PHIL 164 – Technology and Human Values

Summer I - Tuesdays and Thursdays 11:00 AM to 1:50 PM in Sequoyah 147

Instructor: Danny Weltman

dweltman@ucsd.edu | Office Hours: 2 to 3 PM Thursdays in H&SS 7054 and by appointment

Teaching Assistant: Shawn Wang

tiw159@ucsd.edu | Office Hours: by appointment

About This Course: Topic and Goals

In this course, we will be investigating philosophical questions that involve *technology* and the way it involves *human values*. These include issues as varied as genetic modification, whether robots could ever truly think, and whether certain technologies are themselves evil.

Below are the **goals** for this course. Our class sessions and homework are designed not just to help you learn about philosophy, but also for you to learn how to:

- Identify a philosopher's argument and summarize it in your own words
- Generate questions about, extensions of, and objections to the argument
- Reflect on, refine, and articulate your own views on the various topics we address

Course Content

As a class, we will choose which topic to focus on each week after the first week. I have put all the possible readings on a separate sheet so that the syllabus is not huge. When we pick the topics we will examine, I will give you a new sheet that is updated with just the articles we will read. All readings are available on the course TritonEd page. Each week has one or more primary readings, all of which you should read by Tuesday, plus a list of additional readings from which you should choose at least one article to read in addition to the primary readings. *Please* <u>bring the readings to class each day</u>, either printed out or in *easily accessible* electronic form.

Assignments and Grading

There are three kinds of assignments in this class: **weekly reading quizzes**, **weekly discussion posts**, and the **final take-home exam**. Late quizzes or posts will not be accepted except in case of emergency. (Computer issues are not an emergency.) The final will lose 8 points (out of 200) if turned in late, plus another 8 points for every additional 24 hours it is late, unless parts have been turned in early, in which case it will lose 6 points (if one part has been turned in), 4 points (if two have been turned in) or 2 points (if three have been turned in). Turning in a final exam is required in order to pass the course.

Weekly Reading Quizzes (5% of your grade) are to help you focus on the important parts of the reading and to get instant feedback on whether you have understood the reading. Quizzes are due midnight on Monday (except week one). There is one quiz per week, for a total of five quizzes.

Weekly Discussion Posts (40% of your grade) are your opportunity to get practice writing concisely about philosophy. There are two weekly discussion posts due on the TED discussion board for that week. One is due by midnight Wednesday and the other is due by midnight next Monday.

The first post must be 500 words or less, and it should summarize a point from one of the readings, then offer a **question**, an **extension of the idea or argument**, or a **critique of the idea or argument**. The one due the *next*

Monday is 250 words or less, and it should be a comment on someone else's post, offering an **answer to their question**, **your own question**, an **extension** to their post, or a **critique** of their post.

There are nine weekly discussion posts due: one for week 1, and two for weeks 2-5. Posts are graded no credit/half credit/full credit and your lowest score will be dropped. Posts that exceed the word limit will earn half credit at most.

The **Take-Home Final Exam** (40% of your grade) will ask you to summarize points from four of the readings we have done, and then offer **extensions of the idea or argument** or **critiques of the idea or argument**. You may use your discussion posts as a basis for your answers on the final exam. The exam is divided into four parts, one part for each reading. Each part is graded out of 50 points. The exam is due August 5th at 2:30 PM via email or in class but you can turn in any or all of its four parts early.

Early final exam sections will be graded and returned within four days. If you turn in a part any time before the next Monday after the week of that topic, it will get an extra 5 points. So, to get an extra 5 points on part one, you would have to turn it in before July 17th. To get an extra 5 points on part two, you would have to turn it in before July 24th. To get an extra 5 points on part three, you would have to turn it in before July 31st.

Class Participation (15% of your grade) is required. This includes attendance, listening respectfully to me, the TA, and your fellow students, and offering thoughtful questions and contributions to the discussion. Texting, browsing the Internet, coming in late, not showing up, or otherwise ignoring people is not respectful and will reduce your participation grade.

Grade Breakdown:
  5% - Weekly Reading Quizzes (5 total)
  40% - Weekly Discussion Posts (9 total, lowest dropped)
  40% - Take-Home Final (due August 5th at 2:30 PM)
  15% - Class Participation

OSD Information
Students requesting accommodations for this course due to a disability must provide a <u>current</u> Authorization for Accommodation (AFA) letter issued by the Office for Students with Disabilities (OSD) which is located in University Center 202 behind Center Hall. Students are required to present their AFA letters to me and to the OSD Liaison in the department <u>in advance</u> so that accommodations may be arranged.

Contact the OSD for further information:

(858) 534-4382 | osd@ucsd.edu | http://disabilities.ucsd.edu

Plagiarism and Academic Integrity
Any time you use **words**, **phrases**, **ideas**, or **anything else** that you did not think up on your own, you must **cite** your source the best of your ability. Words and phrases from others must be enclosed in quotation marks to show that you did not write them yourself. Failure to cite a source is **plagiarism** and it's not okay. Plagiarism may result in a zero on the assignment and may be forwarded to the Academic Integrity office. You should not need to use (or cite) outside sources for this class. It is perfectly okay to use points made by your classmates in class or on the discussion boards, *as long as you cite them to the best of your ability.* The one exception is that you do not need to cite me in this class.

PHIL 164 - List of Potential Readings

Week 1 - Introduction and Pet Cloning! (July 6)
This week, we will talk about the class in general terms: what is technology? What are human values? How is class going to work? What are good methods for reading, evaluating, and writing philosophy? Then, we will turn to our first topic, pet cloning. A discussion post is due by midnight on Friday, July 7.

Primary Reading:
> Fiester, Autumn. "Creating Fido's Twin: Can Pet Cloning Be Ethically Justified?"

Potential Topics

Could robots think and feel?
> **Primary Reading:**
>> Searle, John R. "Minds, Brains, and Programs."
>
> **Secondary Readings:**
>> Churchland, Paul M., and Patricia Smith Churchland. "Could a Machine Think?"
>>
>> Boden, Margaret. "Escaping from the Chinese Room."
>>
>> Tanaka, Koji. "Minds, Programs, and Chinese Philosophers: A Chinese Perspective on the Chinese Room."
>>
>> Ben-Yami, Hannoch. "A Note on the Chinese Room."

Could we upload ourselves to a computer?
> **Primary Reading:**
>> Chalmers, David J. "Uploading: A Philosophical Analysis."
>
> **Secondary Readings:**
>> Pigliucci, Massimo. "Mind Uploading: A Philosophical Counter-Analysis."
>>
>> Corabi, Joseph and Susan Schneider. "If You Upload, Will You Survive?"
>>
>> Walker, Mark. "Uploading and Personal Identity."
>>
>> Wellington, Naomi. "Whole Brain Emulation: Invasive vs. Non-Invasive Methods."
>>
>> Olson, Nicole. "The Values and Directions of Uploaded Minds."

Should we enhance ourselves?
> **Primary Reading:**
>> Kamm, Frances M. "Is There a Problem with Enhancement?"
>>
>> *and*
>>
>> Kamm, Frances M. "Response to Commentators on 'What's Wrong with Enhancement?'"

Secondary Reading:

Miller, Franklin and Howard Brody. "Enhancement Technologies andProfessional Integrity."

Schwartz, Peter. "Defending the Distinction Between Treatment and Enhancement."

Ashcroft, Richard and Karen Gui. "Ethics and World Pictures in Kamm on Enhancement."

Coors, Marilyn and Lawrence Hunter. "Evaluation of Genetic Enhancement: Will Human Wisdom Properly Acknowledge the Value of Evolution?"

Liao, S. Matthew. "Are 'Ex Ante' Enhancements Always Permissible?"

Martin, Adrienne and Jehanna Peerzada. "The Expressive Meaning of Enhancement."

Robert, Jason Scott. "Human Dispossession and Human Enhancement."

Strong, Carson. "Lost in Translation: Religious Arguments Made Secular."

Trachtman, Howard. "A Man is a Man is a Man."

Taking drugs to erase traumatic memories

Primary Reading:

Henry, Michael, Jennifer Fishman, and Stuart Younger. "Propranolol and the Prevention of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder: Is it Wrong to Erase the "Sting" of Bad Memories?"

and

Henry, Michael, Jennifer Fishman, and Stuart Younger. "Response to Open Commentaries for "Propranolol and the Prevention of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder: Is It Wrong to Erase the 'Sting' of Bad Memories?""

Secondary Readings:

Hall, Wayne and Adrian Carter. "Debunking Alarmist Objections to the Pharmacological Prevention of PTSD."

Kolber, Adam. "Clarifying the Debate Over Therapeutic Forgetting."

Rosenberg, Leah. "Necessary Forgetting: On the Use of Propranolol in Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Management."

Bell, Jennifer. "Preventing Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder or Pathologizing Bad Memories?"

Craigie, Jillian. "Propranolol, Cognitive Biases, and Practical Decision-Making."

Kabasenche, William. "Emotions, Memory Suppression, and Identity."

Hurley, Elisa. "The Moral Costs of Prophylactic Propranolol."

Liao, S. Matthew and David Wasserman. "Neuroethical Concerns about Moderating Traumatic Memories."

Tenenbaum, Evelyn and Brian Reese. "Memory-Altering Drugs: Shifting the Paradigm of Informed Consent."

Sade, Robert. "On Moralizing and Hidden Agendas: The Pot and the Kettle in Political Bioethics."

Giving ADHD medicine to children
Primary Reading:

Singh, Ilina. "Will the "Real Boy" Please Behave: Dosing Dilemmas for Parents of Boys with ADHD."

and

Singh, Ilina. "Response to Commentators on "Will the 'Real Boy' Please Behave: Dosing Dilemmas for Parents of Boys with ADHD""

Secondary Readings:

Appelbaum, Paul. "Psychopharmacology and the Power of Narrative."

Hoffmaster, Barry. "'Real' Ethics for 'Real' Boys: Context and Narrative in Bioethics."

Krautkramer, Christian. "Beyond Creativity: ADHD Drug Therapy as a Moral Damper on a Child's Future Success."

Newson, Ainsley and Richard Ashcroft. "Whither Authenticity?"

Griggins, Cynthia. "Dosing Dilemmas: Are You Rich and White or Poor and Black?"

White, Gladys. "Splitting the Self: The Not-So-Subtle Consequences of Medicating Boys for ADHD."

Hall, Amy Laura. "Welcome to Ordinary? Marketing Better Boys."

Hughes, James. "Beyond "Real Boys" and Back to Parental Obligations."

Kramer, Peter. "Real Impairments, Real Treatments."

Litton, Paul. "ADHD, Values, and the Self."

Do value judgments have any place in science?
Primary Reading:

Anderson, Elizabeth. "Uses of Value Judgments in Science: A General Argument, with Lessons from a Case Study of Feminist Research on Divorce."

Secondary Readings:

Intemann, Kristen. "Feminism, Underdetermination, and Values in Science."

Brown, Matthew J. "Values in Science beyond Underdetermination and Inductive Risk."

Can technology be good or bad? Or does this depend on how we use it?
    Primary Reading:
        Winner, Langdon. "Do Artifacts Have Politics?"

    Secondary Readings:
        Morrow, David R. "When Technologies Makes Good People Do Bad Things: Another Argument Against the Value-Neutrality of Technologies."

        Koepsell, David. "On Genies and Bottles: Scientists' Moral Responsibility and Dangerous Technology R&D."

Deaf children and cochlear implants

    Required Reading:
        Lane, Harlan and Michael Grodin. "Ethical Issues in Cochlear Implant Surgery: An Exploration into Disease, Disability, and the Best Interests of the Child."

    Secondary Readings:
        Davis, Dena. "Cochlear Implants and the Claims of Culture? A Response to Lane and Grodin."

        Spriggs, M. "Lesbian Couple Create a Child Who is Deaf Like Them."

        Levy, N. "Deafness, Culture, and Choice."

        Anstey, K. W. "Are Attempts to Have Impaired Children Justifiable?"

The ethics of self-driving cars

    Required Reading:
        Lin, Patrick. "Why Ethics Matters for Autonomous Cars."

    Secondary Readings:
        Howard, Don. "The Moral Imperative of the Driverless Car."

        Bonnefon, Jean-François et al. "The Social Dilemma of Autonomous Vehicles."

        Hevelke, Alexander and Julian Nida-Rümelin. "Responsibility for Crashes of Autonomous Vehicles: An Ethical Analysis."

        Goodall, Noah. "Machine Ethics and Autonomous Vehicles."