After the Discovery Park visit on October 7, Purdue Calumet students in English 10800 had to write about their impressions of what they all said was a unique experience. They did so surprisingly well. **Kenneth Karrson** summed up the opinions of many of his classmates with the following words: “When I initially heard that our class would be taking a trip to Discovery Park on Purdue’s main campus, I had no idea what to expect. I did not know how I would enjoy the trip because, as a person who has always had a passion for writing, science and technology are areas that have never really piqued my curiosity. I must admit, though, that our class visit to Discovery Park demonstrated time well spent. The trip left me both amazed and inquisitive as to what the future might hold for nanotechnology.”

Likewise, **Catherine Vlahos** commented on the knowledge gap between the humanities and the sciences and how this gap can, in fact, be bridged: “As an English major, I never cared much for science and technology, but personally experiencing the laboratories and experimenters helped build a bridge between my life and the goals of science.” Her reference to the graduate students in general and Lisa Reece’s presentation in particular went as follows: “One way that helped me connect to the technology and experiments mentioned during the field trip is seeing the scientists behind them. That experience humanized the subject for me and gave me a relatable common ground on which to base my opinions. Meeting the scientist who worked to cure breast cancer made me care about her goal more; it made me want to root for science.”

**Brian Rosian** developed the idea of the fundamental differences between the humanities and the sciences thus: “I accept the fact that my mind doesn’t work in the same way as that of a scientist, and that’s okay. I’ll even admit that my views on science, and especially technology, are similar to those of Bill Joy in his argument: “Why the Future Doesn’t Need Us.” I was happily surprised to actually find our visit to Discovery Park both interesting and informative.” Rosian also commented on the architecture of the buildings and the collaborative environment within which scientists work: “It was wonderful to see how interdepartmental the structure of the research is. The fact that all of the departments work together gives me hope that perhaps there is a strong sense of ethics behind the forces driving nanotechnology. Of course, the architecture contributed greatly to this hopeful atmosphere. The buildings are all new and beautifully designed—with so much natural light flowing in through the many windows that it would be difficult for anyone not to feel uplifted when they walk through the doors. The fact that Mann Hall was the first building on Purdue’s campus to be designed by a female architect, Dianna Brenner, was in itself inspirational.” He added that “the manner in which the grad students described the research being conducted conveyed their enthusiasm for their work.”

**Nicole Blas** summed up nicely the global implications of scientific research, saying that “scientific advancement is a double-edged sword. While scientists are working to improve the quality of life for all people, others may use nanotechnology for malicious purposes. This is why, as Ralph C. Merkle explained, nanotechnology needs to be researched by trusted scientists because this science could easily be developed by other scientists who are not careful with this technology.”