

James, I appreciate your informative and well-structured post that covers various perspectives on the topic. As from your post, (ACM, N.D.), (Consumer and Governmental Affairs, 2019), there is a clear description on how Blocker Plus violated numerous principles and also the impacts it had on legal, social issues and Professionalism of computing professionals.

Moreover, by opting to disable the accounts of activist groups while keeping the existing model intact, Blocker Plus's management not only failed to unblock topics outside the scope of The Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA) (ACM, N.D.), but also exacerbated the issue. Their decision could have resulted to potential impacts whereby students may argue that their protected expression is being censored by the software filters thus leading to a valid First Amendment claim (McCarthy, 2004).

Additionally, over censoring of topics that are not under CIPA, especially in public libraries, could potentially lead to discriminatory legal arguments. For example: a case in Oregon demonstrated how website blocking widened the “digital divide” between the rich, who can have unrestricted access to desired websites at home, and the poor, who are dependable to Internet access at their local libraries (Menuet, 2009). This further violates principle 1.4, BSC: public interest (Trustee Board, 2022) and (ACM Code 2018 Task Force, 2018).

I share your point of view regarding Blocker Plus's unethical behavior and their failure to disclose their mishaps. They violated numerous principles and laws, and knowingly did not take the necessary actions to fix them nor did they disclose the issue to the public (of which this leads to more laws and principles like 2.7, 4.1, etc., been violated (ACM Code 2018 Task Force, 2018)).

References

ACM Code 2018 Task Force, 2018. *ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct*. [Online]

Available at: <https://www.acm.org/code-of-ethics>

[Accessed 21 June 2023].

ACM, 2018. *ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct*. [Online]

Available at: <https://www.acm.org/code-of-ethics/case-studies>

[Accessed 21 June 2023].

ACM, N.D.. *Case: Malicious Inputs to Content Filters*. [Online]

Available at: <https://ethics.acm.org/code-of-ethics/using-the-code/case-malicious-inputs-to-content-filters/>

[Accessed 29 June 2023].

Consumer and Governmental Affairs, 2019. *Children's Internet Protection Act (CIPA)*. [Online]

Available at: <https://www.fcc.gov/consumers/guides/childrens-internet-protection-act>

[Accessed 29 June 2023].

McCarthy, M. M., 2004. *Filtering the Internet: The Children's Internet Protection Act*. [Online]

Available at: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ684636.pdf>

[Accessed 29 June 2023].

Menuey, B. P., 2009. CIPA: A Brief History, Computers in the Schools. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Practice, Theory, and Applied Research*, 26(1), pp. 40-47.

Trustee Board, 2022. *COde of Conduct for BCS Members*. [Online]

Available at: <https://www.bcs.org/media/2211/bcs-code-of-conduct.pdf>

[Accessed 21 June 2023].