DEFINE, EXPLAIN, EXEMPLIFY IN ONE OR TWO SENTENCES.

1.1

| SPECIES LOSSES | 90 PERCENT | MURDER/CANCER |
| ANNUAL US CANCERS | CHILDREN'S CANCER | US PESTICIDE EXPORTS |
| POGO | DOWNWINDERS | CANCER INCIDENCE VS. MORTALITY |
| PESTICIDE DEATHS | E. O. WILSON | PRIMA FACIE PRINCIPLES |
| CHERNOBYL | MESTHENE, MCDERMOTT | MILL |

1.2

| ETHICS, MORALITY | MORAL PHILOSOPHY | RELIGION, LAW, ETIQUETTE |
| JAMES NEAL | KITTY GENOVESE | KING EDWARD III |
| ACTIONS | MOTIVES | RIGHT/WRONG |
| CHARACTER | CONSEQUENCES | GOOD/BAD |
| OPTIONAL/OBLIGATORY | SUPEREROGATORY | DEONTOLOGICAL |
| CATEGORICAL IMPERATIVE | PRINCIPLE OF ENDS | HYPOTHETICAL IMPERATIVE |
| KANT, ARISTOTLE | MILL, BENTHAM | TELEOLOGICAL |
| RELATIVE PRINCIPLES | UTILITARIANISM | |

1.3

| ARISTOTLE | GEOGRAPHICAL EQUITY | HARSANYI, RAWLS |
| TECHNOLOGICAL RISK | OVERCONFIDENCE BIAS | JUDITH THOMSON |
| MAXIMIN | AVERAGE EXPECTED UTILITY | SUBJECTIVE PROBABILITIES |
| UTILITARIANISM | EGALITARIANISM | COMPENSATING WAGE DIFFERENTIAL |

INFORMAL LOGICAL FALLACIES

| APPEAL TO PITY | APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE | ARGUMENT FROM IGNORANCE |
| APPEAL TO FORCE | HASTY GENERALIZATION | BEGGING THE QUESTION |
| AMPHIBOLY | COMPLEX QUESTION | IRRELEVANT THESIS |
| DIVISION, COMPOSITION | | |

5 LOGICAL CRITERIA

| ASSUMPTIONS | CONSISTENCY | COMPLETENESS | COHERENCE | CONSEQUENCES |
| (REDUCTIO AD ABSURDUM) | | |

1.1-1.3 ESSAYS: ANSWER IN A PARAGRAPH AND USE THE 5 LOGICAL CRITERIA TO DO SO.
1. WHY ARE RISK ISSUES SO IMPORTANT IN EVALUATING TECHNOLOGY? EXPLAIN.

2. CRITICIZE THE FOLLOWING POSITIONS ACCORDING TO THE 5 CRITERIA: (A) "WE SHOULDN'T WORRY ABOUT CANCER RATES; THEY ARE THE PRICE OF ECONOMIC AND PROGRESS." (B) "ANY TECHNOLOGY THAT CAUSES CANCER OUGHT TO BE SHUT DOWN."

3. EXPLAIN THE DIFFERENCES AMONG ETHICS, MORAL PHILOSOPHY, MORALITY, ETIQUETTE, LAW, AND RELIGION. EXPLAIN THE IMPORTANCE, SANCTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS OF EACH.

4. EXPLAIN THE DIFFERENCES AMONG DEONTOLOGICAL, UTILITARIAN, AND VIRTUE THEORIES. CRITICIZE EACH VIA THE 5 CRITERIA. WHAT EVALUATIVE TERMS DO PHILOSOPHERS USE TO TALK ABOUT ACTIONS, CONSEQUENCES, CHARACTER, MOTIVES? EXPLAIN SAN DIEGO, WALKING AT NIGHT. EXPLAIN SIMULATION.

5. EXPLAIN ALTERNATIVE WAYS TO DEFINE "TECHNOLOGICAL RISK," AND (B) WHETHER PEOPLE REALLY CONSENT TO SUCH RISKS. EVALUATE ALTERNATIVE POSITIONS VIA 5 CRITERIA.

6. EXPLAIN ALTERNATIVE VIEWS ON ASSESSING TECHNOLOGY IN THE FACE OF UNCERTAINTY. USE THE 5 CRITERIA TO EVALUATE JOHN RAWLS' AND JOHN HARSANYI'S POSITIONS.

STV/PHIL 256, SECOND STUDY SHEET FOR TV, SEE SECTIONS 2.1, 2.2, 2.37 (PP. 37-128)

ANSWER, DEFINE, EXPLAIN, EXEMPLIFY IN ONE OR TWO SENTENCES.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TA</th>
<th>ENGELS</th>
<th>DETERMINISM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WITTGENSTEIN, MARX</td>
<td>MODES OF PRODUCTION</td>
<td>SIMULATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TELEVISION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIVACY</th>
<th>DEMOCRACY</th>
<th>NEUTRALITY</th>
<th>REALITY/FACTS/GI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEYER-KAIN STUDY</td>
<td>PROBLEMS/OPPORTUNITIES</td>
<td>TECHNICIANS/EXPERTISE</td>
<td>RESPECT/ALTRUISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEMOCRACY</th>
<th>ELITISM</th>
<th>DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>GRESHAM</th>
<th>REALITY/FACTS/GI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPERTS/OPTIMISM</td>
<td>NEGATIVE EXTERNALITIES</td>
<td>BLACK LADY MOUNTAIN</td>
<td>LAISSEZ INNOVER</td>
<td>RESPECT/ALTRUISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TECHNOLOGY, ILLITERACY, HIERARCHY</td>
<td>CLASS CONFlict, OFFICIAL VIOLENCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GREED</th>
<th>THORP</th>
<th>2 PRESSES</th>
<th>CHOICE</th>
<th>HORMONE</th>
<th>CTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RISK VS. SAFETY</td>
<td>DUE CARE/RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td>FEASIBLE CONTROL</td>
<td>POLITICAL CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>BALANCE TO PROFITS</td>
<td>WHO ELSE COULD WE BE?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY AS A SOCIAL CONSTRUCT</td>
<td>CHILDREN AT DAWN</td>
<td>NEW TECHNOLOGY AND PROFITS</td>
<td>SHIFTING THE BURDEN OF PROOF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.1-2.7, ESSAYS:** ANSWER IN A PARAGRAPH AND USE THE 5 LOGICAL CRITERIA TO DO SO.

1. **Give an example of how different facts about/views of technology lead to different ethical conclusions.**

2. **Summarize and evaluate (via 5 criteria) the Heidegger-Dreyfus, Winner, Mesthene, McDermott, Hollander, and Tatum essays. Who is more correct, Mesthene or McDermott? Explain/evaluate.**

3. **Should Heidegger-Dreyfus criticize those who emphasize destruction, not TUB?**

4. **Give examples of how to pursue safety, not risk, and constructive technology assessment.**

---

**STV/PHIL 256, THIRD STUDY SHEET FOR TV, SECTIONS 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5**

**ANSWER, DEFINE, EXPLAIN, EXEMPLIFY IN ONE OR TWO SENTENCES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER/MODEL</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY</th>
<th>NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRANKENSTEIN</td>
<td>EXPERT JUDGMENT</td>
<td>THREE TYPES OF VALUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDEFINE HUMAN RIGHTS</td>
<td>BENEFIT-COST ANALYSIS</td>
<td>UTILITARIAN-PLURALIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIOLOGICAL</td>
<td>METASCIENTIFIC</td>
<td>COUNTERCULTURE-ACTIVIST-UTOPIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORMALDEHYDE</td>
<td>OBJECTIVITY, LUDDISM</td>
<td>WELFARE/PREFERENCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICTOR</td>
<td>PROMETHEAN IDEALS</td>
<td>AUTONOMOUS TECHNOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEIBNIZ</td>
<td>MONSTER/UNFINISHED CREATION</td>
<td>FRANKENSTEIN IN FILM/BOOK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RULES</td>
<td>UTILITARIAN/PLURALIST MODEL</td>
<td>NEGATIVE EXTERNALITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEABORG</td>
<td>&quot;I JUST WORK HERE&quot;</td>
<td>SCANDAL OF PRODUCTIVITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUMFORD</td>
<td>TECHNOLOGY AS POLITICAL</td>
<td>DIFFERENT SOCIAL LIFE/TECHNOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AESCHYLUS</td>
<td>NEW KINDS OF TECHNICS</td>
<td>DIRECT PARTICIPATION, NONEXPERTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL OF MAN</td>
<td>EPistemological LUDDISM</td>
<td>DIRECT ACTION VS. SUPERIOR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Political Technology**

3.2

- RIGHTS
  - TRIAD: QUALITY OF LIFE + TECHNOLOGICAL MAXIMALITY +
- TRUMP, ACLU
  - TERMINALLY ILL PEOPLE 3 OPTIONS CONTEXTUALIZED RIGHTS
- DUNE BUGGY
  - AGGREGATIVE TM/INDIVIDUAL ABSOLUTIST RIGHTS, FEINBERG
- GOD, LOCKE
  - ELEANOR ROOSEVELT CONCORDE AND FRENCH
- QUINLAN, WANGLIE
  - AUTODEALERS/OREGON 1993/FREE SPEECH
- CRUZAN
  - SAN FRANCISCO/PLANNING

3.3

- OTA
  - UTILITY VS. MORALITY PARETO OPTIMUM/IMPROVEMENT
- SMITH, MILL
  - CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS WASH 1400/NUKE VS. COAL
- WASH 1224
  - CONCRETE APPLICATIONS FINAL TEST OF PUBLIC POLICY
- HARVARD STUDY
  - DISTRIBUTION/DOMINANT IDEOLOGY 3 NOTIONS, COMPENSATING VARIATION
- KEYNES
  - FRIEDMAN, MISES; HOOK WEALTHY/POOR/DISCRIMINATION
- WILDE, MYRDAL
  - HEDONISM, EGOPISM ECONOMIC EXCHANGE, CAUSAL
- DETERM.
- EXTERNALITIES
  - TANK CARS/RAILROADS COMPENS. VARIATIONS IGNORE 4 THINGS
- HOMOGENOUS
  - 4 REASONS, PRICES VS. VALUES US OIL CNSMPTN/SUBSDZED-REAL COSTS
- AUTOS VS. POLLUTION
  - PREFERENCES/WELFARE/STIPULATIVE DEFINITION

3.4

- SEPARABILITY
  - SOCIOLOGICAL VS. METASCIENTIFIC EXPLAIN 4 STEPS RISK ASSESSMENT
- GORSUCH EPA
  - 1983 NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL/ACADEMY OF SCIENCES + 2 REFORMS
- RUCKELSHAUS
  - KUHN, FEYERABEND OLD, POSITIVIST, SCIENTIFC. RATIONALITY
- WEINBERG
  - WYNNE, DOUGLAS, WILDAVSKY FACTS/VALUES/PREMISE P/TRANSSCIENCE
- NUTSHELL PROBLEM
  - INFERENCe OPTIONS OF NRC/NAS SOCIOLOGICAL VIEW: 2 CONSEQUENCES
- REAGAN
  - RISK VS. PERCEIVED RISK FORMALDEHYDE/CIT/REASSESSMENT
- AMMUNITION, 239
  - ASHFORD/RYAN/CALDART TOTHUNTER/GORE/NRDC/WALKER
- RULE (M) WEIGHING INSTRUMENT NEGATIVE EPIDEMIOLOGICAL RESULTS
- DUPONT LIMITED SENSITIVITY SUBJECTIVISM/RELATIVISM

3.5

- SEPARABILITY
  - SOCIOLOGICAL VS. METASCIENTIFIC EXPLAIN 4 STEPS RISK ASSESSMENT
- GORSUCH EPA
  - 1983 NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL/ACADEMY OF SCIENCES + 2 REFORMS
- RUCKELSHAUS
  - KUHN, FEYERABEND OLD, POSITIVIST, SCientific. RATIONALITY
- WEINBERG
  - WYNNE, DOUGLAS, WILDAVSKY FACTS/VALUES/PREMISE P/TRANSSCIENCE
- NUTSHELL PROBLEM
  - INFERENCe OPTIONS OF NRC/NAS SOCIOLOGICAL VIEW: 2 CONSEQUENCES
- REAGAN
  - RISK VS. PERCEIVED RISK FORMALDEHYDE/CIT/REASSESSMENT
- AMMUNITION, 239
  - ASHFORD/RYAN/CALDART TOTHUNTER/GORE/NRDC/WALKER
- RULE (M) WEIGHING INSTRUMENT NEGATIVE EPIDEMIOLOGICAL RESULTS
- DUPONT LIMITED SENSITIVITY SUBJECTIVISM/RELATIVISM

3.1-3.5 ESSAYS: ANSWER IN SEVERAL PARAGRAPHS; USE THE 5 CRITERIA TO EVALUATE PRO AND CON

1. SUMMARIZE (EACH OF) WINNER, MCGINN, SHRADER-FRECHETTE, MAYO ESSAYS, EVALUATE EACH.

2. EVALUATE EPistemological LUDDISM AS A STRATEGY FOR EVALUATING TECHNOLOGY.

3. STATE AND EVALUATE WINNER’S 6 PRINCIPLES FOR NEW TECHNOLOGICAL FORMS.

**STV/PHIL 256, FOURTH STUDY SHEET FOR TV, SECTIONS 4.2, 4.3, 4.4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1771</th>
<th>4.2</th>
<th>TECHNOCRACY MOVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOYALTY</td>
<td>MILITARY FORTIFICATIONS</td>
<td>FAITHFUL AGENT OR TRUSTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATERNALISM</td>
<td>ENHANCE HUMAN WELFARE</td>
<td>TECHNOLOGICAL EFFICIENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORISON</td>
<td>MCDONNELL AND MILLER</td>
<td>VIOLATED SHERMAN ANTITRUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VELEN</td>
<td>1982 SUPREME COURT</td>
<td>LOW-WATER FUEL-CUTOFF DEVICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>BART PROF CODE OF ETHICS</td>
<td>AUTONOMY, PUBLIC DISCLOSURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC WELFARE</td>
<td>O-RING SAFETY</td>
<td>PHYSICAL PRODUCT, KNOWLEDGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME</td>
<td>DESIGN, RESEARCH</td>
<td>SCIENCE, LAB, WORLD, TECHNOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYDROLEVEL</td>
<td>TEST TO DESTRUCTION</td>
<td>CONTROL VS. CHECKING INSTANCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART</td>
<td>BOUNDARY CONDITIONS</td>
<td>COMPUTER SYSTEMS, SUBDIVISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGER</td>
<td>STAR WARS: MILITARY, TOYS</td>
<td>FUNDAMENTAL TECHN. OBLIGATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROGER BOISJOLY</td>
<td>COMPLEXIFYING</td>
<td>APPROPRIATE TECHN. TRANSFER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBIE</td>
<td>DEVELOPING NATIONS</td>
<td>EDUC., DEFENSE, PUBLIC INFO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIDEOS</td>
<td>CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS</td>
<td>5 PRACTICAL GUIDELINES, QUESTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHUMACHER</td>
<td>HJORSTVANG, MULTIDISCIPLINARY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGINEERING SAINTS</th>
<th>WHISTLEBLOWERS</th>
<th>PUBLIC SAFETY PARAMOUNT, JOBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PINTO CASE</td>
<td>GOSHEN, INDIANA</td>
<td>WINAMAC, INDIANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHY FORD WON</td>
<td>NHTSA ORDERED RECALL</td>
<td>30 MPH ONLY COMPACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCIS OLSannels</td>
<td>2ND-GUESS MANAGERS</td>
<td>3 CONDITIONS PERMISSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARLEY COPP</td>
<td>REPORT/INSIST FINDINGS</td>
<td>5 CONDITIONS FOR DUTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL STANDARDS</td>
<td>PREVENT SQUEEZE</td>
<td>SAFETY AS A BENEFIT-COST FACTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 VS. 25 MONTHS</td>
<td>TRY INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>CONSUMER PRODUCT INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REALISTIC PENALTIES</td>
<td>HEAVY LIABILITY</td>
<td>CORPORATE STRUCTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSPECTOR GENERAL</td>
<td>ENGINEERING ASSISTANT</td>
<td>CHANGE CORPORATE ETHICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISK ACCEPTABILITY &amp; ENGINEERING PROBLEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENEFIT-COST ANALYSIS/ABSOLUTE MEANING/WHAT IT IGNORES MANY FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GUN ANALOGY</th>
<th>LOCKE</th>
<th>PRIVACY INVASIONS EASIER/MORE LIKELY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTONOMY</td>
<td>STOICS</td>
<td>10 REASONS PRIVACY A VALUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIED</td>
<td>KANT</td>
<td>PERSONS ARE ENDS IN SELVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIENDSHIP</td>
<td>PERSONAL GOODS</td>
<td>MENTAL SURVIVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITARIANS</td>
<td>DE TOCQUEVILLE</td>
<td>TOTALITARIAN STATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSTON INTER-TECT</td>
<td>P &amp; G COURT ORDER</td>
<td>SCHAEFFER MURDERED VIA CA DMV ADDRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARITAS</td>
<td>CLUSTER ANALYSIS</td>
<td>LOTUS DATABASE ON 120,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORAL ROBERTS</td>
<td>AMERICAN EXPRESS</td>
<td>EMPLOYERS INFO SERVICE IN LA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKERS’ COMP.</td>
<td>CCH</td>
<td>ALEKSANDR SOLZHENITSYN’S CANCER WARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYSTEM SIZE, ERRORS</td>
<td>ACLU</td>
<td>CRIMINAL SCREENING, USED BY EMPLOYERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994 WIRETAP BILL</td>
<td>$500 MILLION</td>
<td>WHO WILL GUARD THE GUARDS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIPPER CHIP</td>
<td>DATA ENCRYPTION</td>
<td>CALLER ID, CREDIT LISTING &amp; PRIVACY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPTR MATCHING</td>
<td>4TH AMENDMENT</td>
<td>1974 PRIVACY ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERGING FILES</td>
<td>5TH AMENDMENT</td>
<td>WELFARE BANK ACCOUNT MATCHES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINGERPRINTING</td>
<td>25 DATABASES</td>
<td>PRIVACY RIGHTS/EFFICIENCY/WELFARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROCERY</td>
<td>1ST AMENDMENT</td>
<td>WARREN AND BRANDEIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973 ROE VS. WADE</td>
<td>9TH AMENDMENT</td>
<td>WHY RESPONSIBILITY ENTAILS FREEDOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPIRITUAL/SOLITUDE</td>
<td>14TH AMENDMENT</td>
<td>EXISTING PRIVACY LEGISLATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREATIVITY</td>
<td>SELF-IMAGE</td>
<td>1990 GAO SURVEY, 59% TREASURY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STV/PHIL 256, FIFTH STUDY SHEET FOR TV, SECTIONS 4.5, 4.6: PARNAS, COHEN, SHRADER-FRECHETTE

**4.5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAR WARS</th>
<th>DETERRENCE</th>
<th>COMPUTATIONAL PROBLEMS</th>
<th>NO ARMS POLICY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDI</td>
<td>EINSTEIN</td>
<td>3 PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL SECURITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICBMs</td>
<td>ARMS RACE</td>
<td>CONFLICT OF INTEREST</td>
<td>DISTINGUISHED EXPERTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALIDATION</td>
<td>VERIFICATION</td>
<td>LIMITS OF SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>IGNORE COMPUTERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PET PROJECT</td>
<td>ESPIONAGE</td>
<td>SDI SOFTWARE ASSUMPTIONS</td>
<td>REALISTIC TESTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDUNDANCY</td>
<td>OVERLOADING</td>
<td>DISTRIBUTED REAL-TIME DATA BASE</td>
<td>FIXED ORBITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VENUS</td>
<td>3 LAYERS</td>
<td>PASSIVE REFUSAL/ACTIVE OPPOSITION</td>
<td>RESEARCH/SHIELD/FRAUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 % FIGURE</td>
<td>EASTPORT</td>
<td>LOOSE/TIGHT COORDINATION</td>
<td>SDIO DISPUTES, STRAW MAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>UNIVERSITIES</td>
<td>SCIENTIFIC REVIEW; DAMAGE CONTROL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEROIN</td>
<td>PROSTITUTION</td>
<td>4 EASTPORT ASSUMPTIONS</td>
<td>EXCESSIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>NOOSE</td>
<td>EXECUTION</td>
<td>200 INSTRUCTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHUTTLE</td>
<td>SAFEGUARD</td>
<td>6 MISINTERPRETATIONS OF PARNAS</td>
<td>PESSIMISTIC PREDICTIONS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STV/PHIL 256, SIXTH STUDY SHEET FOR TV, SECTIONS 4.7, 4.8, 4.9

4.6 S-F, NUCLEAR WASTE

- Chernobyl (P. 355)
- Three Mile Island (P. 355)
- Two Solutions (P. 355)
- Recorded History (P. 355)
- Egyptian (P. 355)
- Italians (P. 355)
- Price-Anderson Act (P. 357)
- Military Expenditures (P. 357)
- Kasli (P. 356)
- Hanford (P. 356)
- Maxey Flats (P. 356)
- 24,000 years (P. 356)
- 300 years (P. 356)
- Spent Fuel Rods (P. 357)
- One Percent (P. 357)
- Price-Anderson Act (P. 357)
- Military Expenditures (P. 357)
- Plutonium (P. 357)
- Other Nations (P. 357)
- Infant Formula (P. 357)
- 1974 (P. 357)
- India (P. 358)
- Plutonium Byproduct (P. 358)
- Canada (P. 358)
- 25.4 Tons (P. 358)
- Grams of Plutonium (P. 358)
- Gamble (P. 358)
- One Hundred Years (P. 358)
- Appeal to Ignorance (P. 359)
- Shoe Fit (P. 359)
- Fallout (P. 359)
- Neutrality Criterion (P. 359)
- Kaspersen (P. 359)
- Locus (P. 359)
- Labor-Lauty (P. 359)
- Legacy (P. 359)
- Preampts Future (P. 360)
- Temporary, Permanent (P. 360)
- Uranium (P. 360)
- Discount Rates (P. 360)
- Geographical Equity (P. 361)
- Vesting (P. 360)
- Land Ethics (P. 361)
- Consent Dilemma (P. 361)
- More Expensive (P. 361)
- Four Dilemmas (P. 361)
- Threshold Dilemma (P. 361)
- West Valley (P. 361 & 362)
- Federalism Dilemma (P. 361)
- Contributor's Dilemma (P. 361)
- Hanford (P. 362)
- Informed Consent (P. 363)
- Compensating Wage Differ. (P. 362)
- Stewart (P. 363)
- Liberty (P. 363)
- Compensation Wage Differ. (P. 362)
- Integrity (P. 363)
- Equality (P. 363)
- Threshold Dilemma (P. 363)
- 10^-6 (P. 363)
- Zero-Risk (P. 363)
- "Average" Exposure (P. 363)
- Ninety Percent (P. 364)
- Jonathan Glover (P. 364)
- Individual Characteristics (P. 364)
- Right to Life (P. 366)
- Doctor-Patient (P. 365)
- Contributor's Dilemma (P. 364)
- France (P. 367)
- Future Generations (P. 366)
- Equity, Consent, Compensation (P. 366)
- Brewer (P. 367)
- French Deficit (P. 367)
- Decommissioning (P. 367)
- Financing (P. 367)
- Electricity Grids (P. 368)
- Capital Intensity (P. 368)
- Terrorist Abuse (P. 368)
- Cathedrals (P. 369)

4.7 PIMENTEL ET AL, PESTICIDE USE

- 600 (P. 375)
- 37% (P. 375)
- 2.5 Million Tons (P. 375)
- 20,000 (P. 376)
- Highest Price (P. 376)
- Dollar Invested (P. 375)
- 10,000 (P. 377)
- Infertility (P. 377)
- Higher Proportion (P. 376)
- 35% (P. 378)
- Immune Dysfunction (P. 377)
- Neurological Defects (P. 377)
- Lung Cancer (P. 378)
- Highest Exposures (P. 378)
- Higher Incidence (P. 378)
- 62% (P. 378)
- $787 Million (P. 379)
- Tests for 41 (P. 381)
- Meat Is (P. 381)
- Hawaii (P. 382)
- Economic Value of Livestock (P. 382)
- Predators (P. 382)
- Parasites (P. 382)
- Beneficial Enemies (P. 383)
- Indonesia (P. 384)
- Secondary Pests (P. 383)
- "Treat-When-Necessary" (P. 384)
- Natural Enemies (P. 385)
- One-Half Reduction (P. 385)
- Pesticide Resistance (P. 385)
- Resistance Traits (P. 385)
- California Cotton (P. 386)
- Resistance Tropical (P. 386)
- Malaria (P. 387)
- India (P. 387)
- Honeybee (P. 387)
- Wild Bee (P. 387)
- Poor Pollination (P. 388)
- Crop Losses (P. 389)
- Drift (P. 390)
- Liability (P. 390)
- Herbicide Persistence (P. 390)
- Watermelons (P. 391)
- Private Distributors (P. 392)
- Three Most Common (P. 392)
- Fish Killed (P. 394)
- One-Half Population (P. 393)
- One-Half Groundwater (P. 393)
- Indicator Species (P. 394)
- Canada Geese (P. 395)
- Sperm Production (P. 396)
- Treated Seed (P. 396)
- "Fix" Nitrogen (P. 397)
- Microorganisms (P. 397)
- Apple Scab (P. 398)
- Earthworms (P. 398)
- Saved Crops (P. 398)
- Thatch (P. 398)
- Public Health (P. 399)
- Costs of Pesticides (P. 399)
4.8 MURRAY, GENOME

THREE CATEGORIES (P. 415)
3 ETHICAL QUESTIONS (P. 417)
GENETIC PROPHECY (P. 417)

BIOETHICS (P. 416)
NANCY WEXLER (P. 417)
HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE (P. 417-18)

CF (P. 418 & 419)
CARRIER SCREENING (P. 418)
ETHICALLY DEFENSIBLE (P. 420)

ABORTION (P. 419)
PURPOSES USED (P. 420)
ADVERSE SELECTION (P. 422)

HALDANE (P. 419)
REDUCING COST (P. 421)
SOMATIC CELL LINE (P. 424)

OTA (P. 421)
FORCE INSURERS (P. 422)
hGH (P. 425 & 426)

TWO REASONS (P. 424)
GERM-LINE (P. 424)
MOUSE (P. 426)

CANCER (P. 425)
CHIMPANZEES (P. 426)
ARMY ALPHA (P. 428)

EPO (P. 426)
EVOLUTION (P. 427)
SCIENCES OF INEQUALITY (P. 429)

EXCUSE (P. 427)
IQ SCORES (P. 428)

4.9 WESTRA, TRANSGENIC DINNER

IGNORANCE (P. 435)
RECOMBINANT DNA (P. 433)
MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS (P. 435)

IRRATIONALITY (P. 435)
DR. FRANKENSTEINS (P. 437)
PRINCIPLE OF INTEGRITY (P. 436)

RESPECT (P. 437)
PLUS SIDE (P. 437)
LINK TO CHEMICALS (P. 437)

MINUS SIDE (P. 437)
GAINS TWICE (P. 437)
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (P. 438)

LOSE TWICE (P. 437)
NORTH CAROLINA (P. 438)
DICHOTOMY, SUSTAINABILITY (P. 438)

BGH (P. 438)
MORAL DIFFICULTY (P. 439)
THEORY AND PRACTICE (P. 439)

EXPERT (P. 439)
PURELY TECHNICAL (P. 439)
SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE (P. 440)

THREE PROBLEMS (P. 440)
MARGARET MELLON (P. 440)
"SLIPPERY SLOPE" FALLACY (P. 444)

29% (P. 442)
EXPERIMENTATION (P. 442)
FAULTY ANALOGY (P. 444)

DAVID KLINE (P. 443)
70 PERCENT (P. 443)
PHYSICAL INTEGRITY (P. 444)

EXOTICS (P. 445)
ZEBRA MUSSELS (P. 445)
STRUCTURAL INTEGRITY (P. 444)

SUPERBUGS (P. 445)
KUDZU (P. 445)
OZONE HOLE (P. 446)

PUBLIC REVIEW (P. 446)
WES JACKSON (P. 446)
TESTING IN FIELD (P. 446)

TRANSFUSION (P. 447)
LABELING (P. 446)
LAWRENCE SUMMERS (P. 447)

WORLD BANK (P. 447)
RIGHT TO KNOW (P. 447)
PROSTATE CANCER (P. 448)

AFRICA ARE (P. 448)
ECONOMIC LOGIC (P. 448)
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4.2-4.6 ESSAYS: ANSWER IN SEVERAL PARAGRAPHS; USE THE 5 CRITERIA TO EVALUATE PRO & CON.

1. WHY DOES PARNAS SAY EVERY INDIVIDUAL’S DECISION IS IMPORTANT REGARDING THE MORAL CHOICE OF WHETHER OR NOT TO PARTICIPATE IN PROJECTS LIKE SDI? DOES HE WANT SCIENTISTS TO TAKE POLITICAL POSITIONS? WHY OR WHY NOT? EXPLAIN.

2. DOES COHEN ADDRESS PARNAS’ ARGUMENT THAT SDI WOULD SPEED UP THE ARMS RACE?

3. WOULD CONSENT, COMPENSATION, AND EQUITY SOLVE THE RADWASTE PROBLEM?

4. CRITICALLY EVALUATE THE MITCHAM, DEGEORGE, EDGAR, COHEN, PARNAS, SHRADER-FRECHETTE, PIMENTEL, MURRAY, AND WESTRA ESSAYS ACCORDING TO THE FIVE LOGICAL CRITERIA.