

5A: Stock's Clone Wars Argument

Word Count: 410

1. Claim	claim is appropriate to the assignment, is clear and precise, and guides the entire text.
2. Analysis	details mentioned apply to the claim.
3. Information	information is correct and relevant; quotes advance argument and are "well framed."
4. Frames	first sentence(s) clearly and precisely summarize claim; final sentence reprises the claim.
5. Development	second paragraph uses information from the first paragraph; key terms are reused.
6. Signposts	use of explicit comparatives ("in contrast"; "similarly"; "however"; etc.); avoid "also."
7. Paragraphs	sentences flow logically; no digressions or repetitions; transitions link paragraphs clearly.
8. Sentences	meaning is clear and comprehensible; vocabulary is precise; sentences have varied structure.
9. Mechanics	document has been proofread for grammar, spelling, and reader's "pet peeves."
10. Format	document follows the required format (font, spacing, length, identifying information, etc.).
11. Extras	novel claim; unexpected evidence; surprising analysis; adept turn-of-phrase.

One of Stock's strongest arguments in this debate against the strict regulation of new biological technologies was his desire to avoid wasting the resources we've already put into our study of life, and to create positive change from our knowledge. Stock argued that slowing or stopping biological research would be a waste of the time and effort we've already put into the field. He stresses that the research and testing that we are currently doing are not created to satisfy any morbid curiosity we may have about biological processes. Instead, our aim is to provide tangible benefits to ourselves, other humans, and future generations through the breakthroughs in science we make. In this point, Stock is trying to make the opposing argument seem illogical. Wasting resources and stopping progress does not make sense, and Stock is highlighting those as results of the opposition's plan. Stock admits that there will be challenges ahead, but he uses that to issue a challenge to the reader, and even touch their sense of pride. He asks "Do we have the courage to continue to embrace the possibilities ahead, or will we succumb to our fears and draw back, leaving this exploration to braver souls in other regions of the world?" He's calling the reader to action; asking them if they are willing to accept the risks to make the world a better place. Overall this appeal to logic and pride is the most powerful of Stock's arguments.

In response, Fukuyama would likely start by pointing out the difference between a cautious, regulated approach to research and Stock's 'charge forward into the unknown' mentality. Fukuyama would acknowledge the importance of medical technology and what they have done for us, but he would make the assertion that no technology is worth changing the morals and ethics of our society. One of Fukuyama's main concerns was with the separation of the human race into classes by advanced genetic alterations. He makes the claim that "we assign political rights to ourselves based on our understanding of the ways members of our species are similar to one another and different from other species." Fukuyama fears that by following different branching paths of rapid evolution, we will create massive problems for ourselves in terms of civil rights, and require complete overhauls of current forms of government. Fukuyama would criticize Stock for not taking these outcomes into consideration; for taking a 'we'll solve it later' approach to coping with the consequences.