Subject: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by _SSnipe_ on Sun, 15 May 2011 21:40:39 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I have to write a 1000 word essay on a piece of technology that has caused more problems then it has solved, and write a solution for it. Does anyone have any ideas?

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by nikki6ixx on Sun, 15 May 2011 21:53:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Internet.

Murdering anyone with a computer.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by iRANian on Sun, 15 May 2011 21:59:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The steam engine.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by R315r4z0r on Sun, 15 May 2011 22:06:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Automobile. Easy.

edit:

Positives:
-Easier/faster personal travel over longer distances
-Created a hobby for enthusiasts(honestly can't think of any more)

Negatives:
-Pollution
-Discourages exercise/makes people lazy
-Rapidly consumes natural resources
-Brought many safety hazards into modern society (crossing the street, car accidents, mechanical malfunction, etc.)

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by Crimson on Sun, 15 May 2011 22:12:14 GMT

Nuclear weapons? Could be argued either way.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by Omar007 on Sun, 15 May 2011 22:22:09 GMT

Crimson wrote on Mon, 16 May 2011 00:12Nuclear weapons? Could be argued either way.
TBH I immediately wanted to post nukes when I read the topic

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by cmatt42 on Sun, 15 May 2011 22:26:48 GMT

Weaponry is too easy. Pick something that's debatable on both sides, such as razor's automobile idea for instance.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by wubwub on Sun, 15 May 2011 22:37:34 GMT

 Video games in general. they give nothing but a simple pass time and sometimes claim people lives (over addiction).

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by _SSnipe_ on Sun, 15 May 2011 23:27:41 GMT

The car idea is great, but I was also thinking of the Nuclear Bomb (H-Bomb), but I may do the car thing, I believe I can get alot out of it!

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by wubwub on Mon, 16 May 2011 00:14:20 GMT

R315r4z0r wrote on Sun, 15 May 2011 15:06Automobile. Easy.

edit:

Positives:

-Easier/faster personal travel over longer distances
-Created a hobby for enthusiasts(honestly can't think of any more)

Negatives:
-Pollution
-Discourages exercise/makes people lazy
-Rapidly consumes natural resources
-Brought many safety hazards into modern society (crossing the street, car accidents, mechanical malfunction, etc.)

 But if you weigh the pros against the cons, are are the negatives really greater than the positives?

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by R315r4z0r on Mon, 16 May 2011 00:37:42 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You're asking if polluting the planet, robbing it of natural resources, and causing safety hazards is outweighed by getting from point A to point B faster than you could on foot?

No, I don't believe it is. When you really get down to it, a car's purpose is just to get you places. You can do that through other means that don't have the negatives of a car. A car's true appeal lies solely within its convenience. It's an invention of luxury... as in people won't die if they don't have a car; they aren't necessary for life.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by nikki6ixx on Mon, 16 May 2011 00:48:01 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You've totally neglected the whole 'transportation of goods' aspect, which was kind of a big deal for influencing how well we live.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by wubwub on Mon, 16 May 2011 00:57:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

 So would you not drive ever again because it is polluting the planet and "robbing the resources"?

I know my families way of life is based on the car, I know you families way of life (unless your a menaknight (sp?)) is based on the car.

My dad is a truck driver, he has been one for the better part of my life (at least 14 years). He has probably driven more backwards than most people forwards. He gets maybe 6mpg in his truck.

Yet, if your so concerned with the planet, you won't stop buying food from the grocery stores, you won't stop buying needs/luxuries at wal-mart or wherever it is you shop at (I am just assuming). all this is delivered by truck which I classify as an auto mobile.

So unless you think walking/riding your bike/taking the bus to the manufacturer for your computer, or to the farmer for your food, then don't tell me a car is more of a con than a pro because I really don't think it is.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by R315r4z0r on Mon, 16 May 2011 01:09:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Actually, no I don't drive.

And I'm not saying a car isn't useful. I'm merely responding to the question that was asked. The idea is to be as controversial as possible. A negative point is a negative point. Something that is good but has a lot of negative points as well does not subtract from its usefulness.

Can you deny that cars consume fuel at an alarming rate or that they are a major cause of pollution? No, you can't because it's true. But does that change the fact that they have a very practical use in society? No, it does not.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by wubwub on Mon, 16 May 2011 01:22:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yes, but your saying it does more bad than good, I am saying the opposite.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by R315r4z0r on Mon, 16 May 2011 01:47:45 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

They do cause more problems though. We, as humans, don't require cars to survive. With all of human history accounted for, cars are only a relatively recent invention. We obviously survived long enough before them, so what makes you so sure that we couldn't continue to do so?

Yes they have their merits, don't get me wrong on that. I'm not saying that cars are a sin against humanity.

The only reason why you're saying cars are more positive than negative is because you've never lived in a society without them. Society today pretty much demands cars... but that is only because society has been built up around the use of them.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by wubwub on Mon, 16 May 2011 02:31:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

So would you prefer living in the 1800's (ignoring the previous inventions that didn't effectively work as a machine that made travel quicker) when we didn't have cars?

Farmers used to have to plow their field with a horse. Now they use harvesters and tractors that allow for enormously large amounts of land to be grown for food and sold.

Since you don't drive, I am going to assume you live in a city where everything is close by. Great, but not everyone has that luxury with the creation of sub division's which (in my city) can be a number of miles away from the grocery store or nearest convenience store.

Society is built upon the creation of fast travel because a lot of people have the option of fast travel.

You say I have never lived in a Society that doesn't depend on cars. I don't think one exists unless your living in some utopia where everyone grows everything they need and all help each other build everything.

What delivers the supplies to build your house? Trucks
What makes food readily available for you to buy and eat? Trucks.

Maybe I am taking it the wrong way, but it irk's me to no end when people bash trucks because they pollute the earth so much. They make life possible, I would know because I spent 14 hours yesterday in a beat up old piece of shit 1978 western star helping my dad deliver a $350 k TerraGator to a farmer 120 miles away from the pickup, and then delivering the tractor he(the customer) had rented to another farmer.

So, I don't pretend to know anything about you personally, but you seem to have an internet connection which suggests your not some menaknight who ignores the technological society and is completely independent from automobiles.

Unless you can give me a society with our (again I am assuming since you have a computer with internet) quality of life that is completely independent from automobiles, than don't say cars are worse than they are good. They may not be good for the planet, and you know what, I am only going to live for a small amount of time, and as harsh as it is to say it, I couldn't care less about global warming. I see it as a marketing scam so people buy "green".

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good

Posted by R315r4z0r on Mon, 16 May 2011 03:07:15 GMT

You aren't getting what I'm saying.

I have absolutely no problem with cars. I only said cars because its controversial and would keep a teacher interested in a paper. I've said this before.

I have no stance to say that cars are bad and are bad for the environment and blah, blah. I honestly don't care. But the fact is I can count more negatives than positives when I look at what they bring to the table.

I'm not saying my opinion is that cars are bad for the environment and it was a mistake to make them. All I'm doing is counting points, disregarding their value.

I proposed it to help him on his paper, not to get into a stupid argument.
Wow, I started way too many sentences with the word "I" there, didn't I? :V

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by reborn on Mon, 16 May 2011 05:06:26 GMT

(SSnipe) -BLU3Y3Z- wrote on Sun, 15 May 2011 17:40I have to write a 1000 word essay on a piece of technology that has caused more problems then it has solved, and write a solution for it. Does anyone have any ideas?

The bottom line is technology itself cannot do more or less harm than good. It's the people using it that make those judgements.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by Gen_Blacky on Mon, 16 May 2011 05:08:13 GMT

Automobiles are the best invention human race has made.

How would be transport extremely heavy machinery thousands of miles?

We wouldn't

Quote:What delivers the supplies to build your house? Trucks
What makes food readily available for you to buy and eat? Trucks.

A bunch of animals pulling 5 tons is not going to happen. they would get tired after a few miles. Also how are you going to get mass amount of feed and water to keep them alive. A lot more difficult most parts of the world would never even get reached.

Today's world has it really easy all the supplies they need to live are brought to them.Your only talking about combustible engines that burn oil. Their are several other types of fuels and engines we can use. Oil its just the most effective. Combustible engines are only like 40% effective the rest is just heat. The Tranmission is whats doing all the work. I have a gmc k1500 truck that gets like 12 miles a gallon and its awesome.

Positives most definitively over power the negatives.

R315r4z0r your really over estimating the power of automobiles and their use in society.

SSnipe don't pick automobiles as your topic.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by Speedy059 on Mon, 16 May 2011 05:31:57 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Why not just choose the internet? Then you can start arguing for Obama censorship.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by EvilWhiteDragon on Mon, 16 May 2011 08:19:27 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Gen_Blacky wrote on Mon, 16 May 2011 07:08Automobiles are the best invention human race has made.

How would be transport extremely heavy machinery thousands of miles?

We wouldn't

Quote:What delivers the supplies to build your house? Trucks
What makes food readily available for you to buy and eat? Trucks.

A bunch of animals pulling 5 tons is not going to happen. they would get tired after a few miles. Also how are you going to get mass amount of feed and water to keep them alive. A lot more difficult most parts of the world would never even get reached.

Today's world has it really easy all the supplies they need to live are brought to them.Your only

talking about combustible engines that burn oil. Their are several other types of fuels and engines we can use. Oil its just the most effective. Combustible engines are only like 40% effective the rest is just heat. The Tranmission is whats doing all the work. I have a gmc k1500 truck that gets like 12 miles a gallon and its awesome.

Positives most definitively over power the negatives.

R315r4z0r your really over estimating the power of automobiles and their use in society.

SSnipe don't pick automobiles as your topic.

Think of it as this: If we wouldn't be able to move heavy machinery 1000's of miles, wouldn't we have found a different solution to either not need to move them or make them smaller so we could move it.

Oh and Oil isn't the most effective, it's just the cheapest because we're not paying the real economic price. That's right, oil is CHEAPER than it should be.
The reason green energy is not competitive with oil is that companies look at the ROI and replacement value of things. With solar panels and wind turbines these things are obvious. With oil they are not, as one does not have to invest in oil it self. It's just there, and you only need to invest in a way to "harvest" it. Problem is, normally one would take into account that your company's "stock" would deplete. With oil this does not or has not happened in the past, making oil cheap. Now however it means that oil corporations will face more and more problems due to the decreasing amount of harvestable oil.
The low prices for oil where also an advantage to the industry. Since it was cheap and seemed endless, everyone started to rely on oil and not invest in more durable but expensive alternatives.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by Caveman on Mon, 16 May 2011 08:27:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

R315r4z0r wrote on Mon, 16 May 2011 02:09

Can you deny that cars consume fuel at an alarming rate or that they are a major cause of pollution? No, you can't because it's true. But does that change the fact that they have a very practical use in society? No, it does not.

I'd just like to add that now n days cars/motorbikes are pretty good on fuel. I know my bike does around 120MPG.

Pollution wise... Cars aren't that bad either, I mean people atm are going in about oh noes co2 gases, greenhouse effect.. blah blah blah.. Truth be told its nothing compared to how much 'pollution' cows make with the amount of methane they release.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by Gen_Blacky on Mon, 16 May 2011 15:30:32 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Quote:Think of it as this: If we wouldn't be able to move heavy machinery 1000's of miles, wouldn't we have found a different solution to either not need to move them or make them smaller so we could move it.

True

Quote:Oh and Oil isn't the most effective, it's just the cheapest because we're not paying the real economic price. That's right, oil is CHEAPER than it should be.

Cheaper and easier to use making it the most effective . Oil is still cheaper then bottled water. Its easy to refine and used for many things besides fuel for automobiles. Everything I own has some kind of influence from oil.

Also the industry is not ready to let it go when the big companies are making millions every day. At some point everyone will realize that we need to be less dependent on oil.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by Herr Surth on Mon, 16 May 2011 16:44:17 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

fucking mobile phones

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by MUDKIPS on Mon, 16 May 2011 18:00:28 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

fire. imagine how many people have been killed by fire since humans invented it

---

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by iRANian on Mon, 16 May 2011 20:06:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

MUDKIPS wrote on Mon, 16 May 2011 11:00fire. imagine how many people have been killed by fire since humans invented it
what about democracy

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by z310 on Tue, 17 May 2011 00:41:34 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

iRANian wrote on Mon, 16 May 2011 13:06what about democracy
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Democracy:_The_God_That_Failed

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by z310 on Tue, 17 May 2011 00:53:38 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

WubWub wrote on Sun, 15 May 2011 15:37 Video games in general. they give nothing but a simple pass time and sometimes claim people lives (over addiction).
As opposed to what?

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by slosha on Tue, 17 May 2011 01:34:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

(SSnipe) -BLU3Y3Z- wrote on Sun, 15 May 2011 18:27The car idea is great, but I was also thinking of the Nuclear Bomb (H-Bomb), but I may do the car thing, I believe I can get alot out of it!
Do something that's fun and little more involved than a nuclear bomb. That's too easy.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by _SSnipe_ on Tue, 17 May 2011 06:34:36 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I rather just get it done i did the car one, my professor does not care.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by EvilWhiteDragon on Tue, 17 May 2011 06:50:28 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

If you really want to go nuclear you should not focus on the bomb. This because nuclear power iw rather imporant (and positive) just as nuclear use for medical reasons.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by Gen_Blacky on Tue, 17 May 2011 07:07:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Best thing I could think of is Calculators. They are very useful but now days most people don't even understand what their doing and just punch in some numbers and they got an answer.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by EvilWhiteDragon on Tue, 17 May 2011 09:01:37 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Gen_Blacky wrote on Tue, 17 May 2011 09:07Best thing I could think of is Calculators. They are very useful but now days most people don't even understand what their doing and just punch in some numbers and they got an answer.
Clever one.

If you do this subject right I'm pretty sure you can get bonus points.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by iRANian on Tue, 17 May 2011 09:26:14 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

theres a large difference between nuclear power and nukes

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by EvilWhiteDragon on Tue, 17 May 2011 10:17:52 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

iRANian wrote on Tue, 17 May 2011 11:26theres a large difference between nuclear power and nukes
Not in the physics underlying both techniques.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by Gen_Blacky on Tue, 17 May 2011 18:21:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Tue, 17 May 2011 03:17iRANian wrote on Tue, 17 May 2011 11:26theres a large difference between nuclear power and nukes
Not in the physics underlying both techniques.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by Jamie or NuneGa on Tue, 17 May 2011 18:30:46 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

getting away from the easy automobiles answer...

torrents would be a good one to argue...

free of information act?
basicly stealing...
has a massive affect on small artists

this would be a fun essay... give me £30 and i'll do it

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by Dave Anderson on Sat, 21 May 2011 08:37:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

(Possibly) HTML5.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by Jamie or NuneGa on Sat, 21 May 2011 12:18:06 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

jaffa cakes!

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by Renx on Sat, 21 May 2011 15:47:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Chemical weapons seems like the most obvious choice no one has picked. The chemicals themselves may be legit, but the technology of weaponizing them really does no good at all outide of dispersing crowds (at the lowest level) that may become more violent and cause more harm.

A little tidbit most people don't know - Police/Military are allowed to use non-lethal chemical weapons against their own civilian population (obviously), but for fear of escalation in retaliation police/military are NOT allowed to use non-lethal chemical weapons (such as tear gas) against an enemy force, according to the Geneva convention. Just gives a little idea of how much people fear them.

On nukes... as brutal as they were in japan, a full on assault of the main island would have been far, far more brutal and both sides knew that (japan was relying on it). In reality the nukes were the reason Japan was able to rebuild so quickly and become the economic powerhouse they are

today.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by DutchNeon on Sat, 21 May 2011 21:50:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Weapons? Not that hard imo.

Edit: Might be too easy.

What about social media and the youth (combined ofc).

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by zeratul on Sat, 21 May 2011 21:56:24 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Television
can be educational
and can be a waste of time

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by EvilWhiteDragon on Sun, 22 May 2011 08:46:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Renx wrote on Sat, 21 May 2011 17:47...

On nukes... as brutal as they were in japan, a full on assault of the main island would have been far, far more brutal and both sides knew that (japan was relying on it). In reality the nukes were the reason Japan was able to rebuild so quickly and become the economic powerhouse they are today.
Wait, you just justified genocide in what, 75 words? Jeezzz.
Personally I think attacking the civil population is never an option, particularly not when the country in question doesn't have a lot of natural resources so you could easily do a siege of the islands. Primitive as well and would've taken more time, but would've worked without all the nasty nuclear side effects for Japan, and not in the least for the children.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by GEORGE ZIMMER on Sun, 22 May 2011 13:49:35 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Oh wow that's a pretty hard thing to write a decent argument for. Because technology, by

---

definition, can not do any harm- but almost anything can be harmful if it's in the wrong hands. I mean, you can kill someone with a pillow.

With that being said though, R3's automobile argument is about your best bet. Specifically, (to not dig yourself into a hole) you should argue against PERSONAL automobiles, rather than ones used specifically for transportation of goods.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by Renx on Mon, 23 May 2011 01:18:02 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Sun, 22 May 2011 05:46Renx wrote on Sat, 21 May 2011 17:47...

On nukes... as brutal as they were in japan, a full on assault of the main island would have been far, far more brutal and both sides knew that (japan was relying on it). In reality the nukes were the reason Japan was able to rebuild so quickly and become the economic powerhouse they are today.
Wait, you just justified genocide in what, 75 words? Jeezzz.
Personally I think attacking the civil population is never an option, particularly not when the country in question doesn't have a lot of natural resources so you could easily do a siege of the islands. Primitive as well and would've taken more time, but would've worked without all the nasty nuclear side effects for Japan, and not in the least for the children.

Attacking civilians was an option in WW2, regardless of whether nukes were involved or not. If it wasn't nukes, it would have been carpet bombings and shellings. Except those wouldn't have inflicted enough fear fast enough and the damage to the country would have been much more extensive, with the potential for even more loss of life.

How many lives do you think would have been saved if the nuke had come a few years earlier, and had been used against Germany? Millions.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by Renx on Mon, 23 May 2011 01:22:12 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

DutchNeon wrote on Sat, 21 May 2011 18:50What about social media and the youth (combined ofc).

Social media is solely responsible for the pro-democracy push sweeping across the middle east and north africa right now, and as long as social media continues to grow the revolutions will continue to spread (China will be on the chopping block as soon as their economic bubble bursts). I'd classify that as being pretty damn good, and I can hardly think of any relevant first world problems it causes besides "it's annoying"

It helps put power exactly where it belongs, in the hands of the people

---

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by zeratul on Mon, 23 May 2011 01:48:34 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

propaganda

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by Crimson on Mon, 23 May 2011 11:58:21 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Religion. By far the worst man-made invention. Responsible for million of deaths and the
brainwashing of even more than that.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by EvilWhiteDragon on Mon, 23 May 2011 13:13:08 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Renx wrote on Mon, 23 May 2011 03:18EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Sun, 22 May 2011 05:46Renx
wrote on Sat, 21 May 2011 17:47...

On nukes... as brutal as they were in japan, a full on assault of the main island would have been
far, far more brutal and both sides knew that (japan was relying on it). In reality the nukes were
the reason Japan was able to rebuild so quickly and become the economic powerhouse they are
today.
Wait, you just justified genocide in what, 75 words? Jeezzz.
Personally I think attacking the civil population is never an option, particularly not when the
country in question doesn't have a lot of natural resources so you could easily do a siege of the
islands. Primitive as well and would've taken more time, but would've worked without all the nasty
nuclear side effects for Japan, and not in the least for the children.

Attacking civilians was an option in WW2, regardless of whether nukes were involved or not. If it
wasn't nukes, it would have been carpet bombings and shellings. Except those wouldn't have
inflicted enough fear fast enough and the damage to the country would have been much more
extensive, with the potential for even more loss of life.

How many lives do you think would have been saved if the nuke had come a few years earlier,
and had been used against Germany? Millions.

They were carpeting bombing cities because otherwise they wouldn't hit shit. If there where nazi

---

HQ in a city it was easier to bomb the entire city centre than to try and hit 3 buildings from 3 or more km high.

I think Japan would've surrendered in the end anyway, even without land invasion. Why? Because Japan does not have a lot of natural resources and would need to get everything from either the sea or overseas. No need to go on land. Just block the ports and airfields.

Would've taken somewhat more time, but would've been perfectly possible and the Japan army would've run out of oil rather fast as long as they where performing manoeuvres.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by EvilWhiteDragon on Mon, 23 May 2011 13:13:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Crimson wrote on Mon, 23 May 2011 13:58Religion. By far the worst man-made invention. Responsible for million of deaths and the brainwashing of even more than that.
Religion and politics.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by danpaul88 on Mon, 23 May 2011 13:15:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Not sure either counts as 'technology' though....

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by EvilWhiteDragon on Mon, 23 May 2011 13:27:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

danpaul88 wrote on Mon, 23 May 2011 15:15Not sure either counts as 'technology' though....
It's a technique to control large groups of people...

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by Crimson on Mon, 23 May 2011 23:10:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Politics isn't so much an invention as religion is.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by zeratul on Mon, 23 May 2011 23:24:58 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

danpaul88 wrote on Mon, 23 May 2011 07:15Not sure either counts as 'technology' though....
anything man made can be twisted to meet the definition

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by nikki6ixx on Tue, 24 May 2011 01:36:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Technology was used to disseminate religious and political ideals. Like the printing press,
telegraph or radio.

But I don't think ideas, thoughts, and fairy tales are actual technologies.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by EvilWhiteDragon on Tue, 24 May 2011 07:29:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

nikki6ixx wrote on Tue, 24 May 2011 03:36Technology was used to disseminate religious and
political ideals. Like the printing press, telegraph or radio.

But I don't think ideas, thoughts, and fairy tales are actual technologies.
Depends. One can argue that politics or religion are techniques to perform crow control and to
influence people. There are (scientific) methods to do this and to do this more efficiently, therefore
I think you can call it technology.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by iRANian on Tue, 24 May 2011 18:46:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

zionism

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by ChewML on Tue, 24 May 2011 22:37:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I'm not gonna touch the religion/politics bit... that's just a mess.

Automobiles/transportation would be your best bet as they are so common in lots of forms. But the
biggest positive you missed in that area would be the jobs they have created all over the world.

Without them we would be lil more than we were before the 1900's.

Yea, the pollution sucks... and anyone who owns a oil company can go get fucked, but from

---

people working on assembly lines to your local mechanic... we no longer drive them, they drive the world. At least I'm told, that's how it goes in Russia.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by EvilWhiteDragon on Wed, 25 May 2011 07:53:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Chew wrote on Wed, 25 May 2011 00:37I'm not gonna touch the religion/politics bit... that's just a mess.

Automobiles/transportation would be your best bet as they are so common in lots of forms. But the biggest positive you missed in that area would be the jobs they have created all over the world.

Without them we would be lil more than we were before the 1900's.

Yea, the pollution sucks... and anyone who owns a oil company can go get fucked, but from people working on assembly lines to your local mechanic... we no longer drive them, they drive the world. At least I'm told, that's how it goes in Russia.
Yes and no. If cars were not invented we would either have eliminated the need to travel this much or found other (better?) ways to travel.

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by Goztow on Thu, 26 May 2011 06:56:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Energize!

Subject: Re: Technology that does more bad than good
Posted by zeratul on Thu, 26 May 2011 13:48:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Wed, 25 May 2011 01:53Chew wrote on Wed, 25 May 2011 00:37I'm not gonna touch the religion/politics bit... that's just a mess.

Automobiles/transportation would be your best bet as they are so common in lots of forms. But the biggest positive you missed in that area would be the jobs they have created all over the world.

Without them we would be lil more than we were before the 1900's.

Yea, the pollution sucks... and anyone who owns a oil company can go get fucked, but from people working on assembly lines to your local mechanic... we no longer drive them, they drive the world. At least I'm told, that's how it goes in Russia.
Yes and no. If cars were not invented we would either have eliminated the need to travel this much or found other (better?) ways to travel.

It would have probably been coal