

Behlul Vardal
ENG1121
04/16/2021
Word count: 1405

Annotated bibliography: Ethics on Technological business practices

Entry:

What are the effects of immoral business practices in tech companies? Once upon a time there was a kid with dreams. A kid with dreams to make things. That kid learned a lot from current technology and a repeating habit that these companies have. Witnessing anti-consumer, anti-competitive, anti-repairability, anti-mind. A question appears looking at this situation, what are the effects of immoral business practices in tech companies? I don't expect to be shocked by what I find, I already know a lot but I do expect to find proof from reliable sources.

Citation 1:

Jerri-Lynn Scofield. "Apple Reverses Course on Right to Repair iPhones: More Concessions to Follow?". Newstex Blogs Naked Capitalism, November 18, 2021 Thursday. advance-lexis-com.citytech.ezproxy.cuny.edu/api/document?collection=news&id=urn:contentItem:643Y-W5H1-JCMN-Y0PH-00000-00&context=1516831. Accessed April 4, 2022.

Summary :

In the article "Apple Reverses Course on Right to Repair iPhones: More Concessions to Follow?" The author Jerri-Lynn Scotfield talks about what apple's response has been to the right to repair movement and act. They have been pressured by activist board members to comply. However it seems that Apple didn't want to do so and made their "solution" ineffective. The author introduces a video cameo by Steve Wozniak, the co-founder of Apple, talking about the right to repair. This is probably one of the most important points to make. The co-Founder of Apple supports the right to repair. Steve Wozniak even mentions that he got into tech with radio repairs. He also mentions that even the apple 2 mac was modular and apple shipped it with Schematics. Steve Wozniak says it was open source and that was one of the main reasons Apple succeeded for 10 years. The main idea of the article was about Apple's control over device repairability and the executive order for Apple to start making their product repairable again.

Reflection :

I agree with the author. I would believe that Apple would do this. . In my opinion, stopping repairability and not open sourcing a product stops art and creativity. It is not a fair business practice. I think overall the author had pretty effective writing because when reading it didn't feel like the author tried to make you click the article for attention. It felt like it was a serious issue because the author laid out all the details about Apple. However I think if this was the first article I read about the right to repair I might want to look up what the right to repair is because it really focuses on Apple and the right to repair isn't just about Apple. It's about all companies following the right to repair. This does help me alot with my research question: What are the effects of immoral business practices in tech companies? It touches on a key issue when Steve Wozniak discusses the right to repair. Which is art. Steve Wozniak uses the words “modifiable” and “extendable” when he describes the apple 2. He describes being able to repair as “Very motivating for creative minds”. I agree with those words, I agree that being able to modify something and make something new is motivating for creative minds.

Quote:

“The shareholder fight that forced Apple's hand on repair rights[14]:
But Apple didn't change its policy out of the goodness of its heart. The announcement follows months of growing pressure from repair activists and regulators — and its timing seems deliberate, considering a shareholder resolution[15] environmental advocates filed with the company in September asking Apple to re-evaluate its stance on independent repair
Apple Reverses Course on Right to Repair iPhones: More Concessions to Follow?”

Citation 2:

"Senate bill targeting Apple, Google monopolies passes committee vote". Big News Network.com, February 6, 2022 Sunday.
advance-lexis-com.citytech.ezproxy.cuny.edu/api/document?collection=news&id=urn:contentItem:m:64R2-9DY1-JDJN-61S5-00000-00&context=1516831. Accessed April 4, 2022.

Summary :

Main point of this article is about the American Innovation and Choice Online Act, and The Open App Markets Act that the senate is passing. The Most important point is that companies like Apple and Google are monopolizing because they are the only online app stores that people can download apps from on mobile devices. It also talks about the huge commission these stores get from purchases made. They use the evidence by showing how Apple and Google have responded. What the two companies statements have been and how the senate is acting.

Reflection:

I agree with this article, Google and Apple have become a monopoly. If a company tries to push their own operating system they can't because they will need an app store and these companies won't allow use of their app stores outside of their os. So people are either stuck with an android or an iphone. Google owns android, you can't escape them and the worst part of it is that there is no alternative. The excuse that Apple and Google give that sideloading is a security risk, and it is complete rubbish. We download software from the internet on desktop computers all the time. There are no issues with it, it's wonderful and I love doing it. I believe there needs to be more freedom on our devices.

Quote:

“In a letter to Senate Judiciary Committee members ahead of the vote, Apple senior government affairs director Timothy Powderly wrote, "The Open App Markets Act includes provisions that explicitly mandate alternative app stores and 'sideloading,' or the direct installation of software from the internet in a way that circumvents the privacy and security protections Apple has designed. These provisions would allow malware, scams, and data-exploitation to proliferate for the first time on Apple's secure platform." Senate bill targeting Apple, Google monopolies passes committee vote”

Citation 3:

Tim Schiesser. "Nvidia gets anti-competitive with unsavory GeForce Partner Program". TechSpot, March 12, 2018 Monday.
advance.lexis.com/api/document?collection=news&id=urn:contentItem:5RVJ-6931-JCMN-Y3GN-00000-00&context=1516831. Accessed April 4, 2022.

Tim Schiesser. "Nvidia gets anti-competitive with unsavory GeForce Partner Program". TechSpot, March 12, 2018 Monday.
advance-lexis-com.citytech.ezproxy.cuny.edu/api/document?collection=news&id=urn:contentItem:5RVJ-6931-JCMN-Y3GN-00000-00&context=1516831. Accessed April 17, 2022.

Summary:

The author talks about how Nvidia tried to cripple amd as competition when it is a dominant holder in the GPU market. The most important point was Nvidia's geforce partner program threatened AIB partners to exclusively use Nvidia's cards over AMD's graphic cards. Saying if they don't join the partner program the AIB's will have issues and partners will be prioritized. The main idea in the article was that Nvidia's actions are bad for the consumer. The author also said that Nvidia is Anti-consumer and Anti-competitive.

Reflection:

I think the main issue was that Nvidia was getting too much control over the geforce partner program. This might be really bad for amd who is the only other competitor in the market but what about the consumer? There are only two companies in the market and the more dominant one just destroys the other when they get close to getting more market share. We need more options in the GPU market or the prices will always be high.

Quote:

“While investigating the GPP, Kyle Bennett from HardOCP spoke with seven companies, none of which wanted to go on the record. However they did speak anonymously about the GPP, and, according to Bennett, all the people he spoke to had similar opinions about the program. Bennett summarizes[5] the opinions as follows: The terms of the GPP agreement are potentially illegal The GPP will hurt consumer choices The GPP will hurt a partner's ability to do business with other companies like AMD and Intel These opinions stem from a key component of the GPP agreement document, which Bennett read but decided not to publish Nvidia gets anti-competitive with unsavory GeForce Partner Program”

Conclusion:

I found a lot of interesting facts in my research and all help answer my question. I wasn't surprised by anything since I have closely followed this market since I was 12 years old. What I found is important because it shows a lot of truth in what companies do. I think people who purchase phones, laptops and computers need to know about this because those will be the people who are affected. Especially people who are into technology like PC building and anyone who enjoys consumer hardware.