

Faith Santiago

Professor Miller

ENG110

1 April 2025

The capacity for adaptation has aided humans for hundreds of thousands of years. It's the reason that humans have become the dominant species on the planet, and adaptation is something that is always occurring in the human population. However, due to the developments of technology, we have lost some adaptations that our ancestors once greatly relied on. For example, there has been a declining trend in people's ability to see in the dark, since we have flashlights and expansive lighting systems in our homes. As technology has become more and more advanced, it has more drastically changed the way that humans think and act. This significant change has become a large topic of conversation in the 21st century, and has a lot of contrasting perspectives. Some skeptics, like American journalist and writer Nichola Carr in his article in *The Atlantic*, "Is Google Making Us Stupid?", believe that society is on a decline because of the way technology has altered our minds. Meanwhile, there are people like Sam Anderson, a writer for *New York* magazine, who takes a more progressive stance on our technology-induced changes in his article titled, "In Defense of Distraction", and weighs the negatives of these changes with the benefits that they may bring. Having analyzed both of these arguments surrounding technology and its influence, I believe that the impact technology and the internet has had on human behavior and potential has been more destructive than beneficial, and is only projected to get worse if developments continue the way that they are.

Technological advancements greatly shape the minds of those who use them, and these changes come with their fair share of naysayers and supporters. Both Carr and Anderson represent these respective communities with passion. Carr provides insight into his cynical idea by connecting his more regular use of the internet to a loss of attention span and critical thinking that he and his colleagues have been experiencing. According to Carr, “[Media] supply the stuff of thought but they also shape the process of thought. And what the Net seems to be doing is chipping away my capacity for concentration and contemplation. My mind now expects to take in information the same way the Net distributes it: in a swiftly moving stream of particles” (Carr, 2). The point Carr is making here is that in our extensive use of the internet, our minds are mimicking the ways in which the internet functions. We expect information to be handed to us on a silver platter and are losing our ability to zero in on a lengthy source and hunt for the knowledge that we are seeking. As this transformation occurs, we are losing our ability for discourse that truly adds something new to a conversation instead of the information that is provided in the most straightforward way possible. Conversely, Anderson portrays his confidence in these mental modifications, and frames them as beneficial changes. Anderson proposes, “...we’re all evolving toward a new techno-cognitive nomadism, a rapidly shifting environment in which restlessness will be an advantage again” (Anderson 11). To Anderson, having a distracted mind is beneficial in current times, as technology has altered the cultural zeitgeist to be more rapidly changing, and more saturated with an abundance of knowledge on virtually any topic imaginable. Technology has become such an integral part of modern society, and the only way to keep up is to allow your brain to be more hyperactive and less intensely focused in order to take in the intense and high-speed influx of information coming at it. On one hand, I understand where Anderson is coming from; information travels fast these days, and it

makes sense for our brains to want to process as much as it can, and the decline in direct focus on minimal topics is a necessary sacrifice for the increase in ability to focus in increments on a wide variety of knowledge. On the other hand, I think Anderson's perspective is missing context on the value that certain topics of information hold over others. For example, information about celebrity gossip and information from a textbook do not hold the same level of importance to a student, and one requires more focus than the other. If the brain is not able to make this distinction and put more focus into the information of greater importance, then this is when the mental "restlessness" (Anderson 11) becomes less of an adaptation and more of an inhibitor of deep reading and thinking, like Carr references. While there are potential positives to the impacts of technology on our minds, the actual changes observed serve to be more harmful than helpful.

Despite conflicting opinions on the harm of technology, both Carr and Anderson conclude that technology has purposely altered our minds for the purpose of making us more reliant on it.