

Caitlyn Goetz

CS 230

February 20, 2015

Homework 1

Question 44, page 43

The debate on free software vs non-free software comes down to one main argument: control. Whether the original software developer or the person that is using the software should be able to control how it works and what it is working on. On the software developers side of the argument is his right to copyright his work. If everyone had access to his source code then he would have no control over how his software was used or even who used it. Some one could very easily share that code with another person, thus that second person would not have to pay to use the software and the developer would be cheated of his money. Another reason to be against free software and pro-developer would be the fact that someone else could take his code and use it in their own project thus plagiarizing his work.

There are somethings that would be good about free software however. For example, if someone had access to the source code for their operating system then they could change how that was running and what it was working on. This would allow people to customize their experiences to better suite their needs. However, a somewhat obvious downside to that would be that that said person would “break” the code and damage their computer if they didn’t know what they were doing. Another point for free software would be the ability to improve upon a code and share it with the rest of the network. Someone could make the software run cleaner or faster than the developer originally released it, and then they could share it with everyone else.

This would make advances in software development increase I think. As long as everyone stated where they got the information and there was some way to regulate the versions coming out onto the network.

Therefore, in my opinion, I believe that free software would be a good thing as long as there is away to regulate how to get the new “improved” versions out to other customers. Also, it would be great if there was a way to state where the source code came from and who contributed so that the appropriate people get the recognition they would deserve.

Question 45, Page 43

Software monopolies are a good thing in the way that the user will be able to transfer their projects from one system to another easily. Also that user would know how to operate the other computers. If every compute ran different software, it would be hard to use other computers because the operating systems would be different and different computers could be able to run completely differently. Thus, the user would be unsure what keystrokes or programs would work on the computer.

However, if there wasn't a software monopoly, people could put together their computers in the way that would benefit them the most. This would make it difficult as previously stated above. It would also give other companies a chance to contribute to the software world and make advances themselves.

Question 50, Page 43

I think car radars are a really interesting new feature that are offered in cars. It would help prevent accidents and prevent personal injuries. However I believe people would become dependent on their car to stop itself. This seems to me like it would promote inattentive driving and a reliance on the technology. If a driver knew that the car would stop itself, they might start letting it slow for them. However, if that technology was damaged or hacked, then the car would not stop itself and perhaps cause an accident. If the driver was used to the technology stopping for them and they then drove a car that didn't have that technology, it could cause an accident. This happened with my date's dad. He was used to the car slowing down for him and then when the borrowed car didn't start slowing, he slammed into the car in front of him.

In my opinion, the technology is a great thing for preventing accidents but, if used incorrectly, could prove to cause other accidents.

Question 35, Page 101

I would choose the Rule Utilitarian because I feel like it is the one ethical theory that we covered that most closely covers my beliefs. For the consequences of having a unit of measure that is difficult to select, I would say that that leaves it up for the individual person to decide if they are happy or not. Thus, giving each person a chance to rule in on whether they are happy or not. Also, even if the benefits are not equally distributed, I think that goes along with what life is like. Not everyone gets a chance to do a certain job or some people might have to work harder. However, I think that as long as you gauge your own happiness then one benefit might be more

beneficial for you than another person so you would feel that you are equally happy as the person who has some other benefit.

Question 44, Page 101

1. I don't have enough money to buy it. - Virtual Ethics says that there are virtues and vices. Virtues being good actions such as buying the CD and vices being bad actions such as stealing the CD. By not buying the CD, the person who cannot pay is basically stealing from the company. Thus, this is a vice and is not moral.
2. The retail price is too high. The company is gouging customers. - Kantianism says that an act is moral if it can be done universally with no bad behaviors. If the price was really too high then why did the friend buy it. He bought it so why cant you.
3. Since I wouldn't have bought it anyway, the company didn't lose a sale. - Act Utilitarianism says that a behavior's morality is measured by the happiness of all the affected parties. Therefore since the person is going to listen to the CD and he didn't pay. He may be happy but the company that didn't get paid is unhappy.
4. I'm giving my friend the opportunity to do a good deed. - Virtual Ethics says that there are vices and virtues. If the friend is really doing a good deed by giving you a CD to copy, he is also helping you steal from the company who copyrighted the CD. Therefore his stealing is a vice in the long run and not a virtue.
5. Everyone else is doing it. Why should I be the only person to buy it when everyone else is getting it for free? - Kantianism says that if the behavior is moral if it can be universalized. If everyone is truly copying copyrighted CD's then the company who originally copyrighted

that CD is losing money. Act Utilitarianism also says that the behavior's morality should depend on the happiness of every affected party. The person getting the CD's contents for free will be happy but the people who rely on the CD for their income would be unhappy if they don't get paid for their work.

6. This is a drop in the bucket compared to Chinese pirates who sell billions of dollars worth of copied music. - Kantianism says that a behavior is moral as long as it is still good if it can be applied as a universal behavior. So if everyone acted like the Chinese pirates then the company that originally copyrighted the CD would lose all of its income.
7. This is insignificant compared to the billions of dollars worth of music being exchanged over the internet. - Kantianism says that a behavior is moral as long as it is still good if it can be applied as a universal behavior. So if everyone acted by stealing the contents of the copyrighted CD then the company that originally copyrighted the CD would lose all of its income. Therefore, if instead of buying and exchanging the money for the music online, the customers would just download it for free off of the internet.

Question 46 Page 102

If a society deems that listening in on others conversations, then it is also immoral for the government to do so. Especially if the government is the one enforcing that law. However, with Act Utilitarianism a behavior's morality is measured by the happiness of the affect groups. If the government does wiretap on someone that is a going to do something bad to other people. It will probably be happier for everyone involved beside the criminal for the wiretap to happen.

Somewhat "the needs of the many outweighs the needs of the few" type of thing.

Question 47, Page 102

I do not agree with Plato's Glaucon because it goes against everything that is good in my beliefs. As in Kantianism, if everyone did the same including government and the ones who have to uphold the laws then we would not be anywhere good. It also goes against Virtual Ethics because if it is something immoral and you do it then it would be a vice and that is not moral. The only happiness that would be going up would be the one's committing the crime and it would affect everyone else's happiness that were involved in a negative way. So this also goes against Act Utilitarianism.

Question 48, Page 102

1. The right to a higher education - This would be a positive right based on the Social Contract Theory. This then would also be a limited right according to the Social Contract Theory. Since school is paid for by taxes from K-12 grade then the people need to take action to keep that going since not everyone can afford schooling.
2. The right to housing - This would be a positive right. And according to the Social Contract Theory since everyone has a right to housing other people need to help those who don't have it to obtain it.
3. The right to health care - This would also be a positive right according to myself. According to Kantianism everyone that has healthcare should also make universally available.
4. The right of a presidential candidate to receive time on television - I think this would be a negative right. According to Social Contract Theory, everyone would have to get out of his

way in order for him to have an uninterrupted time on the television. Meaning no protests, no commercials, etc.

Question 49, Page 102

I would say that the right to life includes food, water and shelter. Since you need food and water to survive it would seem pretty useless to not have this as a universal right according to Kantianism. Under the Act Utilitarianism since everyone's happiness has to be measured, I would also say that having food, water and shelter available for everyone would be a good thing. With everyone living feed and sheltered their happiness would go up and not having homeless on the city streets or in neighborhoods would also make everyone happier.