

Responsibility is an interesting ethical concept because it brings up the question: is everyone who understands a truth morally responsible for bringing the ignorant into awareness?

science is a politics game. Due to the fact that 'science policy' is a federally funded institution, public support is often times based off the elected officials in place. However public support, especially in the age of technology, can also be radically

in the age of technology, can also be radically affected by media. Public support is also based off our educational system that helps build foundation for the understanding of policies and mechanisms of our concepts of 'science'

concepts of 'science' as a tool to help further society.

I think that the responsibility of convincing the public to fund science ultimately falls onto the scientific community. We can think of the public as the constituency that science needs to convince to get more funding.

The best strategy that I can think of for scientists to gain public support in today's climate is to explain and speculate what kind of engineering and technological innovations can come out of their work.

As the initial beneficiaries of science funding, it's tempting to ascribe to scientists the sole responsibility for convincing the public to support science investment.

I think the President is in a unique position to use their bully pulpit in much the same way Kennedy did in '62.

However, an effective strategy would require a persistent and long-term execution. I

sentiments regarding the importance of science. The efforts of education should be to encourage more and better education. Government officials shouldn't have to occupy themselves with encouraging science; it should be

Education should develop good minds and inspire curiosity.

with encouraging science; it should be a drive of the people themselves.

think about is that the President is elected by the public, so a public who is more interested in science will elect a President who values science, which in turn will convince organizations and the public to invest in

not valuing science we currently have, I think change should start in the Department of Education. I think the Department of Education should take greater action to support the development of science interest in

**our nations
underachieving
colleges by derek
bok**

It's mission would be to oversee the dis-aggregated fields of science to make sure they are all working towards one ethical goal of seeking knowledge to better the world, instead of competing with one other.

Of course, proceeding in this manner could lead to an even bigger bureaucracy than what we have now. Its mission:

I think a better approach would be proper mission statements from our other sectors that have scientific themes intertwined in their projects and proposals.

Department of Science endeavors to maintain research and technological superiority by fostering an active environment of free inquiry, promoting science literacy in the public, and assisting in the development of knowledge-based

adding the department would increase the influence of science in the executive branch, and may serve as stepping stone to creating a science institution in the government that could be free of influence of any of the 3 branches

in the development of knowledge-based policy.”

The chief benefit of having a Department of Science is providing a voice for science at least at the president cabinet's table; maybe the secretary of science is elected by scientists, and not appointed by the President.

I honestly think the major requirements should be managerial skill and the ability to recognise and trust others for expert advice. It's a bureaucratic roll. You could do well in that position with no background in science as long as you recognize what you don't know and seek those that do for advice. Even a scientist is only an expert in their area.

**Does anyone
else actually
agree with the
above?**

To be an effective advisor to the president, the most important qualification would not just be the ability to understand science, it would be the interpersonal

ability to communicate the most important concepts from complex science to policymakers in a way which emphasizes their importance to our society.

