**Section1**

1. Technology is a sort of this intentional design process that involves value-laden decisions about how technologies ought to be built. It will produce function and have effect. It's not all about the intrinsic phisics of material

2. It's a type of soft determinism. Technology doesn't control people all the time. However, when we build large system such as laws, policies and physical infrastructrures for it, it becomes deterministic and control over society.

3. It's a concept opposed to individual moral agency. Big data makes it more visible. The seemingly subjective behavior of a group or individual is actually the result of the collected data and their behavior will create new data which influent others (Like a gear).

4. Stealth plane is inherently political. It's a very complicated technology that only a developed country has the motivation and ability to manufacture it and use it, which represents a kind of centralism and hegemonism

5. People need to be concerned with that person or that thing with moral status in a moral way. The characteristics are Sentience and Sapience

6. One example is anonymous forum that generates ID randomly and deletes comments regularly. Cause users are not responsible for what they say, offensive and politically incorrect statements come more frequently than normal life.

**Section 2**

**Picked Question:7**

Computer scientists should not develop moral algorithm, not only is it inefficient to build such an algorithm, but it is inappropriate to use moral algorithm on real life. Moral algorithms are always extremely complex project that needs senior programmers to work for quite a long period of time, because codes are made up of logical judgment based on the different conditions and there are too many conditions in testing environment like real life. It may take a lot of money and time from project approval to launch. However, ethics is not a fixed standard. Like computer ethics in lec 4, new technology will always bring change and challenge to traditional ethics. Moral algorithms have a very short service life compared to its high cost.

It is also inappropriate to use to use moral algorithm on real life. Because it's very difficult for an algorithm to capture the moral complexity of real life. Programmers must simplify moral algorithm in order to turn them into executable program. However, there is no uniform standard for ethics even in the same era. In the process of simplifying moral algorithm, it is inevitable for programmers to add their own values or even biases that even programmers themself are not aware of. Even without considering that moral algorithm is influenced by consequentialist ethics or utilrianism so it will threaten individual rights, it is impossible for programmers to develop moral algorithm of absolute justice.

**Picked Question: 8**

It is still a valid statement in 2020. It's important to know whom he makes this argument about. It's not about all technology. It's about some technologies that have political effects and other technologies that are inherently political. When the connection of technology and politics is obvious ，most people still resist these technologies nowadays，such as intercontinental missle and the military hegemonism behind it. However, when it comes to the inherently political technology whose connection to politics is hidden, there is less resistence. Take High speed rail system for example. High speed rail system is inherently political. The construction of high-speed rail systems in Europe and Asia has not met with strong resistance for these years.The reason why people don't resist this technology is not that they don't care technical changes on political grounds anymore，but because they cannot find its connection to bureaucracy . Most people just regard it as common public transport and accept the bureaucracy behind it unwittingly. He wants to argue that it is important for us to "achieve a clearer view of these matters than has been our habit". (page 9)

To conclude, it is important to consider the political consequences behind technology and not to simply accept the technological progress at face value. In 2020 ，people are still not sensible enough to find the hidden connection between technology and political ground. Therefore, his aregument is still valid and make sense,