

Caitlyn Goetz

CS 230

April 3, 2015

Homework 3

Question 20, Page 214

I think that IP protection can promote innovation but I do not believe that it is necessary. There will always be the people who want to be their own boss and only go into it for the money but there are also going to be those people who are going to do it because that is what they love to do. As stated in the textbook, Benjamin Franklin invented many things without seeking any monetary award. So I believe that there will always be the people who do it because that is what they want to do.

Question 21, Page 214

I draw this cute, little spaceship when I am doodling. I would like to get a copyright on that. A trademark or service mark would be unconventional and worthless because I am not trying to build a brand around it. And to make a trade secret would be silly because I have drawn it on so many things and so many people have seen it that it would make it possible to make it a trade secret. And a patent wouldn't make sense because it isn't an original idea to draw a rocket ship. So the only thing that would make since would be to copyright it that way I could claim it as my intellectual property and own the rights to that drawing.

Posting the 32-character encryption key for HD-DVDs on Digg.com - According to the IP laws, this would be illegal. But using the ethical theory Kantianism, we can see that if every started posting other's property and the encryption keys and intellectual property online, there would be no need for the IP laws because everyone's property would be out there. So if they posted their own IP on the internet universally it would be moral. However if they were stealing the IP and then posting it then it would be immoral. With Utilitarianism, the happiness of the poster would go up and so would the people who uses that encryption key. The happiness of the encrypted data at diggs.com and the person whose encryption key it was would go down. But the happiness of the other people outnumber the diggs.com so it would be moral.

Terminating the poster's account - Terminating the poster's accounts seems like an appropriate consequence of "stealing" their encryption key. Kantianism would consider this moral because if that was the consequence universally then that would be appropriate. Utilitarianism would say that the happiness of the website goes up and the happiness of the poster goes down. It could be argued that the happiness of other users of the website would go up because now they know what the consequence would be for doing something like that. So, it could be considered moral.

Reposting the encryption key - By reposting the encryption key, I believe has the same morality of posting it originally. Kantianism would say that it is immoral but it would be moral through Utilitarianism.

Question 26, Page 214

This ruling will help to keep other peer-to-peer networking technologies from making the same infringements. It will also have other technologies questioning what they can and cannot do to get around this ruling. It would keep companies like social media sites from using each other or other applications from promoting themselves through each other.

Question 27, Page 214

The pros would be that it allows users to choose which application will fit their needs better. They can then shop around for deals and find exactly what they want. Which would increase their happiness. However, with more open-source software being put on the network it could mean the collapse of the economy that relies on the proprietary software.

Question 28, Page 214

I think these should apply to music because music is basically the same as software, except software is a bunch of code that you don't sing while songs and music are a bunch of words that you do sing. Someone had to write the code for software and someone had to write the lyrics and notes for the songs. So they should both be protected equally.