1. I have learnt that three, technically four, rules of robotics set out by Isaac Asimov many years ago. I have also learnt that all these rules have fundamental problems with them. For example, the problems surrounding abortion and rules one and two, or the problems with the zeroth rule about what does harm to humankind mean. I was also fascinated to learn that Asimov came up with these rules in 1942 many years before robots started to become a big thing.
2. I agree with the podcast. I believe this because all of the points that question the different rules are all valid arguments. I believe it is also good to question these rules that are made, especially ones that are set so long ago. If we look beyond the set rules we might see flaws in the rules or we might be able to push technology further than we thought possible.
3. I believe that the role of a software engineer for requirements design will be limited. I believe the role of minimising societal challenges with robotics should be done by specialist robotic philosophers and law makers, these people would have a strong background in both computer science and philosophy. In my opinion there are large problems that would occur if a large company such as amazon, meta or similar were to obtain a fleet of robots of which they had control to programme. The same would apply if it were for governments. The only way I could see this happening is if there was legislation in place that meant the code had to be open source. Even then, when it comes to something so major as a group of human-centred robots there would be an inherent lack of trust towards these large companies with everything already in popular culture.