

The microchips in humans philosophy essay



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Microchips have been implanted in pets and used to identify lost animals for a while and they have also been used in humans to some extent. If someone is dead or unconscious and in need of medical attention a microchip can identify them (Cheung). The technology has also been used as an anonymous version of a debit card (Quinn). It's also much more of a challenge to steal even if you know whether a person has been implanted or not. This just sounds like a great technology with no downsides. It seems like the kind of thing that should be distributed to every human being on the face of the Earth. But is that really the case?

Revelation 13: 16-17 in the Bible talks about a mark that " all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond" are forced to receive in or on their right hand or their forehead without which no one can buy or sell anything. Verse 15 along with chapter 20 verse 4 equate receiving the mark with worshipping the " beast" which is apparently someone in a ruling position over the whole world. Refusal to worship him, and therefore refusal of this mark, is punishable by death.

Many believe that microchip technology could very easily be used to serve this purpose and that this mark will probably be based on this or similar technology. The idea sounds attractive for several reasons. The technology can be used to simplify a lot of things. For example, people are having microchips implanted under their skin that a scanner can read and figure out who the person is even if they're dead or unconscious. Such chips are also used for tracking pets and some children.

Some might argue that the Bible specifically calls it a mark implying that it's a visible imprint like a tattoo on the surface of the skin, and that John would have been able to give a more specific description of an implanted chip when he wrote the book of revelation. However I don't think that's the case.

Chapter 11 verses 8 through 10 mentions the bodies of two witnesses in Jerusalem being left to rot in the streets for three and a half days and the whole world sees them. It has not been possible for the whole world to watch something that happens in a three day period until this last century, yet there is no explanation of how this was accomplished. Roughly 1, 850 or 1, 900 years would pass before anyone had any clue how it could be accomplished. In light of that I see no reason to doubt that this mark may very well be some relatively new technology.

Really, it seems that the only significant potential problem is the concern for Christians. Those that accept this mark are worshipping this man rather than God and therefore give up their opportunity to live and reign with Christ and are instead condemned.

This issue doesn't really deal with the physical world and therefore secular ideas of morality and ethics have no way of analyzing it except by the idea that people have a right to believe what they want. As many people in the world claim a religion, I find it very difficult to believe that a global government could work without supporting freedom of religion. However, in order to impose such a system that some would believe is against their religion, the government would have to either make some sort of an exception (which, based to revelation 13: 16, isn't going to happen) or find some reason to disregard the issue.

<https://assignbuster.com/the-microchips-in-humans-philosophy-essay/>

Based on other information in the book of revelation it seems there will be a global religious organization as well as a global government. This will most likely not be some single global religion as some believe but it seems more likely that it will be some kind of community aiming for tolerance and coexistence between all religions.

Based on this idea I think I have an idea of one great use for such an organization from a secular viewpoint besides the pursuit of peace between religions. There are many religious organizations often considered cults that are dangerous. Other organizations may pose conflicts with certain things the government would like to do, such as imposing this microchip system.

Such an organization could be used to decide which religions could be considered legitimate by which religious groups request and are granted membership based on criteria which would likely focus on inter-religious peace. Many Christian organizations seem more concerned peace and love and such than with knowing and following everything the Bible lays out for them. The Bible does say to live peaceably with all men when possible (Romans 12: 18) but it also calls us to be separated from the world (2 Corinthians 4: 16, and 6: 17).

There are Christian organizations that cannot join such an inter-religious organization without going against their doctrine. As a result, such an organization might be considered illegitimate by the government and therefore the conflict between the members of that organization and the government would not be recognized by the government as anything they need to deal with. By this method, the religious beliefs would not be

disregarded directly by the government and so this inter-religious organization would provide a nice loophole for them.

The dilemma

If the government were to impose this mandatory system to control all buying and selling globally, whether it involves microchips or not, religious beliefs would be violated. Even if there is an inter-religious organization providing a loophole for the government, people's right to their religion would be violated. Is it therefore worthwhile for such a government to impose such a system? Should these beliefs be disregarded for the sake of the government's ease of control over the global economy?

Analysis

Consequentialism

If this economic system is imposed, those whose faith it contradicts would suffer because they have to choose between, on the one hand, their faith and their eternal soul while having to find themselves completely bankrupt in this world, and on the other hand, giving up their faith for the sake of survival in this mortal life. If they believe this then they are also aware that such things are signs of the end of this world as we know it and that the benefits of opting for the mark would be very short lived, lasting very few years.

They also know that the consequence for rejecting this mark is death. This seems extreme for most modern governments to consider such punishment for rejecting this system. On the other hand they might call it something like euthanasia. Since it wouldn't take them long to realize that some people

<https://assignbuster.com/the-microchips-in-humans-philosophy-essay/>

couldn't accept the mark, they could easily see these people as useless to society and allow them to refuse the mark provided they opt for death to avoid suffering starvation from being totally bankrupt.

The government may also suffer somewhat. They have to deal with these people somehow, and killing them could result in loss of respect from many people. That would be another thing the government would have to deal with.

If this system is imposed the benefits would be much like those of creating the Euro. There would be no need to exchange currencies anywhere in the world. Also, as with the example in the book, purchases could be made anonymously and still be tracked by the government. By not imposing this system, really the only benefit is avoiding the issues that would come with it.

Rights and duties

In the U. S. at least there is a freedom to practice religion. A global government organization similar to the E. U. and U. N. may not hold the same ideals but some member nations (like the U. S.) would still. Therefore, by imposing this system the government would violate that right, even if they use an inter-religious organization as a loophole to disregard a religious organization.

Kant

Is the system is imposed, the government would disregard and disrespect those people that refuse it and, as a result, those people would disrespect the government, as would many others if the government imposes a death

penalty. If it is not imposed there is no resulting disrespect as far as I can tell and, therefore, not imposing it is the obvious choice.

Also, if the system is imposed, those Christians will be treated differently than everyone else. If things are left how they are now, unequal treatment remains as it is now. Disregarding that the death penalty is that unequal treatment, it seems that imposing the system is the better choice since more people would be treated equally than they are now.

The benefits of imposing it are doing away with currency exchange and the ability for the government to track all transactions. The benefit of not imposing it is merely to avoid the issues. Therefore again, if the sanctity of life and freedom of religion are disregarded then imposing the system may be the better choice.

Conclusion

If the souls or the lives and the religious freedom of people are worth more than the benefits of globalization, as they should be, then there is not much of a dilemma. This system will only bring trouble and it should not be implemented while life is still sacred and while freedom of religion still exists.

Dealing with the issue

Many people in power all over the world, in political and religious systems alike, have been pushing for many years for globalization of government and economy. There is little doubt that it will happen and probably quite soon. Many Bible scholars project these things all happening in the next couple

decades and it's becoming easier and easier to see it happening without looking to the Bible.

According to Professor Peter Stoner, the probability of anyone fulfilling just 8 of the roughly 300 prophecies that pertain to Jesus' life are about 1 in 1017 and yet there is plenty of extra biblical historical information to support many of those 300 prophecies (Reagan). Therefore it seems highly unreasonable to doubt that what's predicted concerning the end times will happen.

I point this out to show that I don't believe there really is anything that can avoid these things happening. I believe it will happen.

The Bible doesn't give specific dates, probably primarily as an incentive for everyone to stay prepared at all times, but there is some indication that these things would all happen about 2,000 after Jesus' death and resurrection. That combined with modern tendency toward globalization and the development of technologies allowing prophecy to be fulfilled that, until recently, has been impossible suggests that we have very little time left. Now, Jesus was crucified around 29 AD so it seems probable that all these things could happen in about the next two decades, so the situation is not something that can be put off for future generations to deal with anymore.

If, however, there were a way to deal with the situation, international governments would have to be heavily persuaded to maintain that religious freedoms be extended to all religions and not just those with membership in some inter-religious organization. They should also be made aware of the

fact that not everyone can accept the system and that there would be these issues to deal with and what it would mean.

Conclusion

Although I don't believe there's anything that can really be done about it, imposing system like this would be a bad idea because of those few of us who choose to worship our God rather than this man regardless of the threat of death as a result. The thing about religious people is that our eternal life is more important than our physical lives.