

Should government financed DNA research be practical or theoretical?

Scientific breakthroughs like Jeffreys's exemplify what is known in modern science as "impact". This contentious concept tiptoes along the intersection between science and society because it implies that scientific endeavours ought to reap benefits for society. This is where the politics comes in. How much scientific [research](#) should be driven by curiosity and how much should be planned with an end use, such as DNA fingerprinting, in mind?

View the original article here: [Should government financed DNA research be practical or theoretical?](#)