

Name Jamie Cropley

P Number P15188432

Reading of the week Flourishing Ethics

Briefly note down your responses to the answers, which can be in paragraphs or bullet points. But be prepared to elaborate and share them with the class.

What are the key ideas of the paper? Or what key messages are presented by the author(s)?

- To show how Flourishing Ethics can resolve most other anomalies of other ethical theories.
- That animals and humans can be perceived as machines in the sense that all of our emotions and actions are based on what we perceive through human input.
- That Flourishing Ethics takes into many different aspects of old, current, new and emerging theories and such split into the two categories of Human-Centered Flourishing Ethics which only applies to humans and General Flourishing Ethics which applies to every physical entity in the universe as well as humans.
- Flourishing ethics is still perceived as a theory despite its implications and considerations.
- How these key ideas relate to technology.

What evidence or method, if any, is used to support the main argument of the paper?

- By mainly focusing on the theories of Aristotle I believe this gave a good basis as to how a human or animal perceives the world and the implications and considerations of such.
- Other ethical theories of Wiener and Moor.
- Information, how it is perceived, analysed and interpreted by humans and other beings.
- References were used throughout.

Do you agree or disagree with what is being said? Why? Or what are your comments on the argument presented by the author(s).

- Aristotle although his ideas were not based around computers and technology, they are almost broken down and written in their original context as such, more specifically he explains human and animal behaviour as something almost logical, we are in a sense information processing entities almost to the point of vague you could interpret it as humans being like machines, I did not agree with this in that respect as humans and animals are far more complex than this.
- I believe the paper over simplifies human and animal behaviour, by indicating in parts that we are information processing entities, where as there is still a lot that we do not understand about human and animal brains, to say we are information processing entities is a bit vague in this respect. For example, if I were to become overwhelmed with an emotion, I believe an emotional state takes into account many different factors such as past experiences / memories, current health state (If I say had an emotional type of disorder on the Autistic

Name Jamie Cropley

P Number P15188432

Spectrum), basically anything the body already has within them or as a part of them can play a part in what the brain is perceiving or making sense of in terms of information without any sort of sensory input whatsoever, people can become angry or sad based on a memory or conditioning of their brains state.

- Too much focus on the past such as Aristotle and with little to no consideration for the possible future or present especially when it comes to understanding how the human brain is perceiving something, makes it easy for me to conclude that the paper is not really explaining a new theory to me more of an already existing one just reworded into different contexts and situations. I believe too much unnecessary explanation was written about the past before it starts to talk about more modern aspects of the ethics surrounding this subject.
- Wiener indicated that machines should be built based on human physiology, presuming that such aspects of building a so-called 'robot' would have the same intellectual capabilities of a human, showing slightly that his predictions although accurate still were based on technologies existing in his time.
- By Wiener interpreting the types of information that are perceived by humans and animals I believe their explanation of metaphysics and matter-energy gave a better explanation and breakdown of a more modern society, it falls in line with more modern science and understanding and allows it to be more relatable and easier to understand.

How can you relate points made by the author(s) to reality? Any examples?

- I can relate to the points of perceiving information, although it is somewhat a bit broad, narrowing it down to my own situation, I relate to it in the context of having Asperger Syndrome, where I tend to see the world differently and somewhat more logically than others, therefore I can relate to this in the paper by saying that my brain tends to process information in a straightforward and logical sense than others but on the other side as per my point above the implications of this difference in my brain does not allow me as easily to interpret emotional information in the world and how other people are perceiving things. This makes my sensory input different to the majority of humans but seems to fall in line still with what the paper indicates, that I am a sensory being.
- There was a point in the paper that mentioned that humans, being social beings who can not flourish on their own, this I can relate to in a more negative sense because I completely disagree with this, being someone with Asperger Syndrome, it is evident in today's modern society and the way it is now structured that any 'disabled' person actually can flourish given

Name Jamie Cropley

P Number P15188432

the right way, therefore is evident that you don't have to be conformed to being social,
making this statement I believe a bit narrow in its thinking.