

PHIL 164 - Technology & Human Values

Summer I - Tuesdays and Thursdays 11:00 AM to 1:50 PM in Center Hall 205

Instructor: Danny Weltman

dweltman@ucsd.edu | Office Hours: 2 to 3 PM Tuesdays + Thursdays at Mandeville Coffee Cart

Teaching Assistant: Michael Pittman

mpittman@ucsd.edu | Office Hours: 10 to 11 AM Tuesdays in H&SS 7055

About This Course

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

Each week after the first week has two possible topics. As a class, we will choose which topic to focus on each 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 TED page. Each week has one or two mandatory readings, plus a list of additional readings from which you should choose at least one article to read in addition to the mandatory reading. **Please bring the readings to class each day**, 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 1/3rd of a letter grade for each day that it is late. 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 one 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 argument**, or a **critique of the 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 argument** or **critiques of the argument**. You may use your discussion posts as a basis for your answers on the final exam. The exam is due August 1st at 3:00 PM via email or in class but you can turn in any or all of its four parts early - they will be graded and returned within 3 days.

Class Participation (15% of your grade) is required. This includes attendance, listening respectfully to me and to your fellow students when we talk, and offering thoughtful questions and contributions to the discussion. Texting, browsing the Internet, coming in late, not showing up at all, 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 1st at 3:00 PM)

15% - Class Participation

OSD Information

Students requesting accommodations for this course due to a disability must provide a current 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 in advance so that accommodations may be arranged.

Contact the OSD for further information:

858.534.4382 (phone) | osd@ucsd.edu (email) | <http://disabilities.ucsd.edu> (website)

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*.

PHIL 164 - Schedule and List of Potential Readings

Week 1 - Introduction and Pet Cloning! (June 30 + July 2)

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, on Thursday, we will turn to our first topic, pet cloning. A discussion post is due by midnight on Wednesday, July 1.

Required Reading (July 2):

Fiester, Autumn. "Creating Fido's Twin: Can Pet Cloning Be Ethically Justified?"
Hastings Center Report 35.4 (2005): 34-39.

Week 2 - Robots Robots Robots Robots Robots Robots! (July 7 + July 9)

Could a machine ever *think* or *feel* like we can? Or will this only ever be an illusion? Could you transfer your mind to a computer so that you could live even after your body dies? Your first discussion post for this topic is due by midnight on Wednesday, July 8. The second post is due by midnight on Monday, July 13.

Topic #1: Could robots think and feel?

Required Reading (July 7):

Searle, John R. "Minds, Brains, and Programs." *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 3.03 (1980): 417-424.

Secondary Readings (Choose one for July 7):

Churchland, Paul M., and Patricia Smith Churchland. "Could a Machine Think?" *Scientific American* (January 1990): 32-37.

Boden, Margaret. "Escaping from the Chinese Room." in *The Philosophy of Artificial Intelligence* (1990): 89-104.

Tanaka, Koji. "Minds, Programs, and Chinese Philosophers: A Chinese Perspective on the Chinese Room." *Sophia* 43.1 (2004): 61-72.

Ben-Yami, Hannech. "A Note on the Chinese Room." *Synthese* 95.2 (1993): 169-172.

Topic #2: Could we upload ourselves to a computer?

Required Reading (July 7):

Chalmers, David J. "Uploading: A Philosophical Analysis." in *Intelligence Unbound: The Future of Uploaded and Machine Minds* (2014): 102-118.

Secondary Readings (Choose one for July 7):

Pigliucci, Massimo. "Mind Uploading: A Philosophical Counter-Analysis." in *Intelligence Unbound: The Future of Uploaded and Machine Minds* (2014): 119-130.

Corabi, Joseph and Susan Schneider. "If You Upload, Will You Survive?" in *Intelligence Unbound: The Future of Uploaded and Machine Minds* (2014): 131-145.

Walker, Mark. "Uploading and Personal Identity." in *Intelligence Unbound: The Future of Uploaded and Machine Minds* (2014): 161-177.

Wellington, Naomi. "Whole Brain Emulation: Invasive vs. Non-Invasive Methods." in *Intelligence Unbound: The Future of Uploaded and Machine Minds* (2014): 178-192.

Olson, Nicole. "The Values and Directions of Uploaded Minds." in *Intelligence Unbound: The Future of Uploaded and Machine Minds* (2014): 212-221.

Week 3 - Human Enhancement and Ethics! (July 14 + July 16)

Have you ever seen the movie *Gattaca*? It's about a society which discriminates against people who aren't genetically enhanced. Should we enhance ourselves? Or might this lead to bad results? Your first discussion post for this topic is due by midnight Wednesday, July 15. The second post is due by midnight Monday, July 20.

Topic #1: Should we enhance ourselves?

Required Reading (July 14):

Kamm, Frances M. "Is There a Problem with Enhancement?" *The American Journal of Bioethics* 5.3 (2005): 5-14.

and

Kamm, Frances M. "Response to Commentators on 'What's Wrong with Enhancement?'" *The American Journal of Bioethics* 5.3 (2005): W4-W9.
Focus on just the section relevant to the secondary reading you pick.

Secondary Readings (Choose one for July 14):

Miller, Franklin and Howard Brody. "Enhancement Technologies and Professional Integrity." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 5.3 (2005): 15-17.

- Schwartz, Peter. "Defending the Distinction Between Treatment and Enhancement." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 5.3 (2005): 17-19.
- Ashcroft, Richard and Karen Gui. "Ethics and World Pictures in Kamm on Enhancement." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 5.3 (2005): 19-20.
- Coors, Marilyn and Lawrence Hunter. "Evaluation of Genetic Enhancement: Will Human Wisdom Properly Acknowledge the Value of Evolution?" *The American Journal of Bioethics* 5.3 (2005): 21-22.
- Liao, S. Matthew. "Are 'Ex Ante' Enhancements Always Permissible?" *The American Journal of Bioethics* 5.3 (2005): 23-25.
- Martin, Adrienne and Jehanna Peerzada. "The Expressive Meaning of Enhancement." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 5.3 (2005): 25-27.
- Robert, Jason Scott. "Human Dispossession and Human Enhancement." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 5.3 (2005): 27-29.
- Strong, Carson. "Lost in Translation: Religious Arguments Made Secular." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 5.3 (2005): 29-31.
- Trachtman, Howard. "A Man is a Man is a Man." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 5.3 (2005): 31-33.

Topic #2: Should we only have female babies?

Required Reading (July 14):

Casal, Paula. "Sexual Dimorphism and Human Enhancement." *Journal of Medical Ethics* 39.12 (2013): 722-728.

and

Casal, Paula. "Reform, not Destroy: Reply to McMahan, Sparrow and Temkin." *Journal of Medical Ethics* 39.12 (2013): 741-742.

Focus on just the section relevant to the secondary reading you picked.

Secondary Readings (Choose one for July 14):

Temkin, Larry. "What's Wrong with Enhancements?" *Journal of Medical Ethics* 39.12 (2013): 729-731.

Sparrow, Robert. "Sexism and Human Enhancement." *Journal Of Medical Ethics* 39.12 (2013): 732-735.

McMahan, Jeff. "Genetic Modification of Characteristic Masculine Traits: Enhancement or Deformity?" *Journal of Medical Ethics* 39.12 (2013): 736-740.

Week 4 - Changing Ourselves with Medication! (July 21 + July 23)

Should we take pills to erase our traumatic memories? Should we give our children ADHD medicine, even though this changes their personalities? Your first discussion post for this topic is due by midnight Wednesday, July 22. The second post is due by midnight Monday, July 27.

Topic #1: Taking drugs to erase traumatic memories

Required Reading (July 21):

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?" *The American Journal of Bioethics* 7.9 (2007): 12-20.

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?”" *The American Journal of Bioethics* 7.9 (2007): W1-W3.

Focus on just the section relevant to the secondary reading you picked.

Secondary Readings (Choose one for July 21):

Hall, Wayne and Adrian Carter. "Debunking Alarmist Objections to the Pharmacological Prevention of PTSD." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 7.9 (2007): 23-25.

Kolber, Adam. "Clarifying the Debate Over Therapeutic Forgetting." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 7.9 (2007): 25-27.

Rosenberg, Leah. "Necessary Forgetting: On the Use of Propranolol in Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Management." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 7.9 (2007): 27-28.

Bell, Jennifer. "Preventing Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder or Pathologizing Bad Memories?" *The American Journal of Bioethics* 7.9 (2007): 29-30.

Craigie, Jillian. "Propranolol, Cognitive Biases, and Practical Decision-Making." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 7.9 (2007): 31-32.

Kabasenche, William. "Emotions, Memory Suppression, and Identity." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 7.9 (2007): 33-34.

Hurley, Elisa. "The Moral Costs of Prophylactic Propranolol." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 7.9 (2007): 35-36.

Liao, S. Matthew and David Wasserman. "Neuroethical Concerns about Moderating Traumatic Memories." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 7.9 (2007): 38-40.

Tenenbaum, Evelyn and Brian Reese. "Memory-Altering Drugs: Shifting the Paradigm of Informed Consent." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 7.9 (2007): 40-42.

Sade, Robert. "On Moralizing and Hidden Agendas: The Pot and the Kettle in Political Bioethics." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 7.9 (2007): 42-43.

Topic #2: Giving ADHD medicine to children

Required Reading (July 21):

Singh, Ilina. "Will the "Real Boy" Please Behave: Dosing Dilemmas for Parents of Boys with ADHD." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 5.3 (2005): 34-47.

and

Singh, Ilina. "Response to Commentators on "Will the 'Real Boy' Please Behave: Dosing Dilemmas for Parents of Boys with ADHD". " *The American Journal of Bioethics* 5.3 (2005): W10-W12.

Focus on just the section relevant to the secondary reading you picked.

Secondary Readings (Choose one for July 21):

Appelbaum, Paul. "Psychopharmacology and the Power of Narrative." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 5.3 (2005): 48-49.

Hoffmaster, Barry. "'Real' Ethics for 'Real' Boys: Context and Narrative in Bioethics." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 5.3 (2005): 50-51.

Krautkramer, Christian. "Beyond Creativity: ADHD Drug Therapy as a Moral Damper on a Child's Future Success." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 5.3 (2005): 52-53.

Newson, Ainsley and Richard Ashcroft. "Whither Authenticity?" *The American Journal of Bioethics* 5.3 (2005): 53-55.

Griggins, Cynthia. "Dosing Dilemmas: Are You Rich and White or Poor and Black?" *The American Journal of Bioethics* 5.3 (2005): 55-57.

White, Gladys. "Splitting the Self: The Not-So-Subtle Consequences of Medicating Boys for ADHD." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 5.3 (2005): 57-59.

Hall, Amy Laura. "Welcome to Ordinary? Marketing Better Boys." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 5.3 (2005): 59-60.

Hughes, James. "Beyond "Real Boys" and Back to Parental Obligations." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 5.3 (2005): 61-62.

Kramer, Peter. "Real Impairments, Real Treatments." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 5.3 (2005): 62-63.

Litton, Paul. "ADHD, Values, and the Self." *The American Journal of Bioethics* 5.3 (2005): 65-67.

Week 5 - Do Science and Technology Have Any Values? (July 28 + July 30)

Do value judgments have any place in science? Can technology itself be good or bad? Your first discussion post for this topic is due by midnight Wednesday, July 29. The second post is due by **midnight Friday, July 31. Note that it is due earlier than normal!**

Topic #1: Do value judgments have any place in science?

Required Reading (July 28):

Anderson, Elizabeth. "Uses of Value Judgments in Science: A General Argument, with Lessons from a Case Study of Feminist Research on Divorce." *Hypatia* 19.1 (2004): 1-24.

Secondary Readings (Choose one for July 28):

Intemann, Kristen. "Feminism, Underdetermination, and Values in Science." *Philosophy of Science* 72.5 (2005): 1001-1012.

Brown, Matthew J. "Values in Science beyond Underdetermination and Inductive Risk." *Philosophy of Science* 80.5 (2013): 829-839.

Topic #2: Can technology be good or bad? Or does this depend on how we use it?

Required Reading (July 28):

Winner, Langdon. "Do Artifacts Have Politics?" *Daedalus* 109.1 (1980): 121-136.

Secondary Readings (Choose one for July 28):

Morrow, David R. "When Technologies Makes Good People Do Bad Things: Another Argument Against the Value-Neutrality of Technologies." *Science and Engineering Ethics* 20.2 (2014): 329-343.

Koepsell, David. "On Genies and Bottles: Scientists' Moral Responsibility and Dangerous Technology R&D." *Science and Engineering Ethics* 16.1 (2010): 119-133.