**36) Governments should not fund any scientific research whose consequences are unclear.**

Write a response in which you discuss the extent to which you agree or disagree with the recommendation and explain your reasoning for the position you take. In developing and supporting your position, describe specific circumstances in which adopting the recommendation would or would not be advantageous and explain how these examples shape your position.

**72) Governments should not fund any scientific research whose consequences are unclear.**

Write a response in which you discuss your views on the policy and explain your reasoning for the position you take. In developing and supporting your position, you should consider the possible consequences of implementing the policy and explain how these consequences shape your position.

1. 确实，a、政府资 金有限，尤其 是对于发展中国 家，温饱问题 都没解决，应 投入明确研究;许多不明结论研究无意义浪费;

2. 但是，在进行研究之前，很难确定是否有结果。结果可能有重大意 义。因为很多发现处于偶然。例如哥伦布 Columbus 发现新大陆，他本来想找一条 路去印度，结果意外发现了北美大陆。 \*\*发现青霉素

3.科学的发展离不开资金支 持，比如探索外太空，很重要但如果没有政府支持，民间团体很难完成这种consequences unclear的项目 。

结论:尽管政府对未知研究是否和如何投入资金尚需讨论，不投入是不明智的。只要谨慎选择和投入，获得成就很可能 outweigh 失败损失。

some scientific research can’t produce a consequential result?... government should be inspired to suspend their funding of those research? … ‘budget’ ‘research’… government should not endorse those research whose results are unclear since their budget is limited…

no one can guarantee which research is inessential, hence government should fund all research…

… Developing countries, like Zambia, face constraints because of their size. Most of the small countries, have populations below 15,000,000. Because they have tiny populations, the states cannot spread the fixed costs of government or business over a large number of people—that is, they cannot achieve economies of scale in the same way that larger countries can. Forcing those states to protect the wilderness as larger countries did might produce great amount of financial burden. Besides, Zambia faces a generalized HIV epidemic, with an estimated prevalence rate of 12.3% among adults (ages 15–49) in 2015–2016 and the mortality rate per 100,000 births for Zambia is 470. Why should we spend all that money on scientific research whose consequences are even not clear when we could spend it to stop people dying of starvation or disease? In short, it’s unfair to require all nations protecting the old buildings.

…might argue that some important discoveries are accidental. A falling apple prompts physicist Isaac Newton to formulate his laws of gravity. Greek polymath Archimedes takes a bath and figures out how to calculate volume and density. Coincidently, Alexander Fleming serendipitously discovered penicillin. These are iconic “light bulb” moments in the history of science. Or, as Archimedes reputedly said when insight struck, Eureka! Governments are not omniscient, nor can we make sure those eureka moments happen in every research they invest. In short, the ‘accident’ supporters could cite many story about Eureka moment.

Scientific research can’t accomplish without endorsement, and community might not support those project whose consequences are unclear, hence government should stand by them. Take Big Data, a term for data sets that are so large or complex that traditional data processing application software is inadequate to deal with them, as example. Most ordinary people might not understand what it is. Some of them might question why government spent great amount of budget on it when they could spend it to stop people dying of starvation or disease. However, Government found its values and start support those scientists to develop it. In sum, not all issue need to be confirmed by people but government need always be optimism.