

# ISF 100G: Science, Society, and Ethics

## Spring 2017

### University of California, Berkeley

TuTh 2-3.30 pm  
Room: 101 Moffitt

Lecturer: Shreeharsh Kelkar  
Interdisciplinary Studies Program

[skelkar@berkeley.edu](mailto:skelkar@berkeley.edu)

Room: 269 Evans Hall

Office Hours: Wednesdays, 2-4 pm (or email for appointment; or walk in if you see me and my door is open)

---

### **Course Description and Learning Objectives**

This course surveys the entanglements of science and technology with states, publics, and the question of expertise and governance. We will ask: what are science and technology, and how have states deployed them to govern publics while being transformed at the same time? How have citizens, elites, and experts pushed back? In particular, we will examine particular scientific and technological processes and controversies to understand science-state-society relations: from quantification and standardization to race science, standardized testing, technological disasters, GMOs, financial instruments, net neutrality, and digital privacy among others. The question of "ethics" will be explored not so much in terms of evaluating what is right or wrong, but in terms of how the processes of technology design, knowledge production, and governance are themselves saturated with values every step of the way. Our readings will mostly be drawn from the interdisciplinary field of science, technology, and society, but we will also draw on history, sociology, anthropology, political theory, and public policy. By the end of this class, you will be able to use certain tools to navigate questions such as: what is the role of expertise in governing? How might we reconcile the competing demands of public accountability and the technical demands of experts? What are the kinds of uses that states and corporations put science and technology to? What are the consequences of this interplay?

### **Requirements**

The grade breakdown is as follows:

Attendance and Class Participation: 10 pts

Knowledge Systems Analysis: 35 pts

Op-ed: 5 pts

Post 1 (Citation Analysis): 10 pts

Post 2 (Media Analysis): 10 pts

Post 3 (Big-picture Analysis): 10 pts

Midterm: 20 pts  
Final Reflection Paper: 15 pts  
Reading Summaries: 20 pts (1 pt each)  
**Total: 100 pts**

The grading scheme for the class is as follows:

Range and Grade
$90 \leq A \leq 100$
$80 \leq A < 90$
$70 \leq B < 80$
$60 \leq B < 70$
$50 \leq B < 60$
$45 \leq C < 50$
$40 \leq C < 45$
$35 \leq C < 40$
$0 \leq F < 35$

**Attendance:** You are expected to attend all classes, unless you have a documented personal or medical reason.

**Readings:** You are expected to read about 50-80 pages a week. Please read carefully and take notes. I expect that you to be able to converse thoughtfully about the readings in class. Use the “Summaries” assignment as a way to break down the reading into parts and assimilate it.

**Class Participation:** This class will combine lectures with class discussions. We will use discussions of various types (all-class, group, debates, think-pair-share) to tease apart the readings together. The participation grade is not based on how much you speak but whether you speak thoughtfully, engage with others, and contribute to an overall atmosphere where everyone comes away with new insights.

**Assignments:** Prompts for the assignments are provided in the next section. No extensions are permitted without a documented medical or personal excuse. Late papers lose a full grade a day.

**Laptop Policy:** No laptops, tablets, or cell phones will be allowed during class. I encourage you to print out the readings, annotate them, and bring them to class, so that we can discuss them closely. At other times, I can project parts of the readings and/or your forum postings so that we can discuss them collectively. There is a wide literature that shows that overall, students are distracted from the topic at hand because of their laptops and phones, and that students are often distracted by the laptops of other people. For those of you that prefer to take your notes on your laptops, there’s some research that shows that taking hand-written notes forces you to synthesize your points, thereby creating better notes.

## Assignments

**Reading Summaries:** By 12 pm of the day of class, you will submit (from a Google form linked to the reading), a summary of the reading and two questions that the reading raised for you. You have to do 20 of these through the semester, each being worth 1 point. No late submissions are allowed.

**Knowledge Systems Analysis:** The knowledge systems analysis is your own effort to apply the tools you learn in this class to a particular controversy involving the question of science and technology. For instance, depending on your backgrounds, you may be interested in the question of fracking, the labeling of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) or the principles of net neutrality. In your knowledge systems analysis, you will aim to understand the publics, experts, and organizations around a particular issue. The goal is to understand what this controversy means to each actor and how particular images of science, truth, the nation are mobilized around it. To do so, you will look at very specific cases. For instance, if you are interested in the controversy around fracking, your knowledge systems analysis will not be about fracking in general but a particular fracking installation that is generating controversy and conflict.

Op-ed: The first contribution is your op-ed. You will write a 400 word op-ed summarizing your position on the issue. The op-ed is a way for you to begin your analysis. You do not have to use any concepts from this class in your op-ed (in fact, I recommend you not do so). You also do not need a specific case: e.g. your op-ed can be about fracking in general rather than a particular dispute over a fracking site. (400 words)

Post 1 (Citation Analysis): In this post, you track the various knowledge claims that are being mobilized in the controversy. For e.g. what scientific papers are being used by the various actors to make their own points? How are these papers being undermined? Who wrote these papers and when? What other papers do these papers depend on? (1000 words)

Post 2 (Media Analysis): In this post, you look at the media representations of the controversy by looking at how these controversy has been portrayed in newspapers, television, and on the Internet. Ask yourself: as the controversy circulates through media, what is it become? (1000 words)

Post 3 (Big-picture Analysis): Using posts 1 and 2, you answer the question of what the controversy means to the various actors and what techniques they mobilize to make their case. Use concepts from the course like interpretive flexibility, boundary work, objectivity, credibility, and so on. (1000 words)

**Reflection Paper (2000 words):** In your reflection paper, draw on your three posts to explain a scientific/technological controversy using the concepts that you have learnt in this class: publics, experts, interpretive flexibility, jurisdiction contests, and the like. Your reflection paper cannot just be your post 3. A key part of the Reflection Paper is to locate yourself as an actor within a wider debate; to do so, draw on the op-ed you wrote at the beginning of the class. What would you say/do differently after taking this class?

## Schedule and Readings

W	Days	Title and Learning Goals	Readings
1	17-Jan	Introductions; How to read and write summaries	
	19-Jan	Science, Technology, Modernity, Capitalism	Forster, E. M. 1909. <i>The Machine Stops</i> .  Berman, Marshall. 1988. All That is Solid Melts into Air: Marx, Modernism, and Modernization. <i>From All That is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity</i> . 87-129.

2	24-Jan	Technology, Society and Power I: The Dilemma of Technological Determinism and Unintended Consequences	<p>Winner, Langdon. "Do Artifacts have politics?" <i>Daedalus</i> (1980): 121-136.</p> <p>Marx, Leo and Merritt Roe Smith. 1994. Introduction. From <i>Does Technology Drive History? The Dilemma of Technological Determinism</i>. Pages ix-xv.</p> <p>Marx, Leo. "Technology: The emergence of a hazardous concept." <i>Technology and Culture</i> 51.3 (2010): 561-577.</p> <p>Hughes, Thomas. 1999. The Evolution of Large Technological Systems. In <i>The Social Construction of Technological Systems: New Directions in the Sociology and History of Technology</i>. p51-82.</p> <p>Introduces nuanced ways of thinking about how technology impacts society. Key concepts: "technology", technological momentum, technological determinism, inherently political technologies.</p>
	26-Jan	Technology, Society, and Power II	<p>Latour, Bruno. "Technology is Society Made Durable." <i>The Sociological Review</i> 38.S1 (1990): 103-131.</p> <p>Pinch, Trevor J., and Wiebe E. Bijker. 1987. "The Social Construction of Facts and Artifacts" In <i>The Social Construction of Technological Systems: New directions in the Sociology and History of Technology</i>. p28-50.</p> <p>Key concepts: interpretive flexibility, closure</p> <p><b>Op-ed due.</b></p>
3	31-Jan	The Credibility of Knowledge I	<p>Latour, Bruno. 1988. Chapter 1: Literature. From <i>Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society</i>. p21-62.</p> <p>Key concepts: the modality of facts</p>

	2-Feb	The Credibility of Knowledge II	<p>Hilgartner, Stephen, and Charles L. Bosk. "The Rise and Fall of Social Problems: A Public Arenas Model." <i>American Journal of Sociology</i> (1988): 53-78.</p> <p>Gusfield, Joseph. 1981. Chap 3: The Fiction and Drama of Public Reality. In <i>The Culture of Public Problems: Drinking-Driving and the Symbolic Order</i>.</p> <p>Dumit, Joseph. 2004. Chap 5: Traveling Images, Popularizing Brains. In <i>Picturing Personhood: Brain Scans and Biomedical Identity</i>. p139-170. Key concepts: public arenas, operatives</p>
4	7-Feb	Standardization	<p>Cronon, William. 1991. Chap 3: Pricing the Future: Grain. In <i>Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West</i>. p97-147.</p> <p>Cronon explains what the process of standardization looks like and the struggles between different constituencies that shape the process.</p> <p>Busch, Lawrence. 2011. Chap 2: Standardizing the World. From <i>Standards: Recipes for Reality</i>. 77-151.</p>
	9-Feb	The Role of Numbers	<p>Anderson, Benedict. 1991. Chap 1: Introduction, Chap 10: Census, Map, Museum. In <i>Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism</i>. p1-9, 163-187.</p> <p>Hacking, Ian. "Biopower and the Avalanche of Printed Numbers." In <i>Biopower: Foucault and Beyond</i> (2015).</p> <p>Mitchell, Timothy. 2002. Chap 3: The Character of Calculability. In <i>Rule of Experts: Egypt, Technopolitics, Modernity</i>. p80-123.</p> <p>Espeland, Wendy Nelson. "Bureaucratizing Democracy, Democratizing Bureaucracy." <i>Law &amp; Social Inquiry</i> 25.4 (2000): 1077-1109.</p>

5	14-Feb	Looping Effects	<p>Hacking, Ian. 2002. Chap 6: Making Up People. In <i>Historical Ontology</i>. p99-114.</p> <p>Igo, Sarah. 2007. Epilogue: Statistical Citizens. In <i>The Averaged American: Surveys, Citizens, and the Making of a Mass Public</i>. p281-299.</p> <p>Espeland, Wendy Nelson, and Michael Sauder. "Rankings and Reactivity: How Public Measures Recreate Social Worlds 1." <i>American Journal of Sociology</i> 113.1 (2007): 1-40.</p>
	16-Feb	Public Arenas I: The Media, Boundary Work	<p>Gieryn, Thomas F. "Boundary-work and the Demarcation of Science from Non-science: Strains and Interests in Professional Ideologies of Scientists." <i>American Sociological Review</i> (1983): 781-795.</p> <p>Lewenstein, Bruce V. "The Meaning of 'Public Understanding of Science' in the United States after World War II." <i>Public Understanding of Science</i> 1.1 (1992): 45-68.</p> <p>Abbott, Andrew. "Boundaries of Social Work or Social Work of Boundaries?: The Social Service Review Lecture." <i>Social Service Review</i> 69.4 (1995): 545-562. (Only first 10 pages).</p> <p><b>Blogpost I (Citation Analysis) due 19<sup>th</sup> Feb</b></p>
6	21-Feb	Public Arenas II: Science and the Law	<p>Jasanoff, Sheila. "The Eye of Everyman: Witnessing DNA in the Simpson Trial." <i>Social Studies of Science</i> 28.5-6 (1998): 713-740.</p> <p>Alder, Ken. "A Social History of Untruth: Lie Detection and Trust in Twentieth-Century America." <i>Representations</i> 80.1 (2002): 1-33.</p>
	23-Feb	Public Arenas III: Science, Regulation and the State	<p>Jasanoff, Sheila S. "Contested Boundaries in Policy-Relevant Science." <i>Social Studies of Science</i> 17.2 (1987): 195-230.</p> <p>Porter, Theodore. 1995. Chap 7: U.S. Army Engineers and the Rise of Cost-Benefit Analysis. In <i>Trust in Numbers: The Pursuit of Objectivity in Science and Public Life</i>. p148-189.</p>

7	28-Feb	Public Arenas IV: Science, Regulation and the State	<p>Mooney, Chris. 2012. What the Frack is True? From <i>The Republican Brain: The Science of Why They Deny Science—and Reality</i>. pp 209-239. Or maybe his Sci-Am article on fracking.</p> <p>Sarewitz, Daniel. "How Science Makes Environmental Controversies Worse." <i>Environmental Science &amp; Policy</i> 7.5 (2004): 385-403.</p>
	2-Mar	Expertise: Lay, Expert, and Interactional	<p>An Interview with sociologist Harry Collins on "interactional expertise." <i>American Scientist</i>.  <a href="http://www.americanscientist.org/bookshelf/pub/an-interview-with-harry-collins">http://www.americanscientist.org/bookshelf/pub/an-interview-with-harry-collins</a></p> <p>Epstein, Steven. "The Construction of Lay Expertise: AIDS Activism and the Forging of Credibility in the Reform of Clinical Trials." <i>Science, Technology &amp; Human Values</i> 20.4 (1995): 408-437.</p> <p>Key concepts: the different types of expertise; tacit versus propositional knowledge, embodied versus interactional expertise.</p>
8	7-Mar	The Politics of Expertise	<p>Klein, Ezra. "Our Corrupt Politics: It's Not All Money." <i>New York Review of Books</i> (2012). Mar 22.</p> <p>Eyal, Gil. "For a Sociology of Expertise: The Social Origins of the Autism Epidemic." <i>American Journal of Sociology</i> 118.4 (2013): 863-907.</p>
	9-Mar	Experts, Publics, and Democracy I	<p>Lemann, Nicholas. 2008. Conflicts of Interest. <i>The New Yorker</i>.  <a href="http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2008/08/11/conflict-of-interests">http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2008/08/11/conflict-of-interests</a>.</p> <p>E. J. Woodhouse and D. Nieuwsma, "When Expert Advice Works, and When It Does Not," in <i>IEEE Technology and Society Magazine</i>, vol. 16, no. 1 (1997), pp. 23-29, Spring.</p> <p><b>Blogpost 2 (Media Analysis due March 12)</b></p>



9	14-Mar	Experts, Publics, and Democracy II	<p>Zuckerman, Ethan. 2013. Citizen Science versus NIMBY?  <a href="http://www.ethanzuckerman.com/blog/2013/08/29/citizen-science-versus-nimby/">http://www.ethanzuckerman.com/blog/2013/08/29/citizen-science-versus-nimby/</a>.</p> <p>Noveck, Beth Simone. 2016. Interview. The Obama administration wanted to open up government to citizen input. Why hasn't it worked? <i>The Monkey Cage</i>.  <a href="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/06/20/the-u-s-government-could-benefit-from-advice-from-the-public-getting-that-advice-may-be-against-the-law/">https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/06/20/the-u-s-government-could-benefit-from-advice-from-the-public-getting-that-advice-may-be-against-the-law/</a></p> <p>Wynne, Brian. "Misunderstood Misunderstanding: Social Identities and Public Uptake of Science." <i>Public Understanding of Science</i> 1.3 (1992): 281-304.</p>
	16-Mar	Experts, Publics, and Democracy III	<p>Interview with Jerome Ravetz on "post-normal science." 2016.  <a href="http://www.greattransition.org/publication/democratizing-science">http://www.greattransition.org/publication/democratizing-science</a>.</p> <p>Jasanoff, Sheila. 2005. Chap 11: Republics of Science. From <i>Designs on Nature: Science and Democracy in Europe and the United States</i>. 272-291.</p>
10	21-Mar	Review Session: Science, Technology, Experts and Publics	
	23-Mar	Midterm	
11	27-Mar	NO CLASS; SPRING BREAK	
	29-Mar	NO CLASS; SPRING BREAK	

12	4-Apr	Bio-medicine and Health	<p>Angell, Marcia. 2009. Drug Companies and Doctors: A Story of Corruption. <i>The New York Review of Books</i>.</p> <p>Silberman, Steve. 2009. Placebos are getting more effective. Drug-makers are desperate to know why. <i>Wired Magazine</i>. <a href="https://www.wired.com/2009/08/ff-placebo-effect/">https://www.wired.com/2009/08/ff-placebo-effect/</a></p> <p>Freedman, David. 2010. Lies, Damned Lies, and Medical Science. <i>The Atlantic Monthly</i>. <a href="https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2010/11/lies-damned-lies-and-medical-science/308269/">https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2010/11/lies-damned-lies-and-medical-science/308269/</a></p> <p>Aviv, Rachel. 2011. God knows where I am. What should happen when patients reject their diagnosis? <i>The New Yorker</i>. <a href="http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2011/05/30/god-knows-where-i-am">http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2011/05/30/god-knows-where-i-am</a></p>
	6-Apr	Race and Gender	<p>Fausto-Sterling, Anne. "The Sex/Gender Perplex." (2000): 637-646. [pdf]</p> <p>Marks, Jonathan. 2008. Race: Past, Present, Future. In <i>Revisiting Race in a Genomic Age</i>. 21-38. [pdf]</p> <p>Interview with Rogers Brubaker. <a href="http://blog.press.princeton.edu/2016/10/04/rogers-brubaker-on-understanding-transracial/">http://blog.press.princeton.edu/2016/10/04/rogers-brubaker-on-understanding-transracial/</a></p> <p><b>Optional:</b></p> <p>Padawer, Ruth. 2016. The Humiliating Practice of Sex-Testing Female Athletes. <i>The New York Times Magazine</i>. <a href="https://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/03/magazine/the-humiliating-practice-of-sex-testing-female-athletes.html?_r=0">https://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/03/magazine/the-humiliating-practice-of-sex-testing-female-athletes.html?_r=0</a></p> <p>Gelman, Andrew. 2014. The Paradox of Racism. <i>Slate Magazine</i>. <a href="http://www.slate.com/articles/health_and_science/science/2014/05/troublesome_inheritance_critique_nicholas_wade_s_dated_assumptions_about.html">http://www.slate.com/articles/health_and_science/science/2014/05/troublesome_inheritance_critique_nicholas_wade_s_dated_assumptions_about.html</a></p> <p>Gould, Stephen Jay. 1991. The Birth of the Two-Sex World. <i>New York Review of Books</i>.</p>

13	11-Apr	Financial Technologies	<p><i>Margin Call</i>. Written and directed by J. C. Chandor.</p> <p>Tett, Gillian. 2009. Chap 1: The Derivatives Dream and Chap 3: The Dream Team. From <i>Fool's Gold: How the Bold Dream of a Small Tribe at J. P. Morgan Was Corrupted by Wall Street Greed and Unleashed a Catastrophe</i>. 3-22, 41-56.</p>
	13-Apr	<p>Technology and the Legitimacy of Elections</p> <p>Guest Lecturer: Philip Stark, Department of Statistics.</p>	<p>Stark, P.B., and D.A. Wagner, 2012. Evidence-Based Elections. <i>IEEE Security and Privacy</i>, 10, 33–41.</p> <p>Masket, Seth. 2017. The Convenient Scapegoat of Gerrymandering. <i>Vox</i>. <a href="http://www.vox.com/mischiefs-of-faction/2017/3/29/15109082/gerrymandering-convenient-scapegoat">http://www.vox.com/mischiefs-of-faction/2017/3/29/15109082/gerrymandering-convenient-scapegoat</a></p> <p>McGann, Anthony J., Charles Anthony Smith, Michael Latner and Alex Keena. 2017. We have a standard for judging partisan gerrymandering. The Supreme Court should use it. <i>The Monkey Cage</i>. <a href="https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2017/02/02/we-have-a-standard-for-judging-partisan-gerrymandering-the-supreme-court-should-use-it/?utm_term=.4134094a23a6">https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2017/02/02/we-have-a-standard-for-judging-partisan-gerrymandering-the-supreme-court-should-use-it/?utm_term=.4134094a23a6</a></p> <p>Margolick, David, Evgenia Peretz, and Michael Shnayerson. 2004. The Path to Florida. <i>Vanity Fair</i>. <a href="http://www.vanityfair.com/news/2004/10/florida-election-2000">http://www.vanityfair.com/news/2004/10/florida-election-2000</a></p> <p><b>Blogpost 3 due (Big Picture Analysis) due</b></p>
14	18-Apr	Climate Change	<p>Sarewitz, Daniel and Roger Pielke Jr. 2000. Breaking the Global-Warming Gridlock. <i>The Atlantic Monthly</i>. <a href="https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2000/07/breaking-the-global-warming-gridlock/304973/">https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2000/07/breaking-the-global-warming-gridlock/304973/</a></p> <p>Manzi, Jim. 2007. Game Plan: What Conservatives Should do about Global Warming. <i>National Review</i>.</p> <p>Skocpol, Theda. 2013. Learning from the Cap-and-Trade Debate. <i>Grist</i>. <a href="http://grist.org/climate-energy/learning-from-the-cap-and-trade-debate/">http://grist.org/climate-energy/learning-from-the-cap-and-trade-debate/</a></p> <p>Manzi, Jim. 2009. Dunces: Cap-And-Trade. <i>National Review</i>.</p>

	20-Apr	Data: Big, Small, Public, Private	<p>Duhigg, Charles. 2012. How Companies Know Your Secrets. <i>The New York Times Magazine</i>. <a href="http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/19/magazine/shopping-habits.html">http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/19/magazine/shopping-habits.html</a></p> <p>Harford, Tim. 2014. Big Data: Are We Making a Mistake? <i>The Financial Times</i>. <a href="https://www.ft.com/content/21a6e7d8-b479-11e3-a09a-00144feabdc0">https://www.ft.com/content/21a6e7d8-b479-11e3-a09a-00144feabdc0</a></p> <p>Crawford, Kate. 2013. The Hidden Biases of Big Data. <i>Harvard Business Review</i>. <a href="https://hbr.org/2013/04/the-hidden-biases-in-big-data">https://hbr.org/2013/04/the-hidden-biases-in-big-data</a></p> <p>Singer, Natasha. 2013. A Data Broker Offers a Peek Behind the Curtain. <i>The New York Times</i>. <a href="http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/01/business/a-data-broker-offers-a-peek-behind-the-curtain.html?pagewanted=all&amp;r=0">http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/01/business/a-data-broker-offers-a-peek-behind-the-curtain.html?pagewanted=all&amp;r=0</a></p> <p>Feinberg, Ashley. 2017. This is Almost Certainly James Comey's Twitter Account. <i>Gizmodo</i>. <a href="http://gizmodo.com/this-is-almost-certainly-james-comey-s-twitter-account-1793843641">http://gizmodo.com/this-is-almost-certainly-james-comey-s-twitter-account-1793843641</a></p> <p>Zimmer, Michael. 2005. Privacy as Contextual Integrity: Norms of Information Flow. <a href="http://www.michaelzimmer.org/2005/04/13/privacy-as-contextual-integrity-part-2-norms-of-information-flow/">http://www.michaelzimmer.org/2005/04/13/privacy-as-contextual-integrity-part-2-norms-of-information-flow/</a></p>
--	--------	-----------------------------------	--

15	25-Apr	Artificial Intelligence and Automation	<p>Irani, Lilly. 2015. Justice for "Data Janitors." <a href="http://www.publicbooks.org/nonfiction/justice-for-data-janitors">http://www.publicbooks.org/nonfiction/justice-for-data-janitors</a>.</p> <p>Gray, Mary and Siddarth Suri. 2017. The Humans Working Behind the AI Curtain. <i>Harvard Business Review</i>. <a href="https://hbr.org/2017/01/the-humans-working-behind-the-ai-curtain">https://hbr.org/2017/01/the-humans-working-behind-the-ai-curtain</a></p> <p>Madrigal, Alex. 2014. How Netflix Reverse-Engineered Hollywood. <a href="https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2014/01/how-netflix-reverse-engineered-hollywood/282679/">https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2014/01/how-netflix-reverse-engineered-hollywood/282679/</a></p> <p><b>Optional:</b></p> <p>Kelkar, Shreeharsh. 2014. What's the Matter with Artificial Intelligence? <a href="http://blog.castac.org/2014/02/whats-the-matter-with-artificial-intelligence/">http://blog.castac.org/2014/02/whats-the-matter-with-artificial-intelligence/</a>.</p>
	27-Apr	Summing Up: Science, Technology, and Society	<p>Graeber, David. 2012. Of Flying Cars and the Declining Rate of Profit. <i>The Baffler</i>. <a href="https://thebaffler.com/salvos/of-flying-cars-and-the-declining-rate-of-profit">https://thebaffler.com/salvos/of-flying-cars-and-the-declining-rate-of-profit</a></p> <p>Thiel, Peter. 2011. The End of the Future. <i>National Review</i>. <a href="http://www.nationalreview.com/article/278758/end-future-peter-thiel">http://www.nationalreview.com/article/278758/end-future-peter-thiel</a></p> <p>Markoff, John. 2017. No Longer a Dream: Silicon Valley Takes on the Flying Car. <i>The New York Times</i>. <a href="https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/24/technology/flying-car-technology.html?_r=0">https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/24/technology/flying-car-technology.html?_r=0</a></p>
16	5-May		<p><b>Final Reflection due.</b></p>