

Technology: sociology and james stacey taylor

[Sociology](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Kenneth Hunter Dr. Carpenter PL401 13 November 2012 James Stacey Taylor

"In Praise of Big Brother" This essay will argue the point on why we should learn to stop worrying and love (some) government surveillance. James Stacey Taylor's idea about government surveillance monitoring each state will blow you away or open your eyes. I will draw attention to some good points, bad points, and my beliefs and why I think this way about his view. By the end of this essay I hope to have answered your entire question on this topic of interest. Which is government surveillance could be a positive or negative problem for people?

The first inquiry to be address is how Dyson explained his pessimistic doubts that technological innovations frequently serve to increase social oppression and inequality. I will answer this in a two part answers, in which I will tell you how Dyson look at technology was used and who benefited from the changes. Dyson started addressing his pessimistic doubts with examples from history and his own life. He talked about how technology started out in the fourteenth century with printing becoming the first technology transformation in Europe.

With this new invention, people all through Europe had the able to have books to read and educate themselves as well as their fellow countrymen by educating themselves. The technology of printing gave power to the reproduction of the Bible which led directly to the Protestant Reformation in Northern Europe. By using the technology the Protestant ethic carried it with perpetual striving for social justice a vision that was seldom achieved. The next things Dyson begin pointing out was the sensibleness of technology which led the way for social justice during the next two centuries.

<https://assignbuster.com/technology-sociology-and-james-stacey-taylor/>

Dyson talked about how public services such as clean water, sewage treatment, antibiotics and vaccines helped with bring the gap between rich and poor closer. The reason for this as he pointed out was these technologies were effective in protecting the rich from contagion and sickness if also available to poor. So, with being said in some countries where public health technologies are in enforced by law there is no large gaps. He also talked about how technologies starting making synthetic materials to bridge the gaps by introduced fake furs, brilliant colors and silk.

By doing this everyone was able to afford clothes of fashion and no was able to tell a person social class by the clothes they wore. So where does the social oppression exactly begin for people? Willl believeit start with new technology and gadgets introduce to social as new a improve way to something done. What I mean by this statement for example the iPhone or any smartphone. While everyone has a cellphone to communicate with friend andfamilya simple function so we think. Then technology comes along a change the game with apps, internet, and built-in cameras all in a phone that cost about \$600 in the beginning.

Only people that could afford this new slack technology were the people withmoneyand then newer one hit the social world pushing the older version to be affordable for everyone. So, point is like a new toy we get at Christmas time that you didn't want your friends to touch because we have to keep it for self. Until we are bored and no longer wanting to play with it and the newest has wears off, we are more apt to allow others to enjoy it, as long as there is something better or newer to replace the old one. So, gaps are made with each turn of new technology pushing the way.

In conclusion, Dyson hope technology is used to equally by everyone rich and poor. I believe he pointed out everything that would equally shared by all people no matter their social status. Technology and Social Justice will always have some type of gaps between people because money is driving force behind new technology. Dyson never pointed this out but know these gaps were between rich and poor. At the end of his essay said there was no harm to hope. I can see your point on this because Kurzweil took you on ride on many things.

From a computer storage stand point look at what we start with 250mb and now we are at 3Tb for storing information. We are growing at a rate that could way out of control or in our control that is the question? We have to understand what direction these things are taking us because it will be a limit to our growth. Kurzweil know that with growth in time bad things would follow and would have to be ready to protect our self. While reading the case against perfection by Michael Sandel he pointed out a lot of thing we do as humans to modify ourselves by technology. Things like muscles in nhancement to improve our muscle loss from old age but when technology is used for performance enhancement, running, weight lifting, and home slugger are just to name a few. The able to change person genes before even being born is wrong on so many levels. The ethics surrounding this theory wouldn't allow humans to humans anymore. Everyone is born different for a reason and everyone is given their on gift at birth. By using this type of technology to change who we are would cause more chaos then good. Like Sandel pointed with the cloned sheep Dolly which died prematurely with abnormalities was unsafe.

The sad truth behind all this type of technology is no matter how we try to change or improve it the cycle death in the end. Sandel point I believe is we have a right to choose our own path in life and should only everything to change our unique able to be different. In " Preventing a Brave New World" (pp. 317-329), Leon Kass concludes that reproductive and therapeutic cloning of human embryos is unethical. What are the exact steps in Kass's argument for this conclusion? What is your assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of this argument?