

DR. YU

Dr. Yu has been called to testify in front of a Senate subcommittee about the controversial autism research being done in the Yu lab. A child in the project has died and Dr. Yu has been accused of medical malpractice, including experimenting on Roger Yu, Dr. Yu's son. Due to Pentagon involvement in the research, Dr. Yu was able to appeal these concerns all the way to the Senate. However, if the Senate hearing goes poorly, it could be the end of Dr. Yu's career.

The day your son was born was the best day of your life. He was your treasure, your everything. When he was diagnosed with autism, you knew you would do anything to cure him. It broke your heart to see him struggle with the simplest things: words like mama and papa, smiling, all the little things babies do naturally.

You were already working on gene therapy. Recent research had found several possible genetic targets, and you dove into your work. You struggled with finding delivery viruses that could cross the blood-brain barrier, but once you found something that seemed to be working in mice you leaped right in. You couldn't wait and see your son get worse.

You couldn't get the permits quickly enough, so you started experimenting just on your son and the children of a few friends who were just as desperate as you. You hoped that your successes would let the funding agencies overlook the unorthodoxy of your methods. However, once you had a few small failures, you wound up here, in a Senate hearing. You know you have gone too far. You have overstepped scientific bounds. The sensible thing to do would be to go back to mice, apologize and try again in a few years. But you are making progress! It has been hard on the children, you know, but your son said his first complete sentence yesterday. It really is making a difference. You don't know whether you can win if you keep fighting, you might be better off waiting a few years, but you know your son can't wait. Which do you put first, your *compassion* for your son or your *caution* for the sake of your career?

DR. YU

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS AFTER THE SCENE IS OVER:

1. In this scene, your character had to make a choice between two attributes:
Compassionate vs. Cautious. Please circle the one you chose.

COLONEL ROTHENBERG

Dr. Yu has been called to testify in front of a Senate subcommittee about the controversial autism research being done in the Yu lab. A child in the project has died and Dr. Yu has been accused of medical malpractice, including experimenting on Roger Yu, Dr. Yu's son. Due to Pentagon involvement in the research, Dr. Yu was able to appeal these concerns all the way to the Senate. However, if the Senate hearing goes poorly, it could be the end of Dr. Yu's career.

When you heard about Dr. Yu's project to cure autism, you did everything you could to get it funded. Your own little son was autistic, and you wanted, more than anything for it to be possible to make him normal. Arguing that there could at some point be military applications for this virus he was working on, you fought with your superiors until it got funding. Then you fought to be put in charge of the project.

Lately, however, Dr. Yu has been going a little too far. The project has experimented on Dr. Yu's own son, and pushed other children into a dangerous, untested and painful process. You understand the desperation of the parents, but a child is dead because of this program.

At the same time, can you really ask Dr. Yu to stop working on something that could save your own son? The project seems to be making such progress, and a few more years of human experimentation could make all the difference. Your testimony could easily swing this case one way or the other: will you *impulsively* defend Dr. Yu's actions, or *cautiously* demand that the project return to working slowly, going back to rats?

COLONEL ROTHENBERG

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS AFTER THE SCENE IS OVER:

1. In this scene, your character had to make a choice between two attributes: **Impulsive vs. Cautious**. Please circle the one you chose.

SENATOR RICHARDSON

Dr. Yu has been called to testify in front of a Senate subcommittee about the controversial autism research being done in the Yu lab. A child in the project has died and Dr. Yu has been accused of medical malpractice, including experimenting on Roger Yu, Dr. Yu's son. Due to Pentagon involvement in the research, Dr. Yu was able to appeal these concerns all the way to the Senate. However, if the Senate hearing goes poorly, it could be the end of Dr. Yu's career.

Science needs to be long-term. You understand that, and you know that it can have short-term costs. Even if a few people die now, the long-term benefit can save many more lives.

But your constituents don't always understand that. Your constituents see Dr. Yu's project and see only the dangers that it poses now, not the enormous long-term benefit. If you vote to discontinue Dr. Yu's funding unless the project returns to rats and mice, your constituents will see only the lives saved now. What they won't see are the children continuing to suffer down the road. However, if you vote to continue funding, and more children die, you could be voted out yourself, even if many autistic children are saved later.

Will you *compassionately* vote to continue funding this project, potentially helping many children, but putting your own career at risk? Or will you vote *ambitiously* to revoke the funding, potentially saving children now and helping your own career, but losing the long-term benefits of this project?

SENATOR RICHARDSON

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS AFTER THE SCENE IS OVER:

1. In this scene, your character had to make a choice between two attributes: **Ambitious vs. Compassionate**. Please circle the one you chose.

SENATOR GUTIERREZ

Dr. Yu has been called to testify in front of a Senate subcommittee about the controversial autism research being done in the Yu lab. A child in the project has died and Dr. Yu has been accused of medical malpractice, including experimenting on Roger Yu, Dr. Yu's son. Due to Pentagon involvement in the research, Dr. Yu was able to appeal these concerns all the way to the Senate. However, if the Senate hearing goes poorly, it could be the end of Dr. Yu's career.

Every person has a right to strive and to hope. It is important that we provide these poor autistic children with the best opportunities that they can get. At the same time, every person has a right not to be abused. If this research is torturing children in the name of making them something they are not, it cannot be supported, no matter how great the outcomes.

A child has died in this research, and the project has experimented on Dr. Yu's defenseless son. This is wrong; this is abuse of the helpless. At the same time, how can you ignore the progress that has been made? You need to know everything you can about the progress they are making and what the children are dealing with.

Will you vote *compassionately* to bet on the future, to help all the autistic children lost in their own minds by supporting this project? Or will you vote *vigilantly* to stop the human experiments and protect the children already suffering in this program?

SENATOR GUTIERREZ

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS AFTER THE SCENE IS OVER:

1. In this scene, your character had to make a choice between two attributes:
Compassionate vs. Vigilant. Please circle the one you chose.

SENATOR HARRISON

Dr. Yu has been called to testify in front of a Senate subcommittee about the controversial autism research being done in the Yu lab. A child in the project has died and Dr. Yu has been accused of medical malpractice, including experimenting on Roger Yu, Dr. Yu's son. Due to Pentagon involvement in the research, Dr. Yu was able to appeal these concerns all the way to the Senate. However, if the Senate hearing goes poorly, it could be the end of Dr. Yu's career.

Your first goal in politics has always been to protect the children. You worked for better schools, better internet filtering, harsher prosecution of child pornographers and abusers. When you heard that a child died in this project, your deep desire was to see it shut down, and see Dr. Yu go to jail for what these abuses have done.

However, now that you have heard all of what is happening in this project, you're tempted to switch sides. This project could bring great advantages to the future, and there is no time to waste. Each of these children is losing years locked in their own minds. More children are diagnosed with autism every year. If this project saves those children, wouldn't it be worth it?

Should you *vigilantly* continue your longstanding policy of protecting the children against this known harm, or take a risk and *impulsively* let this project continue in the hope of saving others?

SENATOR HARRISON

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS AFTER THE SCENE IS OVER:

1. In this scene, your character had to make a choice between two attributes: **Impulsive vs. Vigilant**. Please circle the one you chose.