platform cared more about health research and nationalistic space research and less about the climate problems we face. It is clear from these numbers that with around 32% of the budget, human health related issues are

related issues are dramatically prioritized. However, if we really think human health should be a top priority, we should realizet hat it is affected by many aspects of life like our environment, which NOAA research could

NOAA research could help.It is short-sighted to only focus on health and ignore the valuable insights that other categories of science could bring for public good and human well being.

think that we should either separate human health funding into its own category of funding, so we can better fund other sciences while appeasing the public, or we should make funding for every discipline of research

The complications arise in that these policy makers are not usually scientists. So it falls upon the scientific community to convince these people tof und appropriately

However, I am unclear whether appropriation comes from public need/pressure, lobbying (whether by scientists or corporations), or even whimsy.

even the NIH's slogan "turning discovery into health" clearly shows that the government, and by extension the public, see science as a tool for technological (health) innovation rather than a good thing in its own (artistic) right.

People with money decide what research should be prioritized. Science has patrons and its avenues are those driven by socio-cultural momentum. In SLMs, extrinsic stressors inspire new priorities.

the ethical position is to use science to enhance the public good and human well being. Using science for the sole purpose of being a threat to other countries isn't necessarily ethical,

I think it depends on the time and what audience you are trying to appeal to. If the US is in peacetime, and you want to convince the public, you should appeal to improving the economy.

But is any of this ethical? Not really. Using nationalism and fear to get funding is not the way I pictured science working, but if that's how the system is set up, you can be unethical but justified.

You can defeat a country with an army or by crushing them economically. To my mind there is no solution to which is better morally.Both are done with the intention of dominance over others.

An ethical position might perhaps be to completely separate funding for specific defense/economic research from all other research.

Which is to say, scientists shouldn't have to depend on Sputnik-like events or perpetual wartime for their funding.

This is why things like preparing for big fires or pandemics don't concern "us" -- there's no foe, no group, to be superior to,

o the government and public don't care about those things, even if those things area greater danger to the general public than a chunk of metal floating in space from another country. This is obviously not ethical!

STUDENT INPUT HERE

seeing cool sci fi stuff

write someting

An understanding of the scientific process, and an ability to understand and engage with scientific writing at the level of an (accurate) news report (like NYT).

Knowledge of the language involved in science. As well as a basic understanding of the natural world. The ability to understand on the most basic level how science is done and what makes it valid.

Understanding the way that objective knowledge about the world is acquired

Science Literacy is understanding the process of how new knowledge is created from the ground level ideas, all the way up to tested theories.

Science literacy involves the comprehension of the systematic methods and contingencies of experimentation and theory.

A basic vocabulary (awareness of basic set of scientific knowledge, models, facts), syntax (combining those to make a new idea), and composition (communication).