

The article and a few other films we've watched during class have consistently touched upon the ethics of science and what responsibilities we have with it. From then until now, we have also seen a continual fascination with scientists trying to create life using machines. What does this say about the ethics of science? Why is mankind so driven towards creating/imagining man-made lives?

The article by Pheasant-Kelly suggests that there are three characteristics prevalent in today's leading science fiction movies: Darwinism, exploitation of ethics (good or bad), and class superiority. Do you think that these characteristics are new, or have they gradually become a universal aspect of Sci-Fi? Also, why do you believe that these have become popular aspects?

The article focuses on the three science fiction films as being set in worlds where the cultural and social boundaries that can restrict science in our world have been ignored, thus leading to these situations with a lack of the ethics that we subject our own scientists to. However, one could make the argument ethics can only do so much to keep up with science, as we can't set limit on things that don't exist yet (think if there were laws regarding stem cell research in 1916). What are some other possibilities where science could advance and something could become unethical before we even realize that it is inherently "bad"?

Many schools around the nation banned The Hunger Games because of its violent depictions, just as the article described. Do you think this is beneficial, or could exposing them to the criticism within the film of violence as entertainment be more beneficial to such influential minds?

Pheasant-Kelly brings up an interesting point about experiments, and their parallels to medical controversies that happened in the 1990's. Is this a fair conclusion to draw from the scene, or is this connection too far fetched? (See top of page 32 for more Context)