

Science, technology and society

[Sociology](#), [Poverty](#)



Science, Technology and Society " The concept of the cell phone is that you have absolutely nothing to say and you have to tell someone now." Jerry Seinfeld " The real progress is putting technology to everyone" Henry Ford

Question: Do the scientific and technological advances together or separate to society? As the years go global society has had to adapt to scientific and technological changes that are being created, but the important question we want to ask is: What generates these advances, the union or separation of society? Zimman said that science is the engine for development and to alleviate inequities as well as Friedman says the differences are eliminated thanks to this. Borgman notes that these artifacts bring us closer to happiness. These different opinions make us generate our initial question. In our view technological advances can make both, unite society and also separate, since we live in a world / very unequal society also generating discrimination, advances bring people that can cover the costs thereof; citing the iPhone, iPod and iPad. Apple handles annually renew your items, putting an added bonus in each of them, generating expectations and desire in society to acquire it, but do not really know if we do or do happy that continues to serve the same functions as above . Separate society because as mentioned in this society so fair not everyone can acquire in this case an iPhone, separating more to the " poor" of the " rich".

BRAINSTORM

FRIEDMAN WORLD IS FLAT - opportunities are matched - The differences are eliminated thanks wings technologies (ICT) - States that are in globalization

3. 0 - Outsourcing - Prevalence of competitiveness requires immersing the growing individual to the global - Taking into account equality? Conditions of equity? Access means real opportunity? Speaking of Barkin, believes that

few have the control of production and poor or emerging countries do not compete on equal terms, in the end he believes that the widespread talk of how good or bad the damage progress outweighs the benefits that this cause. The new market economy does not provide efficient solutions to the equitable distribution of wealth, and agricultural societies are the poorest and in turn to those blamed for the lack of sustainability, however Barkin thinks that sustainability can not flourish in poverty, although it is believed that poor people are to blame for destroying their environments, the conventional theory proposes a development that seeks solutions to poverty by changing the strategy, a free market strategy can not create a bridge so abysmally dividing rich and poor, so we propose an approach which recognizes that natural resources are limited, focusing the issues of poverty and sustainability offering a development program that they were excluded and thus improve conditions the society. They need solutions that do not depend on both the market and increase the awareness of which is redundant for many communities into the current structure of production and economic growth, he believes that when given opportunity and access to resources, the poor are likely to take direct action to protect and improve the environment. One more option is given by Berkin creating policies that encourage and safeguard rural producers, capital has assumed control of the state changing social and productive structures to depress wages and buy products at low prices. Meanwhile Zimman is more optimistic because it puts science as omnipresent in everyday life of all people, either as technology or medically, weapons, or converted into political power, he takes science as a major institution in our society, which is essential to the social order and

an essential component of our culture. Science relies heavily on the social environment in which it is leading, depend on the culture in which people live, influences and historical and national roots, very different in underdeveloped countries, and in turn the education and religious context have significant influence on how the public perceives science. Science is political, is as important in public life that every nation is shaped by government authorities, industrial, commercial, military and clerical, each social system gives him a role that fits their political agenda. Proponents of scientific socialism believed in technocracy, argued that science and technology should be the main source of authority, however in capitalism is assumed that all social action is in the hands of private companies, companies that compete freely by consumers . Technoscience is a mixture of scientific research and technological innovation. Capitalism has its critics, many propose an alternative social system where the power of multinational corporations and their political allies be removed or braking, so that technoscience have to free themselves from their government and corporate masters before they can operate as a force for popular liberation, our society is characterized by large areas of concern on health, energy sources, food resources, employment, nature conservation and voices from another alert, the analysis of how it could be avoided born of a science like ecology , climatology, epidemiology and economics, however Zimman holds that human life would be difficult without the wonders encountered by scientific curiosity, believes there should be a social contract that should serve the purposes of human development to be more in line with the world today and while science also serves as an engine for development and avoid inequities.

Technoscience and science are incompatible instrumental. however the general public feels that the academy is essentially a moral enterprise. Zimman think compared to most professions, scientific research is still systematic corruption free but unspoken rules and conventions that protect professionals such influences are being eliminated. BORGAM technology and happiness are in conflict with its inevitability. happiness from Aristotle and technology since the industrial revolution. , Borgam believes that technology is the environment which can not escape, the relationship between them is too complicated. by Michael Shermer is nondestructive technology and use it s all up to the minimum task, which believes it is hypocritical to criticize. the used " technology" as a social and cultural phenomenon that is based on scientific knowledge and is expressed in machines and processes such as aircraft and medical technologies. - Technology and happiness - Artifacts can approach happiness? - End or medium - Commitment, true virtue and pleasure purposes - Technological Determinism? or + technology = more freedom or or + + technology = dehumanizing