

Chapter 1 : The Urban Matrix: How Far Should We Go? - Land8

How Far Should We Go. Brian had eight months left in Willow Brook Elementary before he entered middle school, 6th grade, six classes, and six new teachers but he was still reading at a first grade level!

The play involves electrocution, incest, forced sex-reassignment surgery, and in a scene that has particularly shocked audiences, one character has their tongue cut out and hands placed in a shredder. Many others have walked out of the performance. But do we really need to see graphic depictions of violence in order to reflect upon the darker side of human nature? On-stage horror in *Cleansed*. Despite the many horrific things that happen in Greek tragedy self-mutilation, child-killing, incest, torture, these are never directly depicted. Instead, the audience is given descriptions, hears off-stage cries, and sees only the aftermath of the bloody action. But the Greek dramatists were also aware that an audience gets more implicated in the action if they have to do some of the work. By not directly portraying violence, the tragedians forced their audience to imagine the horrors for themselves. The power of imagination can do far more than any stage gore. Greek drama uses several tricks to make the off-stage horror truly upsetting. Graphic descriptions of what has happened, usually related by a messenger, use metaphor and similes to unforgettable effect. Odeon of Herodes Atticus Theatre, Athens. Even more chilling scenes are those where we hear the sounds of violence taking place off stage. This allows imaginations to run riot as the audience tries to piece together what must be taking place. As the scene continues, the screams of the children suddenly stop, and we realise that Medea has gone through with her plan. Tame for Roman audiences. But violence as entertainment was normal in ancient Rome: Far from having to suspend disbelief or engage their imaginations, the audience could see for themselves what these grisly stories would have been like. In these theatrical executions, the events of *Cleansed* would have been merely a warm-up act. We hear of one criminal forced to castrate himself telling the story of Attis, who did this in a moment of religious frenzy. Another was burned on a pyre, in the style of Heracles, while yet another was dressed as the poet Orpheus and expected to bewitch the animals, but in fact was killed by a bear. The most disturbing example comes from the poet Martial, who praises a rendition of the myth of Pasiphae, where a woman has intercourse with a bull. So while *Cleansed* might seem extreme to modern British tastes, to a Roman audience her plays would be fairly tame stuff. Katie Mitchell has spoken of the nightmares her cast suffered while rehearsing *Cleansed*.

Chapter 2 : How far should we go in shaping animals for aesthetic pleasure? | Aeon Essays

Sept. 29, -- Few medical or scientific issues have stirred up more controversy in recent years than the idea of using cells and tissue from human embryos in medical research. Many scientists.

How far should researchers go? January 5, Greg Lamb
Ever since it was discovered that yeast could turn dough into bread, people have toyed with biotechnology to improve their lives. But much more profound uses of that technology lie on the immediate horizon. What is the greatest fear people have about biotechnology? Could you pass a US citizenship test? There are people more on the left who are inclined to worry about the use of these powers by some people over other people, the pacification of populations producing a certain kind of conformity. Does the report debunk some fears about biotechnology as illegitimate? There is a lot of hype and fear - exaggerated promises and exaggerated dangers - and one of the things this report is able to say with some confidence is that this much-talked-about prospect of "designer babies," in which parents can determine in advance the precise genetic makeup of their children, is scientifically unfeasible [now] and unfeasible for the future. This is way down the road The virtual impossibility of engineering the precise changes you want means that genetically engineered designer babies are something that we should relax about. It is somewhat worrisome now with an enormous amount of direct advertising from pharmaceutical companies to parents and children offering them a kind of instantaneous solution to their problems. Lots of people are going to accept these partial solutions to their difficulties that might come at the cost of Lack and aspiration are twins. If you have easy self-contentment, you might have a very, very cheap source of happiness that might in fact get in the way of those kinds of richer pursuits that we pursue as a result of the things that we are missing. Do we need to slow down scientific research in biotechnology to allow ethics to catch up? Almost everybody is enthusiastic about the promise of biotechnology to cure disease and to relieve suffering And the reason for this is simple: The benefits of biomedical progress are obvious, clear, and powerful. The hazards are much less well appreciated The problem in this area is something like the Midas problem: Is what we asked for what we wanted? That kind of double-edged character to some of these technologies [means we need] simply to get people to think about this. There is a danger that the freedom to transform everything embraces the freedom to transform our own nature and even to destroy that very freedom itself. So some kind of limits have to be set on how far one can simply use the One should simply proceed with caution. We may simply not be wise enough to do some of the kinds of engineering things that people are talking about doing. The report seems to deal with some fundamental questions about identity. When the biotechnologies go to work on the human body and mind for purposes other than restoring [them] to normal and healthy, a crucial question is: What does it mean to be a human being? What does it mean to be an individual? What does it mean to flourish? And can these means help me flourish or will they give me a poor substitute for flourishing and maybe undermine the likelihood that I will find my path to a full and rich life. Will these things be done whether we try to regulate them or not? This is a common argument. And on the other hand, we say Either human beings are going to try to exercise some control over where the technological juggernaut might take us or we have to abandon this view that we really can exercise some kind of rational control The United States is an international leader in biotechnology. What do you hope will result from it? This has been written with the hope that it will have a fairly long shelf life. That people who are the gatekeepers of the uses of some of these technologies, like some of the people in the medical profession, might begin to think about some professional self-regulation in these areas. And there might be areas that eventually become ripe for public policy discussion and intervention.

Chapter 3 : How Far Should We Go?

But just how far should we go to save them? That's not a dilemma early veterinarians wrestled with. The American vet of years ago was more of a mechanic than a physician.

If he encounters a steep drop while traipsing through the most rugged vegetation in Hawaii or on other Pacific islands, Mr. Perlman simply pulls out ropes and rappels down to where he wants to go. But not everyone agrees on the best way to save the vast amount of the natural world that is under threat. Some say conservationists should use some sort of triage system to prioritize which species or ecosystems get attention, while others suggest that every species is valuable and deserves conservation attention. Are you scientifically literate? Take our quiz Acknowledging the limits on time and financial resources, Possingham has developed a formula for prioritizing conservation projects that also takes into consideration the number of species that could potentially benefit from each project and the probability of success. Both are profoundly dedicated to preserving biodiversity but approach the problem from vastly different perspectives. Where Possingham finds clarity in careful cost-benefit analysis, Perlman functions in a perpetual race against time. And he is willing to do whatever it takes to try to save them: The canyon was once dotted with the white of the flowers of the now-rare Hibiscus waimeae, which is only found on Kauai, he recalls. But on a global scale, nurturing each individual species back to health is a more weighty proposition. In some cases, his formula has helped Kiwis stretch conservation dollars to save more species. On the other end of the ideological spectrum, however, conservationists like Stuart Pimm worry that the triage-based approach not only dooms species that potentially could have been saved, it also stymies innovation. When biologists are fighting to save the last few individuals of a species from extinction, they are driven to innovate, he says. One risk of extinction is that when a species disappears, its absence could disrupt other parts of the ecosystem if, say, it was the primary food source for a particular animal. But after two hurricanes slammed the island, just one plant is known to remain in the wild. Some, like these pictured, grow in nurseries at the National Tropical Botanical Garden on the island of Kauai in Hawaii. Having a variety of plant genetics to draw from could be useful to scientists in the future who want to innovate in agriculture, pharmaceuticals, or to produce other plant-based products, says Stuart Thompson, a senior lecturer in plant biochemistry at the University of Westminster. With many mouths to feed, Dr. Thompson says, scientists may need to breed new genetics into agricultural crop species to make them more resilient or more productive. Furthermore, he adds, "we could potentially be making use of non-agricultural species to facilitate agricultural innovation. Some inedible plant could perhaps contain the genetics to revolutionize agriculture, but researchers need its genetics to be able to figure that out. In that sense, the potential benefits of preserving a species is immeasurable. And so, day in and day out, Perlman heads for the cliffs, following his intuition and clues offered by the natural world to save as many species as he can access. Get the Monitor Stories you care about delivered to your inbox. For him, saving plant species is all about responsibility.

Chapter 4 : Great Ocean Road - how far should we go? - Great Ocean Road Forum - TripAdvisor

But we need to hold fast to those things we have got right: a commitment to revealing the workings of other communicative worlds to our students by grounding pedagogical decisions in an understanding of target texts and practices.

Ingfei Chen Genetic Literacy Project June 13, In the United States, the clock is ticking for more than , adults and children waiting for a donated kidney or other lifesaving organ, and each day, nearly 20 of them die. Researchers are devising a new way to grow human organs inside other animals, but the method raises potentially thorny ethical issues. Other conceivable futuristic techniques sound like dystopian science fiction. As we envision an era of regenerative medicine decades from now, how far is society willing to go to solve the organ shortage crisis? I found myself pondering this question after a discussion about the promises of stem cell technologies veered from the intriguing into the bizarre. I was interviewing bioengineer Zev Gartner, co-director and research coordinator of the Center for Cellular Construction at the University of California, San Francisco, about so-called organoids, tiny clumps of organ-like tissue that can self-assemble from human stem cells in a petri dish. These tissue bits are lending new insights into how our organs form and diseases take root. Some researchers even hope they can nurture organoids into full-sized human kidneys, pancreases, and other organs for transplantation. Certain organoid experiments have recently set off alarm bells, but when I asked Gartner about it, his radar for moral concerns was focused elsewhere. Never heard of it? The science still has many years to go, but if it pans out, it could be one solution to the organ shortage crisis. However, the prospect of creating hybrid animals with human parts and killing them to harvest organs has already raised a slew of ethical questions. In , the National Institutes of Health placed a moratorium on federal funding of this nascent research area while it evaluated and discussed the issues. But even if it turns out we can produce human organs in these novel ways, the bigger issue, in each technological instance, may be whether we should. Gartner crystallized things with a downright creepy example: These are called interspecies chimeras, colorfully named after a mythological beast , and researchers have long experimented on this front. But the latest big advance unexpectedly came in a study , when a Japanese team led by geneticist Hiromitsu Nakauchi created mice that were unable to grow their own pancreases. However, when the rodents were still pre-embryos at the so-called blastocyst stage , the biologists injected pluripotent stem cells from a rat into them. The pluripotent stem cells, which can transform into any cell type of the body, automatically filled in for the missing organ. The result was mice with functional rat pancreases. Pig embryo injected with human cells. Juan Carlos Izpisua Belmonte For some ethicists, human-animal chimeras, on the face of it, simply violate human dignity. Another worry is a small risk that pig-grown organs might transmit deadly swine viruses into the human population, a hazard that begs careful examination. And then there are fears about other unintended consequences. What if, for example, human stem cells inserted into pig pre-embryos form into human sperm or eggs, and the pig and human gametes could fertilize each other? Might the pigs even have freakish human-like external features? But perhaps the biggest moral considerations have to do with the ever-controversial issue of animal welfare. Is it ethical to turn pigs into organ factories, bred solely for human purposes? On the latter, animal rights advocates would say no. Of course, in the broader picture, once you start looking at using pigs as organ banks, other conceivable scenarios come up “ and, like Gartner at UCSF suggested, each may present its own moral can of worms. Want to follow the latest news and policy debates over agricultural biotechnology and biomedicine? Subscribe to our free newsletter. Still, what sounds crazy now might not seem crazy in 30 years. Once upon a time, IVF was an alarming and distasteful or sacrilegious notion to many people, yet today, almost no one blinks an eye at test-tube babies. In August , nine months after holding a fall workshop to review the concerns about blastocyst complementation research, the NIH announced its intention to lift its funding ban “ pending a proposed update to its policy restrictions on funding of stem cell science. With the arrival of the Trump administration, the proposal has stalled, and the federal funding moratorium remains in place. Still, the research continues. But public sensitivities “ such as those expressed in the feedback to the NIH “ may be the ultimate barrier for radical organ-farming

technologies, ethicists say.

Chapter 5 : Biotechnology: How far should researchers go? - theinnatdunvilla.com

Robert Dingwall is a consulting sociologist, providing research and advisory services particularly in relation to organizational strategy, public engagement and knowledge transfer.

Press photo The play involves electrocution, incest, forced sex-reassignment surgery, and in a scene that has particularly shocked audiences, one character has their tongue cut out and hands placed in a shredder. Many others have walked out of the performance. But do we really need to see graphic depictions of violence in order to reflect upon the darker side of human nature? Imagination running wild Ancient Greek theatre took exactly the opposite approach to staging violence, pushing it all off stage. Despite the many horrific things that happen in Greek tragedy self-mutilation, child-killing, incest, torture , these are never directly depicted. Instead, the audience is given descriptions, hears off-stage cries, and sees only the aftermath of the bloody action. But the Greek dramatists were also aware that an audience gets more implicated in the action if they have to do some of the work. By not directly portraying violence, the tragedians forced their audience to imagine the horrors for themselves. The power of imagination can do far more than any stage gore. Tristram Kenton Greek drama uses several tricks to make the off-stage horror truly upsetting. Graphic descriptions of what has happened, usually related by a messenger, use metaphor and similes to unforgettable effect. Even more chilling scenes are those where we hear the sounds of violence taking place off stage. This allows imaginations to run riot as the audience tries to piece together what must be taking place. As the scene continues, the screams of the children suddenly stop, and we realise that Medea has gone through with her plan. But violence as entertainment was normal in ancient Rome: Far from having to suspend disbelief or engage their imaginations, the audience could see for themselves what these grisly stories would have been like. In these theatrical executions, the events of *Cleansed* would have been merely a warm-up act. We hear of one criminal forced to castrate himself telling the story of Attis, who did this in a moment of religious frenzy. Another was burned on a pyre, in the style of Heracles, while yet another was dressed as the poet Orpheus and expected to bewitch the animals, but in fact was killed by a bear. So while *Cleansed* might seem extreme to modern British tastes, to a Roman audience her plays would be fairly tame stuff. Katie Mitchell has spoken of the nightmares her cast suffered while rehearsing *Cleansed*. Read the original article. This post was written by the author in their personal capacity. Do you want to receive news like this one directly in your mailbox? Subscribe our newsletter now and receive news like this one by email on a regular basis.

Chapter 6 : How far should we go when depicting violence?

How far back in our limited memories should we be allowed to go making accusations that are unprovable and unverifiable, and should never have been mentioned in the first place without substantiation?

It is covered, face to fin, in horizontal black-and-white stripes, giving the minnow its name: The fish are striking and hardy which has made them popular pets. Over the decades, the fish have spread beyond the shallow, silty waters of the Indian subcontinent to show off their racing stripes in living rooms around the world. But today, these fish – at least, the original, black-and-white model popular among generations of aquarium keepers – are beginning to seem like relics from a simpler, bygone era. Thanks to biotechnology, the zebrafish has gotten a modern, Technicolor upgrade. By plucking pieces of DNA from jellyfish, sea coral and sea anemones, and popping them into the tiny, tropical fish, biologists have created zebrafish that glow in electric shades of red, orange, green, blue, and purple. In late , a small Texas company called Yorktown Technologies began selling these animals, which they dubbed GloFish. Two years ago, I bought six of them, along with a special tank designed to bring out their vibrant colours. I was enchanted, watching the fish dart around the aquarium in a neon blaze. But I also found myself confronting some thorny ethical and philosophical questions. And how far should we allow ourselves to go in the pursuit of animal beauty? Over the course of history, we have often treated animals as raw material, mounds of clay that can be sculpted and shaped into whatever forms suited our own needs. In many respects, the domestic dog is our masterpiece. Starting with the gray wolf, and using nothing more than selective breeding, we created a whole new universe of creatures. Among the or so dog breeds that exist today, there are canines with round, floppy ears the basset hound and pointed, erect ones the German shepherd ; dogs with smooth, silky coats Afghan hounds and rough, wiry ones Airedale terriers ; poodles with long, graceful legs the Italian greyhound and short, stubby ones the corgi. Thanks to our careful breeding, the dog is now the most morphologically diverse species on Earth. The explosion of dog types and characteristics was initially fuelled by the search for differentiated dogs that excelled at one specific task, whether it was hunting, herding, or guarding. That began to change in the late 19th century, with the birth of kennel clubs and the rise of dog shows. But the dog organisation he founded, and the ones that followed, helped turn dogs from working animals into ornaments. Kennel clubs, which were established to help standardise the hodgepodge of existing breeds and keep track of canine pedigrees, also helped to organise canine competitions. Instead, they merely needed to look the part. Dog shows are like the Miss America pageant without the talent competition. Or the evening wear. The breed, which originated in Germany, was once cherished by hunters for its swimming and retrieving prowess. But the show criteria make no mention of these skills. He has thickly feathered ears and dark, oval eyes. His small feet have well-arched toes and short nails. His tail is straight and short, carried high over his body and never, god forbid, curled. To rise to the top of the pack, a poodle must be painstakingly groomed, his face, throat and feet shaved to the skin, with puffy pompons of hair adorning the legs, hips, and tail. The same is true of many other dog breeds: The young of many species look similar, with their large heads, big eyes, round foreheads, and snub noses. We have a natural affinity for these traits, thanks to evolution, which has equipped us to find human babies irresistible. Some evolutionary biologists have gone so far as to suggest that neotenic animals – such as puppies and kittens – are actually hijacking our innate attraction to infants, tapping into our natural parental instincts and tricking us into caring for them. More recently, our love of all things neotenic might be responsible for the development of dwarf cats or tiny teacup-sized pigs. And also, perhaps, the proliferation of videos and pictures of adorable animals on the internet. Apart from neoteny, the breeding of aesthetic companion animals has been driven by a different impulse – the human appetite for novelty. We are drawn to creatures that are new, unusual, and rare. Throughout history, rich and powerful families have kept exotic pets, and some celebrities still do. The ornamental fish industry, in particular, is engaged in a constant arms race to provide fish fanciers with ever more unusual specimens. The goldfish, which is native to China, is usually a silvery gray in the wild; the yellow-orange hue is a rare, natural variation. Fishermen spotted these rare golden mutants and, by the 13th century, they had become popular pets for wealthy Chinese families, who

kept the fish in private, outdoor ponds. However, over the next several centuries, earthenware vessels became widely available, allowing fish fanciers to keep their pets indoors, and making fish-keeping possible even for those who were not privileged enough to have their own ponds. As goldfish became more popular – first in China and Asia, and then further afield – breeders created an endless array of new varieties. First came new colours, including a white goldfish and one with a black-and-white tortoiseshell pattern splashed across its back. The pursuit of novelty has spurred a similar explosion of types in other pet species as well. In , for instance, there were 10 different rabbit breeds. Today, there are close to 50, which come in a range of colours, sizes, ear shapes, and fur lengths. Bird lovers can now buy canaries with frilled or crested feathers, or corn snakes that come in so many different shades and patterns with names such as candycane, sunkissed, lavender, zizag, creamsicle, bubblegum snow, and more that they could be mistaken for jewellery. For instance, a study at the University of Washington, Bothell, in showed that we prefer penguin species that feature a dash of red or yellow on their bodies to those that are merely black and white. Perhaps this is why canaries, which are a dull greenish-yellow in the wild, now come in more than 50 different colour combinations. This bias toward saturated and warm hues might be another reason why Chinese fishermen initially plucked those golden mutants out of the river. The dye is sprayed onto the birds or injected into the eggs before they hatch. And Fluffy and Fido can now have their coats turned into painterly palettes during a routine trip to the groomer. Last year the British actress Emma Watson was spotted walking a pink bichon frise. Meanwhile, in China, the craze seems to be for dyeing pet dogs to look like more exotic animals, such as tigers and pandas. None of this is to say that we all share the same tastes when it comes to our creature companions. But whatever our individual tastes, we have, as a society, turned animals into aesthetic objects, into products to be fetishised and possessed. As we moved from an agrarian society into a modern, industrialised one, it became less and less common for the animals we owned to serve in working roles. Instead, animals became companions and ornaments, and function took a backseat to form. Over time, what once was merely a luxury for the rich and powerful became a democratic commodity: The trouble is that in our quest to create alluring animals, we sometimes inflict great damage. Even simple selective breeding can have calamitous effects. Purebred dogs are the classic example. Once conformational dog shows became the arbiters of breed standards, we began to exaggerate the canine form: The double curl is perfection. The list goes on and on. Pet birds with unusual tufts of feathers are prone to feather cysts and can find it difficult to fly or regulate their own body temperatures. And in some kinds of goldfish, guppies, and angelfish, long, ornate tails impair movement and make reproduction difficult. Our obsession with appearances can spur even more extreme action, such as subjecting pets to painful cosmetic surgery. The procedure, performed on puppies, is often done without anaesthesia. As the American Veterinary Medical Association, which opposes tail docking, states on its website: Both procedures have been illegal in the UK since , and docking is banned in 11 US states. And in a dog shelter in the UK sent two chocolate labradors to have breast reductions – the dogs had sagging mammary glands after being overused for breeding – in order to make them more attractive to potential owners. Molecular biology can re-engineer animal bodies in profound new ways – and could allow us to push our aesthetic preferences to new, sci-fi-like extremes. Today, biotechnology has given us more power than ever to reshape other species. So perhaps it was inevitable that we would figure out how to use our modern genetic tools to imbue animals with a new and purely aesthetic value. GloFish are manmade creatures, but they are possible because some marine animals – including jellyfish, sea anemones, and sea coral – are naturally luminescent. These creatures manufacture their own fluorescent proteins, and in the s, scientists learned how to take the genes that code for these proteins and insert them into other organisms. Using a technique known as microinjection, a biologist can squirt a fluorescence gene directly into, for instance, a zebrafish embryo. Fluorescent zebrafish – first created by scientists in the s – were not initially intended to be just pretty pets. One researcher engineered the colourful fish in the hope of eventually turning them into living pollution detectors. The idea was to create a fish that would start to glow only when swimming in contaminated water. Other scientists planned to use the fish as medical models in order to study development and disease. But when entrepreneurs caught sight of the incandescent animals, they realised that they might appeal to ornamental fish enthusiasts who are, after all, always on the lookout for the next big thing. The fish are popular, and when I checked them

out myself a few years ago in the animal supplies chain PetCo, it was easy to see why. When I set up a miniature GloFish habitat in my own living room, I found the creatures dazzling. In a world in which dogs are beaten, neglected, and forced into brutal fights, I find it difficult to get too worked up about some creative costuming. However, GloFish were not universally embraced. Some activists vigorously opposed the fish, raising several concerns about their sale. For example, the Center for Food Safety in Washington DC, which in January sued the Food and Drug Administration to block the sale of these pets, posed questions about what might happen if the fish escaped into the wild. One of the most common objections to the fish, however, was simple – that they were unnatural. This fallacy – that what is natural is good and what is unnatural is bad – seems to be everywhere. Animals might have become cosmetic commodities, but they are still living creatures capable of suffering. And so interfering in their lives – and re-engineering their bodies – involves balancing pain against gain. However, cosmetic procedures present a different calculus: In deciding where to draw the line, our governing principle should be a simple four-word phrase familiar to doctors everywhere: This simple precept rules out barbaric procedures such as tail docking and nicking, as well as artificial selection for physical traits that cause handicaps and deformities. It also means we need to think seriously about animal dyeing. Some dyes and dyeing procedures are toxic, and even non-toxic ones can cause skin irritation or allergic reactions. The practice can also have indirect welfare effects:

Chapter 7 : BBC NEWS | Have Your Say | How far should genetic engineering go?

I think we should go to war with the British because we could win freedom, stop having our rights violated, and we could get rid of all of those stupid taxes. We have a good chance at winning the war and if we do, we could get the freedom that we want and need.

How Far Should We Go Brian had eight months left in Willow Brook Elementary before he entered middle school, 6th grade, six classes, and six new teachers but he was still reading at a first grade level! His dad had died when Brian was in the first grade, and his mom seemed overwhelmed by the demands facing her. Yes I like them The other 26 children in the room seemed oblivious to him. The only problem was they were all beginning first-grade-level books. Brian was part of a continuous progress classroom for students in third, fourth, and fifth grades. Brian came to the classroom two years ago as a third grader from another district. He had been identified as language learning delayed in the first grade and had received special education services in a self-contained classroom prior to coming to Willow Brook. As LuAnn listened to Brian read, she thought back to the first day he entered the classroom. He was such a loner. The only thing that she and Karen could interest him in was drawing. He still loved to draw but he had made tremendous gains socially. He was athletic, so quick and fast that all the kids wanted him to play on their teams at recess. He was a great soccer player but more than that, the kids just really liked Brian. LuAnn and Karen agonized over his academic progress, however. Karen thought about the last two years she had been working with LuAnn. She especially loved the co-teaching, continuous progress model because they had the same students for more than one year and were able to spend more time building a rapport and relationship with them and their families. Both teachers thought that was critically important. Karen reminisced, "I did a good job as a teacher for ten years and a great job for two with LuAnn. Eight of the students in their class, including Brian, had special education labels. The students themselves did not know who they were because both teachers interacted with all of the students. Sheree, a student with learning disabilities, was considered one of the smartest by her classmates because she had read so many books. No one knew the books were below grade level. Even Brian was getting 80s on his "adjusted" spelling tests. Because of his language processing difficulties, the number of correct letters were credited rather than correct words. If he got the "h" in the word horse, that was a success. Fortunately, math was not a problem for Brian. He was on grade level in his math skills and his pride in his accomplishments in that area provided motivation in the areas in which he struggled. He was able to follow along as the story was read aloud and had no problem with listening comprehension but, whether he read aloud or silently, his reading comprehension was very limited. He also stumbled over words, often words he had known the day before. LuAnn told Karen, "He just has no strategies for attacking the words. He has no way to blend. Something gets lost in the translation. LuAnn and Karen were stumped by the severity of his learning disability. It seemed to Karen and LuAnn that his mother was overwhelmed trying to raise two children, work, and go to school at night in a nearby city. On one occasion last year, Karen phoned Mrs. Adams to let her know Brian was not bringing in his homework. Adams explained as if Karen had never heard this before. It seemed to the two teachers that Mrs. Adams had been gone for five years but the family was having difficulty moving past it. Adams," Karen implored, "Brian needs to get his homework done. Adams hung up on her. The two decided that perhaps Lu Ann should try to talk with Mrs. After repeated calls Mrs. Adams seemed less angry. Eventually, she was willing to talk to both teachers and the channels of communication between school and home were reopened. Both LuAnn and Karen were grateful for the co-teaching situation where one or the other could usually find a way to engage a child or parent. At the very least, they could reflect and brainstorm different approaches that might enable their students to be successful. They arranged to have a school volunteer come in the class each afternoon and work with him on his homework. The teachers were also able to arrange for Brian to take advantage of a local Big Brother program because there were no adult male figures in his life. Adams over the phone. Adams said in a tired, discouraged tone. Adams seemed genuinely concerned with Brian, his welfare, and what the school was trying to do. In thinking about the situation, LuAnn felt sorry that Mr. Adams had died and that Mrs. Adams was so

overwhelmed. In an additional effort to help Brian, Karen and LuAnn were able to find a university student who volunteered to work with Brian at his home intensively over the summer. LuAnn and Karen had had tough cases in the past but managed, through tremendous team effort, to get the child close to grade level. It simply was not happening for Brian, no matter how hard they tried.

Chapter 8 : How Far Is Too Far Sexually? - Christian Dating Advice

The long limbs, light frame and deep chest of sighthounds, like the Borzoi or Russian wolfhound, give them the speed and endurance to outrun their quarry.

How far should genetic engineering go? Is the creation of human embryos with genetic material from two mothers taking it too far? Is this decision a medical breakthrough or unethical? Should scientists transfer genetic material? Send us your comments. This debate is now closed. Please read a selection of your comments below. The following comments reflect the balance of views received: If the scientists could prevent mothers from passing a genetic diseases onto their unborn babies, it would be a win win situation. What we should be concern about is whether the system will be abused and exploited. Sometimes it is difficult to give a black and white answer to everything. Christina Spybey, London, UK It is an unassailable fact that man is richly endowed to do great things and I believe that the zeal of British scientists to prevent mothers from passing-on genetic diseases to their offspring is the best thing to happen to human race in a very long time. All hands must be on deck to improve the lot of homo-sapien. Science needs to go on but there needs to be a line drawn in the sand beyond which it must not go. Imagine some sort of latter day Bush or Cheney gaining control of the human race in such a manner and you can understand the importance of this issue. He gave us the desire and curiosity to explore it. There is nothing unethical about exploring the unknown. Nick, London This is progress and we should support it! Maybe, it is the intent behind it that should be resolved. It should be for the advancement of science and knowledge, not a money making machine nor a freak show. Victor, Miami We need more information, and public debate Gill Bloxham, llnfyrnach We need more information, and public debate. Are other characteristics which may be beneficial being suppressed at a sub-presidential level and are we going to allow any genetic characteristics to be removed from our pool by anyone, albeit acting in our best interests? Gill Bloxham, llnfyrnach I think that people have a natural conservatism that is shown in their views on genetic engineering. But the wilful desire of business and some scientists to be progressive will do harm, then sense will prevail and a consensus will be reached on how humanity should go forward with the tools we are giving ourselves. But we will do terrible things before we learn how powerful we have made ourselves. Alastair, London, UK The main problem for genetics will be the future. If everyone could choose the genes for thier children most people would choose the same genes such as IQ, diseases, height etc. This would mean people would become more and more alike. You could then end up with people not being able to have kids normally, as their partner is more likely to have the same genes. Lucian, London I am utterly amazed at how the public continues to tolerate an unelected and unaccountable group of bureaucrats making exceptionally important decisions without any reference to them or even Parliament. It is absolutely appalling. So much for "democracy". The pioneers of this speciality did all their early research with public funding; once successful, they opened a private clinic and made millions. I reckon the next step in evolution is for us to genetically remove all the defects in our DNA so that we can have disease-free children. James, Cheltenham I suffered a severed nerve that has paralyzed my left foot. As horrible as this may sound there actually may be a reason for genetic defects as part of the evolution of man. It may sound absurd, but it could be true, at least something that needs to be address. I mean why do we have an appendix - who knows, so many unanswered questions. This process is making me nervous. It sounds very much like the type of engineering that people feel is crossing the line. Keith, US As far as it helps people and reduces the risk of preventable and genetic diseases and malformations, it should advance. The old theory of people who say that had God wanted us to fly we would have had wings on our backs is backward and primitive. If research helps in providing parents and children with a normal healthy life, it should be encouraged and promoted. This is a groundbreaking finding. One can say that vaccines and antibiotics are also unnatural since they are man made. It is now clear that the HFEA think anything goes. They are unelected and unaccountable. They have no place for public consultation and are totally out of control. To such we trust the future on mankind. Paul, Hereford How can it be unethical to seek to bring a child into the world fit and healthy instead of burdened with a crippling genetic disease? Maybe we need to ask the disabled what they

think about it. John, England At the end of the day, this is nothing but tampering with the entire human gene pool, an ironic attempt to eliminate natural selection itself. Whether or not it is moral is irrelevant. This is one area of British public life in grievous need of overhaul. Parliament should intervene to stop this immediately and reform the HFEA. This is a step too far. Michael Calwell, Edinburgh I notice the usual mixing of myth Bible and science taking place here. Let the geneticists eliminate all the inheritable diseases from the gene pool so families can have children safe in the knowledge they are free from these killers John R Smith, UK Every time we do something like this, we blur the edges of what it means to be human. Why do we only ask the "should" questions after the "can" questions? Surely it is better to have this discussion first, so the path ahead can be travelled in consensus and not conflict. Ezajur Rahman, Kuwait Whilst I appreciate that many people object to genetic engineering on the grounds of their religious beliefs, why should those who do not share these beliefs be prevented from benefiting from such scientific breakthroughs? Elaine, Glasgow This barn door has been open for some time. It is inevitable we shall all walk through it together, for better or worse. Chris, Dunsmuir, CA, USA How long will it be before children will be "grown" in labs and raised like specimens with a number and harvested for their body parts to the highest bidder? Medical science must have an ethical foundation How can that be possible if genetic engineering is for profit? Whatever can be done will be done to save lives. Only people with no medical problems have the time to sit and chatter. John , UK A "breakthrough" no; a hard-earned step on the road to a healthier future, one in which we can help assure a higher quality of life for those like me who suffer daily, one which sees their individual and collective contributions, yes. Eventually this might lead to a more advanced human - Darwinian theory taken to its logical conclusion if you like. Mark Chisholm, Dereham, Norfolk Ethics are transitory. What was considered unethical in the past is commonplace today. Think of test tube babies, organ transplants and use of cadavers in medical research. Any technology to advance the human species and eliminates genetic disease should be welcomed. Andrew, Cardiff, UK Natural selection is a part of the human race and keeps us strong as a whole. Ethics can be influenced by background. It is in fact the science suggests that this practice can damage our race in ways that are currently invisible to us. Time and money is better spent sorting other global issues that affect us all. Woody, Melton Mowbray Leicestershire There are people alive and breeding now who should have died or never been conceived if we had let nature takes its course. We have been bypassing natural selection for hundreds of years by using medicines, surgery and intensive care. It is only right that we continue this trend to its conclusion by embracing genetic engineering. One without the other is suicide of the species. Danny, England It would be plainly unethical to not allow genetic engineering to progress as a valid science. Anything we can do now to further the expansion and survivability of future generations should be taken serious. Such talk regarding this is just as silly. Shawn, Washington, DC, USA Every piece of research is aimed at preventing disease, but always transfers over into the lifestyle choice market soon enough. Ken, London, UK I think it should be allowed to enable scientists to remove the genes that cause hereditary problems. But not time ever to give designer babies. A very fine line divides this. Debbie Loader, Oxford, UK Are we treating a would-be conscious human being as if he or she were a grain of wheat or a perhaps an animal? Has our lust for life driven us to defy death to the point of an artificial existence? Surely the Newcastle University can find truly beneficial line of research in which to put its funds and leave Frankensteinian boys play to fiction and mythology. This work disgusts me. Jakob Hartel-Schwarz, Ales, France Genetic engineering potentially holds the cure for many of the problems. However, I only hope that in search of the best of "quality of life", we are not trying to circumvent the idea of death. I am not sure if the genetic engineering marvel has potentially disastrous consequences for the already bulging planet. Radiation, man made chemicals and pollution causing birth defects and genetic engineering a product of our own science to try and act on the faults of our own science of the past. We have no concept of the consequences of our actions in this area in the long term and seem to have the attitude that we know enough but do we really? The priorities are all wrong.

The scientists at the forefront of this research have said that due to biological barriers, these effects shouldn't happen, and they're working to build in safeguards to ensure that human stem.