



THE SCRIBLERIAN

(Semester Year) Edition

The Scriblerian is a publication sponsored by the SUU Writing Center. This online journal is the result of a competition organized by Writing Center tutors for ENGL 1010 and 2010, and General Education 1000 and 2000, students.

Contents

Argumentative- English 1010.....	2
1st Place Winner: Makaela Smith, “Labeling”	2
2 nd Place Winner: Scott Moxon, “The Profound Effects of Daily Exercise”	6
Honorable Mention: Sandra Keck, “Eating in the New World”	7
Expressive- English 1010	11
1 st Place Winner: Paige Pully, “Here Comes the Spiderman”	11
2 nd Place Winner: Tammie Yamashita, “You Write It, I’ll Read It”	14
Argumentative- English 2010.....	15
1 st Place Winner: Lex Oveson, “The Dangers of Traumatic Brain Injury”	15
2 nd Place Winner: Sydney Poulson, “Time Travel and the Ethics of It”	16
Honorable Mention: Baylee Duncan, “Physician Assisted Suicide”	22
Expressive- English 2010	23
1 st Place Winner: Jenny Johnston, “The Peak of Many Faces”	23
2 nd Place Winner: Ayleen Perry, “How Technology Saved My Life”	24

Argumentative- English 1010

1st Place Winner: Makaela Smith, "Labeling"

For Professor Natalie Johansen

A man once killed twelve girls between the ages of 12 and 28. His name was Kenneth Bianchi. Each girl was sexually abused, tortured, and then strangled. When he was finally caught, Bianchi was charged with kidnapping, rape, and torture. At his trial, he pleaded not guilty due to insanity, and falsely convinced several psychologists that he had a mental disorder called MPD, or Multiple Personalities Disorder. Thankfully, a couple psychologists discovered that Bianchi was lying, and he was denied parole in 2005 (George; "The Hillside Murderers"). MPD is among the disorders that are difficult to correctly diagnose. Though Bianchi's example is extreme, psychiatric labels can have huge effects on the lives of so many people. In schools, labels such as Autism, ADD, OCD, and many other disorders are stigmatized, causing difficult, and sometimes harmful, situations for the children who receive these labels, especially if they are wrongfully diagnosed. The medical field is working to improve the accuracy in diagnosing children. However, schools cannot wait until all of the flaws in the system are ironed out; action needs to be taken now. The lives of children are at stake. Psychiatric labeling can be useful, but it has to be used in careful moderation, especially when used in an attempt to describe the behaviors of children in school.

Psychiatrists and other clinicians use a tool called the DSM-5 to diagnose mental disorders. DSM-5 stands for Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition, and is a manual that contains all known and distinguished mental illnesses. It describes each illness or disability, how long symptoms must be present for, and symptoms, disorders, and conditions that must be ruled out first (DSM). Medical doctors are able to use the results from tests (for example CT scans, x-rays, cardiograms, etc.) to distinguish and theorize the cause of abnormal, physical symptoms a person may be experiencing, and provide a diagnosis. Whereas, for psychiatric diagnoses, the descriptions of psychological symptoms often come from the individual themselves, or from the observations of a care giver or guardian. Many of the diagnoses given through this diagnostic tactic are correct. However, because the diagnosis rests mainly on the perceptions of the individual, care giver, and clinician, as opposed to results from hard tests, some of the labels can be incorrect. Some mental disorders, such as anxiety, may have bodily manifestations, but most involve psychological and behavioral deviance such as Depression and Autism.

Psychologists are continually researching to find ways to improve the DSM-5 and better diagnose individuals. Someday, psychologists and other clinicians might be able to diagnose children using methods similar to that of medical doctors by measuring levels of chemicals in the brain, viewing the structure of neurons, and using that information to understand what exactly a person is feeling, seeing, and comprehending. But for now, clinical psychologists and psychiatrists use the DSM. As time goes on, the DSM has gotten better at aiding clinicians in the proper diagnosis of individuals. However, because there is still room for error, and because they describe a variety of symptoms, these psychiatric labels must be used with more caution than they are currently being applied.

A common phenomenon can be used to better illustrate the effect of labeling. Diagnostic labels simplify life for a lot of people. Take for example, the scenario of a teacher showing some children pictures of

different kinds of birds in a lesson. Without the label of bird, it would become very exhausting if every time the teacher showed another example of a bird, they had to say something along the lines of “now, this feathery living thing with wings and twig-like legs...” Here is another example. What is the first thing that comes to mind when hearing the label of dog? Most people will picture a four legged, furry animal with ears, a snout, a slobbery tongue, and a tail. That three letter word elicited an image that took several words to describe. The same goes for psychiatric labels. A diagnostic label, such as autism, briefly describes several behavioral tendencies and psychological characteristics of a person in a very short amount of time. And, just like dog, there are also variations from child to child such as: the intensity of breakdowns, the functionality of the individual, and many other characteristics. It is the ignorance of these variations, and the connotations that can often follow, that make labeling dangerous.

A psychiatric label does not always describe the person it is given to. In an article titled “To Label or Not to Label,” the authors express the opinion that “in society, an assigned label essentially places the individual into a specified group possessing similar characteristics” (Gold and Richards). Think of this as the classification, or label, of dog. The authors go on to say that “by design, a label can serve the discriminatory purpose of distinguishing the individual (and others similarly labeled) from the rest of society and provide information about the individual regardless of its accuracy” (Gold and Richards). Often, people’s opinion of a label is based on the experiences that person has had with individuals belonging to that group. If a child’s first experience with dogs results in a bad one, that child will usually be afraid of all dogs, regardless of whether or not they need to be. Likewise, if a teacher is afraid of dogs, and their actions around dogs communicate to a child that dogs are scary, that child will usually learn to be afraid of dogs too. By using psychiatric labels to describe a child, teachers and staff may not only draw incorrect conclusions about the child and their behavior, but may also affect the perceptions of the other children as well.

The use of psychiatric labels can often lead to prejudice and discrimination. Paul Bloom gave a TED talk in January of 2014 that discussed the pros and cons of labeling when it came to stereotypes and bias. To understand how this relates, a stereotype can be defined as a generalization of or a set of expectations pertaining to a specific group, even if an individual of that group does not exhibit some of those characteristics. For example, cheerleaders are often given the stereotype of being “blonde” and ditzzy. Even when a cheerleader is very intelligent, people often continue to see them as a ditzzy cheerleader. Because this cheerleader is a rare exception, people often continue to apply that same stereotype to the people in that group. Bloom talked about the effectiveness of stereotypes and how, without them, life would be extremely difficult. He says “For the most part, we make good guesses both in the social domain and the non-social domain, and if we weren’t able to do so, if we weren’t able to make guesses about new instances that we encounter, we wouldn’t survive” (Bloom, 1:51). He goes on to say that even though there are many benefits of using stereotypes, when they are taken too far, they can become harmful (Bloom).

I once had an acquaintance who announced over Facebook that they had been diagnosed with depression. They gave off the impression that diagnostic had changed their perception of their life, and in later interactions with him, he acted more “depressed.” In a scholarly article titled “A Modified Labeling Approach to Mental Disorders: An Empirical Assessment,” it talks about the idea that an individual, upon receiving a psychiatric diagnosis, will often internalize “the attitude of the community” that is portrayed through a variety of sources, and “chronic mental illness is the consequence” (Link, 402). Often, once a person receives a label, that person is almost confined to it. It is hard for people to

see them differently once they have been categorized with a specific group. Many children view their teachers as an authoritative, respectable person. Once a student has received a label, it's hard for them to see themselves differently. This principle can be demonstrated through an experiment that was done about 40 years ago, but is still referenced to by scholars today.

In the 1960s, a psychiatrist by the name of David Rosenhan conducted an experiment that is widely disputed over even today. He and a group of seven other sane people (pseudo-patients, 5 women and 3 men total), set up interviews with 12 psychiatric hospitals in 5 U.S. states. During the interview, the pseudo-patients were to say that they were hearing voices, and that the voice they kept hearing was of the same gender, and was vague and unclear, but used words like 'empty,' 'hollow,' and 'thud' (the "symptoms" were not found in any diagnostic book available at the time). The pseudo-patients were also instructed to use fake names and occupations. Other than those deviations, the pseudo-patients used factual life events, thoughts, and relationships. All except for one case were admitted with the diagnosis of schizophrenia. After the initial interview, the pseudo-patients acted completely normal. Some of the patients in the hospital with them actually made comments that directly referenced the fact that the pseudo-patients were not actually crazy. When asked by staff members how they were doing, the pseudo-patients would reply that they felt fine and were not experiencing symptoms anymore. Despite their efforts, the pseudo-patients were kept in the hospital anywhere from 7 to 52 (with an average of 19) days.

Though the patients acted normally, once in the hospital, some of their actions were considered to be an extension of their mental illness. For example, the patients often wrote in journals about their experiences and observations. At first this was done secretly, but eventually was done out in the open. In some of the nurses' notes about the patients, they would describe their writing as "an aspect of their pathological behavior," saying that "Patient [is] engaged in writing behavior" (Rosenhan). There were several other aspects of the events and attitudes of the psychiatric institutions that elicited feelings of invisibility and misinterpretation due to the staff's connotations of the patient's psychiatric label. This demonstrates the confinement a label can have, even if the label is not completely demonstrative of the situation, object or person, or idea at hand. There have been times when certain behaviors of a child are attributed to their psychological state, when in reality, the behaviors should be attributed to another factor such as boredom.

The diagnostic label given to the pseudo-patients was falsely acquired through the untruthful descriptions of the individual, but it was due to the "stickiness" of the label that kept the patients in the hospital. Not only did it keep them in the hospital, but they were also continually defined by that original label. There were accounts given when the pseudo-patients would initiate a normal, expected conversation with a staff member. Rosenhan said that "the encounter frequently took the following bizarre form: (pseudopatient) 'Pardon me, Dr. X. Could you tell me when I am eligible for grounds privileges?' (physician) 'Good morning, Dave. How are you today?' (Moves off without waiting for a response)" (Rosenhan).

Rosenhan's experiment was conducted five decades ago, but Dr. Murray J. Goddard related a similar experience that he had in 2011. Goddard explained that he was unwillingly admitted to a mental institution under the erroneous diagnosis of bipolar disorder: a disorder in which the person experiences quick changes in extreme emotions. Reflecting on the experience, Goddard confirms almost all of

Rosenhan's original findings, setting at rest most of the criticisms relating to the methods of his study, and his findings (Goddard).

Scientists have "...[shown] that 'mental illness' is one of the most highly rejected status conditions, clustering with drug addiction, prostitution, ex-convict status, and alcoholism..." (Link, 401). Because of this, there are many people out there who feel that schools should get rid of the labeling system entirely. During an interview about learning disabilities, Mel Levine said "I don't even like to think [labels like ADD or LD] exist. I believe there are some children who have trouble with attention, but labeling all of them ADD doesn't make sense to me. It implies some homogeneity that doesn't exist. Labels oversimplify kids" (qtd. in Gorrell).

Some of the perceptions and actions towards those given psychiatric labels are written into the functions of society. However, each teacher, each school administration board, and each district can implement changes that will affect the lives of so many children, and potentially affect the society as a whole. Through acknowledging the stigma, discrimination, and other various negative effects of labeling students, there will be huge changes. By taking it a step farther and continually working to avoid using labels when describing a child, especially around other children, huge bounds will be made in improving their lives. And finally, by recognizing that each child with the same label is different, and needs access to different resources, drastic changes will occur that cannot be fathomed at this time. Ample amounts of time are put into improving schools because they help shape the lives of children.

One of the main benefits of using psychiatric labels is that they simplify life. However, these labels must be used in careful moderation due to the ideas that negatively connote mental disorders. These connotations affect the lives of so many people, and add stress to the life of the individual. People must be aware of their actions that are associated with these labels. At the end of his speech, Paul Bloom says that there are many natural reactions that affect judgments for good and for evil, but through "rational deliberation" and "intelligent planning," the correct emotions will come into play. "And it's in this way that reason helps us create a better world" (Bloom, 16:09). Schools can change the world, even if it is just the world for one child. The change lies in your hands.

2nd Place Winner: Scott Moxon, "The Profound Effects of Daily Exercise"
For Professor Nathan Price

Withheld by student's request

Honorable Mention: Sandra Keck, "Eating in the New World"

For Dr. John Belk

In high school, everything is easy. There are assigned portion sizes in the cafeteria, the food offered has to undergo federal nutrition standards, and there is usually only one meal instead of a big buffet to choose from (Kaphingst, French, and Story 115). When entering college, everything changes. There, the traditional "cafeteria menus are usually loaded with items like juice cocktails, soda, diner foods like hamburgers, grilled cheese sandwiches, French fries and breakfasts that contain large amounts of oils and fat (i. e, bacon, sausages, pancakes and syrup), along with an endless selection of sugary desserts" (Garcia). According to a study of the American College Health Association, over one third of college students are considered to be overweight or obese based on their BMI while childhood obesity is still increasing (Sander). Gaining weight is a serious problem which mostly affects the age group of college students between 18 and 29 throughout all years of college, not only during the freshman year (LaCaille et al. 531). Cafeteria food cannot be blamed for obesity rates in the USA because there are many other determinants influencing a healthy lifestyle and good eating habits. As a Human Nutrition major, I can say that having a meal plan can even be an advantage, and one can always make healthy choices.

College is the transition phase from adolescence to adulthood. It is also the time when students are most likely to develop their individual eating habits independently, leading to long-term effects as they are going to keep them for the rest of their lives. As a result, the weight gained during the first year of college is usually maintained. With 20.2 million students attending American colleges and universities in the fall semester of 2015, the food offered in cafeterias on campus plays an important role in the life of every college student because most of the first year students are usually enrolled in a meal plan ("The NCES Fast Facts..."). It is not only a place to eat, but also a place to make friends and socialize with others (Cardone 12). Therefore, the food offered on campus can have a huge impact on the students' eating habits as well as their social life. During this transition phase, many students go from having a normal weight to being overweight, but there are many factors besides eating in the dining-hall that change and influence the amount of weight gained (LaCaille et al. 531).

One of those reasons might be a decrease of physical activity while increasing the caloric intake. Most of the time, students postpone their workout routines because they have many important decisions to make during the first weeks of school without family support. This makes it even harder to get back to exercising regularly, and connects to the problem of time management skills and the lack of time. Many students have a very busy schedule with lots of activities almost every single day. A student from a Midwestern university said: "It was something new so I needed to feel how to cope with meeting new people and getting my class work done, and then I started to work out" (LaCaille et al. 535). I had to struggle with this situation myself because it took me a while to build up a new daily routine and get a certain structure in every day by prioritizing activities that were important to me.

Peer pressure can be seen as another cause for why students gain weight during college. They are surrounded by many other scholars who might function as role models or bad influences, either in the college cafeteria or the apartment kitchen. Of course, almost everyone wants to live and eat healthy which should result in avoiding junk foods. The Segen's Medical Dictionary defines those nutrients as "highly salted", "high in refined carbohydrates", and "high in saturated fats" ("Junk Food"). Therefore,

foods like potato chips, soft drinks, and cakes should be eliminated from the daily meal plan. Instead, students should replace them with healthy foods such as fruits and vegetables which are “especially high in fiber, natural vitamins [and] fructose” (“Healthy Food...”). However, not many students follow that guideline as they have other approaches to achieve their goals. I noticed that some students will try to convince their friends to eat ice cream as well, so they don’t feel as bad about not following their diet. As a result, the motivation to eat healthy and the self-control that one needs to do so is most important. It shows whether the student is ready to resist the temptation or not, a skill that one would also have to apply when cooking for themselves, going through a grocery store, or passing a fast food restaurant. The temptation is going to be everywhere in the world and not just only in the cafeteria. Defeating one’s weaker self is essential for the future, the key point of a healthy lifestyle, and also the part where many students are struggling.

Most of the time, it is not the limited variety of cafeteria foods that lead to weight gain and unhealthy eating, but the temptation and huge variety of dishes which constantly require students to make wise decisions they will not regret. The reason for serving all these different kinds of food is that people eating at the cafeteria are really diverse, and all of them have different nutritional needs. As a result, the cafeteria has to offer a big variety of different foods in order to be appealing to the majority of scholars. Athletes, for example, need to follow a diet that is “based on a variety of physiological, sociological, and psychological factors” (“The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition” 1070). According to the College Student Journal, their nourishment depends “on the type of sport, hours spent training, season, weather conditions, gender, and body mass index” (Webber et al. 252). Another student from a Midwestern university discovered herself to be challenged by the food selection: “‘I think you realize the food you’re eating when you look at the main course [in the Dining Center] and it doesn’t look very healthy, and then you see the salad bar, and obviously you know which one’s better’” (LaCaille et al. 534). After realizing the better choice, is it always made? No. Usually, the smell of fast food is much more convincing than the salad or sandwich bar. That is the reason why pizza is often times provided for on campus events since it will simply attract more people than apples would.

Additionally, the all-you-can-eat dining option does not make these choices easier because it gives the opportunity to increase portion sizes. “The unlimited availability of so many good tasting foods resulted in decreased self-control” (LaCaille et al. 534). This leads to going back for seconds and eating more than one usually would. In order to prevent students from taking too much food, many cafeterias already abolished the use of trays, but distractions such as watching TV or being on the cell phone while eating still lead to an increase of the amount of food. It makes it harder to realize when one is really full which results in increased portion sizes, one of America’s biggest struggles. A study has shown that current sizes for French fries, hamburgers, and soda are two to five times bigger than the originals in the 1970s (Young and Nestle 246). Even the automobile industry adjusts to that development by providing bigger cup holders in new cars (247). Nowadays, American fast food restaurants can be found all over the world, but their portion sizes are still different, depending on the location. As an international student from Germany, I can prove that an “Extra-Large” in Europe would equal a “Large” in the United States. Usually, a size “Small” in every fast food restaurant would be enough for me to eat and drink. This is something I have also experienced at SUU’s cafeteria. Most of the time, I am done eating once I have finished my plate while other people go back two or three more times to fill them up again. They are always surprised by how less I eat which I think is already enough. The problem of increased portion sizes is that people will eat those larger amounts when they are offered to them instead of stopping

when they are actually full. This was proven by several studies: “For example, when adults were served 4 different portions of macaroni and cheese on different days, subjects consumed 30% more energy (676 kJ) when offered the largest portion (1000 g) compared to the smallest portion (500 g)” (Ledikwe, Ello-Martin, and Rolls). This, of course, leads to an increased caloric intake while hunger and fullness after eating remain the same. It can be assumed that people will be even less aware of their portion sizes when they are more distracted than in a laboratory setting where these studies took place. One of these locations could be the dining- hall or a fast food restaurant outside of campus.

Nevertheless, many people argue that eating off-campus is a lot healthier and a better alternative to eating on campus because cafeteria food can never be as good as homemade food since it needs to be prepared under completely different requirements for a lot more students. Unfortunately, the temptation is waiting everywhere, especially around college campuses. Studies have shown that eating off campus does not necessarily result in better food choices, even if many people say they would do so. Again, convenience goes over quality and the lack of time results in fast food choices. Those are often considered to be cheaper and equate “to high-fat, calorie-dense foods that are prepackaged or fast foods that are readily available in the university’s food court and vending machines” (LaCaille et al. 536). As a result, eating off-campus and cooking for oneself can be a great and healthier option, but it really depends on the person’s cooking skills, whether they take the time to prepare their own meals, and clean the kitchen up afterwards. In the end, it comes back again to making the right choices which requires enough self-control.

Having a meal plan, I can say that it definitely helps me by adding a clear structure to my day because it requires me to balance my other activities around the opening hours of the cafeteria. Furthermore, I don’t want to waste the money I am paying, and therefore I am never tempted to skip a meal which avoids continuous and unnecessary snacking between meals. Jennifer Haubenreiser makes a really good point by saying that “colleges can shape the environment where students live, work, and play so that good choices are easy” (Sander). I have to agree with that statement because students spend a lot of time on their college campus during the transition phase of becoming an adult. It is where they make many important decisions for their future and the rest of their lives. Different opportunities on campus can influence it in a good or bad way. The cafeteria is usually more convenient because it still gives every student a healthy option. Furthermore, it saves time since students never need to do their dishes afterwards and can socialize with their friends while eating. In order to keep up their revenues and attract enough customers, cafeterias are often forced to offer unhealthy fast foods with strong, mouth-watering smells. However, offering some fast foods does not have to exclude healthy alternatives because the food selection in the cafeteria continues to be important even if it is only one determinant for weight gain in college. Nevertheless, it does not matter how hard a dining-hall will try to advertise healthy foods to students because it is still the scholar who has to make that decision. The cafeteria can only try to make it easier for the students and support them with living a healthy lifestyle, but will never be able to convince the scholars to do so. The first step begins in the head, and that is an important choice for the future that only oneself can make.

Works Cited

“The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition.” N.p., n.d. Web. 17 Nov. 2015.

- Cardone, Kenneth. "Learning to Eat." *New England Journal of Higher Education* 24.1 (2009): 12–13. Print.
- Garcia, Anthony. "Chef Ann Foundation - College Cafeteria Food: The Good, the Bad and the Ugly." N.p., n.d. Web. 4 Oct. 2015.
- "Healthy Food | Definition of Healthy Food by Medical Dictionary." N.p., n.d. Web. 17 Nov. 2015.
- "Junk Food." *TheFreeDictionary.com*. N.p., n.d. Web. 14 Nov. 2015.
- Kaphingst, Karen M., Simone French, and Mary Story. "The Role of Schools in Obesity Prevention." *The Future of Children* 16.1 (2006): 109–142. *Project MUSE*. Web.
- LaCaille, Lara J. et al. "Psychosocial and Environmental Determinants of Eating Behaviors, Physical Activity, and Weight Change Among College Students: A Qualitative Analysis." *Journal of American College Health* 59.6 (2011): 531–538. *EBSCOhost*. Web.
- Ledikwe, Jenny H., Julia A. Ello-Martin, and Barbara J. Rolls. "Portion Sizes and the Obesity Epidemic." *The Journal of Nutrition* 135.4 (2005): 905–909. Print.
- "The NCES Fast Facts Tool Provides Quick Answers to Many Education Questions (National Center for Education Statistics)." N.p., n.d. Web. 19 Oct. 2015.
- Sander, Libby. "In the Cafeteria and Beyond, Colleges Take On Obesity." *Chronicle of Higher Education* 59.12 (2012): A24–A25. Print.
- Webber, Kelly et al. "Diet Quality of Collegiate Athletes." *College Student Journal* 49.2 (2015): 251–256. Print.
- Young, Lisa R., and Marion Nestle. "The Contribution of Expanding Portion Sizes to the US Obesity Epidemic." *American Journal of Public Health* 92.2 (2002): 246–249. Print.

Expressive- English 1010

1st Place Winner: Paige Pully, "Here Comes the Spiderman"
For Professor Natalie Johansen

It was about 6 o'clock at night when I walked into the seemingly unexpected dark hallway, making my way toward the sound that no child ever wants- or expects to hear. Soft sobs gathered from the top of the staircase. I hesitated, not because I was fearful, but because my subconscious was telling me that this exact moment ahead would be something that would lie engraved in my memory forever. I could keep walking and let the image of the depths of my childhood soul haunt me for years to come- or turn back and remove myself completely from this agony. What did persist my intrigue, however, was my nurturing heart. Each soft step followed along with the rhythm of every sob, snuffle, and sigh. Those moments felt as though a million miles passed along this short, narrow hallway. My eyes drifted downward toward my mother, which was not a particular view I was familiar with. I saw her at the top of the staircase. But not the woman of grace, durability, and strength, and rather, a small shriveled child. Hands in palms, I gradually placed my hand on her delicate shoulder. Startled by my touch, her intense sorrowful gaze met mine. In that moment as her eyes reached to find mine, I no longer saw her iris of deep blue. Deep charcoal like paint flooded down her cheeks like a faucet. The deep blue was something like a polluted sea, and I longed for the clarity. In that moment, I was at a loss for both thought and action. At 7 years old, you don't usually run into those situations. I felt both so confused and helpless at the same time. All I wanted was to reassemble this little girl in front of me back to composure.

As I asked the words I was eager to say- yet distraught to hear, I felt weak. ..."Mommy, what's wrong?" ... Not prepared for what lay beyond the veil of those words that no child ever wants to ask. I remember feeling as though something heavy lay atop of my chest, making me want to gasp for air that was already so thin in that hallway that continued to grow narrower and narrower. She pulled me close and didn't say anything while the time grew into minutes, I felt smothered by the things that were hanging in the air. Growing impatient, I looked at her again to see that same despairing look, while waiting for some sort of relief to these fears gathered in my mind. But my 7 year old mind could not yet process some of these agonies. I can still remember the tone, and the chill that followed when she said, "Paige, Cade has leukemia." Not because I knew what this grave word meant, but because of the way it sounded. I still felt blank, like my thought processors had failed me. My baby brother of 4 years old...hurt...something wrong... leukemia? These were the only words that reappeared for minutes. I had so many questions, yet no desire to ask them as my mother continued to break down into tiny pieces. So instead, I sat and held her close while observing the brightly lit night through the window adjacent to the top of the stairs.

Too restlessly troubled to fall asleep, I crept into my brother's bedroom. I quietly made my way to edge of his bed and stood silently. Minutes passed, as I watched his chest rise and fall rhythmically. My adolescent mind didn't comprehend that this was a prolonging disease, and not an acute one. I remember standing in his room that night with the fear that something could just as easily go wrong. "Please don't take him" I repeatedly begged in my head to some higher power, "I need him here". I eventually sat on the bottom edge of his bed, waiting- just waiting for something to happen. I wanted to be there to protect him. Every stutter of breath and irregular breathing caused my heart rate to spike.

My irrational fears grew due to my misunderstandings. As I sat there in the black night, I remember seeing trophies, baseball caps, and toy trucks sitting in the glare of the light. What would come of all of his feats, his accomplishments, and endeavors? How could a boy with such love and life possibly be stricken with something that could take all of that away? I couldn't comprehend. These emotions were things that I had never experienced before, like many children of my age. As these foreign feelings submerged my soul, I was overwhelmed. Tears started flooding the pools of my eyes as I blinked away each tear with a memory. My already low threshold for pain caused my heart to twist with every unexpected emotion. After over exhausting myself, I pulled back and retreated to my bedroom where I would lay with my face plastered to my damp pillow.

The surrealism of the following days were as hazy as if I had placed vaseline over the cover of my eyes. I wanted to know everything; I wanted to know what would become of my brother's cancer, I wanted to know what this would mean for our family, I wanted to understand how everything in my life had become so unstable. My anticipation for answers was growing shorter and shorter. Along with my own anxieties, my home was erratic. It seemed that the only way I could stop the tension from growing was to snip it with sharp scissors. My first hero- my father, began to shrink just as my mother did the previous night before. A man of a broad structure and unshakeable nature began to lose sight of his own composure, as did I. At 7 years old, I was positive I could face life's problems head on and end world poverty. Nothing could possibly get in my way... nothing that is, until I realized that I couldn't piece together solutions in my own home. Part of myself was taken that day, something that I never quite got back. That something was my idealistic beliefs that everything was going to play out the way that I expected them to. One day you would be at your peak of existence and then next you could be hitting rock bottom. But what I did find, however, was that it was important for me to remain upbeat and hopeful. This wasn't for myself, or for my family even, but more for the boy who was the center for all of this mass chaos. The 4 year old boy who had little to no idea what was at risk here, and I wanted it to remain that way for him. I wanted him to still see life as a place where he was always going to be safe and where no wrong could happen. I wanted to protect him.

At the time, my brother's favorite superhero was Spiderman. He was giddy for anything red with a web. As they pricked and prodded at my tough little brother on the first day of his treatments, I watched as his strength overcame his fears. I admired as the doctors and nurses would come in and refer to my little brother as "Spidey". With each needle and injection of fluid, I remember them telling him that he was being injected with radioactive spider venom, soon giving him Spiderman-like abilities. "With each injection of venom," they would say, "you will soon be stronger than ever". There sat my tiny brother in the oversized doctor chair grinning with content at his new found calling in life. I was especially grateful for those doctors that day, as they had just replaced another day of his childhood that had unwillingly been taken away from him.

Days after he had his head shaven, I remember him receiving a gift. There in a brightly colored gift bag was red Spiderman beanie. I watched as his eyes widened and excitement fluttered through his body. From the second he put it on, I could see the invincibility in his puffy eyes. That moment on, the beanie was practically glued to his head. Later that day, we walked down the local mall. I became observant to the people who stared at the little boy in a Spiderman beanie in mid-July. As we shopped, people would notice the bandages covering his forearm where the PICC line would have laid, and the mask he would wear to protect him from foreign particles. Heads turning, crowd stopping, but the little boy made no connection to it. I watched as this brave confident boy walked down the mall with no care that the

world was observing him. As I continued to watch, I noticed that these people were not judging him- they were admiring him. I started to do the same.

Cade had truly defined the word hero for me that day. For such a long time, I strived to shape my actions to protect his fragile existence. I wanted to be his keeper, his comforter, his protector. But it was as if the cancer spreading in his brittle body was strengthening his disposition. My defense was overpowered by his strong will to thrive and survive. Every day for him was something less than ideal, but with the way he carried himself, that would have never been assumed. He fought against his enemy's everyday as they dared to threaten his health. He carried his head high despite the one thing that would give him every reason to do otherwise. Most of all, he remained resilient to the obstacles that obstructed his path. He was the hero of his own story. Not even his despicable self-destructing disease could possibly take that away from him. His childhood ambition to become a superhero, like many little boys his age, was achieved by beating the unbeatable. In my book, he will forever remain the tough little man behind the Spiderman mask.

2nd Place Winner: Tammie Yamashita, "You Write It, I'll Read It"
For Professor Nathan Price

Withheld by student's request

Argumentative- English 2010

1st Place Winner: Lex Oveson, "The Dangers of Traumatic Brain Injury"
For Professor Jodi Corser

Withheld by student's request

2nd Place Winner: Sydney Poulson, "Time Travel and the Ethics of It"
For Dr. Bryce Christensen

Everyone has regrets. Everyone has those "if only" moments in their life. "If only I had studied a little bit harder for that test." "If only I had gotten that cute boy's phone number." "If only I hadn't slept through that job interview." We all have moments and times in our lives that we wish we could go back and change. But what if we had the ability to actually go back in time and change those events? What if science advanced to the point where time travel was a serious question to be dealt with and considered? If scientists were able to unlock the secrets to time travel, we could not only go back and get that cute boy's phone number, but could even change much more monumental events. Would we stop Hitler before he ever came to power in Germany and maybe even prevent the Second World War entirely? If time travel is actually possible, is it our place or our right to go back and change the course of events throughout history or even future events? As a believer in the endless possibilities of science, I agree with distinguished physicist Stephen Hawking when he said, "Time travel used to be thought of as just science fiction, but Einstein's general theory of relativity allows for the possibility that we could warp space-time so much that you could go off in a rocket and return before you set out." However, I also believe we have to take into consideration what *Star Trek* actor William Shatner pointed out when he said, "I find the whole time travel question very unsettling if you take it to its logical extension. I think it might eventually be possible, but then what happens?" When science gets to the point where time travel is an option, Shatner's question must be considered; but then what happens? Where do we go from there?

The ethics of going back in time to change events or going into the future to see where our world is headed must be considered when question of time travel is posed. As I researched more thoroughly this subject and what it would mean for the world, I discovered that time travel is very much possible. However, I've also come to realize that it is completely unethical to go and toy with things of the past or things of the future. In my research I looked into different ways time travel has been represented through various ways of media, how it was achieved, and what that meant for those who had the ability to do it.

Time travel is portrayed in many different ways throughout films, TV shows, and books. In the popular 1980's film *Back to the Future*, the flux capacitor is "what makes time travel possible" (*Back to the Future*). However, there is not a clear description of what the flux capacitor actually is and how it is able to transport people to different times. In the film, the inventor of the flux capacitor was Dr. Emmett Brown. While in the movie Dr. Brown didn't describe the details of the flux capacitor, he did mention that the DeLorean, the car that stored the flux capacitor, had to go eighty-eight miles an hour and required 1.21 gigawatts of power made available by plutonium nuclear reactions in order to time travel to any year on any day at any time. After Dr. Brown explains this process to his young friend Marty, he is shot and killed. In an attempt to get away from the murderers, Marty accidentally transports himself thirty years back in time in the DeLorean to the year 1955. He ends up preventing his parents from falling in love, changing the whole course of their lives and almost erasing his and his siblings' existence. Marty attempts to get his parents back together, as well as save Dr. Brown's life. In this case, time travel seems to be a fairly simple process with repercussions that are severe, but can be modified and manipulated by Marty and Dr. Brown to reverse the effects.

Another way time travel has been misrepresented through media is found in Stephen King's novel, *11/22/63*. In the novel, a high school English teacher named Jake Epping hears about a time travel portal from his friend. To go back in time all he has to do is to go through his friend's pantry and "keep walking until you feel your foot fall" (King). The purpose for Epping's time travel is to stop the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. Every time he goes back in time, everything from the last occasion he time traveled is erased and he has to start all over. Every time Epping goes to the past, regardless of how long he stays, only two minutes pass in present time. This perception of time travel makes it seem as if it's a random thing that is simply a fluke in nature, or something someone can just happen upon. There is very little actual science behind this perspective of time travel, giving readers a false sense of what is possible. King simplifies the process so much, it seems as though time travel is a fantasy as real as Bigfoot or mermaids. This representation of time travel distorts how possible it really is to achieve because the description of it is so outlandish.

These are just a couple examples of time travel in the media. Oftentimes, the media that depicts time travel is considered science fiction. Stephen Hawking said that "today's science fiction is often tomorrow's science fact" ("Hawking, Protecting"). While these TV shows, movies and books are fun to experience, enjoy, and are never thought of as actual science, they may actually be more possible than one might think. Physicist and Nobel Prize winner Albert Einstein determined through his theory of special relativity that time isn't a constant, but an illusion (Howell). Time is relative based on who is observing it and where their position is in and how fast they are moving in space (Howell). In Einstein's general theory of relativity, Einstein essentially states that gravity has the ability to bend time. This theory has been proven true through the use of Global Positioning System, commonly known as GPS. When an astronaut goes into space, "the effects of gravity, as well as the satellites' increased speed above the Earth relative to observers on the ground, make the unadjusted clocks gain thirty-eight microseconds a day" (Howell). This outcome is known as time dilation and an astronaut would technically return a very small amount younger than he would have been, had he stayed on Earth (Howell). Basically, time can be altered based on how high in space someone is and the speed at which they are traveling. While this isn't exactly time travel, it shows that time can be manipulated and twisted, giving the first clue to the possibility of time travel.

There are multiple ways scientists believe traveling through time may be possible. The first of which is to enter a wormhole (Howell). The idea of a wormhole was first proposed by Albert Einstein and Nathan Rosen. They used Einstein's theory of general relativity in 1935 to come up with the possibility of these wormholes, also called Einstein-Rosen bridges, that created a way to "connect two different points in space-time, theoretically creating a shortcut that could reduce travel time and distance" (Redd). Wormholes are essentially a tube with two openings and a "bridge" between them (Redd). However, wormholes are not exactly easy to come by, considering one has not actually been observed by scientists (Howell). Wormholes are extremely complicated and as physicist Kip S. Thorne mentions in his book, *Black Holes and Time Warps: Einstein's Outrageous Legacy*, they close quickly and have "hardly any life at all" (Thorne). Thorne is credited with being the first scientist to seriously consider and discuss the possibility of traveling through time (Hawking, Protecting). Thorne suggests a couple ways to extend the lives of wormholes, the first being holding the wormhole open with a material "quite different from any material that any human has ever yet seen" (Thorne). This "exotic material" would have to be able to defocus any light that would come through the wormhole and affect the gravitation of it as well as have "a negative average energy density" (Thorne). Thorne explains that "exotic material" is necessary,

meaning that the material has the ability to defocus a beam of light as well as have a negative energy density. All of these elements are required to keep a wormhole open, and they all rely on each other to exist. Many scientists disregarded the possibility of exotic material because it seemed to defy the laws of physics. (Thorne). However, in 1974 Stephen Hawking made the observation based off of a black-hole evaporation that “vacuum fluctuations near a [black] hole’s horizon are exotic” (Thorne).

With this new information that “vacuum fluctuations of the electromagnetic field are a promising form of exotic material” the possibility of wormholes became somewhat realistic (Thorne). Thorne came to the conclusion that when traveling through a wormhole, one would be able to travel faster than the speed of light (Thorne). This idea of traveling faster than the speed of light is important to time travel in that the greater the speed one is able to travel, the more time seems to slow down; eventually slowing down so much that one would be able to actually go back in time (Moskowitz).

Another theory on how to accomplish time travel is through black holes (Hawking, How). A major theorist in this idea is physicist Stephen Hawking. At one time he averted himself from exploring time travel, “for fear of being labelled a crank” (Hawking, How). However, his opinion has drastically changed since his younger years and is now “obsessed with time” (Hawking, How). Hawking suggests that if astronauts would orbit close enough to a black hole, “time would be slowed down” to the point where those orbiting the black hole would experience half of the time as those on Earth (Hawking, How). Hawking says that to travel to the future, all one has to do is, “travel very, very fast...to avoid being sucked into a black hole” (Hawking, How). As mentioned previously, one would have to travel at the speed of light (Hawking, How). To sum up his theory, Hawking boldly states, “It really is that simple. If we want to travel into the future, we just need to go fast. Really fast” (Hawking, How).

The possibility of traveling through time is not accepted and welcomed by everyone, however. There are physicists, though not as well-known as Hawking and Thorne, who are firm in stating that time travel is impossible (“Time Travel”). Scientists in Hong Kong have declared that they have come to the conclusion that Einstein’s theory is law, meaning that traveling faster than the speed of light cannot be done (“Time Travel”). While the idea of traveling faster than the speed of light may seem absurd, technology is constantly improving and science is always advancing. At one time scientists thought humans wouldn’t be able to survive traveling faster than the speed of sound. Today, we know that breaking the sound barrier is very possible (The Science Guys).

While the process would not be an easy one, gaining the ability to time travel is likely possible. It may take more technological advancements and a lot more attempts, but eventually it might be done. When asked about time travel, former NASA employee Vincent Salomonson said that there were, in fact, people at NASA doing research on time travel. He mentioned how he believed it was definitely something that was worthwhile to look into despite the lack of funds going into the research (at least from what he saw while working at NASA). (Is Time Travel a Possibility?) The rules of time travel and the drastically altering effects involved because of it, would have to be dealt with and considered before any space traveler goes “back to the future”.

One of the main issues that would need to be discussed with the possibility of time travel is the Grandfather Paradox. This is basically the idea that when a time traveler goes to the past and “kills his grandfather before the traveler’s father was born, then the traveler himself would never have been born” (On the Paradoxes). This paradox poses the question, if these series of events did happen, how would it change history? Some believe the answer to this question is through the “hypothetical Many

Worlds Interpretation" (On the Paradoxes). This is the idea that an event that can have multiple outcomes (like whether or not someone was born). Multiple worlds are then created, each one specific to the possible outcomes. We are only able to experience a "certain outcome in our world, so there exist many other such parallel worlds around us with different outcomes" (On the Paradoxes). However, if this Many Worlds Interpretation does exist, then another question is posed, can we travel to a different world where we could see those alternate situations? If we could, then the Many Worlds Interpretation suggests that whatever we do in that specific world wouldn't change anything from our actual world (On the Paradoxes).

In addition to the Grandfather Paradox, there is also the transfer of possessions paradox. Essentially this paradox is the question, what happens if you go back in time to give yourself something you have in the present day? (On the Paradoxes). How will this futuristic item alter the timeline of history in the long run? There are many unknown answers to the hypothetical situations society could face in regards to time travel. At this point scientists and theorists are unsure as to what time travel is actually capable of doing. However, there are three essential laws to remember when time traveling in order to dodge disaster.

The first law is that "the traveler must not alter a historical event that originally provided the motivation to time travel in the first place, as doing so could remove that motivation" (On the Paradoxes). The second law is that the individual time traveling cannot "kill anyone, as the action would radically change history, perhaps to the point where the traveler cannot initiate the time travel in the first place" (On the Paradoxes). The last law that any time traveler must follow in order to avoid chaos and potential mishap is that the traveler can't "give anyone an object that can fall into an infinite time loop" (On the Paradoxes). This just means that the traveler can't bring something from the future that hasn't yet been created. These laws, while not yet applicable, are something to be seriously considered in order to prevent disaster when time travel is accessible.

Once the laws of time travel are observed, the question of, "Is time travel even ethical to being with?" remains. Is it our responsibility or even our right to go back in time and alter other individuals' decisions? There are so many questions to be asked because it is such an unknown world with endless possibilities. Some of the moral and thought-provoking questions we may ask concerning time travel include, "Am I morally obligated to go back in time and change a tragedy that has already happened?" or "How would the ability to change the past affect punishment for crimes? If a crime can always be undone, how bad can it be?" (Ethics). While time travel would not be easily accessible and most likely wouldn't be offered to a great number of the population, would it be appropriate for anyone to go at all?

The biggest problem involved with the ethical side of time travel is that we don't know how one small action can drastically change the course of the future. Even if a time traveler followed the three laws to avoid disaster, drastic things may still occur. For example,

If someone goes back in time to the side of some lonely country road, flags down a car, and asks the driver for five bucks to pay for a meal, the driver may leave without enough money to fill up his car and arrive on time to meet his date at a restaurant. Because he misses her and doesn't get another opportunity to see her again, he can't go on to marry her and start a line of descendants that ultimately produces the person who plays a key role in preventing a nuclear

Armageddon. Borrowing that five bucks could mean covering the world in mushroom clouds. (Goldman).

This scenario is dramatic, but one small action can have a huge rippling affect. If we were to go back in time and change something major, perhaps by capturing Hitler before he gained power in Germany, how can we be sure that our efforts, as genuine as they may be, may end up making the situation worse? (Goldman). We can't. There is no way we would be able to know what consequences our action would create. Time travel would be exciting and a huge step forward in technology and science, but the risks are much too high to pursue.

Aside from all of the risk and uncertain consequences of changing past events, it is not our place to change other people's actions. We each have the ability to make our own decisions and that right should never be taken away from anyone. Morally, time travel would have little to offer because we have our own agency and have a responsibility for our own actions. This field of study is undeniably an intriguing one and distinguished scientists such as Stephen Hawking and Kip Thorne have kept an open mind to the idea of time travel and have even gone as far as to say it is achievable. The possibility is out there.

With today's constant improvements in science, technology, and knowledge of the world and universe around us, it is no surprise something as impressive as traveling to a different time period is somewhere in our future. It may not be in especially soon, but as more developments and insights of things like exotic matter and black holes are being brought to light, the possibility seems to be closer and closer. At this point, there is no clear answer as to what time travel through a wormhole would be like or what would happen when attempted. There is no discernible solution to whether or not we will actually be able to travel at the speed of light. The science behind those predictions, however, is there. Highly intellectual and educated scientists came up with these hypotheses and have spent a lot of time calculating and considering their theories.

While the technology to properly test the predictions is not available quite yet, it may be. The option to time travel, whether we use it or not, will be accessible. I am in agreement with Mr. Salomonson when he says, "If it ever comes to using a human to transport back or forward in time, I would imagine it would be pretty risky—not something I would volunteer to do at the least" (Is Time Travel a Possibility?) Traveling through time would not only be risky physically for the traveler, but also morally and historically. Time travel is a fascinating and complicated process. It is not something to be taken lightly or to disregard.

This kind of science, as amazing and mind boggling as it is, would affect mass amounts of people, whether they would be willing to agree to it or not. It is not anyone's right to go back in time to meddle with their own past decisions or with the decisions of others. It is essential that we are able to learn from our past, and apply that knowledge to our future; not to change either of them. I believe that cartoonist Bil Keane said it best when he said, "Yesterday is history, tomorrow is a mystery, today is a gift of God, which is why we call it the present."

Works Cited

- Back to the Future*. Dir. Robert Zemeckis. Perf. Michael J. Fox and Christopher Lloyd. Universal, 1985. DVD.
- "Bil Keane Quotes." *Goodreads*. N.p., n.d. Web. 01 Nov. 2015.
- "Ethics of Time Travel." *Reference Request*. N.p., n.d. Web. 05 Oct. 2015
- Goldman, Sam. "The Ethics of Time Travel - Worldly Ponderings." *Medium*. N.p., 16 Sept. 2013. Web. 05 Oct. 2015.
- Hawking, Stephen. "How to Build a Time Machine." *Mail Online*. Associated Newspapers, n.d. Web. 01 Nov. 2015.
- "Protecting The Past Is Time Travel Possible?." *Astronomy* 30.4 (2002): 46. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 9 Oct. 2015.
- Howard, Jacqueline. "Is Time Travel Real? Physicists Say It Happens All The Time." *The Huffington Post*. TheHuffingtonPost.com, 17 Apr. 2012. Web. 05 Oct. 2015.
- Howell, Elizabeth. "Time Travel: Theories, Paradoxes & Possibilities." *Space.com*. N.p., 21 June 2013. Web. 05 Oct. 2015.
- King, Stephen. *11/22/63: A Novel*. New York: Scribner, 2011. Print.
- Moskowitz, Clara. "Hidden in Einstein's Math: Faster-than-Light Travel?" *Space.com*. N.p., 08 Oct. 2012. Web. 1 Nov. 2015.
- "On the Paradoxes and Ethical Implications of Time Travel." *A Reasoners Miscellany*. N.p., 04 Nov. 2009. Web. 05 Oct. 2015.
- Redd, Nola Taylor. "What is a Wormhole? Facts, Theory & Definition of Wormholes. *Space.com*" N.p., n.d. Web. 19 Oct. 2015.
- "The Science Guys." *Science Guys*. Union University, Apr. 2001. Web. 01 Nov. 2015.
- Thorne, Kip S. *Black Holes and Time Warps: Einstein's Outrageous Legacy*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1994. Print.
- "Time Travel Impossible, Say Scientists: DNews." *DNews*. Discovery.com, 24 July 2011. Web. 01 Nov. 2015.
- "William Shatner Quotes." *BrainyQuote*. Xplore, n.d. Web. 01 Nov. 2015.
- "Is Time Travel a Possibility?" Interview by Vincent Salomonson. n.d.: n. pag. Print.

Honorable Mention: Baylee Duncan, "Physician Assisted Suicide"
For Dr. Bryce Christensen

Withheld by student's request

Expressive- English 2010

1st Place Winner: Jenny Johnston, "The Peak of Many Faces"
For Dr. James Aton

Withheld by student's request

2nd Place Winner: Ayleen Perry, "How Technology Saved My Life"
For Dr. John Belk

I hid under the safe-haven my blankets provided, reminiscing thoughts of horror for any five year old, foreign little girl. The laughter of kids while they tormented me and viewed me as a distinct alien species is a memory that replayed in my head like a broken record. I would dissolve into a midnight sleep and hoped that when I woke up, I was back in Mexico, comforted by the soothing essence of my grandmother's home. Picking up my things and traveling to the U.S. at the age of five was the hardest change I have ever experienced. The people around me all used a foreign tongue and spoke with words my mind raced to decipher. The culture shock and lack of knowledge in the English language caused me to seclude myself from society, until I was introduced to something that in a sense, "saved my life".

Technology is often thought of as a three headed monster that continually grows, devouring every sense of natural intellect. It is an external tool that is used to aid us and make our lives better. However, if we draw our attention past technology's cliché definition, we can see that technology is actually language in disguise. It may be dubbed as harmful to society; however, it allows for people from all over the world, like me, to communicate through means of writing, speaking, and reading. For our ancestors, language was as new and foreign as the technological advancements our modern era has made. Technology is indeed, an advancement of something human beings are already born with- the capability of communicating. Through various articles and a personal anecdote, I will narrow down the complex definition of technology as simply being language- an external, yet eternal tool that makes our planet go round.

When one is born, the ability, desire, and need to communicate with others is simultaneously born as well. With that being said, we don't come out of womb speaking Turkish. Instead, we turn the "goo-goo-ga-ga" sounds we manage to release from our larynx into a combination of letters that correspond to the language we are taught. Language is not natural, it is a technological advancement that humans have made in order to make things "easier".

Mark Changizi, a neuroscientist in the Huffington Post, analyzed the concept of language and developed a theory supporting its technological roots. Changizi states that for something to be considered natural, it needs to be found in our intrinsic biology. He argues:

"instead, language is a result of cultural selection, a kind of evolutionary process capable of 'design' that occurs at lightning speed compared to natural selection... We humans have speech because spoken words have culturally evolved to sound like nature. We speak because we've been nature-harnessed, not because we evolved to speak" (Changizi).

Although our ability to speak may seem like second nature, it's far from being natural.

On a day to day basis, the average American walks around and says "thank you" after someone opens the door, or says "bless you" after someone sneezes. Speaking to our neighbor is as difficult as breathing... but not if your first language is Spanish. Even reading this essay is a piece of cake to any college student... but not to a kindergartener who has never been taught how to read a full sentence. Am I starting to make a point? What may seem natural to one person is not natural to another. Language did not occur by natural selection, one must make an attempt to learn how to speak English or

learn how to read. Not being able to communicate with your peers is something that literally impairs your ability to live. For example, as a Spanish speaking first grader, I was placed in special education classes because my teachers believed my learning abilities were below average. Without technology, I would not have been able to learn how to speak English, let alone write this five page paper. Without technology, my family would have never been able to have a future in America. Without technology, my life would not have been the same.

While I feel that I owe technology an endless deal of appreciation for its significant impact, opposing views still exist. Wendell Berry, an American novelist and farmer at heart, is the first one to jump on the "technology is ruining the world" bandwagon. In his 1988 article, "Why I Am Not Going to Buy a Computer", he exercises his opinion on living the old fashioned life. In his eyes, technology is an innovation that we've become dependent upon, making us vulnerable to the tragedy that could occur if that technology ever cuts off. For example, Berry refuses to buy a computer because he lives with the freedom of being able to write without electricity. Additionally, because investing in a technological advancement always means having to replace something else. "It is well understood that technological innovation always requires the discarding of the 'old model' - the 'old model' in this case being not just our old Royal Standard, but my wife, my critic, my closest reader, my fellow worker" (Berry). According to Berry, more important things exist beyond expensive technology, such as family and community that would otherwise be disrupted if we became mesmerized by the overly-simplified society our technological tomorrow promises.

The American farmer disagrees with technology because it does the work for us, inherently converting people into lazy, inconsiderate, dependent sloths. If we thought like Berry and inserted my definition of technology into the equation, we'd basically be saying that utilizing language to communicate is a luxury. Language makes our lives easier and does the work of getting a message across to another person for us. Language is unnecessary because we can always play a game of charades to decipher what the other person is saying. I apologize, Berry, but I'd rather communicate with words rather than doing a lyrical dance to tell you good morning. Furthermore, a new piece of technology doesn't mean that a replacement is bound to occur. However, when we define technology as language, we realize that it can in fact simply be an addition to our lives, it doesn't have to necessarily replace the "old version". Before English, Spanish, French, Chinese, Portuguese, etc., there wasn't a previous existing form of language. Sure, people drew hieroglyphics and pounded on rocks with their fists, but the invention of communicating with words was a brand new concept. Without the technological advancement of language, Berry wouldn't be able to tell his wife what to write on the typewriter, or even write his paper on why he hates technology so much. Berry, technology says you're welcome.

Wendell Berry isn't the only person that benefits from technology; language affects the entire world because everyone uses it to communicate. With that being said, specifically in the United States, the benefits go beyond our everyday speech. Language allows for a blend of cultures to come together and form the melting pot that is our country. Our land of the free has also become the land of opportunity, serving as a home to a plethora of different ethnicities and races. Stephanie Siek, a CNN reporter, states in her article, "Foreign-born Population in U.S. Higher than Ever," that America has welcomed 40 million foreigners into her home, including me (Siek). Saying that technology is harmful to society is rejecting the endless amount of benefits that have risen from language, the doorway to an international bond.

According to the Huffington Post, “Immigrant-Founded companies in the U.S. were responsible for more than \$1.7 trillion in revenues in 2010... [and] a 2012 report found immigrants as a whole are more than twice as likely to start a business as someone born in America” (Fairchild). Technology allows people to learn other languages, opening the doors to new opportunities, enhancing our quality of living.

Arguments are often made that pertain to the way technology has made people “dumber”, but learning an entirely foreign language is an impressive, useful accomplishment. In 2000, the U.S. Census Bureau found that “1 in every 5 Americans spoke a foreign language at home” (Ryan). Not to mention, AOL Jobs reports that, “on average, bilingual pay differentials range between 5 and 20 percent per hour more than the position's base rate” (“Why It Pays to Be Bilingual”). Being fluent in more than one language not only pays big, but furthers your overall knowledge. We live in a multilingual world, globalized by the second. Our increased diversity throughout the last ten years calls for a willingness to learn beyond what our nationality may entail. It’s important to realize that as time advances, more and more job advertisements require second, third, or even fourth language fluency. Not only that, but we ought to make it a goal for ourselves to stay connected with the rest of our global neighbors- a goal that can only be achieved with the help of technology.

I come from a blend of cultures; all entwined and knit together to give me my multiracial background and curly, out of control, ethnic mane. English was not my first language, but ironically enough, happens to be my major, my passion, my reason for being Ayleen Perry. When I was held back from second grade because I didn’t know how to communicate, I devoted my entire life to the English language; perhaps that’s why I fell in love with her. I spent every single day engaged in writing and practicing my reading skills; slowly but surely I was going to get there. The moment I was finally able to write coherent sentences felt amazing- I was finally able to express myself. Every time my pencil danced on the paper, the feeling of freedom overwhelmed me. We ought to quit blaming technology for its supposed captivity. Maybe the definition of technology isn’t even language, perhaps it goes beyond communication. Maybe technology is actually a disguise for liberation. Regardless, technology saved my life.