

### Manifesto Guidelines

You will write a manifesto on either (1) what it would take for you to be an ethical scientist in the world, or (2) why it matters to you, as a non-scientist (possibly occupying a place that is “science adjacent” but possibly just being a person who shares a world with scientists), whether the scientists in your world are ethical — and what responsibilities you have as a non-scientist toward the scientist. The elements of the manifesto are intentionally open-ended so that you have space to reflect.

#### General Guidelines

- Your manifesto should be 750-1000 words.
- Be clear and compelling! If you were to show your manifesto to a friend who is not in the class, they should be able to understand what you are claiming in it and why it matters.
- I encourage you write in the first person, since this assignment is about *your* take on these questions.
- You’ll submit a draft-for-review (worth 50 points) and a revised manifesto (worth 65 points)

#### Elements of the Manifesto

I. In general, what is involved in being an ethical scientist in the world? [20 points]

- Clearly and compellingly described what it takes for scientists in general to be ethical members of the world.
- Get extremely clear on the ethical framework(s) guiding your view.
- Describe **your** place in the world in a concrete and personal way:
  - For (1), what kind of scientist will you be? How will this shape your responsibilities or effects on your scientific community, your non-scientific community, the larger human community, etc.?
  - For (2), describe the place in the world you do (or will) occupy. Are you anticipating a career that is “science adjacent” (e.g., as a medical doctor, a pharmacist, a science teacher, a science journalist, etc.)? Do you have a personal history that informs your relationship with science or scientists? How is your place in the world impacted by science or scientists? How could someone in this place influence the impact of science or scientists on this place?
- **Argue** for your position (i.e., spell out the **reasons** for your claims). To do this, it may be helpful to use examples or consider objections.

II. What will **you** have to do? [10 points]

- Clearly and compellingly describe your responsibilities here (either as a scientist trying to live ethically in the world, or as a non-scientist trying to share your world with science and scientists).
- Consider to what extent living up to these responsibilities is going to depend on factors not fully within your control.
- Consider how important it is for you to live up to these responsibilities. (For example, if you can’t live up to your responsibilities, what happens then? Why does it matter?)

III. Connection to the readings. [10 points]

- Incorporate at least three of the assigned readings (NOT lecture notes or case studies from case study assignments).
- For each reading, be sure to:
  - Explain the part of the reading that’s relevant to your point (e.g., don’t just include a random quote).
  - Engage with the reading in depth.
- It’s acceptable to use a point from a reading as an objection to your view.
- Cite your sources!

**Execution.** [10 points]

- *Organization*: The structure of the manifesto should be clear. (Feel free to use section headings to help with this.)
- *Clarity*: Can a fellow SJSU student easily understand what you are saying?
- *Compellingness*: Would someone who starts reading your manifesto want to read it to the end?
- *Mechanics*: Does the manifesto use correct spelling, grammar, and punctuation?
- *Citations*: Make sure you cite any source that you use. (There should be at least three.)

**Your draft-for-review is due at class time on Wednesday, March 25.**

By Wednesday, April 15, you will receive detailed feedback from me (and possibly from one or two classmates – see below).

You will then revise your manifesto in light of the feedback and include with your revised version a memo of no more than 1 page explaining how you responded to the feedback (or, if you were given suggestions you decided not to follow, explaining why you decided not to follow them).

Your revision will be evaluated on the same “Elements of the Manifesto” described above, plus the following:

- **Addressing substantive critiques and suggestions in the revised manifesto** [10 points]
- **Memo gives clear explanation of how you responded to feedback** [5 points]

**Extra-credit opportunity: peer reviews of manifesto draft-for-review.**

You may also get feedback on your draft-for-review from a classmate, and give that classmate feedback on their draft-for-review. Here are the rules:

1. You must **both** participate in the reviewing – the classmate whose draft you are reviewing must also review your draft. (*I will pair reviewers and reviewees from those who opt in.*)
2. Your reviews should use the reviewing form provided. Reviews are due to the person you’re reviewing **and to me** by April 15.
3. In your revision, you must address the feedback you received from the peer review – either how you used the suggestions or why you decided not to use the suggestions.
4. You will earn 4 extra credit points for each manifesto you peer-review, up to two (for a maximum of 8 extra credit points).

**Revised manifesto + revision memo + draft-for-review + feedback on draft-for-review (from instructor AND peer reviewer(s), if applicable) due at class time on Monday, May 4.**