**Introduction**

 Wolfgang Peterson’s movie, *Outbreak* (1995). Steven Soderbergh’s movie, *Contagion* (2011). John Dowdle’s movie, *Quarantine* (2008). Juli Plec’s TV series, *Containment* (2016). Cameron Porsandeh’s TV series, *Helix* (2014). The list goes on. And, for each film and show, one common denominator stands out: disease. The same archetype has multiplied in a myriad of forms but it always keeps an identical baseline: a pathogen finds its way into the general population and the entire plot line follows the journey each character must take to destroy the virus before it destroys them (personification). Some purely watch these shows for the entertainment purposes, they never think twice about them when it comes to the non-digital real world. That, however, in itself is a gargantuan mistake. So, why does this mere movie topic matter (rhetorical question)? The answer is simple. Problems in the TV shows and films, reflect the fears that normal citizens can face in everyday life. These fears have reasoning behind their existence because contagion stands alongside the plethora of dilemmas that besiege the human race in this day and age. Overpopulated areas contribute to the spread of disease, and with the recent outbreak of Ebola, many have begun to realize the true power one tiny strain could cause. Some even fear that pestilence could bring about the end of humanity, should it be allowed to ride around the world rampant (allusion). These worries, drastic as they may seem, have sparked a movement for a change in the CDC’s quarantine regulations, yet, just like most topics in the twentieth century, it has become a matter of controversy.

 Common sense seems to dictate that only a quarantine can contain disease outbreaks. When it comes to the CDC’s regulations, most of us readily agree that *cordon sanitaires* overshadow most of the other containment methods due to their effectiveness. Where this agreement usually ends, however, is on the question of how much power the CDC should possess. Whereas some believe that the rules benefit the common good, others maintain that they violate civil liberties. In the discussions of the CDC’s new rules, the worry that the CDC will misuse the power that will come with the changes has arose. On the one hand, CDC workers and scientific experts argue that in order to destroy deadly outbreaks these new regulations must pass. On the other hand, normal citizens and a select few healthcare workers contend that they will lead to false containment, mass panic, and a decrease in numbers for the healthcare field. Others even maintain that they verge on unconstitutional. In my eyes, however, the rules protect America from fatal unforeseeable disasters. I have always believed that the value of life should come before all. I have studied the effects of Ebola and have dealt with the worry that only a relative of a pilot or traveling healthcare worker can understand. At many times I would fear the possible spread of the disease and I would ask myself “how can the outbreak be contained?” In my mind, I knew that if the CDC had more power, the disease could have died off sooner. The CDC exists to save the public from pestilence, therefore, they should have quarantine regulations with the strength needed to effectively obliterate any future contagions.