JEN SEMLER

jen.semler@philosophy.ox.ac.uk | www.jensemler.com

RESEARCH AREAS

SPECIALIZATION Philosophy of AI, practical ethics, normative ethics

COMPETENCE Philosophy of mind, philosophy of action, experimental philosophy

AFFILIATIONS Oxford Institute for Ethics in AI

Oxford BioXPhi Lab

ANU Machine Intelligence and Normative Theory Lab

EDUCATION

DPhil in Philosophy | University of Oxford 2025 (expected)

Dissertation: Artificial Moral Agency

Supervisors: Carissa Véliz and Alison Hills

MPhil in Philosophy | University of Cambridge 2021

Thesis: The Right to Create Future Generations

MA in Medieval Icelandic Studies | University of Iceland 2020

Thesis: *Is Njáll a Compatibilist? Aristotelian Voluntary Action*

in Njáls Saga

BA in Philosophy and Public Policy | Duke University 2019

Magna cum laude; economics minor

PUBLICATIONS

JOURNAL ARTICLES[†] Recent Experimental Work on 'Ought' Implies 'Can' 2019

(with P. Henne)

Philosophy Compass

Against Some Recent Arguments for 'Ought' Implies 'Can' 2019

(with P. Henne, V. Chituc, F. de Brigard, and W. Sinnott-Armstrong)

Philosophia

TEXTBOOK Corporate Human Rights Obligations Under Contract

CONTRIBUTIONS case study for the "Human Rights" chapter in

Issues in Political Theory (edited by R. Jubb and P. Tomlin)

Oxford University Press

[†] I share first authorship with P. Henne on both co-authored papers.

	Lockdowns case study for the "Liberty" chapter in Issues in Political Theory (edited by R. Jubb and P. Tomlin) Oxford University Press	Under Contract	
AWARDS			
	Oxford-Reuben Graduate Scholarship (full fees and living expenses for the DPhil)	g 2021-25	
	Global Priorities Fellowship (£5,000) Forethought Founda in conjunction with the Early Career Conference Program the Global Priorities Institute (Oxford)		
	Kate Bertram Prize (£100) Lucy Cavendish College, Cambridor passing with distinction in the MPhil	idge 2021	
	American Friends of Cambridge University Studentship (Lucy Cavendish College, University of Cambridge	£2,500) 2020	
	Phi Beta Kappa Society Duke University	2019	
TALKS (* indicates invited)			
	Moral Agents Unlike Us - Workshop on Partiality, Relationships, and AI Ludw Maximilian University of Munich (LMU)	ig 2024	
	Two Types of Moral Agency Open Minds XVII <i>University of Manchester</i>	2024	
	Minimal Artificial Moral AgencyAgency and Intentions in AI Conference <i>University of Göttingen</i>	2024	
	Artificial Moral Behavior – Ethics and Computing Colloquium* Cornell University	ty 2024	
	 Locating Consciousness in Moral Agency Machine Intelligence and Normative Theory Lab Au National University 	estralian 2023	
	AI and Moral Agency AttributionsEuropean Experimental Philosophy Conference <i>Uniof Zurich</i>	versity 2023	
	 Moral Psychology of AI Conference University of Ker Oxford BioXPhi Lab University of Oxford 	2023 2023	

	Types of Artificial Moral Agency – Philosophy, AI, and Society Doctoral Colloquium <i>University of Oxford</i>	2023
	Can AI be a Genuine Source of Moral Action? – Oxford AI Society Mini-Conference* <i>University of Oxford</i>	2024
	 Artificial Non-sentient Moral Agency AAAI/ACM Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Ethics, and Society (AIES) Student Track Program University of Oxford 	2022
	People Infer Temporal Order and Causal Structure from Causal Judgments	
	 European Experimental Philosophy Conference University of Granada 	2022
	 Society for Philosophy and Psychology & European Society for Philosophy and Psychology (SPP & ESPP) Joint Conference University of Milan 	2022
	Against the Epistemic Response to Moral Luck - Free Will, Moral Responsibility, and Agency Graduate Conference Florida State University	2021
TEACHING		
PRIMARY INSTRUCTOR [‡]	Practical Ethics Moral Agency in Nonhumans (with Virginie Simoneau-Gilbert) Ethics of AI and Digital Technology Ethical Computing in Practice AI Ethics and Public Health AI Ethics and Warfare Ethics	2024 2024 2022-23 2023 2023 2023 2023
SEMINARS	Why Be Good? An Introduction to Ethics Exeter College Summer Programme, University of Oxford	2023-24
TEACHING ASSISTANT	Why Be Good? An Introduction to Ethics Michael Hannon, Exeter College Summer Programme, University of Oxford	2022-23

[‡] These courses were taught as Oxford-style tutorials: weekly, hour-long teaching sessions consisting of a tutor and 1-2 students. Tutors set a syllabus with readings and essay questions for each session. One exception: "Moral Agency in Nonhumans" was taught as a lecture series.

Project Vox | Duke University

Oxford, University of Edinburgh

ASSISTANTSHIPS

COVID-19

Updated: October 2024 Semler CV

REFERENCES

Carissa Véliz

Associate Professor of Philosophy University of Oxford carissa.veliz@philosophy.ox.ac.uk

Alison Hills

Professor of Philosophy University of Oxford alison.hills@sjc.ox.ac.uk

Milo Phillips-Brown

Lecturer in Philosophy University of Edinburgh milopb@ed.ac.uk

Joanna Demaree-Cotton

Research Fellow in Moral Psychology University of Oxford joanna.demaree-cotton@philosophy.ox.ac.uk

Michael Hannon (teaching)

Associate Professor of Philosophy University of Nottingham michael.hannon@nottingham.ac.uk

Updated: October 2024

DISSERTATION ABSTRACT: ARTIFICIAL MORAL AGENCY

Suppose Aasha destroys Dottie's house. We might have some questions—whether, for instance, Aasha committed a moral wrong or whether Aasha is morally responsible. The answers to these questions depend, in part, on what kind of entity Aasha is. Our evaluation of this scenario differs if Aasha is a strong gust of wind, or a giraffe, or a human. Specifically, our assessment turns on whether Aasha is a *moral agent*. My dissertation considers what follows if Aasha is an AI system.

On my novel account of moral agency, AI systems can be moral agents in principle, but existing AI systems fail to meet the necessary conditions. As such, our use of AI in moral decision-making should be limited. Moreover, even if future AI systems are genuine moral agents, artificial moral agents will be different from human moral agents in normatively significant ways.

Part I—Towards a Theory of Moral Agency—develops a theoretical account of moral agency. In Chapter 1, "Locating Consciousness in Moral Agency," I preempt a common objection to the prospect of artificial moral agency, namely that AI systems cannot be moral agents because they lack consciousness. I argue that phenomenal consciousness is not necessary for moral agency. In Chapter 2, "Two Types of Moral Agency," I propose and defend a distinction: deontic moral agents are appropriate subjects of deontic evaluations—their actions can be described as morally wrong—and responsible moral agents are appropriate subjects of responsibility ascriptions—they are fully-fledged moral agents. This distinction illuminates difficult cases of moral agency (e.g., children, psychopaths, and nonhuman animals) as well as instances of genuine responsibility gaps (cases in which a moral wrong has been committed for which no one is morally responsible).

Part II—Prospects of Artificial Moral Agency—evaluates the extent to which AI systems are moral agents. I take a technically grounded approach: I consider whether existing machine learning methods and empirical results support classifying AI systems as moral agents. In Chapter 3, "Artificial 'Agents' are Not Agents," I argue that AI systems lack the kind of agency required for moral agency—namely, the capacity for intentional action. Against recent claims to the contrary, I argue that AI systems, especially large language models and reinforcement learning systems, lack mental states. In Chapter 4, "Artificial 'Agents' are Not Moral," I argue that even if existing AI systems were agents, they are far from instantiating the relevant capacities required for deontic and responsible moral agency (which I outline in Chapter 2). AI systems lack responsiveness to moral reasons and moral understanding.

Part III—Using Artificial (non) Moral Agents—considers how the moral agency, or lack thereof, of AI systems bears on how we use those systems in moral decision-making. In Chapter 5, "Artificial Moral Behavior," I argue that delegating moral decisions to AI systems is wrong—even if the AI system's outputs are reliable and accurate—because doing so replaces moral *actions* with, at best, moral *behaviors*. We have both intrinsic and instrumental reasons to avoid shrinking the moral domain in this way. In Chapter 6, "Moral Agents Unlike Us," I argue that even if AI systems qualify for responsible moral agency, they are different from human moral agents in morally significant ways. Even though a lack of consciousness is no barrier to moral agency (as I argue in Chapter 1), a lack of consciousness *is* a barrier to playing certain roles in the moral community. Moral agency isn't all that matters.