

# HER

(Spike Jonze, 2013)



## Filosofia 4t ESO

**Nom cognoms:** .....

## EXERCICI 1

El director Spike Jonze en una entrevista declara que la idea de **Her** va sorgir quan va trobar un enllaç a internet sobre IA, Intel·ligència Artificial: *“Fui y escribí “Hola”, y me contestaron “Hola, ¿cómo estás?”. Hubo un pequeño intercambio de impresiones, y al cabo de un rato pensé “Wow, estoy hablando con esta cosa, y esta cosa me escucha”. Antes de acordarme de que “el otro” estaba repitiendo estereotipos y frases hechas, y que no era humano, la sensación fue completamente excitante”*

Explica clara i explícitament la gran diferència que existeix entre Samantha, i allò amb el qual va parlar el director de la pel·lícula, segons la referència anterior.

## EXERCICI 2

Explica les següents afirmacions escrites en crítiques sobre la pel·lícula; pots fer-ho per separat, o en conjunt. Es tracta que demostris que entens les crítiques aportant allò que has vist de la pel·lícula. A més, pots mostrar el teu acord o desacord amb el que diuen les crítiques, però raonant.

**Fragment de crítica 1:** *“El director de la pel·lícula i el guionista van coincidir en que el fil narratiu, malgrat les aparences, no giraria al voltant de la tecnologia i la ciència ficció, sinó sobre les dificultats per fer compatibles les relacions humanes (amb pretensió de permanència) i l'evolució i el canvi inevitable que tots patim al llarg de la vida”*

**Fragment de crítica 2:** *“Contaba Leo Ferré: “Mozart murió solo, acompañado a la fosa común por un perro y sus fantasmas... Convendría que la gente solo se conociera cuando está disponible, a ciertas horas pálidas de la noche, con problemas humanos, con problemas de melancolía”. Y Moustaki nos dice que “Nunca estoy solo con mi soledad”. La soledad. La última historia de Jonze es la soledad. El ser humano que huye hacia la soledad y se mece en ella, en el desasosiego espeso cuya venda sobre los ojos impide reconocer la felicidad que aporrea la puerta. Pero lo mejor no es la lucidez desbordante del guión y la realización de las escenas, ni una sólo de más, sino la sensación de inmediatez, de proximidad del personaje. Parece que le toquemos la piel. La intimidad es tan triste como verídica; la sexualidad es tan deprimente como auténtica. Freud brindaría: su sexualidad es él, en todo momento, con todas sus consecuencias. ¿Sonreímos? Claro, porque todos somos risibles”*

Comentari crítica 1 (100 paraules mínim).

Comentari crítica 2 (150 paraules mínim)

## EXERCICI 3

**(aquest exercici és opcional, només serveix per pujar nota; si no es fa, no baixa nota)**

En el següent article (fragments) en anglès, escrit per una professora universitària de filosofia, trobaràs una sèrie de preguntes i reflexions sobre **Her**. Els paràgrafs estan numerats per respondre algunes de les preguntes que es formulen al final.

# The Philosophy of ‘Her’

*By Susan Schneider*

*Susan Schneider, an associate professor of philosophy at the University of Connecticut, is the author of “The Language of Thought” and “Science Fiction and Philosophy.”*

[http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/03/02/the-philosophy-of-her/?\\_r=0](http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/03/02/the-philosophy-of-her/?_r=0)

...

(1) “Her” raises two questions that have long preoccupied philosophers. Are nonbiological creatures ... capable of consciousness — at least in theory, if not yet in practice? And if so, does that mean that we humans might one day be able to upload our own minds to computers, perhaps to join Samantha in being untethered from “a body that’s inevitably going to die”?

(2) Might we humans be able to upload our minds to computers, perhaps to join our digital lovers in the virtual universe?

(3) This is not mere speculation. The Future of Humanity Institute at Oxford University has released a report on the technological requirements for uploading a mind to a machine. A Defense Department agency has funded a program, Synapse, that is trying to develop a computer that resembles a brain in form and function. The futurist Ray Kurzweil, now a director of engineering at Google, has even discussed the potential advantages of forming friendships, “Her”-style, with personalized artificial intelligence systems. He and others contend that we are fast approaching the “technological singularity,” a point at which artificial intelligence, or A.I., surpasses human intelligence, with unpredictable consequences for civilization and human nature.

(4) Is all of this really possible? Not everyone thinks so. Some people argue that the capacity to be conscious is unique to biological organisms, so that even superintelligent A.I. programs would be devoid of conscious experience. If this view is correct, then a relationship between a human being and a program like Samantha, however intelligent she might be, would be hopelessly one-sided. Moreover, few humans would want to join Samantha, for to upload your brain to a computer would be to forfeit your consciousness.

(5) This view, however, has been steadily losing ground. Its opponents point out that our best empirical theory of the brain holds that it is an information-processing system and that all mental functions are computations. If this is right, then creatures like Samantha can be conscious, for they have the same kind of minds as ours: computational ones. Just as a phone call and a smoke signal can convey the same information, thought can have both silicon- and carbon-based substrates. Indeed, scientists have produced silicon-based artificial neurons that can exchange information with real neurons. The neural code increasingly seems to be a computational one.

(6) You might worry that we could never be *certain* that programs like Samantha were conscious. This concern is akin to the longstanding philosophical conundrum known as the “problem of other minds.” The problem is that although you can know that you yourself are conscious, you cannot know for sure that other people are.....

(7) In the face of the problem of other minds, all you can do is note that other people have brains that are structurally similar to your own and conclude that since you yourself are conscious, others are likely to be conscious as well. When confronted with a high-level A.I. program like Samantha, your predicament wouldn't be all that different, especially if that program had been engineered to work like the human brain. While we couldn't be certain that an A.I. program genuinely felt anything, we can't be certain that other humans do, either. But it would seem probable in both cases.

(8) If the Samanthas of the future will have inner lives like ours, however, I suspect that we will not be able to upload ourselves to computers to join them in the digital universe. To see why, imagine that Theodore wants to upload himself. Imagine, furthermore, that uploading involves (a) scanning a human brain in such exacting detail that it destroys the original and (b) creating a software model that thinks and behaves in precisely the same way as the original did. If Theodore were to undergo this procedure, would he succeed in transferring himself into the digital realm? Or would he, as I suspect, succeed only in killing himself, leaving behind a computational *copy* of his mind?

(9) Ordinary physical objects follow a continuous path through space over time. For Theodore to transfer his mind into a computer program, however, his mind would not follow a continuous trajectory. His brain would be destroyed when the scan was made, and the information about his precise brain configuration would be sent to a computer, which could be miles away....

(10) Furthermore, if Theodore were to truly upload his mind (as opposed to merely copy its contents), then he could be downloaded to multiple other computers. Suppose that there are five such downloads: Which one is the real Theodore? It is hard to provide a nonarbitrary answer. Could all of the downloads be Theodore? This seems bizarre: As a rule, physical objects and living things do not occupy multiple locations at once. It is far more likely that *none* of the downloads are Theodore, and that he did not upload in the first place

## QÜESTIONS:

1. Esmenta dues qüestions plantejades per l'autora, traduïdes al català, i digues en quins paràgrafs apareixen (no poden ser dels paràgrafs 8-10)

2. Quan l'autora escriu el paràgraf 10, està responent el paràgraf ..... (indicar un nombre) i està dient rotundament ..... (indicar “sí” o “no”), ja que....

#### EXERCICI 4

Argumenta perquè creus que són vertaderes o falses les següents afirmacions sobre l'escena eròtica de la pel·lícula.

A-La intenció del director és centrar l'interès de l'escena en el fet “morbòs” que és un trio.

B- No hi ha cap situació factible a la vida de les persones que tingui un paral·lelisme o una proximitat amb l'escena i el seu rerafons.

C- L'escena és més tràgica que còmica o eròtica



## EXERCICI 5

Comenta el final de la pel·lícula:

Com interpretes el que es diuen els dos personatges al terrat de l'edifici on viuen?

Creus que és un final trist, bonic, alegre, esperançador, pesimista,...?