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.*

The path to the research in any scientific domain is convoluted and time-consuming process, its results are unforeseeable with so many factors deciding on the very outcome of the process. The prompt asserts that the government should only fund the scientific research which can produce the desirable outcomes. However, in my opinion, I strongly disagree with this prompt as the scientific research isn’t an easy operation to conduct and hence we can determine the consequences of it without ever having hands on around it for three reasons.

To begin my position, the scientific research is very complex and diverse domain whose outcomes are uncertain, it includes the vast topics like nanotechnology, rocket science, extra-terrestrial life, particle physic to modern computation and so on where the prediction and determination of the outcomes is almost nil. We have history of reservation while conducting the scientific research from early ages: for example, the concept of planetary motion where attacked viciously in early and middle ages. However, this very understanding of those motion has enabled us to achieve many great feats in space science and exploration from sending spacecrafts to space and planets to path to searching extraterrestrial life in universe. The evolution of the human being to this age has always fueled by the outcomes of some incredible inventions like computers, modern medicines, artificial intelligence, electricity and so on. The funding is very crucial to fuel the research so that new life changing discovery has to made. Let’s, consider the case of the modern cellphone was it fathomable before 1900s that humans will be able to communicate with each other at far corners of this planet by via text and speech. It was insane idea for common human at that era and they would debunk this idea as an unachievable one. Hence, predicting the outcomes with consensus by non-scientific persons are always daunting ones which hinders the process by creating an undesirable obstacle which will require a lot of time focused in convincing people about the impact of research.

Secondly, the impact of the scientific research among people always evolve with time and results which are considered trivial and immaterial today may have wide application in unforeseeable future. There is plethora of examples, where invention of two find wide spread application some decades or even some centuries later. For example, gun powder discovered by Chinese in early period of time found its widespread use in the age modern warfare age. Not only, it was used as weapon of mass destruction it was precursor of modern fuel in the spacecraft today; it can be safely said that gunpowder fuel early rocket system. Another example, can be given for that of artificial intelligence, during cold war era every major power were working in the field of machine learning to break enemy codes however, some unforeseeable obstacle presented at that time lead to cut the funding in projects as computer at that era wasn’t powerful at that point of time and research community lost it interest around it. However, it is one of the hot topics of research and most visible technology in current age where it found use in self-driving vehicle to fraud detection in financial sectors and many more.

Thirdly, if we worry about the expense and started to finance the research with only foreseeable results. There is greatly possibility that many ground-breaking discovery and inventions will be in shelf and humanity will suffer by losing the grace of those inventions. Researchers will tend to choose only those easy, pragmatic topics to avoid this hassle and hence, there will be hindrances to radical ideas with infinite possibilities. For example, if we think about outcomes of space exploration it can be easily interpreted as expensive project with no directions and any possible benefits. Some may argue that we are depleting our limited financial resources on such field where the focus of government must be towards eradicating poverty, clean drinking water and so on. However, who can predict that these knowledges will not help us to migrate another planet or even galaxy when disaster hits our planet and it cannot support our life anymore, thus, saving the humankind from extinction.

Of course, some people argue that many scientific researches have failed miserably and hence the taxpayer’s money has been wasted around it. However, it is also a whole truth that fruits can be only bear by plant when it is cultivated without thinking about the drought and other hinderances in plant growth. Likewise, new radical ideas will only give us ground breaking result which outcome impact can’t be predicted or comprehended now. Hence, it’s imperative to have smooth flow of cash to fuel the research and discover new ground breaking technologies and keep the researches out of politics of cashflow and cash crunch.

The following report appeared in the newsletter of the West Meria Public Health Council.

"An innovative treatment has come to our attention that promises to significantly reduce absenteeism in our schools and workplaces. A study reports that in nearby East Meria, where fish consumption is very high, people visit the doctor only once or twice per year for the treatment of colds. Clearly, eating a substantial amount of fish can prevent colds. Since colds represent the most frequently given reason for absences from school and work, we recommend the daily use of Ichthaid — a nutritional supplement derived from fish oil — as a good way to prevent colds and lower absenteeism."

*Write a response in which you discuss what specific evidence is needed to evaluate the argument and explain how the evidence would weaken or strengthen the argument.*