

Chapter 1 : Create Your Website for Free – www.nxgvision.com

In this week's Interchange, we apply lessons about innovation from other industries to advanced nuclear. Plus, we look at how soon batteries will start to put economic pressure on gas-fired.

In the next decade? Can we end hunger, achieve gender equality, halt climate change, all in the next 15 years? Well, according to the governments of the world, yes we can. In the last few days, the leaders of the world, meeting at the UN in New York, agreed a new set of Global Goals for the development of the world to And here they are: The Global Goals are who we, humanity, want to be. Can this vision for a better world really be achieved? But not with business as usual. Now, the idea that the world is going to get a better place may seem a little fanciful. Watch the news every day and the world seems to be going backwards, not forwards. But please, I invite you to suspend your disbelief for just a moment. And the flagship target there was to halve the proportion of people living in poverty by Did we hit this target? This year, global poverty is going to fall to 12 percent. So how did we achieve this success? Well, a lot of it was because of economic growth. Some of the biggest reductions in poverty were in countries such as China and India, which have seen rapid economic growth in recent years. So can we pull off the same trick again? Can economic growth get us to the Global Goals? Well, to answer that question, we need to benchmark where the world is today against the Global Goals and figure out how far we have to travel. Over 17 goals, there are then targets and literally hundreds of indicators. Also, while some of the goals are pretty specific – end hunger – others are a lot vaguer – promote peaceful and tolerant societies. What this does is measures all the stuff the Global Goals are trying to achieve, but sums it up into a single number that we can use as our benchmark and track progress over time. The Social Progress Index basically asks three fundamental questions about a society. First of all, does everyone have the basic needs of survival: Secondly, does everyone have the building blocks of a better life: The Social Progress Index sums all this together using 52 indicators to create an aggregate score on a scale of 0 to The highest performing country, Norway, scores The lowest performing country, Central African Republic, scores And we can add up all the countries together, weighting for the different population sizes, and that global score is In concrete terms, that means that the average human being is living on a level of social progress about the same of Cuba or Kazakhstan today. What do we have to get to to achieve the Global Goals? So having looked at the numbers, my estimate is that a score of 75 would not only be a giant leap forward in human well-being, it would also count as hitting the Global Goals target. Can we get there? And what that lets us do is understand the relationship between economic growth and social progress. Let me show you on this chart. And then on the horizontal axis, is GDP per capita. Further to the right means richer. And what this tells us is that as we get richer, social progress does tend to improve. However, as we get richer, each extra dollar of GDP is buying us less and less social progress. And now we can use this information to start building our forecast. So here is the world in How rich are we going to be in ? Well, the best forecast we can find comes from the US Department of Agriculture, which forecasts 3. So now the question is: Well, we asked a team of economists at Deloitte who checked and crunched the numbers, and they came back and said, well, look: Just a tiny increase. Now this seems a bit strange. Well, I think there are two things. And also, we know that economic growth comes with costs as well as benefits. There are costs to the environment, costs from new health problems like obesity. So are the pessimists right? Because the Social Progress Index also has some very good news. Let me take you back to that regression line. So this is the average relationship between GDP and social progress, and this is what our last forecast was based on. But as you saw already, there is actually lots of noise around this trend line. What that tells us, quite simply, is that GDP is not destiny. We have countries that are underperforming on social progress, relative to their wealth. Russia has lots of natural resource wealth, but lots of social problems. India has a space program and millions of people without toilets. Now, on the other hand, we have countries that are overperforming on social progress relative to their GDP. First of all, it tells us that we already in the world have the solutions to many of the problems that the Global Goals are trying to solve. Enough to get us to the Global Goals? What we know already: How much social progress does that get us? Well, that takes us to Well then, we get to What if every country in the world

chose to be like Costa Rica in prioritizing human well-being, using its wealth for the well-being of its citizens? Well then, we get to nearly 73, very close to the Global Goals. Can we achieve the Global Goals? Certainly not with business as usual. Even a flood tide of economic growth is not going to get us there, if it just raises the mega-yachts and the super-wealthy and leaves the rest behind. We have to prioritize social progress, and really scale solutions around the world. And we need to hold them to that promise by holding them accountable, tracking their progress all the way through the next 15 years. It grades our performance on the Global Goals on a scale from F to A, where F is humanity at its worst, and A is humanity at its best. Our world today is scoring a C-. Because getting to the Global Goals will only happen if we do things differently, if our leaders do things differently, and for that to happen, that needs us to demand it. Michael, just one question: Now the new Global Goals are explicitly universal. They ask for every country to show action and to show progress. How can I, as a private citizen, use the report card to create pressure for action? And every country is going to have challenges in getting to the Global Goals. Then we can really see, how are we doing? And that, then, I think, is to provide a point of focus for people to start demanding action and start demanding progress. Thank you very much.

Chapter 2 : Michael Green: How we can make the world a better place by | TED Talk

Yes we can. It's called a small modular nuclear reactor (SMR) and NuScale Power is the company that will build the first one in America. Last year, they submitted to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory.

We are shaped by our decisions. Some have life-or-death consequences, while others are less important. Decisions come in all shapes and sizes. Every day we face decisions about what to eat, whether to exercise, how to use our time. We also fairly regularly run into larger decisions that may have even bigger immediate and long-term consequences. What will we study? Where will we live? Who will we marry? What church will we go to? Then there are the moral choices we are faced with. Will we cheat on our taxes? Will we turn down the drugs we are offered? Will we allow ourselves to be pulled in by the soft porn we stumble across? Steps for making good decisions Whatever type of decision we face, there are biblical principles that can help us make better decisions. So, where does the Christian decision-making process start? As Christians, our overall direction in life is determined by our commitment to God, and we must remember to ask Him to direct our lives. How does God direct us? Through the wisdom He gives us in the Bible and through wise biblical counsel from His servants. It all starts with understanding how much greater God is than we are. As we study the Bible, we should act on what we learn. Sometimes it is a simple matter to know what decision to make—simply because only one choice would allow us to obey God. But most of our decisions are not that clear-cut. Sometimes there are several good choices, and sometimes none of the choices are morally wrong. The following steps can help us make wise decisions in these cases. Define the problem or opportunity. When our problem seems fuzzy, it can be very difficult to come up with a solid solution. Sometimes it can be helpful to look at the problem from many angles in order to clearly define it. What caused the problem to erupt at this time and in this way? Who is affected by it? If other people are involved in causing the problem, why? What do they get out of it? If your decision is an opportunity, what exactly do you get by choosing it? Dig out the relevant information. We have already discussed looking for the related passages in the Bible. We also need to search out the pertinent facts about the specific problem or opportunity. Many search tools are available in our information age, and it can be helpful to explore everything from the library to the Internet. Look for reputable sources with relevant expertise. Be sure to put all the information you gather through the filters of fact checking and biblical truth. Different people will likely have different information and different perspectives that can give you a broader understanding of the situation. With all the facts in hand, you can begin brainstorming various options that could solve the problem or best deal with the opportunity. Combining and concentrating on all the information gained from the previous steps should give us several possible choices. Depending on the situation, it can be valuable to explore some outside-the-box solutions. This is especially true when none of the obvious options seem that good. Throwing around creative ideas and trying to see possible connections to seemingly unrelated fields can help you generate additional options. How long should we spend on this step? That depends on our deadline and on understanding our own personality. Some of us might be tempted to cut short this stage in the interest of reaching closure as soon as possible. Others might be tempted to continue in this stage for too long, out of fear that the perfect solution will be missed. This, too, can be a problem if we put off a decision too long and perhaps miss the deadline. At some point, we have to decide we have enough options and move on to step 5. Make lists of pros and cons for each one. Weed out the worst ideas and carefully examine the best ones. This is a principle that Jesus Christ advised His followers to apply: Whether deciding to commit our lives to God in baptism or to remodel our kitchen, we need to count the cost and weigh the options. Wise King Solomon also pointed out the importance of looking ahead to foresee the possible results of our decisions: This process of deliberating, counting costs and foreseeing future dangers and opportunities should prepare us for the next step. With all the research and preparation, this part should be easier. Another prayer for guidance and additional consultation with advisers can give us the confidence to make a wise choice. If we have followed these steps carefully and put the decision into practice diligently, we will likely be happy with the results. God gives this encouragement to those who seek His will and follow His way: What can man do to me? Doing so can be a good decision too.

Chapter 3 : Can we make water? | Physics Forums

Often, people who don't understand the law or can't pay for lawyers end up being mistreated. Lawyer Vivek Maru calls for a global community of paralegals to place the law on the side of the people.

The Social Order Politics and law When Lawrence Summers suggested that biology might be partially responsible for the relative rarity of female mathematics professors, he was provoking an academic giant. Sax begins by arguing that variations in how boys and girls learn result from brain biology. But, unlike many believers in hardwired sex differences, he goes on to argue that we can triumph over biology through single-sex education. If we teach boys and girls separately and in sync with their biologically based learning styles, he claims, they will perform equally well in all academics, including math. If those who assert biological differences between the sexes disagree about whether we can overcome them, the same might apply to those who assert the power of cultural differences. Even if we do provisionally hold that virtually all differences between men and women are cultural, might it not also be true that those differences are impossible to overcome? This fourth view suggests that the very same cultural forces that make feminists desire androgyny may actually prevent us from achieving it. Some social thinkers focus on the conscious transmission of cultural messages through religion and custom, while others highlight the influence of deeper social structures, such as economic organization or family forms. The most sophisticated feminist theories of gender—those that offer the most plausible alternatives to biological explanations—take the latter view. To explain the reproduction of gender differences, they zero in on family structure, especially during the first months and years of life, to a time when the way we care for children is far more important than the words we speak. Chodorow hypothesizes that the differences between the sexes simply derive from the contingent circumstance that women happen to be the primary caretakers of children. Identifying with their daughters, moreover, mothers tend to stay tightly connected with them for years, drawing them into a circle of mutual dependence and empathy that is the essence of femininity. Boys learn their gender lessons early, too, Chodorow maintains. Since traditional mothers assume that boys are different from girls, early on they tend to encourage their sons to be independent. No one would assume that only people with a certain kind of body should be caring and empathic. The speed with which a child became independent would no longer depend on whether it was male or female. A new era would dawn. Yet even if this understanding of gender as learned behavior is right, androgyny proponents quickly run into a problem. As Chodorow herself underscores, mothering by women produces women who themselves want to be mothers. Otherwise, their recalcitrant mental habits would sabotage the creation of the new order. The fact is, attempts to force a society out of its most deeply held cultural values can be every bit as tyrannical as schemes to override our biological nature. But what if a society actually existed—not just a theoretical utopia—whose inhabitants yearned for androgyny? What if a society existed whose citizens, motivated by a burning passion for perfect justice, committed themselves to a total reorganization of the traditional family system, with the express purpose of eliminating gender? Such a society has existed, of course: It was as part of this larger socialist vision that the kibbutzniks set out to wipe away gender. Boys and girls would henceforth do the same kind of work and wear the same kind of clothes. Girls would learn to be soldiers, just like boys. The experiment collapsed within a generation, and a traditional family and gender system reasserted itself. Indeed, in his now-infamous conference remarks, Lawrence Summers invoked the history of the kibbutz movement to help make his case that biology might partially explain sex roles. However committed to gender justice the kibbutzniks might have been, they were all traditional Europeans by upbringing. Somehow they must have transmitted the old cultural messages about gender to the children. Perhaps, too, those messages came from the larger Israeli society, from which it was impossible to shelter the boys and girls entirely. Yet American androgyny proponents rarely refer to the kibbutz experiment—for understandable reasons. Its failure—even if you accept their own cultural explanation for it—puts a serious damper on the idea of androgynizing America. It would take a massive amount of coercion—unacceptable in any democracy—to get us even to the point where the kibbutzniks were when they failed to build a post-gender society. They wanted to take care of their

young children in the old-fashioned way, themselves. Even among the kibbutz founders, Spiro notes, women often agonized over the sacrifice of maternal pleasure that their egalitarian ideology demanded. This parting from the child before sleep is so unjust! But a plausible cultural explanation is even more devastating to feminist hopes for a gender-free America. What really defeated androgyny on the kibbutz, this interpretation posits, was the profound tension built in to the very culture of modern democratic individualism that the kibbutzniks embraced—the tension between liberty and equality. As part of their insistence on their unique individuality, the kibbutzniks recognized the unbridgeable unique individuality of everyone else. Hence, their insistence on radical equality. Full equality meant that everyone had to treat everyone else the same way. And inseparable from this individualism are certain aspirations—to express yourself personally, and to treat yourself, your possessions, and your family differently from how you treat everyone else. In fact, in modern societies people pay far greater attention to the unique characters of their children than people do in traditional, group-oriented societies. Lavishing intense, personal attention on their kids is a favorite way for modern individuals to exercise personal liberty. Kibbutz mothers who hoped to treat everyone the same thus also wanted to express their individual characters by molding their own kids. The two goals—reflecting the two sides of modern democratic individualism—were finally incommensurable. Eventually, the desire for personal expression trumped the quest for radical equality. The parents decided to raise their own kids in their own way. The culture of democratic individualism characterizes contemporary America, too, of course, and it still cuts two ways. Feminists insist on radical equality, and androgyny is the logical outcome of that drive for equality. Yet at the same time, especially since the baby boomers came on the scene, many American women have treated the experience of motherhood as an exercise in self-expression—indeed, they do so more fervently than the kibbutzniks. Until the link between women and child rearing completely breaks down, neither corporate boardrooms nor Harvard professorships of mathematics will see numerical parity between men and women. In the meantime, in disproportionate numbers, at critical points in their careers, women will continue to choose mothering over professional work. From either a biological or cultural point of view, then, the feminist project of androgyny is ultimately doomed. In America, many boys are slipping behind in school; their sisters are significantly more likely to go on to college. Yet thanks largely to the influence of academic feminists, legal and educational resources still flow disproportionately to supposedly victimized girls.

Chapter 4 : How to Make Computer Games: 11 Steps (with Pictures) - wikiHow

He can't make laws, he is only one voice, and he can only overturn laws that are clearly unconstitutional (if a majority of the other justices agree). Looks like he's probably not going to have.

Chapter 5 : Can we make ourselves more intelligent? | Life and style | The Guardian

This is a well known fact that water is scarce. Not any water, but the water which we can drink. Although earth is majorly covered by water (water covers 71% of the surface of Earth), but out of that water 97% of water is held by oceans which is saline i.e undrinkable.

Chapter 6 : NOVA Wonders Can We Make Life? | NOVA | PBS

Lack of AI explainability is a major problem and is limiting adoption in crucial sectors like healthcare and law. IBM may have made a major step towards tackling this issue, announcing today a.

Chapter 7 : Projects Archive | Make: DIY Projects and Ideas for Makers

Use one of the services below to sign in to PBS: You've just tried to add this video to your Watchlist so you can watch it later. But first, we need you to sign in to PBS using one of the services.

Chapter 8 : NPR Choice page

We are glad to share Ensia articles free of charge under the terms of Creative Commons' Attribution-NoDerivs Unported license. At the beginning of your post, please attribute the writer and Ensia as the original source and link to the Ensia article. You must use the "Get Article" link.

Chapter 9 : What Can We Make of Conflicting Reports About Maddon Seeking Contract Extension? - Cubs

But before we get into the requisite consider-the-source caveats, Jeff Gordon of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch "not the race car driver of "Wrigley Stadium" infamy" wrote a day after the above reports that Maddon had "sought a contract extension."