

Discussion: For each module, I will post a few discussion questions. You will be given 1% for each good contribution to the discussion. Answers need not be right to get full marks, but they must answer the question and, if you're not the first to contribute, they must discuss what others have said in answer to the question. These do not have individual deadlines, except for the end of term. NOTE: Unlike homework questions, you may answer questions from previous weeks. And you are responsible for making sure you have posted often enough. I do not report tallies. **10 Postings.**

Module 1: Question 1:

In the article, *Ethics*, from the Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, the author, James Fieser, discusses the three main types of normative ethical theories: virtue theories, duty theories, and consequentialist theories. Which, if any, do you think is right and why?

I don't believe that any of the theories presented in the Ethics article are completely correct. Virtue theorists, as stated in the article, believe that the ultimate criteria of moral conduct is the development of good character habits, such as benevolence or courage. It also states that once a good character quality has been developed, it becomes a habit that one will always act upon. Though I believe that moral conduct is based on the implementation of good character qualities (ie. wisdom, courage, benevolence, temperance, and justice), the idea that these qualities once learned will be habitually performed is, in my opinion, an concept representative of an idyllic world.

Duty theorists on the other hand believe that moral conduct is based on "specific, foundational principles of obligation." Duty theorists believe that following specific, defined duties is obligatory, irregardless of any possible consequences that may result. These duties may be to ourselves or to others. The idea that in order to act morally one must meet his/her obligations to themselves, society, and a higher power does reflect how people should act to do what is right, however duty theories ignore consequences to actions. By ignoring the outcomes that results from our actions, we could in fact be ignoring a greater wrong by looking at what we believe our true duties are. I also feel that duty theories do not reflect which duties takes precedence over others. Which duties are the most important for moral conduct? When does our duty to ourselves become more important than that of our duty to others? Moral conduct does not just occur because we fulfilled our duty, it is also reflective of the outcomes of those actions and they impact everyone involved.

Consequentialist theorists on the other hand, state that moral conduct is defined only by "the cost-benefit analysis of an action's consequence." Consequentialists believe that for an action to be morally right, the favourable outcomes of the action outweigh the unfavourable outcomes. This theory is potentially problematic because who gets to be favoured by the outcomes? How does this theory weigh the outcomes and whose rights are more important, the individual performing the action, everyone else's, or everyone's? Consequential theorists have subdivisions for each of these previous mentioned, but is it realistic that one would be looking at these seperately? I believe that one should look at the common good, but there are many sticky situations that can't just involve the outcomes. Moral conduct must involve more than just weighing the outcomes to the risks, which is why I believe that consequentialists are impractical in there definition of moral conduct, though they do define an important piece of it.

Module 1: Question 2:

Allen Wood argues that relativism is self-defeating. Why does he think so? Is he right? Is relativism self-defeating or not?

Relativism is self-defeating as Wood claims. To paraphrase Wood in less eloquent writing: if relativism is absolutely true, then it must not be absolutely true since it claims there is no absolute truth, but it would be the absolute truth that refutes itself. Wood goes on to explain the many ways around this one glaring contradiction that relativists have tried to use to maintain their belief, but in the end, if one believes at all in the idea of any truth for anyone, then relativism cannot be true. As Wood explains, when one even supposes that there is only one absolute truth, that being relativism (an explanation that Wood rightly points out as being very unjustified and very ad hoc), one must then begin to realize the many other absolute truths that must exist. Ex. To prove that it is Peter's truth that his response to this discussion is good, we must first prove that Peter perceives his response to this discussion is good. We must state that it is absolutely true that Peter thinks his response to this discussion is good before we can say that it is Peter's truth that his response to this discussion is good. To have any kind of concept of relativism or what that would mean, one must first believe in absolute truths. By way of reductio ad absurdum, Wood shows that when taken to its logical conclusions, relativism cannot exist if relativism exists.

Module 1: Question 3:

Do you think the increased use of computers has changed our lives for better or for worse? In what ways do you feel that it has made life better, and in what ways do you feel it has made life worse? Discuss in reference to what other students said.

I believe that computers have both changed our lives for the better and for the worse. Computers have advanced our ability to search and gain information, communicate to people and business across the world along with much more. Unfortunately, I believe that although computers make our lives much easier they also make us humans lazier. Everything comes so easy to us, we don't have to put effort in to complete task like people used to. Research entailed going to the library for hours looking through books while today we can just "google it" and find the answer in minutes. There is no need to put any effort in to get what you need. You get what you want at the click of a mouse in the comfort of your own home.

Module 1: Question 4:

Tell everyone a bit about yourself. What are your hobbies and interests? What do you hope to learn from the course?

Module 2: Discussion Question 1:

Consider the internet viral videos of "the Star Wars Kid" and the "Bus uncle". If you're not familiar with them, look them up. Is it morally acceptable to post a photo or video of someone on the Internet without their permission? Why or why not? Are there specific kinds of situations when it is acceptable or when it is unacceptable?

After familiarizing myself with these two Youtube video's, I think that it is not acceptable to upload video's of others without their permission. With any choice there are consequences that impact the individuals and others around them. For the boy who had a video uploaded called "The Star Wars Kid", I looked up a website blog from <http://knowyourmeme.com/memes/star-wars-kid>. According to this blog post, the boy in the video named Ghyslain Raza video taped himself pretending to fight off

characters in Star Wars. When he left, he forgot to take the tape out. Three boys from the highschool found the tape and uploaded it onto the web. This video has gone viral and had many parodies made from it. Ghyslain Raza has had terrible repercussions from this video being uploaded. His mental health declined and he ended up in a psychiatric ward and dropping out of school. Although the boys probably thought that this video was hilarious and thought that everyone should see it. They did not think about how this would impact Ghyslain Raza. I think that all too often, people post things on the web from the comfort of their own computers and never feel the consequences of their actions because they are not interacting with the individuals directly, but are just in contact with their computer screen. It is too easy to post things on the internet and then realize later that it was wrong because the consequences are delayed. This is how cyberbullying has become a very severe and horrific issue as children are posting very terrible, mean or embarrassing things about their classmates and do not think that it is wrong since the other individuals they are posting about do not hear and read what they say until later. However, there are consequences and people need to be educated that what goes on the internet is forever there. Peers, family, employers and the rest of the world can see what you post and it is a reflection of who you are. So post carefully. You don't want to regret what you have uploaded on the internet.

Module 2: Discussion Question 2:

Do you agree or disagree with Mill's "Harm Principle": that people can do anything they like as long as it does not harm others. Why? Is there anything that people cannot or should not do, even if it doesn't harm anyone else?

I disagree with Mill's "Harm Principle" not necessarily because I think it is wrong but because I think it does cover enough. It is too simple to say that it is ok to do anything you want just because it is not hurting someone else. How would we know? Is it just the immediate effect of what you do or do not do that is measured or the future implications which would be virtually impossible to fully know? Also, what of contributing to society? I think this is the key point that Mill misses in his principle. While theoretically if we follow the principle we will not cause harm, but we may not necessarily be improving our society or future generations which may in fact cause harm in the future.

Mill states that people should have three liberties. These are the liberties of your consciousness or your thoughts (and therefore the results of them), the liberty of pursuing your interests, and the liberty to collectively unite with other likeminded individuals as long as this unity is non-harmful. These liberties seem innocent in themselves, but how can we know if our actions while exercising these liberties will cause harm or not? Without boundaries on our liberties we may easily cross lines and cause harm immediately or in the future. We cannot always know who our actions are affecting.

There is also the matter of contribution to society. We could do whatever made us happy, as long as we didn't harm anyone but that is not always possible and sometimes not harming others in fact causes us harm. For example, new jobs can often be competitive. Taking a job for yourself will cause you to be happy, but it may harm another person who does not get the job because you are getting it and they may need the job more than you. According to Fieser's article, "Ethics" morality is more than just following rules, but more about developing virtues. With this idea in mind, Mill's harm principle would be the rule that he thinks we should follow, but according to Fieser the moral thing to do would be more than just not committing nonmaleficence, but to actually be involved in beneficence (produce more good than harm). Also according to Fieser we have a duty to promote the wellbeing of others. As human beings sharing this world we have more than just an obligation to not cause each other harm, we have an obligation to bring out the best in each other. Not hurting each other is not enough, we are to each other up and provide morals and standards for future generations. Otherwise, our culture and our society will eventually deteriorate into nothing.

Module 2: Discussion Question 3:

Richard Posner notes that mainstream media is becoming more polarized politically. Posner says it's not as bad as that may seem. Why does he say so? Is he right? Do you think that this is a good thing or a bad thing?

When Richard Posner states that mainstream media is becoming more politically polarized, he means that the dominant voice in the media, the liberals, are being pushed farther "left", becoming more liberal to keep its viewers interested. He says that this polarization is occurring because of a decrease in the cost of "electronic communication," and to less regulation of what is said in the media online. Because of the decrease in cost, the media online don't have to worry about staying within a small political range to keep as many viewers as possible. They can be as liberal as they want because they no longer have to worry about gaining new visitors to make the amount of money they need. Because all mainstream media no longer have to worry about the profit from new readers, every media now must worry about how to keep the readers they already have, thus polarizing, becoming more liberal or more conservative. Richer Posner when he states that it is not a bad thing that polarization is occurring, he explains himself by saying that the media is just giving the public what they want to here. To retain their "friends" in the public, they are not challenging their audiences' biases. The media already had the readers that they do now because of their political veiwpoints, so now that they don't have to worry about attracting more attention, they are free to become more polarized in their political viewpoints, simply meeting the demands of their current audience.

I don't think that Posner is wrong when he says that media polarization isn't necessarily a bad thing, but possibly where it is headed may be problematic. If the polarization continues to occur then eventually the media will be on the extreme of either side of the table, right or left, conservative or liberal. Though the media will always be looking for the "best" story or the most eye-catching spin on a story, with the lower cost of media, anyone will be able to post online anything they want, true or not. The media's need to meet the demands of their audience, often comes at the cost of another person, often a celebrity. This is where I beleive that it could be problematic and ethical. I beleive that everyone should be able to have a life and privacy without the media constantly being there to catch whatever mistake they make. As the media doesn't need to worry about reaching new viewers due to the lowered cost, then they are free to write whatever they think would suit the fancy of the already politcally extreme readers follow them regularly. This freedom to become more polarized due to less cost and less regulation may lead to ethical issues in the future. Newspapers are under the inspection of an editor, and if they don't think the story is true or appropriate then they won't publish it. Online there are no such, or at least much fewer regualtions, therefore the media is much more free to say whatever they want.

Module 2: Discussion Question 4:

Watch the following segment Here we have one person on television from Last Weekend Tonight with John Oliver. Here is one television personality criticizing another, more popular, television personality (Dr. Oz). In it, Oliver makes a point about the incentives on television, how it can distort the purpose of a television show, and how its audience can be mislead. In particular, he thinks that Dr. Oz's need to stay interesting and relevant is what leads him to exaggerate or make false claims. Is Oliver's assessment accurate? Does Oliver's criticism apply more broadly? And if we think about television more broadly, do we get an overall counter effect to Dr. Oz from the other point of view, namely from John Oliver, such that it is a good balance to have both? Any other thoughts?

Overall, I feel that John Oliver was correct. It is not surprising, but interesting to know that senators were given money by the supplement companies. One would think that Dr. Oz is possibly receiving similar financial gains as well for his contribution to the "pushing" of these supplements on people who are looking for a miracle instead of just eating healthy and exercising, even though he said he wasn't. So many are just looking for a "magic pill" that doesn't mean they have to actually work to achieve a healthier body and lifestyle. I know, because I used to be one of them; but these supplements are not regulated by the FDA at all. Nothing is regulated in this industry and they can make claims that are untrue. Knowing this, it is disturbing that Dr. Oz would support these supplements on his show and not point out that none of these products have been adequately tested or approved by the FDA. As a nurse, I know how the medications I give have been tested for side effects. When you go to the pharmacy to get a prescription filled, they give you a pamphlet that details all of the adverse effects and contraindications. When I fill out a medication report for a patient, I have to list any herbal supplements on their medication sheet as many of these supplements are contraindicated for certain medications, yet those supplements are not regulated.

As John Oliver is a comedian of sorts, his hyping up of the claims against Dr. Oz are for his benefit as an entertainer as well. It is the same with The Daily Show with Jon Stewart. I enjoy that show, but it's because I have similar beliefs to Jon Stewart, so it is very entertaining to me. John Oliver makes a huge deal about the fact that, "more people wrote to Congress over the Supplement Bill than wrote about the Vietnam War." This would seem mind-boggling, however, it is much easier to write to Congress in this day of e-mails and fast communication rather than actually sitting down to write out a letter. Could that possibly have something to do with the number of people that contacted Congress for one Bill versus another; especially one that happened over 40 years ago.

Dr. Oz was, however, misquoted at times. At one point, Dr. Oz says, "This little bean has scientists saying they've found the magic weight loss cure for every body type." He said, "Scientists say" so that's not him actually claiming it was magic, but it is still very misleading. Also, Dr. Oz will not even be held accountable for his false claims in a court of law as it is technically not illegal. This would seem to be just a scare tactic on the part of the US government. If they are bringing Dr. Oz in for questioning, why are they not doing the same for the supplement companies who have no one to report or regulate them?

Module 2: Discussion Question 5:

Alvin Goldman and Richard Posner disagree about the value of the blogosphere. Who do you think is right and why?

I think Richard Posner is right because the biggest problem caused towards journalism by the increased competition is that journalists now have to become pretensions in order to meet consumer wants. This causes both a lack of respect towards journalists and a lower quality in the news presented itself. As someone who is planning to be a journalist, it concerns me to hear about the changes being made in journalism, especially the decrease in paid journalism. Posner briefly mentions that Journalism is a profession and not a trade, but perhaps he has missed the solution right there. If journalism comes a government provided service instead of relying on the income of the profit itself, then a non-bias newspaper would be able to emerge again and discuss the points of both left and right wing news.

Module 3: Discussion Question 1:

Hettinger notes that "expressions of ideas are copyrightable; ideas themselves are not." Explain this distinction. Are there any problems with this distinction? Hettinger notes that this distinction is difficult to make in art. Why does he think so? Can you give an example?

Hettinger explains that ideas that have been transferred into expressions can be copyrightable. On the other hand, an idea or concept itself cannot be copyrightable because it has not been transcribed or put down on paper, if you will. Hettinger further explains that when dealing with works of art such as poetry or fiction, where style and content intermingle can cause issues when trying to distinguish between if it's an idea/concept or is it someone's expression of their idea. For example, an ad agency decides to copy an old song that was well known in the past and is sued by a band that claims the ad agency stole their song. In the courts they would have to prove they had recorded such a song in order to make a claim of copyright infringement.

Module 3: Discussion Question 2:

In what ways is private intellectual property different from private property in general? How important are these differences?

The difference I can see with private intellectual property (PIP) and private property (PP) are PIP can be modified as a different spin on someone's original "idea" or "subject matter" (copyright infringement) i.e., Steve Jobs taking the mouse idea from Xerox and making his own idea as GUI, whereas PP is someone's ownership that was once free (land) now has value and is bought from a developer for economic gain (once free land, now owned for profit) and is sold to a home buyer. These differences can be seen as intangible and tangible. (PIP), for example can be a legal agreement that an author has a right to their novel and no one has the right to change their work, whereas a tangible (PP) property can be in a form of a physical house that is owned.

Module 3: Discussion Question 3:

Stallman offers various proposals on how to have software developers get paid, even if software is free. What are his proposals? Are they plausible? Why or why not?

Some of Stallman's proposals are to reduce copyright as a 10 year limit on software, where there are less restrictions on sharing and authors can be compensated by a tax from revenues that are distributed among all that is based on cubic roots based on their popularity. This ensures the fairly successful unsuccessful stars get a greater share as opposed to private copying levy. Another proposal from Stallman is a system that is made of a convenient anonymous micropayment where people can directly support authors.

Stallman's proposals are not plausible because people are missing the point or social movement he is trying to create. Instead, people have taken this movement of free software and have changed the idea to "open source" where it is seen as more practical, rather than ethical. Open source misses the point of respecting users freedom to use software freely. Therefore, by using certain words such as "open source", do not necessarily mean the same thing as "free software".

Module 3: Discussion Question 4:

I won't ask you if you've ever illegally downloaded anything off the internet (e.g. a movie or a song, maybe). But do you think it is okay to download a movie or a song illegally off the internet? Why or why not?

In one way I believe that it is okay to download a movie or a song off the Internet if it's already out of the theaters (movies) and if the song has been out for a while. This goes along with the utilitarian reasoning where the directors/actors (those involved in the making of a movie) or writers/band (those involved in composing the song) have the right to their private property as well as an economic ownership, yet as time passes they lose this right, it should be seen as a free market on the internet to download what ever people choose. The laws state otherwise and favor

capitalism. I think to be fair, songs or movies should not cost so much and maybe people will honor the legal system and choose to pay instead of stealing something on the net since its not exactly "tangible". On the other hand, I am too scared to get a virus from downloading such movies or songs so I choose to pay. As I am writing this I am seeing how unethical this subject matter is. I am just being honest!

Module 3: Discussion Question 5:

Is online piracy any different from other kinds of theft? In what ways is it similar?

Roberta I think made an important distinction about tangibility of items and theft. We agree here that it actually does not matter because it is still property being stolen just in a different format. I am interested in why so many people still do it though. I think most people understand that what they are doing is theft even if we a trouble getting our minds around why exactly. We still know it is wrong. I believe this is a disturbing trend that these actions are becoming socially acceptable even if we may not yet pulicaly say we do it. (Everyone understands the other person does it and viceversa.)

But William you make a good point that people do not feel as bad because there is no sense of being watched. With physical items displayed there is simply this sense that somebody is going to be more careful in protecting their stuff that is just sitting out in the open. But if I may expand on this thought it may also the be the sense that the item (say being digitally downloaded illegally) is physically not there that makes people feel better about doing it. The interenet gives the sens to people that everything is a free for all and we can do what we want adds to this.

Module 4: Discussion Question 1:

Helen Nissenbaum does not think that there is anything distinct about the online world such that it would require its own distinct set of privacy rules. Is she right? Do you think there's anything distinct about the online world such that it needs its own rules?

Answer: I definitely agree with you Roberta, online privacy policies would never be complete because there are just far to many variables in terms of context. I think we would be far better off creating policies specific to the online context. For example, using Rosen's idea of offering expiration dates in terms of managing social media. This option won't obviously solve all privacy issues but it would definitely be a great starting point!

Module 4: Discussion Question 2:

Do you think that you, as an internet user, should be able to stop advertising companies and others from collecting data about you, even if those companies aren't doing anything bad with that data? Why or why not?

I agree with you Roberta, if we decide to volunteer our information to these advertising companies then use it, but if we don't, then these companies should not have access to it. It's simple as that. Generally when we share our data with companies its often because we are purchasing something or communicating with a particular company of our choice. If we were interested in other companies having this information, we would take it upon ourselves to voluntarily share it with them.

Module 4: Discussion Question 3:

How much and what do you choose to reveal to the public over the internet? Do you have a large Twitter or Instagram (other social media) following? Do you yourself follow famous people on Twitter,

Facebook, or Instagram? How has your use of social media, if you use it, benefited your life and in what ways do you think it hasn't?

I do not engage in social media either. I have never had accounts with Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, etc., and anything I do online that entails using my personal info, such as banking or making purchases, I do only through specified secured websites only. Unfortunately, the drawbacks to not having Facebook, Twitter, or Instagram accounts is that I miss out on a lot of information in which my fellow classmates share with one another. Its unfortunate, but thankfully, I have good friends and so they keep me informed about the latest through either text or email.

Module 4: Discussion Question 4:

Do you think people should be able to be anonymous online? Or not? Or do you think anonymity is acceptable in some places (like from advertisers), but maybe not in others (for instance, Twitter or Facebook)? Why or why not?

I agree with you to Josh, this question is difficult because there are in fact both pro's and con's associated with remaining anonymous. As you stated, I also believe that this is of a circumstantial issue. If I'm sharing my credit card number to purchase a text book, I generally prefer that my information not be shared with others on the internet but on the other hand, I think its important to not have the option to hide ones anonymity so officials such as the police have the ability to track down individuals who choose to break the law on the internet.

Module 5: Discussion Question 1:

Do you think that the Canadian government should enforce net neutrality rules on internet service providers in Canada? Why or why not?

Based on the readings from this week I find it hard to come to a consensus on what view point is better or worse. The conversational article between Christopher Yoo and Tim Wu makes valid arguments for both cases. According to Christopher Yoo and the FedEx analogy people are more then willing to pay for a service that is better and fast. Capitalism would support this idea as well as state that dismantling Net Neutrality would open up a new structure that would be much more efficient. Also Net Neutrality gives organizations such a google the power to monopolize because they have an built up the resources to carry purchasing power and build greater networks. Although Net Neutrality being enforced would keep the big players in the Canadian telecom industry honest. As someone who try's to save a dollar anywhere I can it would be ridicules to live in CChristopher Yoo's world where paying premiums on speed to operate a business or do relative task to other people. In Canada and the US television as reffed to by Christopher Yoo has installed the practice of Blocking. For example in Canada Rogers Cable and Bell Satellite are completely different and offer different services, and with in each service you need to purchase different levels to watch various programing. The difference between cable and satellite eliminates competition and prices are not competitive or reasonable. Within the services offered consumers must pick various packages for channels and sporting events. This means in order to watch documentaries, hockey, football, and say the golf network a consumer needs to pay separate premiums. The television provider industry has gone nuts and its makes more sense to put a digital antenna in your backyard for the first and only payment of \$50 and get basic cable for free. For this reason Net Neutrality becomes undesirable for some one like myself because blocking could result in the installation of various web services. Ultimately, I believe it should not be enforced by rather similar to what the CRTC and federal government strives for currently, which is to keep the Internet as neutral as possible.

I agree with Xiang as well! Enforcing net neutrality rules would be very beneficial to Canadians. Access to information should be unlimited for everyone, particularly in terms of education! Companies should not have the right to monopolize the information of other companies. For some reason many of us forget to sit back and place ourselves in the shoes of others before acting. I couldn't imagine being the target of someone's unjust behavior. I don't understand how these companies think they can get away with this!

Module 5: Discussion Question 2:

Do you think that having the government ratify something like Powell's internet freedoms would be a useful thing to do? Why or why not?

I would agree if the Canadian government was to ratify Micheal Powells four Internet freedoms it would be useful. The four Internet freedoms were designed to benefit the consumer and targeted to protect the Internet users from the Internet providers. The first rule being the freedom to access content, in 2005 Telus blocked access of union blogs to customers during an employee strike. This being said it is safe to safe that many of the employees would have used Telus as a service provider, and this censorship would have violated Micheal Powells Internet freedom. Telus has been famous for blocking sites that speak ill about their service and platform and in this case Micheal Powell's freedom would step in to ensure free speech. The Internet freedoms are similar to the Canada charter and have a value that is extremely relevant and important for the future of the Internet and service providers. Users need rights because it has become impossible to exist in society without the Internet.

I definitely agree with the government ratifying actions similar to that of Powell's Freedoms. Doing so would allow Canadians to have control to choose what they would like to have in terms of applications, devices, services, etc. If this right to choose was taken away, I personally feel that it would end a lot of what we have today in terms of technology. I also think this type of restriction would cause an increase in illegal activity as people who are tech savvy would find ways around it to discretely as they pleased.

Module 5: Discussion Question 3:

Recently, (June 2015) the president of Bell Media said that watching U.S. Netflix in Canada by using various location-hiding services is stealing. See this article here: <http://bit.ly/1cA7y6F>. What do you think? Is it stealing or not? Why?

I think that Virtual Private Networks or VPNs are no different than sites where you go to download music for free rather than paying for it through iTunes. Both types of sites are providing access to pirated media works. To say one agrees with doing this is to say it is okay to steal. People who access VPNs use the lame excuse that they are doing it because they can not access the quality or variety of viewing that is available on Netflix's U.S. This is no different than saying it is okay to illegally access electronic devices (like the latest Apple watches) that have been stolen in the US because we don't offer the same product yet in Canada. You can rationalize it any way you want such as by complaining that you are accessing this content because we don't have it here, but you are receiving stolen property and as far as I am aware, that is a crime in this country

David I agree with your thoughts as well. This issue is the same as all the other issues relating to piracy. This is stealing and for those who own the rights to these products (books, music, movies, etc.) are being deprived the money that they worked hard for. I know for some people it's hard to

understand but we are essentially dipping into pay cheques that do not belong to us. I definitely know I would be very upset if that was my hard earned money being dipped into!

Module 5: Discussion Question 4:

Read the two following articles:

- <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/style-blog/wp/2015/05/25/a-reminder-that-your-instagram-photos-arent-really-yours-someone-else-can-sell-them-for-90000/>
- <http://www.thestar.com/entertainment/2015/06/01/richard-princes-use-of-her-instagram-image-angers-toronto-woman.html>

What do you think? Is this right or wrong? Why or why not? How does this fit in with our readings on intellectual property?

I like many other have probably posted a photo or two that I shouldn't have but I like to defend this by state that they were all before I was 18. Young and stupid is my defense and i'm sticking to it. This being said I could not be upset if someone took anything i've posted on Facebook and "remixed" it because I understood what I was getting myself into. The issue is that Anna allowed her sister to post the photo which means she agreed to the terms. Sometimes its a hard decision people get caught up in, when it comes down to posting something you really want to and weighing in that someone else can use the photo. This case is especially interest because Annas sister posted the photo. Personally, i've seen hundred of photos post on Facebook accounts of someone else downing a bottle of beer or maying doing something a little risky to say the least and I disagree with this. On a boys cottage weekend it is understood that everyone leaves their camera phones on the fridge and the first person to take a video or photos might leave with a broken finger. It is impossible to control all aspects of life though people are taking photos close to my office in downtown Toronto all the time. I know i'm in the photo and that the photo is most likely getting posted but I can't control this. I do not think it is right, because you do not have control, in Annas case she did allow her sister to post the photos so she was well aware. I find this topic tricky to address when it comes to intellectual property because I do believe in remixes of music and movies so its hard to play both side of the coin. This topic is obviously extremely relevant to the topics we covered in our intellectual property readings.

Module 6: Discussion Question 1:

Cocking and Matthews describe three different accounts of friendships. Which, if any, do you think is the correct one? Which do you think best accurately describes your friendships? Why?

I think all three of the accounts of friendship are accurate and one does not especially stand out for me. I have friends that are very similar to me in that they are interested in sports, and are very outgoing and social. Conversley I also have friendships with people who are more shy and withdrawn, and with these people I can become very protective if someone makes fun of their withdrawn behaviors. With friends that I will describe as close friends I have very trusting relationships and will share things with them that I may not share with others. So I guess you could say that there are different types and levels of friendships, but one is not really more important than another from my perspective because life is so much more interesting with all types of friendships.

I to agree with David, all three accounts of friendship in which Cocking and Matthews describe in the article do not stand out more than the other. The personalities among each of my friends vary significantly from happy go lucky to shy and withdrawn. However, in terms of what information I

share with each of my friends also varies. I feel more comfortable sharing specific things with different friends. For example, some of my friends have children and some don't. For my friends who do have children I find we tend to talk about the things that relate to our kids such as events taking place at their schools, sales on kids clothing, organization techniques to help make life easier within the home, etc. As for my friends who do not have children, we talk about things that relate more to ourselves such as our personal interests, shopping, relationships, jobs, etc.

Module 6: Discussion Question 2:

Do you think it's often difficult to be sincere in real life, the way Briggie and Emerson seem to think? Why or why not?

I believe the feeling of sincerity to also be of a situational matter. I definitely feel as though it's easy to be sincere towards those who are close to me however, I have also felt the same towards complete strangers because for some reason they just touched my heart. I personally struggle with being sincere to others over the Internet. Emailing, texting, social media, all those things can be misinterpreted quite easily. Because of this, I proof read everything multiple times before clicking on the send icon. I'm very cautious about the things in which I send via email, text, etc., I don't want my recipients to think that I'm coming across as strong or that I'm being rude in any way. I'm very sensitive towards things like that because I have interpreted many emails and text messages the wrong way and so I'm careful to not do that to others.

Module 6: Discussion Question 3:

Do you think you can be friends with someone you've only interacted through the internet? Both articles confine themselves to thinking about internet friends through text-based correspondence alone. Now that many non-text based forms of interacting exist – Instagram, Snapchat, etc – do you think that has made it easier or harder to form real friendships entirely over the internet?

Yes Catherine, I think you make a good point as well. I believe you can only become online friends with someone to a certain degree. In the digital world, the sincerity is just not the same in comparison to a face-to-face friendship. I don't necessarily think it's impossible to be sincere online, but I do think it can be hard to achieve at times. Not to mention it can also become extremely exhausting when it comes to watching your p's and q's, especially if you have a lot of people in which you communicate with online. I personally stress over everything, and so of course sending a simple email can sometimes take me an hour to send because I proof read it a dozen times before sending it out. I think it's important to ensure you're not coming across as being rude or heartless because it is very easy to misinterpret the meaning of a text or email.

I am not sure about exclusively sustaining a friendship with someone on the internet without some sort of offline connection. For example, perhaps if the person in question was a friend of a friend, that you'd been put in touch with, and online was the only means of communication, then yes, it's possible. However, I would expect that this should or could lead to an in-person meeting. What I don't understand about either Cocking and Matthews or Briggie's articles is the black and white approach that you have either one kind of friendship or the other. I think that friendships online are intended to evolve to an in-person meeting, at least that's my expectation. Alternatively, an offline friendship may morph into a primarily online friendship based on distance if someone were to move or just being really busy to the point where you aren't connecting physically. I think in any case, you aren't strictly friends with someone in one aspect. You are connected in a variety of ways so that the ability to present only one aspect of yourself is impossible whether online or off. For example, someone you are friends with online, likely has access to the same Facebook or Instagram accounts

as your offline friends. So both online and offline friends are seeing you in the same mediums despite that your primary communication vehicle may be different.

Module 6: Discussion Question 4:

Do you think there's anything wrong with playing violent video games? Are some worse than others? Why?

I agree, I have never played violent video games before myself. I try not to judge those who do, but at times I do wonder the purpose behind playing such games. Ultimately however, I believe playing violent games is a personal choice and for the most part, anyone I have ever encountered that does engage in playing these types of games generally engage in them purely for the entertainment. I do agree however, that for some individuals, playing these types of games will lead to the desensitizing of attitudes and behaviours, particularly among those who are younger in age. Overall though, I do not see a huge issue with these types of games as long as the individual playing them maintains an appropriate level of behaviour!

Module 6: Discussion Question 5:

McCormick mentions playing violent video games over the internet has a particular set of problems, due to the abusive, demeaning, and disrespectful comments to each other. As someone who is not a gamer, I want to know: how prevalent is this? How bad and dangerous do you think it is? And why?