

Answer THREE of the following FIVE questions in at least 5 sentences:

2. Thinking along with Landon Winner, what are the politics of TSA body scanners? Describe at least two distinctive ways that TSA body scanners have a policy and indicate their respective ethical stakes. Make sure to use at least one tool from the HCE toolkit in your answer.

Landon, winner, believes that “artifacts” can have politics behind them or they can be correlated with politics. With that in mind, the TSA body scanners are artifacts that are built on politics and justified through policies. One is that invasion of one's privacy, where you can go through the TSA scanner which scans your body or you can get a physical pat down, either way your privacy is breached even if you consent. Politically this means they can access your body anytime and violate human rights as it is for "your own safety". If you have to travel somewhere, and you know you have to go through the checking, you don't have an option but to agree to them (no choice). The other was that TSA scanners have the ability to store data, which means they could store people's body scans, and which they have been, which violates a person's right to consent. With this stored data they can make a political statement or policy that would indicate a person's ethical stake.

3. Describe an example we have touched in the class about how people are “made into data.” What does it mean to say people are “made into data” in this specific case? What purposes were served by making them into data? How may they have benefited in the process? How may they have been harmed? Please be as specific as possible about the nature of the benefits and harms.

Two examples that we touched in class where people are “made into data”, would be punch cards and Hollerith machines and John Graunt's Tables U.S Census (1790). The punch card started storing people into data, where people felt that they were a part of a computer rather than a human, and that they were being programmed. The punch cards were bad because they took people's data without their consent and were reducing everyone down to numbers which could be easily inferred by a machine known as the Hollerith machine, hence creating the phrase “do not fold, spindle or mutilate”. The other is that of John Graunt, who studied death records and made tables of where people had died, and started creating classification on how someone can die. His tables lead to predicting and solving the underlying issues of death, in one where he conducted that cholera comes from contaminated water. In case one, the punch cards were used negatively, where they wanted to take advantage of the people through data and there was also no warning/informed about what the punch cards main purpose was. In case

two, John Graunt's data didn't get consent of the people but he helped the people with classifying/identifying the causes of death.

5.Kuhn argues that the main agent of scientific change is the “scientific community.” What, according to Kuhn, is a scientific community, and how does he use it to explain scientific change? In your answer, use at least one tool from the HCE toolkit that you think is most helpful to illustrate what Kuhn means by “scientific communities.”

The word scientific community by Kuhn refers to ideologies(theories) or systems of a given time period. The example he gives in his text is that of Galileo's views of the solar system versus everyone else in the world, which lead to great scientific change of understanding the universe. So the scientific community would be everyone in the world that believes in a theory and agrees on it. The scientific changes come slowly or sometimes they come in a revolution (big changes) but they are always progressing with time. He wants people to know that aren't linear, but have plateaus. Today we have institutions such as schools which teach about biology and important scientific theories to students and people. And everyone agrees with the teaching through the system hence creating the scientific community of this time. People agree on Human biology and the laws of physics or marriage forms in societies.

Option 1:

This document includes a clear narrative about Artificial Intelligence in the present and the future. Using the text as evidence, please reconstruct and critically analyze this narrative, using the following questions as a guide:

- 1. What is the scope of the narrative and what drives it forward? And what are the major agents, goals, and challenges involved in AI research and development, according to this narrative?**

The scope of the narrative of AGI is that it will be “good” for the world. It is driven forward by OpenAi that it will “elevate humanity” by “turbocharging the global economy, and aiding in the discovery of new scientific knowledge that changes the limits of possibility”. This article peruses this idea that open AGI will be good for the world. I would like to talk about the term “turbocharging the global economy” because most people fear AI that it will take people's jobs and they use their phrase to open people up to an AI good for them financially. Then they address the small issue of the risk of AI, which talk about the “Serious risk of misuse” and how this risk can be outweighed by the good/benefits AGI will provide to the world. Exactly what is this “good” and “benefits”

they refer to is something the reader should consider. Because from the sound of it they are in favor of utilitarianism, where they favor this idea that as long as the majority are good (AGI decisions/moves) and only a small portion suffer, the AGI is a success. Then they also tell us that AGI will slowly be released in the real world. They emphasize on the small change to let people get used to it, and control it. With this narrative they talk about their previous inventions such as ChatGPT, which was released with “default settings” and people interacting with it created its behavior. This gives the reader this hope that AI is still within their grasp of power as they get to control its behavior. They believe that AGI will fit similarly to that of ChatGPT, being an aid to the people, and helping with faster research. This narrative would pursue a Sociotechnical system, where if the AGI would fail it would be hard to identify if it failed because of human morality or its algorithms. The OpenAI is letting people control its behavior so by that reason people have influence on how the AGI would work and respond but at the same time it has its own algorithm.

Question 2B (required)

Answer the following question with respect to the article in *at least 5 sentences*:

The AGI will have two ethical agents, one is OpenAI, who create the said “default settings” algorithm and the rate that it is released to the real world (controlling its power). The other ethical agent is us, the people that will interact with said AGI and create its behavior from the default settings. Then the AGI will take ethical action based on ethical agents' moral rules. These ethical actions are supposed to reflect good morality of the people. And if the AGI takes “good” ethical action, it will be “rewarded”. The mechanism for achieving good for the AGI is that it will help bring the “maximum good” to the world and “elevate humanity”.

They clearly overlooked how AGI would create power dynamics in the world and classification of people or of a given situation. They mentioned that they bring AGI slowly into the world and have feedback loops from the people giving it feedback as it is the case with ChatGPT. The exact problem they are overlooking here is that people aren't “good” people. Some people are “racist”, some are “homophobic” or “transphobic” or “islamaphobic”, and since its working on this feedback loop it may associate/classify these people as “bad” people based on the feedback. In class we talked about how AI had a high rate of discriminating against people of color, where it associated them with higher rates of crime or future criminals. The AI learned that from people and books, or it mistaking a black person for a “gorilla”. For example if you go and ask ChatGP to

draw you middle eastern culture, it will draw you either a desert, camel, or a man in a turban, because these three are the highest classification of middle east by the western culture. So having it work on a feedback loop may create "bigoted" Ai. In discussion, we played the game moral machine which was a test on a moral test for self driving cars, and at the end it would display your morals compared to others. If the AI runs on the feedback loop it would create this machine that would think is morally correct to homeless people because it seems that everyone that played the game wanted to kill homeless people and save anything else. This would create a system where they would put values on people's lives, and if your value is less, then it's morally correct to kill you. They address/slightly mention of the AI being misused by the bad actors but since it will be so good it will outweigh the negative effects. This statement clearly shows that OpenAI supports Utilitarianism, where they think as long as the majority are in good hands, it doesn't matter how the small portion is affected. This tells me that "bad actors" will take advantage of this to their own benefit and make a profit or whatever purpose they seek. This would matter greatly if they cared how the small portion of people will be affected, and that they should be compensated for their loss or whatever they might be affected by it. They don't address the negatives of the AGI, or any possible concerns people may have of it.