into decisions that harm them financially.

Discussion Questions:

追踪她深夜通勤的行为，算法将其标记为高风险，导致她的保险费上涨。莎拉并不知道自己的个人信息正被利用，而如今她面临更高的开支，这进一步加重了本已紧张的预算负担。

道德困境： 尽管大卫的计划使公司和数百万保单持有人受益，但它却以萨拉等个人为代价，在未经他们同意的情况下对他们造成了伤害。

讨论问题：

- 1. 总体利益能否证明对萨拉等个人造成的伤害是正当的？
- 2. 强调最大化效用如何忽视了知情同意和隐私问题？
- 3. 为了更大利益而使用数据是否存在伦理限制？

讲座5 – 功利主义II – 暗黑模式

当误导性设计模式最大化效用时

背景： Emily 是一家热门在线零售公司的用户体验设计师。她的团队任务是提高销售额并降低退货率。为了实现这一目标，Emily 在网站上设计了多种误导性设计模式：具有误导性的按钮让用户难以拒绝附加购买、自动订阅且难以取消的服务，以及在最后一步之前隐藏最终总价的结账流程。这些手段显著提升了公司收入，降低了退货率，并改善了季度业绩。公司因此可以将利润再投资于更优质的服务、为忠实客户提供更低价格，并改善员工福利，从而带来广泛的积极影响。

然而，这些误导性设计模式会操纵用户花费超出原本计划的金额，迫使他们陷入不想要的订阅，并对购物体验感到沮丧。其中一位顾客 Alex 是一名预算紧张的大学生，他无意中被注册到一个难以取消的月度订阅服务中。由于资金有限，他不得不削减生活必需开支以承担这笔意外支出。

道德困境： 尽管艾米丽的设计选择极大地惠及了公司及其忠实客户，但它们却利用了亚历克斯这样的用户，误导他们做出在经济上损害自身的决定。

讨论问题：

1. Are the benefits to the company and other customers worth the harm caused to individuals like Alex?
2. How do manipulative design practices impact the trust between companies and their users?
3. Should companies prioritize profits and overall utility, even if it means exploiting customer behavior?

Using dark patterns in a fitness app

Context: Laura is a marketing manager for a popular subscription-based fitness app. The company is under pressure to increase user retention and minimize cancellations. To meet these goals, Laura’s team implements dark patterns: the cancellation process is buried in the settings, requiring users to navigate through multiple confusing steps, including misleading prompts like “Are you sure you want to lose all your progress?” The app also uses subtle guilt tactics, like showing users how many workouts they’ll miss if they cancel. These strategies successfully reduce churn rates, increase company revenue, and allow the app to offer more free trials to new users and fund community wellness programs.

However, this approach manipulates users into staying subscribed against their best interests. One user, Megan, a busy nurse who signed up during the pandemic, finds herself stuck paying for a service she no longer has time to use. The convoluted cancellation process frustrates her and drains funds she would rather use for her children's extracurricular activities.

Ethical Dilemma: While the dark patterns lead to greater retention and broader community benefits, they come at the expense of individuals like Megan, who are manipulated into spending money they can't afford on a service they don’t use.

Discussion Questions:

1. Does the overall benefit of increased revenue and community support justify manipulating users like Megan?
2. How do these design tactics impact the long-term relationship between the company and its users?
3. Should companies be allowed to use manipulative designs if it leads to greater good, or is there a line that should not be crossed?

1. 公司和其他客户所获得的利益，是否值得以亚历克斯这样的个人受到伤害为代价？
2. 操纵性设计实践对公司与用户之间的信任有何影响？
3. 即使意味着利用客户行为，公司也应优先考虑利润和整体效用吗？

在健身应用中使用黑暗模式

背景：劳拉是一家流行的订阅制健身应用的市场经理。该公司面临提高用户留存率和尽量减少取消订阅的压力。为了实现这些目标，劳拉的团队采用了黑暗模式：取消订阅流程被隐藏在设置中，用户必须经过多个令人困惑的步骤，包括诸如“确定要丢失所有进度吗？”之类的误导性提示。该应用还使用微妙的内疚诱导策略，例如向用户展示如果取消订阅将错过多少锻炼次数。这些策略成功降低了用户流失率，增加了公司收入，并使该应用能够为新用户提供更多免费试用机会，以及资助社区健康项目。

然而，这种做法操纵了用户，使其违背自身最佳利益而继续订阅。一位用户梅根是一名在疫情期间注册的忙碌护士，她发现自己被困在一项已无时间使用的服务上，却仍需付费。复杂繁琐的取消流程令她倍感沮丧，并消耗了她本想用于孩子课外活动的资金。

道德困境： 尽管这些黑暗模式带来了更高的用户留存率和更广泛的社区利益，但其代价是像梅根这样的个体被操纵，花费他们负担不起的钱去购买一项他们并不使用的服务。

讨论问题：

1. 增加收入和社区支持的整体利益是否能证明像操纵梅根这样的用户行为是正当的？
2. 这些设计策略对公司与用户之间的长期关系有何影响？
3. 如果使用操纵性设计能带来更大的好处，公司是否应该被允许这样做？还是有一条不应逾越的界限？

Lecture 6 – Kantian Ethics I – Property rights

The Leaked Algorithm

Context: Laura is a senior software engineer at a tech firm that has developed a groundbreaking algorithm for enhancing cybersecurity. This algorithm is a closely guarded trade secret, representing years of research and development. Laura discovers that her colleague, Mike, is contemplating sharing the algorithm with a rival company in exchange for a substantial bonus. Mike believes that by doing so, the rival company could offer improved security solutions, benefiting a wider range of users and potentially enhancing overall cybersecurity.

Ethical Dilemma: While Mike’s intention to share the algorithm could lead to broader benefits, such as enhanced security for more users, it involves breaching the company's property rights and confidentiality agreements.

Should Laura report Mike’s intentions to management?

Discussion Questions:

1. What should be Laura’s decision?
2. What are the moral implications of breaching trade secrets in the tech industry? How does protecting intellectual property contribute to a principled and trustworthy work environment?
3. Is it more important to uphold principles and agreements, even if it means potentially missing out on broader benefits? Why or why not?

The Stolen Code

Context: Alex is a software developer at a startup that has created an innovative accessibility tool for people with disabilities. The tool includes a unique code crucial for its personalized features. Alex discovers that his friend Jamie, who works at a larger tech company, is considering using this code without permission to enhance his company’s product. Jamie believes this could improve accessibility for many users and boost his company’s market presence.

Ethical Dilemma: While Jamie’s use of the stolen code could benefit a wide audience, including improving accessibility for users, it involves taking Alex’s intellectual property. This could harm Alex’s startup and, more personally, affect users like Elena, a visually

讲座6 – 康德伦理学I – 财产权

泄露的算法

背景： 劳拉是一家科技公司的高级软件工程师，该公司开发了一种突破性的网络安全增强算法。该算法是一项受到严密保护的商业机密，凝聚了多年的研究与开发成果。劳拉发现她的同事麦克正考虑将该算法分享给一家竞争对手公司，以换取一笔可观的奖金。麦克认为，这样做可以让竞争对手公司提供更优的安全解决方案，惠及更多用户，并可能整体提升网络安全水平。

道德困境： 尽管迈克分享该算法的意图可能带来更广泛的好处，例如为更多用户增强安全性，但这涉及侵犯公司的财产权和保密协议。

劳拉是否应该向管理层报告迈克的意图？

讨论问题：

1. 劳拉应该做出什么决定？
2. 在科技行业中泄露商业机密的道德影响是什么？保护知识产权如何促进一个有原则且值得信赖的工作环境？
3. 坚持原则和协议是否更为重要，即使这意味着可能错失更广泛的利益？为什么？

被盗的代码

背景： Alex 是一家初创公司的软件开发人员，该公司开发了一种创新的面向残障人士的无障碍工具。该工具包含一段关键的独特代码，用于实现其个性化功能。Alex 发现他的朋友 Jamie（在一家大型科技公司工作）正考虑未经许可使用此代码，以提升其公司产品的性能。Jamie 认为这可以为更多用户改善无障碍体验，并增强其公司在市场上的地位。

道德困境： 尽管杰米使用被盗代码可能使广大用户受益，包括提升用户的可访问性，但这涉及侵犯亚历克斯的知识产权。这可能会损害亚历克斯的初创企业，并且更具体地说，会影响像埃琳娜这样的用户，她是一位视力

impaired individual who relies on the specific features of Alex’s tool. If the code is stolen, Elena might lose access to the personalized support she needs for her daily activities.

Alex decides to confront Jamie, emphasizing the importance of respecting intellectual property and protecting users like Elena. By doing so, Alex upholds the integrity of his work and safeguards the needs of individuals depending on the software.

Discussion Questions:

- 1. How does Alex’s choice to protect the code reflect the importance of respecting intellectual property and individual contributions?
- 2. What are the personal impacts of using stolen intellectual property on users like Elena?
- 3. Is it justifiable to use someone else’s intellectual property for broader benefits if it harms individuals or undermines their needs? Why or why not?

Lecture 7 – Kant II – open source

The Misused Open Source Code

Context: Jamie is a developer at a tech company that builds tools for non-profit organizations. Jamie integrates a widely-used open-source library into their latest project aimed at improving data management for various charities. The open-source license requires that any derivative works must be shared under the same open-source terms and include proper attribution.

Jamie’s colleague, Sam, suggests modifying the library to include proprietary features and making the updated version closed-source. Sam argues that this approach could significantly boost the company’s profits, which could then be redirected to support more charitable initiatives and expand their impact.

Ethical Dilemma: Although Sam’s plan could increase funding for charity, it involves altering the open-source library in a way that contradicts its licensing terms and potentially misuses the community's resources. This could impact the open-source community by undermining the principles of open collaboration and fairness. On the other hand, the additional revenue could provide substantial benefits to various charitable organizations.

Jamie must decide whether to adhere to the open-source license and maintain the library’s open nature, or to modify and restrict it for the potential benefit of charitable causes.

障碍人士，依赖亚历克斯工具的特定功能。如果代码被盗，埃琳娜可能会失去她日常活动所需的个性化支持。

Alex决定直面Jamie，强调尊重知识产权的重要性
通过这样做，Alex维护了自己工作的完整性，并保护了依赖该软件的用户的需求。
并保障了依赖该软件的个人的需求。

讨论问题：

- 1. Alex选择保护代码的行为如何体现了尊重知识产权和个人贡献的重要性？
- 2. 使用窃取的知识产权对Elena这样的用户个人会产生哪些影响？
- 3. 如果使用他人的知识产权会对个人造成损害或忽视其需求，那么为了更广泛的利益而这样做是否正当？为什么？

讲座7 – 康德II – 开源

被滥用的开源代码

背景： Jamie 是一家科技公司的开发者，该公司为非营利组织构建工具。Jamie 在他们最新的项目中集成了一款广泛使用的开源库，该项目旨在改善各类慈善机构的数据管理。该开源许可证要求，任何衍生作品都必须以相同的开源条款发布，并包含适当的署名。

Jamie 的同事 Sam 建议对该库进行修改，加入专有功能，并将更新后的版本变为闭源。Sam 认为，这种方法可以显著提升公司的利润，而这些利润随后可用于支持更多的慈善事业，从而扩大其影响力。

道德困境： 尽管 Sam 的计划可能增加对慈善事业的资金支持，但它涉及以违反开源许可条款的方式修改开源库，可能构成对社区资源的滥用。这可能会通过破坏开放协作和公平原则而影响开源社区。另一方面，额外的收入又能为各类慈善组织带来巨大益处。

Jamie 必须决定是遵守开源许可证并保持该库的开放性，还是对其进行修改和限制，以期慈善事业带来潜在利益。

Discussion Questions:

1. Should Jamie follow the open-source license and keep the library open, or modify it for potential increased charitable impact?
2. What are the potential consequences of altering open-source software in violation of its license for both the community and users?
3. Is it ethically justifiable to restrict open-source software for financial gain if it could fund significant charitable work? Why or why not?

The Exclusive Feature

Context: Priya is a developer at a startup that has recently released an open-source project aimed at providing free educational tools for students. The project is growing in popularity, and the team is excited about its positive impact on education. However, Priya discovers that a major tech company is interested in adding exclusive premium features to their version of the open-source project and selling it commercially.

The tech company’s plan involves taking the open-source code, integrating additional proprietary features, and selling the enhanced version with a subscription model. They argue that this could generate significant revenue that could be used to support further development and improvements to the original open-source project. This revenue will also help fund educational initiatives and reach more students.

Ethical Dilemma: While the potential revenue could support further development and educational outreach, it involves taking an open-source project and modifying it into a commercial product, which may conflict with the principles of open-source sharing and community collaboration. Assume that they find a way to not face legal consequences so her decision is purely an ethical one. Priya must decide whether to support the tech company’s proposal, which could bring financial benefits and additional resources for the students, or to maintain the project’s open-source status and uphold its original spirit of free access and collaboration.

Discussion Questions:

1. Should Priya support the tech company’s plan to add exclusive features and sell the software, or maintain the open-source nature of the project, and why?
2. What are the potential impacts on the open-source community and the original goals of the project if it becomes a commercial product?

讨论问题:

1. 杰米是否应该遵守开源许可证，保持该库的开放性，还是为了可能带来更大的慈善影响而对其进行修改？
2. 违反开源软件许可证对其进行修改，会对社区和用户产生哪些潜在后果？
3. 如果限制开源软件以获取经济利益能够资助重要的慈善工作，这种做法在道德上是否站得住脚？为什么？

专属功能

背景: Priya 是一家初创公司的开发者，该公司最近发布了一个开源项目，旨在为学生提供免费的教育工具。该项目越来越受欢迎，团队对其在教育领域产生的积极影响感到振奋。然而，Priya 发现一家大型科技公司有意在他们版本的开源项目中添加专属的高级功能，并进行商业化销售。

这家科技公司的计划是获取开源代码，集成额外的专有功能，并以订阅模式销售增强版本。他们认为这可以产生可观的收入，用于支持原始开源项目的进一步开发和改进。这笔收入还将有助于资助教育项目，惠及更多学生。

道德困境: 尽管潜在的收入可以支持进一步的开发和教育推广，但这涉及将一个开源项目修改为商业产品，可能与开源共享和社区协作的原则相冲突。假设他们找到了一种避免法律后果的方法，因此她的决定纯粹是一个伦理问题。普丽娅必须决定是否支持这家科技公司的提议——这可能带来经济利益并为学生提供额外资源，或者维持项目的开源状态，坚守其自由访问与协作的初衷。

讨论问题:

1. 普丽娅是否应该支持科技公司添加专属功能并出售软件的计划，还是应保持项目的开源性质？为什么？
2. 如果该项目变为商业产品，会对开源社区和项目的最初目标产生哪些潜在影响？

3. Is it ethically acceptable to commercialize open-source software if the proceeds are used to further support the project and related educational causes? Why or why not?

3. 如果将开源软件商业化的收益用于进一步支持该项目及相关教育事业，这种做法在伦理上是否可接受？为什么？