


I'm not robot



reCAPTCHA

Continue

On May 19, 2020, an essay by the writer in the story of Kurt Vonnegut Jr., Harrison Bergeron, the installation makes a significant contribution to the meaning of the story. Set in 2081, an alternative reality in which the future U.S. government achieved equality among all citizens by passing amendments that handicap those who outnumber other citizens in strength and talent. Vonnegut gives a satirical tone to America's desire for equality and justice. Vonnegut criticizes the idea of absolute equality in Harrison Bergeron and argues that it allows political leaders to pass laws that prohibit citizens from being individual and competitive. The short story by Harrison Bergeron presents the son of two main characters, George and Hazel Bergeron, and was taken at the young age of fourteen. Later in the story, Harrison returns, interrupting the broadcast of which it turned out that he has remarkable strengths and intelligence, as a fugitive from prison, wanting to overthrow the government and help the citizens of society. Vonnegut's point of view helps me understand his story, the satirical tone makes fun of the idea that the United States wants absolute equality. Vonnegut ridicules the government for allowing amendments that would create absolute equality. The power of government can be dangerous and condemn if citizens give their leaders the opportunity to restrict the rights of citizens in any way. For example, from an excerpt: Hazel had a perfectly average intellect, which meant that she could not think of anything but short bursts. And George, while his intelligence was well above normal, there was a bit of a mental radio handicap in his ear. By law, he had to wear it at all times. He was set up for a government transmitter. Every twenty seconds or so, the transmitter will send some sharp noise to keep people like George from unfairly using their brains. (Vonnegut 1) Those who had more than average intelligence are limited to be equal with the rest of society. I believe his tone points to the discontent of citizens who allow their leaders to become more nourishing. As a last resort of society in 2081, they tried and managed to eliminate all the stresses associated with fulfillment and having to be competitive. For example, when George and Hazel were watching ballerinas on TV, he noticed them as, They weren't really very good- no better than anyone else would have been, anyway. The reason was because of the limitations even the professionals were under. They were saddled with sash weights and bags with a bird shot, and their faces were masked, so that no one, seeing a free and graceful gesture or a beautiful face, would feel like something of a cat drug in (Vonnegut 1). I think it means that people also don't want to feel like they were less attractive to their spouse or loved one as we know, above-average intelligence had mental limitations along with those that were physically better than others. The consequences of allowing political leaders to become too powerful can be great. People consciously accept amendments that will give the government the right to develop and use technologies to monitor citizens are far-fetched. These laws were passed because not all citizens were aware or because most of them were simply afraid. From the story Hazel said: If there was just some way we could make a small hole at the bottom of the bag and just take out a few of them to lead the balls. Just a few (Vonnegut 2), of which George replied: Two years in prison and two thousand dollars fine for each ball I took out (Vonnegut 2). A fine for weight relief from a person will result in hefty fines. It seems to me that the smart ones are also watching in their house so they pose a threat. The narrator's point of view is to ridicule the idea of the government creating absolute equality. Vonnegut then returns Harrison to the stage. He revisited Harrison with the latest news while George and Hazel where to watch TV. Later find out that he is a fugitive with incredible strength and a smart mind, because he does not want where the limitations are. As this man claimed to be the new emperor and began to free those around him, the United States Handicapper General, Diana Munpers Glampers, entered the studio with a bi-barrelled ten-camera shotgun. She shot twice, and the Emperor and Empress were dead before they fell to the floor (Vonnegut 5). Vonnegut illustrates Harrison as a revolutionary who wants freedom for citizens. Harrison was too dangerous for the government with little patience for those who broke the law. For example, from the excerpt: Diana Luna Glampers loaded the gun again. She took aim at the musicians and told them they had ten seconds to get their handicaps back (Vonnegut 5). Although it was Harrison who interrupted them, Handicappers saw the musicians as a threat without restrictions. In conclusion, Kurt Vonnegut Jr.'s satire tone in the short story suggests that he opposes the idea of absolute equality. He ridicules the main characters because they are more likely to live with limitations, that is freedom. The story of Vonnegut is an alternative reality of the future if we head down a path where our government takes power from the people by implementing laws and passing bills that will contribute to their longevity. Improving technology makes this possible as well as the underlying greed of most leaders. There are two ways to equality: the rise of some people and the destruction of others. In fact, ignoring for a moment the second option (which is the theme of Vonnegut's story), the first is quite a split in itself. All our modern political ideologies, concerned about the concern it is, after all, the extent to which society, the Government, must be held accountable for its people, and whether or not helping each other infringes on any inalienable right not to help each other. The reality is that all there are two ways to equality: raising some people, and breaking others. In fact, ignoring for a moment the second option (which is the theme of Vonnegut's story), the first is quite a split in itself. All our modern political ideologies seem to be preoccupied with this, after all - the extent to which society, government, should be responsible for its people, and whether helping each other actually violates some inalienable rights not to help each other. The reality is that all this nonsense about how the involvement of modern civilization should be in general in helping people is not an interesting question. The answer to the question Should we feed the poor? is always yes. This is a moral answer, though not always practical. There's nothing wrong with the fact that we can't feed the poor right at this second because we're also poor - that's ok; it shows an understanding of both our responsibility and our shortcomings, but the rationalization of immorality or selfishness or greed through sociopathic selfishness disguised as philosophy, or whining about the ever-flexible definition of property (the notion of which, incidentally, is only a temporary contrivance of our existence, governed by scarcity), is a pretext for barbarism. Many will object, arguing that giving their money to the poor is unfair. That's a good point. But suppose for a moment that you agree to live in civilization, among other people, and you agree to make the necessary concessions... Why would you do such a thing, you ask? Well, it is impossible to be one billion, as grotesquely rich as many, many people are in civilization without this civilization. In fact, someone like the CEO of Viacom, whom I understand to be - and forgive me if I'm wrong - is not only physically weak but mentally retarded, and also, no doubt, will be many times poorer all by itself in the wild, with bears and wolves and insects for the company... Think about it for a second. Suppose we had not anarchy, but complete independence of each other. The

richest man would be absolutely poor. Although, such a materially poor soul may actually be happier. And that's the point actually: that homeless people are largely to blame for having a society in the first place - as a nasty side effect - because having a society means you can buy land (that concept!) and soon there's no room left to build a house or make a house. In other words, poor people today are many times worse than they would be without civilization (compared to all the others - the definition of wealth), while like rich people today many times than they would have been without modern civilization. So you're telling me who has a responsibility to uphold civilization, to pay attention for its existence, to feed the poor, if not the ones who benefit the most? Because believe me, if you're poor, you know what I'm talking about: given the choice between living in the wild without technology, and being homeless today, it's hardly a choice at all. Maybe you would build a small house in the woods and plant a small garden and grow tomatoes or something. Or you could starve to death. The fact is, in any case, you will certainly be better off sleeping next to a dumpster Chicago. So year, at the end of a tangent discussion of the first path to equality. The second way, breaking the others down to make us all equal, also carries a modern ideological parallel of social limitations. Suppose someone doesn't like marijuana, and as a fanatical consequence determines also dislike anyone who likes marijuana. I thought about it the other day. I don't do drugs personally (not because I think it's wrong, I just can't afford it), but imagine someone who decides to smoke a pot that I hear is a great drug and other people have learned. These other people would actually like to come to his house and arrest him. I know! Isn't that fun? I mean, wait! Here he is in his house, after a long day's work, and he decides that he would like to inhale harmless smoke and feel soft. There are actually people out there in our sublime government who believe that the right social response is to immediately break into his house and arrest him. All this is done at great expense (something like 40,000 taxpayers' money a year, at pothead). So instead of building schools and playgrounds and parks, they would prefer to lock people up to make sure these criminals no longer inhale more smoke. It strikes the mind! If you thought it was a good moral age of reason, I'm sorry to break it with you, but we live in a barbaric world full of savages and idiots. Okay, so abusing other people because they're different, which can be uncomfortable, it's wrong. It's part of Vonnegut's point. A more superficial warning is that there is a difference between fairness, equal advantage and equal disadvantage. Managing a society based on a social and genetic lottery is a stupid idea, but we don't have the technological or moral know-how to do otherwise, and simply accepting that the terrible thing we are doing is probably a good start. I mean, it's a kind of evolution of our economic morality. For the modern man, it goes something like: Libertarianism: a little clever, a lot stupid. It is clear that success the system, unlike some meritocratic alternatives, would be a matter of opportunity, not talent. But above all, libertarian society will all rules and standards as things quickly fester into a kind of corporate feudalism, complete with individual cartels and good oligarchy etc. You give freedom to urinate in the water supply, in exchange for freedom do not have to drink urine. etc. But, libertarianism: some people like wee. Even if it were possible to actually reward efforts based solely on merit, meritocracy would still be based on some kind of genetic or environmental lottery. Obviously, this is not a paradigm of moral evolution. Although personally I am rooting for the post-deficit stiminal utopia of anarchy. It's just me.... More... More kurt vonnegut short story harrison bergeron pdf

[normal_5f8781a6f13b1.pdf](#)
[normal_5f87234da0088.pdf](#)
[normal_5f87c47ed8243.pdf](#)
[normal_5f88132887e28.pdf](#)
[normal_5f871929828d1.pdf](#)
[physics for scientists and engineers with modern physics volume 1](#)
[swot analysis nokia company.pdf](#)
[thidwick the big hearted moose.pdf](#)
[worksheet arithmetic sequence and series word problems](#)
[cm launcher 3d themes.apk](#)
[upcoming spiderman games for android](#)
[pathfinder 2nd edition core rulebook.pdf free](#)
[advanced download manager pro.apk onhax](#)
[basic accounting exercises.pdf](#)
[aladdin 2019 full movie free](#)
[congruent triangles practice answers](#)
[stageline sl 250](#)
[huahua you long chapter 10](#)
[normal_5f878412cf83f.pdf](#)
[normal_5f8bbf3db177c.pdf](#)