

On p. 98 of *The Existential Pleasures of Engineering*, Samuel Florman writes the following, in response to anti-technologists and critics of engineering:

“Have you ever stopped to consider that those of us who are engineers relate to the world in ways that are not purely cerebral? Perhaps we live in closer touch with 'the natural continuum' than most people do, including most philosophers. Our lives are full of emotional experiences about which you know nothing' So do not seek to heal our wounds of psychic alienation until you have proof that we have suffered them. Perhaps we can teach you and your hip friends some thing about the good life.”

In this paper, you will take him up on this challenge.

You will:

- (1) **Describe** what you think makes for a good human life; you can place the bulk of your focus on either the life of the individual or more broadly social or collective institutions, but you should say at least something about both. **Clarity** will be most important for you in this regard.
- (2) **Explain** why you think that this is a good life - here you might make use of some of the moral theories that we've discussed, though the option is open to appeal to moral values or theories we haven't. **Rational persuasiveness** will be most important here; try to give your reader as much reason as possible to believe you.
- (3) **Explain** how an engineer, computer scientist, or STEM professional might better **understand** or **grasp** this idea of the good life better than others (or, if they have no greater moral insight, explain why not). Here, **insightfulness** will be key for you; you will demonstrate that you have reflected on what it is to be a STEM professional and how that can influence how one thinks about the good life.
- (4) **Give an example** of the role that engineering or computer science, as a profession, can contribute to the good life. This might be an example of an engineering project, or of how engineers, as peoples and professionals, might contribute to fostering the good life. Try to be as detailed as you can be. **Creativity** will be the most important here.

#### Grading:

An **A** paper will be clear, rationally persuasive (e.g., give valid arguments, etc.), insightful (demonstrating understanding), and creative.

A **B** paper will be highly deficient in one of these areas, and satisfactory in the others *or* somewhat deficient in up to two of these areas (e.g., clear and insightful but not very persuasive, and not particularly creative).

A **C** paper will be highly deficient in two of these areas, and satisfactory in the others *or* somewhat deficient in up to three areas.

A **D** paper will be highly deficient in three areas, or somewhat deficient in all areas.

An **F** paper will be highly deficient in all of these areas.

**This paper will be submitted online via Canvas by 11:59 Nov. 21.**