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The most important aspects of life should be God, family, community, and country, as Wendell Berry so intelligently points out in *What Are People For?* Education, the education system, the consumer economy, and thought of the future have contaminated our once pure thoughts of life. Technological progress has hurt our society rather than helped it.

Our children need to be raised with the right priorities in mind. If they go to school and learn about the world and other people’s ideas and beliefs, or watch the news on television or read articles on the Internet, they will no longer value the ideas of their parents, and they will begin to develop a sense of responsibility to actually think about what they hear before believing it.

Can you even imagine having a child that knew that some people do not believe in God? Or perhaps our children should learn about those people. That way, they will be able to know who they should defend in a religious way, because clearly it is more important to defend our country and our religion than to preserve peace in the world.

The economy should not have nearly as much importance as it does. We do not need to import technological materials and, more importantly, we should not even think about exporting food to third-world countries. Buying and selling anything should be outlawed. Everyone should grow what he or she needs to eat, and if they can't,
Then he or she is too weak to live a simple, pure life, and he or she deserves to starve.

As Wendell Berry says, "The higher aims of 'technology' are money and ease." The only reason the Internet was created was because lazy people did not want to have to look up information in books. It was not created to connect the world, nor to provide the world with more information than can be found in the local library. People who believe that are just as stupid as those who believe that NASA is sending satellites and spaceship rockets into space to learn about the universe. Clearly it is really building a secret luxury hotel on Mars for the upper class to go to during their vacations.

Why think of the future? No one knows what will happen tomorrow, so why not spend everything you have today? Parents do not know if their children will get into college, they might even get sick and die before even applying; therefore, parents should not save money for it. There is enough oil in the world now, so why look for more out in the desert? No one knows what will happen so there is no need to even try and be prepared, that is just silly.

There are really only two possible answers to this dilemma: Live the way you live in this wretched world of international relations, technological advancements, and preparations for the future, or move out into the woods in the middle of nowhere with an outhouse because plumbing.
is for those with "money and ease"), teach your children to live for the community softball team and live enjoying the present, like Wendell Berry.
In this piece, Wendell Berry asserts that most technological progress that is being made today has a negative effect on our society. I wholeheartedly agree.

Television is an excellent example of the evil that technology can quickly become. Sixty years ago, the United States was full of close-knit, friendly communities. Crime, drugs, even swearing was frowned upon. Today, crime is tolerated, drugs are cool, and swearing is part of everyday life. What has changed over those sixty years? The major factor: television. When televisions were first made commercially available, the TV shows were very constructive. Even as recently as ten years ago, TV shows like "Barney" and "Sesame Street" were popular with children. Today, TV shows are mostly scandalous, violent displays of hormones. Even eight year old kids wouldn't dream of watching something like "Barney" or "Sesame Street". Instead, they watch violent shows such as "The Mighty Morphin Power Rangers". And that is just the children. Teenagers and adults watch "WWF" and "Buffy the Vampire Slayer". Every night has some new, different and violent show offered. The result: kids don't hang out together on summer nights - they watch TV. Drugs are glorified. Crime is made to look like a joke. This is why our society is going downhill.

I spent a year of my life in Liberia,
West Africa. TV has not become common over there, and it shows. The differences in attitude and beliefs are amazing. People actually look out for each other. Stealing is rare. Parents help each other look out for kids. Their society is in good shape. They don't need technologies like TV and the internet to take their innocence away. In Liberia, technology development will be a bad thing for their society. As far as other technologies being developed—cloning, weapons, energy sources—do we really want them? Can we handle them? The answer is no. We have enough conflict and war in the world, so the last thing we need is more ways to kill people. Our society is already a mess—we have unemployment, crime, drug problems—why would we want to create more people through cloning? Our law enforcement is already stretched thin, and they do not need the added twist of identical people. We are polluting at an alarming rate—we do not need more energy sources to add to our rate of destruction. In short, we cannot handle our current technology, so how could we handle future innovations?

I agree with Wonderl Berry that we should stop our technological progress now, unless we are certain that we are doing the right thing. To this point, our technological progress has not helped our lives; it has made them worse.
As the world begins its first stride in the twenty-first century, it has accepted the potent system of globalization as its method of handling world affairs. Well, perhaps the world has not accepted globalization—certainly not all of the world's nearly six billion people support the system of rapidly advancing technology, diminishing trading barriers between nations, and "increasing quality of life." But whether the people of the world appreciate it or not, globalization is here, and, until the elite of the world stop gaining money from it, it will continue its reign over global life. Despite the worries of family-conscious, retrospective nationalists like Wendell Berry, technological progress is a cornerstone of life in globalization.

Although Berry does not decry technology itself in the excerpt from What Are People For?, he certainly views it in a very negative light. Berry claims to oppose the "higher aims of technological progress" (line 13), but it is obvious that he considers technology narrow-mindedly and with a great deal of fear. Since the beginning of time, anything that has been invented has been, in its chronological birthplace, technology. Berry does not attack technology intrinsically, yet he clearly harbors deep resent for it. The "community, country, and God" (line 38), "which Berry apparently professes support for," have all been created possible by technology. Berry never draws the line in technology between what is "necessary" for life and what is superflous. After all, if humankind were to forsake technological advancement right now, if all technology
that currently exists in the world were to suddenly disappear, would not civilization recede into a world not unlike the island of William Golding's Lord of the Flies? Would not the human institutions of "love for family, community, country, and God" wither away with civilization?

Berry's point in his essay — that society has become entirely based on avarice — is very nearly accurate. His call for a return to family life, a redoubled focus on the environment, and a renewed sense of nationalistic identity is entirely noble. Yet the expedient that Berry suggests for reversing the decadence that technology has supposedly caused is invalid, and in this age of globalization is implausible. How can families take care of themselves and achieve sustenance without technology when the economics of this time in history are completely based upon that which Berry so disdains? The answer to this problem is that technology must be democratized so that all who use it can have a say in what goes on in the world. Technology is incredibly powerful, yes. Why not use it for noble causes? The real problem with the world is that technology is abused; people are forced to work long hours without ever getting time to spend with their families.