

Global Perspectives Summer Assignment- Two Sources Annotated Bibliography and Deconstruction

Plagiarism and/or use of AI to complete this assignment will result in a grade of a 0. Your work will be submitted on canvas through turn it in the first week of school.

Directions: Find two quality articles (credible sources, at least 1 page in length) and complete an annotated bibliography and deconstruction on each. Both articles must be related to the issue of **food insecurity**. Work must be typed.

****If you are unsure of what to do at any point, see the sample deconstruction and sample annotated bibliography at the end of this document**

For the annotated Bibliography: Include full APA or MLA citation and a detailed annotation of the source. Be sure to complete them in alphabetical order.

Annotated Bibliography Format

- All entries should be alphabetized by **FIRST WORD** appearing in the citation
- All citations should be in **ONE** consistent style (APA, MLA)
- Avoid citation generators (which often produce incomplete or inaccurate results); rather, consult a style guide and create your own citation- for example: owl.purdue https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/resources.html
- An annotated bibliography asks you to think critically about **WHY** or **WHY NOT** a source will help support the argument you're crafting. The more information you can provide now, the better off you'll be when selecting evidence that appears in the final draft of your paper.
- Length 200-400 words

For each source you find, include

Properly formatted citation in either APA or MLA format- be consisted for both sources

Then, in paragraph format, analyze and discuss the quality of the source.

Include:

- A summary of the source and what it's about. (Minimum of 5 sentences)
- Credibility of author(s) and source
- The source's strengths and weaknesses
- An evaluation of the research methodology (not likely to be in the source you use for the summer assignment unless your source discusses how the research was conducted)

- The source's conclusion
- How and what will you use from the source in your paper? Relevance to your issue (in this case it's food insecurity)
- How does this source connect to other source of evidence you've found? (If this is the first source you've looked at, then you need to go back to answer this after reviewing other source)
- What perspectives (viewpoints) are represented in the source and what does each perspective say?

For the Deconstruction- transfer questions 1-10 on to a separate word doc and complete your responses next to each question.

Source 1:

1. Provide an APA citation of the source:
2. What are the credentials of the author? Provide a detailed explanation:
3. What continent/country does this article represent?
4. Provide a summary of your source:
5. Detail at least 2 perspectives within your article.
6. What are the key components of the argument or claim?
 - a. Facts presented:
 - b. Arguments presented:
 - c. Opinions presented:
 - d. Speculation presented:
 - e. Predictions presented:
 - f. Conclusions presented:
 - g. Assumptions presented:
 - h. Assertions presented:
 - i. Supporting evidence presented:
7. What are the implications of the conclusions, arguments, reasoning or claims?
8. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the arguments, reasoning or claims?
9. Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses.
10. Suggest any other evidence required to substantiate or refute claims or counterclaims.

Source 2:

1. Provide an APA citation of the source:
2. What are the credentials of the author? Provide a detailed explanation:
3. What continent/country does this article represent?
4. Provide a summary of your source:

5. Detail at least 2 perspectives within your article.
6. What are the key components of the argument or claim?
 - a. Facts presented:
 - b. Arguments presented:
 - c. Opinions presented:
 - d. Speculation presented:
 - e. Predictions presented:
 - f. Conclusions presented:
 - g. Assumptions presented:
 - h. Assertions presented:
 - i. Supporting evidence presented:
7. What are the implications of the conclusions, arguments, reasoning or claims?
8. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the arguments, reasoning or claims?
9. Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses.
10. Suggest any other evidence required to substantiate or refute claims or counterclaims.

Example Deconstruction

1. Provide an APA OR MLA Citation of the source:

RISKS AND REWARDS OF GENE EDITING. (2020). *Issues in Science and Technology*, 36(4), 11+. <https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A632367564/OVIC?u=novaseumain&sid=OVIC&xid=20256d42>

2. What are the credentials of the author? Provide a detailed explanation:

The article is written by Marcy Darnovsky who is the Executive Director at the Center for Genetics and Society in Berkeley, California. She earned her doctorate from History of Consciousness program at the University of California, Santa Cruz. Her focus is typically on biotechnology and bioethics and she has been published in *The New York Times*, *Nature*, *The Guardian*, *Los Angeles Times*, *Wall Street Journal*, *Harvard Law and Policy Review*, *Democracy*, and *New Scientist*. Darnovsky used to work as a professor at Sonoma State University and at California State University East Bay.

3. What continent/country does this article represent?

The article's author and the viewpoints explained are both from the United States. It should be mentioned that Iceland is used as an example.

4. Provide a summary of your source:

The main focus of the article is a response to an interview published in the previous season's issue of the same journal, *Issues in Science and Technology*. The interview was with Jennifer Doudna and the ethics surrounding the CRISPR gene-editing technology. The article presents two viewpoints on the interview from Roger Stoffregen and the author Marcy Darnovsky.

Roger Stoffregen stresses the question of why it is the responsibility of bioethicists to create guidelines for the technology. He explains how the people in charge of many of the institutions have religious or other interests which would affect their opinions. He explains that the decision should go past bioethicists and even include people within different faiths. He uses the example of Iceland, where fetuses with Down syndrome are identified and aborted, to show that he is unsure about the bioethicist's opinion about the morality of this

practice but he knows that no one would accept it as a “law.” He ends with how important it is that the decisions about this new technology be made beyond just bioethicists.

Darnovsky’s perspective is clear as well where she explains that Doudna’s interview showed us that there is now a way to alter genomes and traits of children in utero. Darnovsky points out that she, along with many others, noticed that Doudna’s interview did not explain what is termed as responsible use of this technology and how mistakes can be avoided.

Darnovsky tells us that Doudna claimed that the main issue with embryo editing is the ethical ramifications that come with editing genes like consent, enhancements vs. medical necessity, and possible harm. Darnovsky critiques that the interview Doudna gave did not mention how these issues could be solved or how gene editing would make current inequalities even starker. Darnovsky says the interview tasks scientists to guide a vague public conversation about how gene editing should be done, rather than letting the public decide if it should be done at all. Darnovsky says that Doudna failed to explain why these others should be left out of the conversation other than the research is necessary.

Darnovsky ends the article advocating for a conversation about whether the practice of gene editing should be permitted at all rather than focusing first on how it should be used.

5. Detail at least 2 perspectives within your article.

The article is written from the perspective of a scientist and bioethicist. The article explains the effects that the technology will have on the general public and even future children.

Doudna:

The first perspective is that of Jennifer Doudna who appears in the initial interview that the article responds to. Doudna focuses on the importance of the CRISPR technology for the future. She stresses the importance of bioethicists to determine the moral and ethical “codes” of how to apply the technology, especially as it relates to editing the genes of a child before they are born.

Stoffregen:

Another perspective within the article is Roger Stoffregen who disagrees with Doudna’s assertion that bioethicists should create the so-called rules of this new technology.

Darnovsky:

The author of the article, Marcy Darnovsky continues with the perspective that Roger Stoffregen presents and explains that not only should bioethicists not be responsible for creating the code for what is appropriate for gene editing, but the entire process should be part of a wider conversation for if the practice should be done at all. Darnovsky claims that Doudna is trying to keep other audiences out of this conversation when it is integral for them to have an understanding of the technology and potential impacts.

6. What are the key components of the argument or claim?

a. Facts presented:

- i. Some of the facts presented within this article include the interview from Jennifer Doudna that discusses the CRISPR gene-editing technology which is the subject of the debate.
 - b. Arguments presented:
 - i. Jennifer Doudna argues that bioethicists should be the creators of the guidelines and developers of the management for this new technology which would allow scientists to edit genes more extensively.
 - ii. Roger Stoffregen argues that Doudna is incorrect, citing many institutions of higher education and religious authorities would be making decisions for the general public. He explains the ethical ramifications of leaving the guidelines of this technology simply to bioethicists.
 - iii. Marcy Darnovsky argues that then entire concept of using this technology, as whole, should be a discussion first before the implementation or the guidelines are visited. She explains that the inequities caused by the inception of the technology would be vast and the conversation cannot just be had between scientists.
 - c. Opinions presented:
 - i. The opinion presented by Jennifer Doudna is that the CRISPR gene-editing technology will be accepted throughout the community because it is revolutionary. Jennifer Doudna believes that the bioethics community will determine the moral and ethical guidelines because they are the best to do so.
 - ii. The opinion that Roger Stoffregen presents is that there is corruption and inequities within the community and that the community is too small to determine or accept guidelines as fact.
 - iii. The opinion that Marcy Darnovsky presents is that gene editing as a whole is a social justice issue that needs to be discussed. She believes that Doudna fails to address any risks that the new technology presents.
 - d. Speculation presented:
 - i. The main speculation of the article is Doudna's belief that the public and other figures outside the science and bioethics community would not be able to determine the guidelines of how to implement the gene-editing technology.
 - e. Predictions presented:
 - i. Some of the predictions presented include: Darnovsky's claim that there would need to be further conversations about the morality of gene-editing in our society; Stoffregen's worry of the possible corruption of those who would create guidelines for the technology; and Doudna's prediction that CRISPR would be implemented within our society.
 - f. Conclusions presented:
 - i. Conclusions presented by both Darnovsky and Stoffregen stress the need for taking a step back to ethically and responsibly decide when and how to address the use of the gene editing technology.
 - g. Assumptions presented:

- i. The main assumption within the argument is that this new discovery of gene-editing technology should be used. Doudna assumes that the CRISPR technology will be something implemented and has progressed to the discussion of who will decide on the guidelines of its implementation. This assumption is later criticized by both Stoffregen and Darnovsky.
- h. Assertions presented:
 - i. The assertion presented in the article is that this CRISPR gene-editing technology will provide new avenues into eugenics. Arguments proceed for if that is moral and how these directions should be taken ethically and responsibly.
- i. Supporting evidence presented:
 - i. Supporting evidence for Doudna's interview was presented in an article in the Fall 2019 issue, "Incorporating Ethics into Technology Assessment," by Zach Graves and Robert Cook-Deegan, which described the role of bioethicists in the assessment of new biotechnologies.

7. What are the implications of the conclusions, arguments, reasoning or claims?

The implications of the arguments in the article are life changing. If, as Doudna argues, the CRISPR gene-editing technology is implemented without including the general public in the conversation, issues of ethics may be overlooked. As Stoffregen pointed out, there can be issues within both faith based and educational institutions with the concept of gene editing all together than can have negative consequences. Another possible consequence is highlighted by Darnovsky discussing the lack of equity in access to the technology which would only increase the current inequalities in our society.

8. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the arguments, reasoning or claims?

An important strength in this article is its use of logical reasoning from both Stoffregen as well as Darnovsky. They explain the risks of both leaving the decision making to bioethicists alone as well as the risks of implementing any system of gene editing. Stoffregen uses an example of Iceland to defend the idea that instituting guidelines does not necessarily make bioethicists accept an idea. Darnovsky highlights a strength by appealing to pathos and discussing how the conversation is one that needs to be had with all communities, not just the elite. As the author, she highlights how important understanding and creating a system for the use of the technology is to all members of society.

One of the weaknesses of the article is that Stoffregen is not given academic credits. We are aware of Darnovsky's credentials and we respect her opinion based on her biography, that which we do not have of Stoffregen. Another weakness within the article is the lack of quotes from the original interview it references. Without knowing Doudna's exact arguments, we must take the two other author's rebuttals as all the facts we have received.

9. Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses.

Though without the original interview, or even a few excerpts, a true weakness of this argument, the counterclaims presented have a strong effect on all people in our society. The magnitude of implementing how, when, and who decides what gene-editing technology will become available to the general public cannot be understated. For that reason, this argument is important to the conversation.

10. Suggest any other evidence required to substantiate or refute claims or counterclaims.

The most important evidence required to substantiate or refute these claims would be the original interview, which I can access as well. In order to weigh the claims within this article, we must first look at the assertions made within the interview. Another important piece of evidence needed would be to complete research into the gene-editing technology to determine its reach and abilities.

Sample Annotated Bibliography

Warrington, James. "Germany's Biggest News Publisher Strikes Deal to Let Chatgpt Read Its Stories." *The Telegraph*, Telegraph Media Group, 13 Dec. 2023, www.telegraph.co.uk/business/2023/12/13/axel-springer-strikes-deal-with-openai-to-let-chatgpt-read/.

This article is about a German company called Axel Springer which made a deal with Chatgpt. It is the first deal of its kind. The news company is giving Chatgpt access and permission to their newspaper for training purposes. Chatgpt will use the access to train its program to give stronger responses in its chatbox. Axel Springer will be financially compensated for its use, but the exact amount is currently unknown. The author; James Warrington, is a senior business reporter for the Telegraph which is a well respected British newspaper which has been publishing since the late 1800's. This is one of the article's strengths. In addition, the article quotes individuals with direct knowledge of the deal such as the chief executive of Axel Springer and the chief operating officer of AI. Another strength is the inclusion of other corporations which are in talks of making similar deals with AI. Weakness would include not giving the amount of money or how Axel Springer will be paid. Another is that the perspective of journalists doesn't include names or direct quotes.

Perspectives in this article include journalists who are upset not to have been involved in the negotiations. Matias Dopfner is the chief executive of Axel Springer and his perspective is that it's a great deal for both his company and AI. He feels this is an opportunity to see how AI and journalism can work together. Brad Lightcap works for open AI and his perspective is that his company is looking to help the journalism field be stronger and more effective. The perspective of Owen Meredith (chief executive for New Media) is that this is a good start in protecting the intellectual property of media, but more needs to be done. I plan to use quotes from this article from the executives to Alex Springer and AI to demonstrate how this type of deal benefits both corporations. I will also use it to show the perspective of individuals in the journalism field and how they want and need their intellectual property protected.