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Intellectual Property

Human dependency on computer related property has grown exponentially over the past 20 years, constantly sparking the argument over true ownership and usage of intellectual property (IP). The desire to own the property created by an entity is understandable, while sharing the processes and technologies behind the idea is just as important. Protecting both the owner and the product is necessary to further improve technology for the future. For the sake of mankind, we must find a medium area which we can earn compensation for our time and ideas, while also sharing the IP for educational purposes.

As a community it is vital to learn from other’s creations. We would not be where we are today technologically without being allowed to learn from them. Studying certain intellectual property takes time and understanding to appreciate its value and mechanisms, furthermore, preventing the public from the “behind the curtains” methodologies would stunt the expansion of computer science and mathematics (Zoracki 595). For instance, when studying C++ language, we learned about complex data structures known as trees. Some trees are so complex, they are only available for purchase online. The simplest version s of trees are studied through text, but the more complex structures are more difficult to locate. Thanks to the internet, nearly anything can be found and studied from the internet for free, but this intellectual property can vary between developers. To study the simplest versions of IP, it is as easy as performing a search using Google, and there you have it. Another example is the theory of electricity. I assume some students studying computer science have a basic knowledge on the theory of electronics, but if companies didn’t spend the money for R&D to creating prototypes to test theoretically new processes, that technology could become stale or even surpassed by another company or country. We strictly adhere to some of our basic principles which we live by, including the IEEE 5th code of ethics which states we must strive “to improve the understanding by individuals and society of the capabilities and societal implications of conventual and emerging technologies, including intelligent systems.” In parallel, the ACM code of ethics guideline 1.5 also says “to respect the work required to produce new ideas, inventions, creative works and computing artifacts.”

As programmers, we have the right to receive compensation for the value of our time and ideas. This is our natural right as creators of IP, which declares “[t]he natural law justification for intellectual property protection rests on the idea that a person is ‘entitled to the fruits of his labor’” (Zoracki, 583). Protecting the IP is necessary, disregarding bias to either side in this argument allows others to modify and learn from the technologies or to safeguard it completely from utilization through copyrights or patents, but at a minimum there is a growing need for protection to be in place to prevent others to benefit financial.

To conclude, we must recognize the need to protect IP and its creators, while also allowing the public at a minimum, to study and at most, to utilize the code to serve a purpose. We naturally desire compensation for our hard work, having turned ideas into IP, although as members of the IT community, we must ensure to protect and support new technologies that lie in the future.
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