I will be analyzing this piece- The Code I’m Still Ashamed of, author Bill Sourour, published on FreeCodeCamp.com on 16 November 2016 and available at www.freecodecamp.org/news/the-code-im-still-ashamed-of-b8f502511f00/. The article commences with the hook: ‘If you’re a coder, you will be asked to write malicious code someday.’ It elaborates, ‘It happened to me in 2000 when I landed a job in Toronto, Canada. Not much prescription drug advertising is allowed in Canada, like in the US. Instead, they normally create websites and provide general information about certain symptoms. If the searcher has similar symptoms, they can show the viewer their prescription drug in specifics. My team was contracted on the site. The site was almost ready. Then, we asked: what are the conditions of the quiz? Management asked questions about the criteria of the client and received them.’ They’ve finished the site and the quizzes with the last key; he continues: ‘My associate tried the website, and guess what? The quiz was always rigged to give the client’s drug as the answer.’ Why, we asked? Shrug from us because it was given to us as an exercise. That day, my boss handed me the press brief about how the client’s drug could lead to a suicidal feeling; this was the worst they expected resulting from taking that drug, and a user committed suicide. After reading that article, I came to realize that I invested a great deal of my time writing articles that encourage codes to continue with their careers, and here he was writing about his suicidal ideation (right to the point). The article elaborates: So, from then on, I hold all my possibilities on the other side of life as I write this article on 8 March 2021. And from now on, whenever I am writing code, I will imagine all the possible worst outcomes of that work I do down to the next year sometime. In this Case Analysis, I will argue that the ethical tool – deontology/Kantianism – will show that the code caused harm. Sourour should have done otherwise because he had the opportunity to act differently. His moral responsibility was to act responsibly, which could have prevented some consequences.

In this stage of my analysis, within the medicine, engineering, and accounting article. (The researcher's name is Merry Beth Armstrong.). They are delving into an article to compare medicine, engineering, and accounting. All this study did was compare the three disciplines, drawing attention to the confidentiality of all three professions and the later violations caused by challenges in disclosing confidential information in their respective communities. This article explained that the engineers ethically valued originally their employers. However, this concept was highly considered later. Rather, it denotes public safety as a matter of importance. In the following paragraphs, it’s for you will examine the concepts above about the main articles.

The first thing you learn from the article is that protecting and serving your employer is important. Returning to the Sourour case, he was willing to do the job beyond the call of duty. After he received that problematic quiz requirement from his employer, he continued coding the website as this was all easy money and something he thought he could do in his sleep. He chalked everything up to the way of the job. And he certainly did not report his client until he heard that the side effects could be severe. From the Kantian perspective, the concept and our actions are wrong. Why? Because they are myopic. They zoom in on the few, whereas we are addressing a society – and individuals must always be given respect. This is bad: there is a good reason to think about the well-being of society and its members if you are the person manufacturing the drugs. It is the business’s responsibility to have good intentions, not just the client’s or the doctor’s – intentionality that employers and employees are obliged to care about. This commission was for the client and Sourour, but it was a means to an end for the rest, so the concept was later revised. An engineer should value the well-being and safety of the public before his employer or clients, which brings us to the next section.

Another of the article's fundamental ideas was dissent – how an engineer must speak up in case certain issues that could put the public at risk were overlooked. For example, the paper suggests that, first, an engineer must speak to their superior about the issue. If the superior ignores the problem, then it would be acceptable for the engineer to overstep and talk to management about the issue. Let’s consider this when examining the Sourour case. From what we see in the main article, we can highlight that he never went to his team or even spoke with the team about the damages the website could potentially have. The main article points out that Sourour only stepped down from the team. From a moral standpoint, this was wrong on his part. For instance, when he was asked to be at the celebratory dinner with the rest of the team after news of the victim first came about, he should have spoken to the client and made them aware of the issue. Although classified, it would seem to fit the case in the article, and this was a legitimate way for him to break confidentiality. From a Kantian perspective, we can judge this as wrong by an infringement of respect for persons – for a Kantian, respecting a person is their foremost moral consideration. He did not say anything to co-workers and later resigned from the team. The trusting users who relied on the site to enable them to help themselves were disrespected.

I will include a brief on the IEEE Code of Ethics in this analysis portion. The IEEE Board wrote this code of Directors, which its members have approved amid assistance from case discussions and industry panels. The code of ethics is a guideline that can help members realize which decisions are right or wrong in their affiliations or business pursuits.

The IEEE is one of the many associations that set up these standards in aid of the particular career or the workforce engaged professionally in definite practices or jobs to assist them, and the individuals establish themselves or follow the path towards success in the field they are involved in. These standards are set up by professionals who have possessed themselves by providing directions for the behavior in a well-kept book, which is discussed several times before people can adopt the codes. The IEEE has established ten codes that outline a set of moral principles. However, for this analysis, we will focus on code number one. Code One emphasizes prioritizing public safety, health, and welfare. It also emphasizes the need to adhere to ethical design and sustainable development practices, protect the privacy of others, and promptly disclose any factors that may threaten the public or the environment. In the context of the case, we see that Sourour's behavior was indeed an insult to that guideline. Sourour is the person who was supposed to make sure that his code didn’t endanger the safety of the people, but it indeed did end up taking people's lives. This code also means that professionals should do their best to design ethically. Sourour’s quiz had deceived the public into thinking only a single drug could help them. Sourour had just received the quiz requirements; from that moment, he ought to envisage the ethical design of the code. Looking through the eye of the Kantian adherent, we see that Kantians believe if the actions of man cannot be willed as a universal law, then they are not moral. Thus, if we look at Sourour’s decision, we see that he was wrong. This is because a Kantian sees men’s decisions as only an act to better the individual's act. If we all acted in this manner, the universal outcome would be the anti-pursuit of the purpose.

Looking at number four in the code of ethics, avoid illegality in professional activity and unethical behavior – for example, not accepting bribes. It turns out that Canada’s regulations were iron-fisted around advertising prescription drugs. This behavior might not have been illegal, but it was sketchy. When Sourour found out what quiz questions they were putting together, she told me: ‘All of the questions should lead to the same prescription drug.’ A coworker took the test and realized it was ‘always one prescription.’ At that point, Kantians would argue that they should have questioned the legitimacy of the website they coded. Looking back at this scenario again through the lens of a Kantian was a moral slip – these users were viewed as a means to an end. Since the code never gave users real results, this situation is wrong from a Kantian perspective.

Overall, based on the situation, I have concluded that Sourour’s actions are, in fact, unethical for doing nothing and even for the damage he had done to public relations. While he had the power and reason to speak up about the problem, unjustified actions were taken. Based on the IEEE’s guidelines and other ethical codes, he did not speak, act, or act in the proper manner of professionalism that an ethical worker should have. A rebuttal for my argument would be that Sourour is just doing his job. By referencing the story, he did perform what was exactly asked of him. However, he later received news of the danger and still did nothing. As an employee, based on the project, Sourour should had more moral intuition instead of doing nothing. Secondly, there were also many opportunities where he could have taken the initiative to prevent more damage. Lastly, I also believe that Sourour could have been better informed of the company he was originally going to create the site. Based on the story, it was a Canadian-based project, and the online prescription laws are extremely strict. The rules must have been put into place for a reason, and this exact case is clearly why the rules are set in place.