

DEFINE, EXPLAIN, EXEMPLIFY IN ONE OR TWO SENTENCES.

1.1		
SPECIES LOSSES ANNUAL US CANCERS POGO PESTICIDE DEATHS CHERNOBYL	90 PERCENT CHILDREN'S CANCER DOWNWINDERS E. O. WILSON MESTHENE, MCDERMOTT	MURDER/CANCER US PESTICIDE EXPORTS CANCER INCIDENCE VS. MORTALITY PRIMA FACIE PRINCIPLES MILL

---

1.2		
ETHICS, MORALITY JAMES NEAL ACTIONS CHARACTER OPTIONAL/OBLIGATORY CATEGORICAL IMPERATIVE KANT, ARISTOTLE RELATIVE PRINCIPLES	MORAL PHILOSOPHY KITTY GENOVESE MOTIVES CONSEQUENCES SUPEREROGATORY PRINCIPLE OF ENDS MILL, BENTHAM UTILITARIANISM	RELIGION, LAW, ETIQUETTE KING EDWARD III RIGHT/WRONG GOOD/BAD DEONTOLOGICAL HYPOTHETICAL IMPERATIVE TELEOLOGICAL

---

1.3		
ARISTOTLE TECHNOLOGICAL RISK MAXIMIN UTILITARIANISM	GEOGRAPHICAL EQUITY OVERCONFIDENCE BIAS AVERAGE EXPECTED UTILITY EGALITARIANISM	HARSANYI, RAWLS JUDITH THOMSON SUBJECTIVE PROBABILITIES COMPENSATING WAGE DIFFERENTIAL

---

<u>INFORMAL LOGICAL FALLACIES</u>		
APPEAL TO PITY APPEAL TO FORCE AMPHIBOLY DIVISION, COMPOSITION	APPEAL TO THE PEOPLE HASTY GENERALIZATION COMPLEX QUESTION	ARGUMENT FROM IGNORANCE BEGGING THE QUESTION IRRELEVANT THESIS

---

<u>5 LOGICAL CRITERIA</u>		
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.

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

CLEARING SOLUTION PARADIGM HAL	ESSENCE OF MODERN TECHNOLOGY RELEASEMENT CATHEDRAL CELEBRATORY MEAL FREE RELATION TO T	TECHNOLOGY UNDERSTANDING OF BEING (TUB) IS HEIDEGGER REACTIONARY? WHY DOES H. SAY ONLY GOD CAN SAVE US? THE GREATEST DANGER UNIFIED BUT OPEN COMMUNITY
TA ENGELS DETERMINISM	WITTGENSTEIN, MARX MODES OF PRODUCTION SIMULATION TELEVISION	2.3 TECHNOLOGICAL SOMNAMBULISM TECHNOLOGY AS A "FORM OF LIFE" SAN DIEGO, WALKING AT NIGHT MARX, WITTGENSTEIN ON TECHNOLOGY
PRIVACY DEMOCRACY NEUTRALITY	MEYER-KAIN STUDY PROBLEMS/OPPORTUNITIES TECHNICIANS/EXPERTISE SECULAR RATIONALITY	2.4 THREE UNHELPFUL VIEWS DEFINITION OF TECHNOLOGY EXTERNALITIES AS THE PRICE OF BENEFITS LOGIC OF MODERN DECISIONMAKING
DEMOCRACY ELITISM DISCIPLINE GRESHAM REALITY/FACTS/GI	EXPERTS/OPTIMISM NEGATIVE EXTERNALITIES BLACK LADY MOUNTAIN LAISSEZ INNOVER RESPECT/ALTRUISM	2.5 SOCIAL DIMENSION: IMPORTANCE CONCRETE DEFINITION OF TECHNOLOGY TECHNOLOGY, ILLITERACY, HIERARCHY CLASS CONFLICT, OFFICIAL VIOLENCE RIGHT-WING IDEOLOGY
GREED THORP 2 PRESSES	RISK VS. SAFETY DUE CARE/RESPONSIBILITY FEASIBLE CONTROL	2.6 GERMAN INDUSTRIAL SAW SAFETY AS A SOCIAL CONSTRUCT CHILDREN AT DAWN
CHOICE HORMONE CTA	POLITICAL CONSTRUCTION BALANCE TO PROFITS WHO ELSE COULD WE BE?	2.7 NEW TECHNOLOGY AND PROFITS SHIFTING THE BURDEN OF PROOF TECHNOLOGY AND THE HANDICAPPED

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 HEIGEGGER-DREYFUS, WINNER, MESTHENE, MCDERMOTT, HOLLANDER, AND TATUM ESSAYS. WHO IS MORE CORRECT, MESTHENE OR MCDERMOTT? EXPLIAN/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.

NUMBER/MODEL FRANKENSTEIN REDEFINE HUMAN RIGHTS SOCIOLOGICAL	3.1 DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY EXPERT JUDGMENT BENEFIT-COST ANALYSIS METASCIENTIFIC	NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL THREE TYPES OF VALUES UTILITARIAN-PLURALIST COUNTERCULTURE-ACTIVIST-UTOPIAN
---	---	--

FORMALDEHYDE	OBJECTIVITY, LUDDISM	WELFARE/PREFERENCES
	3.2	
VICTOR LEIBNIZ RULES SEABORG MUMFORD AESCHYLUS FALL OF MAN TECHNLGY	PROMETHEAN IDEALS MONSTER/UNFINISHED CREATION UTILITARIAN/PLURALIST MODEL "I JUST WORK HERE" TECHNOLOGY AS POLITICAL NEW KINDS OF TECHNICS EPISTEMOLOGICAL LUDDISM  POLITICAL TECHNOLOGY	AUTONOMOUS TECHNOLOGY FRANKENSTEIN IN FILM/BOOK NEGATIVE EXTERNALITIES SCANDAL OF PRODUCTIVITY DIFFERENT SOCIAL LIFE/TECHNOLOGY DIRECT PARTICIPATION, NONEXPERTS DIRECT ACTION VS. SUPERIOR

	3.3	
RIGHTS TRUMP, ACLU DUNE BUGGY GOD, LOCKE QUINLAN, WANGLIE CRUZAN	TRIAD: QUALITY OF LIFE + TERMINALLY ILL PEOPLE AGGREGATIVE TM/INDIVIDUAL ELEANOR ROOSEVELT AUTODEALERS/OREGON SAN FRANCISCO/PLANNING	TECHNOLOGICAL MAXIMALITY + 3 OPTIONS CONTEXTUALIZED RIGHTS ABSOLUTIST RIGHTS, FEINBERG CONCORDE AND FRENCH 1993/FREE SPEECH

	3.4	
OTA SMITH, MILL WASH 1224 HARVARD STUDY KEYNES WILDE, MYRDAL DETERM. EXTERNALITIES HOMOGENOUS AUTOS VS. POLLUTION	UTILITY VS. MORALITY CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS CONCRETE APPLICATIONS DISTRIBUTION/DOMINANT IDEOLOGY FRIEDMAN, MISES; HOOK HEDONISM, EGOISM  TANK CARS/RAILROADS 4 REASONS, PRICES VS. VALUES PREFERENCES/WELFARE/STIPULATIVE DEFINITION	PARETO OPTIMUM/IMPROVEMENT WASH 1400/NUKE VS. COAL FINAL TEST OF PUBLIC POLICY 3 NOTIONS, COMPENSATING VARIATION WEALTHY/POOR/DISCRIMINATION ECONOMIC EXCHANGE, CAUSAL  COMPENS. VARIATIONS IGNORE 4 THINGS US OIL CNSMPTN/SUBSDZED-REAL COSTS

	3.5	
SEPARABILITY GORSUCH EPA RUCKELSHAUS WEINBERG NUTSHELL PROBLEM REAGAN AMMUNITION, 239 RULE (M) DUPONT	SOCIOLOGICAL VS. METASCIENTIFIC 1983 NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL/ACADEMY OF SCIENCES + 2 REFORMS KUHN, FEYERABEND WYNNE, DOUGLAS, WILDAVSKY INFERENCE OPTIONS OF NRC/NAS RISK VS. PERCEIVED RISK ASHFORD/RYAN/CALDART WEIGHING INSTRUMENT LIMITED SENSITIVITY	EXPLAIN 4 STEPS RISK ASSESSMENT OLD, POSITIVIST, SCIENTFC. RATIONALITY FACTS/VALUES/PREMISE P/TRANSSCIENCE SOCIOLOGICAL VIEW: 2 CONSEQUENCES FORMALDEHYDE/CIIT/REASSESSMENT TODHUNTER/GORE/NRDC/WALKER NEGATIVE EPIDEMIOLOGICAL RESULTS 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

	4.2	
1771 LOYALTY PATERNALISM MORISON VEBLEN 1947 PUBLIC WELFARE ASME HYDROLEVEL	SOCIETY OF CIVIL ENGINEERS MILITARY FORTIFICATIONS ENHANCE HUMAN WELFARE MCDONNELL AND MILLER 1982 SUPREME COURT BART PROF CODE OF ETHICS O-RING SAFETY DESIGN, RESEARCH TEST TO DESTRUCTION	TECHNOCRACY MOVEMENT FAITHFUL AGENT OR TRUSTEE TECHNOLOGICAL EFFICIENCY VIOLATED SHERMAN ANTITRUST LOW-WATER FUEL-CUTOFF DEVICE AUTONOMY, PUBLIC DISCLOSURE PHYSICAL PRODUCT, KNOWLEDGE SCIENCE, LAB, WORLD, TECHNOLOGY CONTROL VS. CHECKING INSTANCES

BART UNGER ROGER BOISJOLY BARBIE VIDEOS SCHUMACHER	BOUNDARY CONDITIONS STAR WARS; MILITARY, TOYS COMPLEXIFYING DEVELOPING NATIONS CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS HJORTSVANG, MULTIDISCIPLINARY	COMPUTER SYSTEMS, SUBDIVISION FUNDAMENTAL TECHN. OBLIGATION APPROPRIATE TECHN. TRANSFER EDUC., DEFENSE, PUBLIC INFO. 5 PRACTICAL GUIDELINES, QUESTIONS
---	---	--

4.3

ENGINEERING SAINTS PINTO CASE 1978, 1980 WHY FORD WON FRANCIS OLSEN HARLEY COPP FEDERAL STANDARDS 43 VS. 25 MONTHS REALISTIC PENALTIES INSPECTOR GENERAL RISK <u>ACCEPTABILITY</u> & <u>ENGINEERING</u> PROBLEM BENEFIT-COST ANALYSIS/ABSOLUTE MEANING/WHAT IT IGNORES MANY FACTORS	WHISTLEBLOWERS GOSHEN, INDIANA FORD, 1971-1978 NHTSA ORDERED RECALL 2ND-GUESS MANAGERS REPORT/INSIST FINDINGS PREVENT SQUEEZE TRY INDIVIDUALS HEAVY LIABILITY ENGINEERING ASSISTANT	PUBLIC SAFETY PARAMOUNT, JOBS WINAMAC, INDIANA \$6.65, \$21 MILLION 30 MPH ONLY COMPACT 3 CONDITIONS PERMISSION 5 CONDITIONS FOR DUTY <u>SAFETY AS A BENEFIT-COST FACTOR</u> CONSUMER PRODUCT INFORMATION CORPORATE STRUCTURE CHANGE CORPORATE ETHICS
--	--	--

4.4

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

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

4.5

STAR WARS SDI ICBMs VALIDATION PET PROJECT REDUNDANCY VENUS 90 % FIGURE DOD HEROIN COMMUNICATION NOOSE SHUTTLE	DETERRENCE EINSTEIN ARMS RACE VERIFICATION ESPIONAGE OVERLOADING 3 LAYERS EASTPORT UNIVERSITIES PROSTITUTION  EXECUTION SAFEGUARD	COMPUTATIONAL PROBLEMS 3 PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES CONFLICT OF INTEREST LIMITS OF SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY SDI SOFTWARE ASSUMPTIONS DISTRIBUTED REAL-TIME DATA BASE PASSIVE REFUSAL/ACTIVE OPPOSITION LOOSE/TIGHT COORDINATION SCIENTIFIC REVIEW; DAMAGE CONTROL 4 EASTPORT ASSUMPTIONS  200 INSTRUCTIONS 6 MISINTERPRETATIONS OF PARNAS	NO ARMS POLICY INTERNATIONAL SECURITY DISTINGUISHED EXPERTS IGNORE COMPUTERS REALISTIC TESTING FIXED ORBITS RESEARCH/SHIELD/FRAUD SDIO DISPUTES, STRAW MAN TECH EXCESSIVE  REDEFINING THE PROBLEM PESSIMISTIC PREDICTIONS
--	---	---	---

4.5

DICHOTOMY	IRRELEVANCE	R AND D VERSUS DEPLOYMENT	PROFESSIONALS AND TURF
BETHE	PREDICTION	RELIABILITY/TESTING/CONTEXT	BALDWIN, CHURCHILL
ALICE IN W.	REAGAN	CAPABLE SYSTEM VS. RESEARCH	FUTURE KNOWLEDGE
NORAD	BM/C <sup>3</sup>	"LONGEST POLE"	ABRAHAMSON
APOLLO	VOYAGER	ALL MAJOR DEFENSE SYSTEMS	SHUTTLE FLIGHT CONTROL

#### 4.6 S-F, NUCLEAR WASTE

CHERNOBYL (P. 355)	THREE MILE ISLAND (P. 355)	TWO SOLUTIONS (P. 355)
EGYPTIANS (P. 355)	ITALIANS (P. 355)	RECORDED HISTORY (P. 355)
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)
KASPERSON (P. 359)	LOCUS (P. 359)	LABOR-LAITY (P. 359)
LEGACY (P. 359)	PREEMPTS FUTURE (P. 360)	PLUTONIUM ECONOMY (P. 360)
URANIUM (P. 360)	DISCOUNT RATES (P. 360)	TEMPORARY, PERMANENT (P. 360)
VESTING (P. 360)	LAND ETHICS (P. 361)	GEOGRAPHICAL EQUITY (P. 361)
MORE EXPENSIVE (P. 361)	FOUR DILEMMAS (P. 361)	CONSENT DILEMMA (P. 361)
WEST VALLEY (P. 361 & 362)	FEDERALISM DILEMMA (P. 361)	THRESHOLD DILEMMA (P. 361)
HANFORD (P. 362)	INFORMED CONSENT (P. 363)	CONTRIBUTOR'S DILEMMA (P. 361)
STEWART (P. 363)	LIBERTY (P. 363)	COMPENSATING WAGE DIFFER. (P. 362)
INTEGRITY (P. 363)	EQUALITY (P. 363)	THRESHOLD DILEMMA (P. 363)
10 <sup>-6</sup> (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)
BREEDER (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)	

#### STV/PHIL 256, SIXTH STUDY SHEET FOR TV, SECTIONS 4.7, 4.8, 4.9

#### 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)

ECOSYSTEMS (P. 399)	MASTERY (P. 399)	EQUITABLE ALLOCATION (P. 400)
PUBLIC ILLNESSES (P. 400)	REDUCED ONE-HALF (P. 400)	PUBLIC CONCERN (P. 400)
INVESTMENT (P. 401)	PESTICIDE CONTROL (P. 401)	NONCHEMICAL CONTROLS (P. 400)
SCARCE DATA (P. 401)	COMPLETE ACCOUNTING (P. 401)	COSTS OF PESTICIDE USE (P. 401)
	VALUABLE TOOL (P. 402)	LONG-TERM COSTS/BENEFITS (P. 401)

#### 4.8 MURRAY, GENOME

<i>THREE CATEGORIES</i> (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)	<i>STRUCTURAL</i> 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)	

STV/PHIL 256, SEVENTH STUDY SHEET FOR TV

#### 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.