Humans have always strived to improve the world in which we live. We underwent the Agricultural Revolution 10 KYA, the Industrial Revolution in 1750, and the Technological Revolution which is where we are now. Each revolution brought new changes to our lifestyle, which we opposed because we are neophobic, afraid of new ideas. Our neophobia can lead us to make abstract claims about what "the revolution will bring!"

Most people believe that Google, the Internet, and new technology is making us smarter. The main reason why is because it gives us greater ease of access to information, and it allows us to store information which we once had to memorize. This storage of information enables more free space on our hippocampal tissue (tissue of the hippocampus [main place of memory – located in the brain]). This allows us to remember what we once did before, and go out to explore new things, improving our knowledge. These improvements can allow for betterment of society which could create new technology, and allow us to become even better. Technology also improved space-time compression. Imagine yourself working for some large organization, and you live in Ruston, LA, and your boss lives in Geneva, Switzerland. With the technology mentioned in the article would allow for the two of you to collaborate on a project without going far or spending a large sum of money. This turns your former "ok" idea into world changing idea because it was very easy to reach your boss.

Others are opposed to Google, the Internet, and technology because they claim it makes us less intelligent. One person who opposes this is Nicholas Carr, born in 1959, and writes for *The Atlantic,* a US magazine. Mr. Carr states, "My mind isn't going – so far as I can tell – but it's changing. I'm not thinking the way I used to think...The deep reading that used to come naturally has become a struggle" (Carr 1). Mr. Carr is opposed to the change that the current technological revolution has brought. This is because he is unable to concentrate on "deep reading" of long texts. One reason Mr. Carr is against the usage of Google and related technologies is because it, "...naturally become a struggle" (Carr 1). By using this as an argument for his claim is erroneous as it is an appeal to tradition fallacy as he refuses anything new because he likes the past as it is. Also, the skimming that Mr. Carr mentioned in the study by University College London is used so commonly because it is how one must read the data that is accessible to us. Similar to, as before hand, one must deep read. I, personally, believe that the two forms will merge together and create a new reading form which will become the most common way for reading.

With several obvious improvements and the faulty reason of Mr. Carr, one should view Google, technology, and the Internet as something beneficial. The ability to learn new information and the increased connectivity makes Google beneficial.