

Kevin Abena's Thesis #1

abenak

Posted Jan 9, 2007 7:34 PM [New!](#)

Washington state should impose stricter laws/regulations on the logging of our forests in order to preserve and maintain what little untouched wildlife our state has to offer.

schuetzc

Posted Jan 9, 2007 10:06 PM [New!](#)

I disagree. Humans will continue needing products from the trees, and therefore, imposing stricter laws will only decrease the logging industry. The animals can be relocated.

shawny08

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:58 AM [New!](#)

I agree. People are not as concerned as they should be with taking care of the environment. Especially trees because they are so essential to clean air and healthy environment.

atg3

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:50 PM [New!](#)

I agree. I believe we should totally are wasteful human beings and have been so for many many years. It is until now that we have started to panic and worry about the environment.

Andrea True-Garcia

mlicata

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:00 PM [New!](#)

I agree. I don't really have a great argument for you on why, but I do know how great it feels to take the long way

through the passes on highway 2 solely because of the great drive through the forest. I don't want to see it leave.

mikaml

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:35 PM New!

I agree. everyday we lose more of our precious natural resources and we should take care of what we have left.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 4:42 PM New!

I agree. We will need trees for living anyway but at least we have to protect little trees which has room for growing. For keeping our environment fresh and respecting a small trees as a life, we need to restrict the logging to only grown-up trees and limited number of trees at a time.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 6:58 PM New!

I agree. I think the environment has slipped a little too far down the priority list of politicians.

bpcliu

Posted Today, 2:46 AM New!

I agree. If we deplete our natural resources and destroy our habitat, the life quality for all on earth will diminish. It is our moral responsibility to protect the ecosystems on earth.

dakid07

Posted Today, 8:17 AM New!

I agree...we aren't called the verdant state for nothing. I consider wildlife to be great natural resource and one that should be preserved. In addition, we receive 30% of our oxygen from forests and a continuation of clearcutting

would add yet another negative element to our already strained ecosystem and atmosphere.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Rushawn Darden's Thesis # 1

shawny08

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:06 AM New!

The University of Washington should create a 2 credit optional link to fig classes for freshman that teaches them about what to expect from different majors, how to apply, what resources they have on campus, and rules about annual drops and grading.

atg3

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:46 PM New!

I think this is a great subject topic. I as a transfer student feel like a fish out of water as things are so different here from WSU.

Andrea True-Garcia

mlicata

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:03 PM New!

I'm confused. My fig leader totally went over all of that stuff with us. We even had speaker from different majors come in and talk to us specifically about applying and what different majors offered. You may have had a bad fig leader.

abenak

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:57 PM **New!**

agree. i had a horrible fig leader, he cancelled class half the time. this should definitely be an option for students, it would be greatly appreciated by many.

mikaml

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:26 PM **New!**

i agree. it seems that fig leaders and the information they give students is not very controlled, so this is a good idea to make sure that all students are getting the same info.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 4:12 PM **New!**

I am an exchange student here so I don't know how the fig classes are conducted. But I think it needs to have some standardized contents for every fig classes for students not to have any disadvantage from it.

mproctor

Posted Yesterday, 4:18 PM **New!**

I agree, I think that's very important information for freshmen.

droppd

Posted Yesterday, 4:41 PM **New!**

I agree. Our fig leader tried to get us more involved in the UW community (which I am not saying is a bad thing), but almost completely missed going over any majors and info on how to apply and prerequisites, although she did a good job of going over resources. I think there should be a part of the class that must go over these things.

vxn

Posted Yesterday, 4:44 PM **New!**

I agree, that would give students more opportunity to choose

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 6:55 PM **New!**

I disagree. Anyone can research this kind of information on their own.

bpcliu

Posted Today, 2:49 AM **New!**

I disagree. There is no way to expect a fig leader to know the ins and outs of applying to all the possible majors at UW. Issues like that should be addressed to campus councilors, that is what they are paid to do.

dakid07

Posted Today, 8:13 AM **New!**

I agree tath this should be an optional add-on for FIG's. It probably shouldn't be taught by the FIG leaders, but that is ana option. It probably wouldn't be too hard for the university to set up speakers for the FIGs to go and listen to once or twice during their FIG meeting times.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Jonathan Lee's thesis #2

jonlee7

Posted Yesterday, 10:08 AM **New!**

A woman should have the right to have an abortion.

mikaml

Posted Yesterday, 6:05 PM **New!**

I am going to have to agree with you on this. Women should have the choice in certain circumstances that she should have an abortion such as she can't properly take care of her victims.

mlicata

Posted Yesterday, 6:12 PM **New!**

I agree. There are certain circumstances where the women should get this right.

abenak

Posted Yesterday, 6:16 PM **New!**

I agree. this should definitely be the case, especially if rape or some other unfortunate circumstance occurs.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 6:19 PM **New!**

I agree. For example: I think it would be better for a drug addict to have an abortion than to have a child.

droppd

Posted Yesterday, 6:25 PM **New!**

Agree. Why do old men of Congress feel they have the power to determine what a woman can do? Even if a woman is not raped or is a drug addict, etc., accidents happen! And an abortion has a huge impact with a 16 year old's future, whether she goes to college or not.

mev776

Posted Today, 6:56 AM **New!**

I agree. But abortion should be the last resort. That's why it's so important t

dakid07

Posted Today, 8:10 AM **New!**

I agree, the right to choose should be protected by the state and all of these
that there is a seperation of church and state and that abortion is not really s
sometimes a necesaary evil.

YOUR NAME:

Billy Holdsworth's Thesis #2

dakid07

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:37 PM **New!**

The effort by the United States to end world hunger
should be postponed until we are able to end hunger wthin
our own borders.

mikaml

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:48 PM **New!**

I agree. there are so many people in the U.S. who are left
without available resources and this should be a pressing
matter. however, we are all in some part responsible for
others in this world.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 4:40 PM **New!**

I disagree. Present US's world leading status comes from U.S citizen's demoratic spirit and its clement actions to the others in the world which includes supporting program for poor nations. Of course, U.S should do more to solve the hunger problem inbound. If, U.S forgive to support other poor nations, U.S will be lost its status as the leader of the world.

vxn

Posted Yesterday, 4:48 PM New!

I agree, that money could be better allocated and would help millions of US citizen with hunger needs and even health insurance.

droppd

Posted Yesterday, 4:49 PM New!

I disagree. I believe that equal attention (although I can certainly understand why many believe we should lean attention towards our own) should be given to both Americans and non-Americans. To be honest, America has an abundance of food (many of the diseases we die from are from eating too much), and we could end American hunger and put a dent in world hunger if funds were properly spent.

By the way, the United States could end/(put a huge dent in) world hunger if we stopped raising beef. If we used the grains and other food stocks that we feed our livestock and used the land they currently occupy to raise even more crops, we would have a overabundance of food. Will this ever happen???

mev776

Posted Today, 6:50 AM New!

I disagree. The level of hunger in America is nothing to the levels of hunger outside of the country. We do not see children with distended stomachs, dying in the streets. As the wealthiest nation, we have an obligation to help people in desperate need for food. We presently do not do enough.

mproctor

Posted Yesterday, 5:15 PM **New!**

Agreeded. Let's fix problems at home before we try to save the world.

bpcliu

Posted Yesterday, 5:26 PM **New!**

I agree. It is a good idea to concentrate efforts on a specific focus so as to be more productive in our attempts to relieve the issue of hunger.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 5:35 PM **New!**

I agree. It is good to be philanthropic and all, but I feel it is so much more important to solve problems in our own country before we help others.

abenak

Posted Yesterday, 6:30 PM **New!**

agree. same goes with many issues. i believe we should focus internally as long as we have such problems as hunger, unemployment...

brookj4

Posted Today, 8:07 AM **New!**

I agree. We have so many more domestic issues to worry about rather than

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Becky Liu Thesis #1

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 1:24 PM **New!**

I agree. The better we know, In a better way, we can use them. But, when it is considered, it should have constraints; only for better health care, no intention and relation to human cloning.

mikami

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:42 PM **New!**

I agree to some limit. I believe that great things can be done through the study of cloning however, ethically there is a line that shouldn't be crossed. It's just hard to determine where that line is...

mproctor

Posted Yesterday, 2:42 PM **New!**

I agree, to a point. I think there should be some restrictions, otherwise there's a risk of, 'where does it stop?' But, if handled with caution, I feel the benefits (such as treatments for disease) are important for humanity.

mev776

Posted Today, 6:39 AM **New!**

I can't agree or disagree with this statement. Maybe you could make this thesis more specific. Are you talking about animal cloning? Human cloning? Plants? Are you talking about something like cloning specific organs or tissues or cloning an entire entity?

dakid07

Posted Today, 7:56 AM **New!**

I agree, to the extent of stem cell and disease research. I don't think that we need to be cloning entire people. However, if we can use cloning for the betterment of man kind, and not the recreation of individuals, then cloning can be a very useful tool.

bpcliu

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:02 PM **New!**

Advancements in the study of cloning technology should be pursued.

hmp5

Posted Yesterday, 5:51 PM **New!**

i disagree. I feel that people are warmed by the idea of being able to "grow" organs for people in dire need and push aside how BIG of a deal it is. To me it's like playing with fire. Unexpected results can always happen and i dont think this is an appropriate area to "play God" with or to attempt to intervene into. The human body is amazing and does so many functions, give it credit and dont try to imitate it.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 5:56 PM **New!**

I disagree. It has too much potential to get out of hand and be used for more evil rather than good (like eugenics).

brookj4

Posted Today, 8:04 AM **New!**

I agree. If it could potentially save lives or advance new technology it is worth it as long as it stays ethical.

abenak

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:23 PM **New!**

disagree. I dont think we have any business looking into the cloning of humans or animals as a whole. Although, if we could produce individual organs through these operations i think that could be a worth while investment.

atg3

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:24 PM **New!**

I totally think it is morally and unethical for us to do any advanced studies in cloning human beings or animals.

Andrea True-Garcia

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Kevin Abena's Thesis #2

abenak

Posted Jan 9, 2007 7:54 PM **New!**

The University of Washington should disallow its practice of forcing students to apply for admission to its various departments, and rather put forth a system that allows students to decide their own faith by making the grades.

I didnt know how to word this really, and after this is still may be confusing, but basically i am proposing that instead of students having to apply to certain university departments (engineering, nursing, architecture...), the UW create a certain grading criteria for each department,

therefore making students get certain grades in their pre reqs in order to go into a certain field. therefore allowing students to decide their own faith, and not be subject to some random scheme decided by others.

schuetzc

Posted Jan 9, 2007 10:09 PM New!

I disagree. The whole point of applying to a certain major is so the faculty within that specific field can decide if you are an adequate student. To me, this seems like a more lenient system. In your idea, with the only factor being your GPA, if you slip up in one class it could mean an entire different career choice. However, with the way major admissions are currently set up, if your GPA does not meet the requirement set by the application standards, you can still get into the major by discussing other factors with the faculty (extracurricular activities, student involvement, etc). I like this one the best out of your two! =)

atg3

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:56 PM New!

I disagree. I think that is why UW is such a highly recognized University and very competitive. That is why I wanted to come here.

Andrea True-Garcia

mlicata

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:52 PM New!

A disagree. The UW already makes us jump through so many hoops just to get in that I want to know I worked hard for my placement. I had to work my butt off to get into my major and I feel good knowing I beat out some of my peers to get there. Grades are already a large source of stress can you imagine how crazy the bio majors would be?

mikami

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:40 PM New!

i disagree. the various departments are looking for students who are well rounded and who can contribute the most to their department in all areas of school and the society. If they based their decisions purely on grades then students would be stuck in their rooms studying and not out experiencing life.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 5:06 PM **New!**

Grade is also one of the main aspects which should be assessed for admission of any department, but it is not the only reason why we attend the university. If someone who has full interest in some field but cannot enter that major only for his/her GPA, it will be too harsh. UW is now giving opportunity for everyone who is willingly to be involved in particular field and it makes our campus more lively, searching for what their interest is. Final judgement will be on professor's hand.

droppd

Posted Yesterday, 5:13 PM **New!**

I disagree. I have had many friends who have gotten into the department of their choice because of the classes they have taken and other activities they have been involved in. For example, the faculty of the architecture department could see what kind of student one would be, despite, say, a horrible grade in chemistry that destroyed their GPA. Be sure that you could stretch this topic into a 6-8 speech.

mproctor

Posted Yesterday, 5:24 PM **New!**

I disagree. Having students apply for majors means that there aren't more students in any one major than can be supervised. If people didn't have to apply, there might be a problem with too many people trying to get into too few class spots.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 6:48 PM **New!**

I disagree. Many departmenes have early entrance requirements where if you get good enough grades in a few of the pre-requisite classes that you can enter into the major early.

bpcliu

Posted Today, 2:53 AM **New!**

I disagree. Regulations were set up by departments for specific reasons. A lot of majors are not purely based on how well an individual tests, nor on academic grades (music, art, and drama, for example). Just because you are able to get a certain grade doesn't mean that you would make a good artist.

dakid07

Posted Today, 8:00 AM **New!**

I would say that your idea seems to align closely to what the university already does. Although, yes, you have to apply, your acceptance is usually based entirely on the grades that you have received thus far in your pre-reqs. I really dont see how this is controversial aside from the fact that it eliminates the need to apply, which could have the affect of drastically overloading some departments in the university.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Erin Whittington Thesis #2

esw6

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:55 PM [New!](#)

Safe sex education is a reasonable alternative to abstinence only sexual education in public high schools.

[atg3](#)

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:27 PM [New!](#)

I disagree. I don't think that teenagers are fully capable of understanding the incredible importance of safe-sex vs. no-sex. I really think we are sending mixed messages if we encourage safe sex as the more practice alternative to abstinence.

Andrea True-Garcia

[abenak](#)

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:54 PM [New!](#)

agree. i believe in high schools abstinence should be taught first and foremost, but with youth today i strongly agree that safe sex needs to be intertwined in this.

[abenak](#)

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:55 PM [New!](#)

ok, dont hover over the post button when you push it, otherwise you get that business

[mlicata](#)

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:26 PM [New!](#)

I agree. While I believe in abstinence, students are far more likely to listen if we adress abstinence and safe-sex together.

[mikaml](#)

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:05 PM New!

i also agree that abstinence and safe-sex together would create a better message to the youth today.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 3:34 PM New!

I strongly agree that safe sex education is necessary whether students decided to have sex or not. It is crucial because it is related to the life and anybody will have such a relationship in the future also.

mev776

Posted Today, 6:41 AM New!

I agree. It's arguably unconstitutional to not fund comprehensive sex ed.

dakid07

Posted Today, 7:54 AM New!

I do agree that it is reasonable, but I also think that high school is an inappropriate setting for young people to start having sex. So while I do think that it is important for young people to learn about practicing safe sex, I also think that abstinence should be the main message.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Andrea True-Garcia's Thesis # 2

atg3

Posted Jan 10, 2007 1:58 PM **New!**

Washington State Family Court systems should impose a 6 month waiting period for divorce when children are involved. This would include mandatory family counseling for all parties.

Andrea True-Garcia

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 12:37 PM -- edited Yesterday, 12:39 PM by jhk86 **New!**

Basically I agree, because one of victims from divorce is children. However, when children admitted that the divorce is the best for their life as well as their partents', I think 6 months waiting period would be unnecessary.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 7:26 PM **New!**

I disagree. What if someone is trying to divorce an abusive spouse? Then those children should be able to get away from the abusive parent ASAP.

bpcliu

Posted Today, 2:39 AM **New!**

I agree. However, to take into the account of possible issues of abusive spouses, you should also suggest that exceptions will be made if a judge deems the situation appropriate.

abenak

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:07 PM **New!**

disagree. sometimes divorces are filed for reasons that are very important, such as spousal abuse that can affect the

children more than the adults. prolonging these potentially dangerous situations is not a wise decision. i think the parents should be more responsible and protective of the children when considering divorce.

mlicata

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:23 PM New!

I agree. Sometimes counselling can help but I do worry about the kids. Most divorces are ugly situations that most kids could be spared from. On the other hand, maybe this would help the problem of single parents.

mikaml

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:14 PM New!

i disagree. divorces are often about private matters that the individuals need to repair if possible without complete interference from the state. If there are children involved, hopefully the parents will do whats best for their kids.

mproctor

Posted Yesterday, 3:51 PM New!

I disagree about the waiting period. In some cases I think keeping the kids in limbo is difficult on them. The mandatory counseling is something that I agree with, though. It would help the mental health of the children.

mev776

Posted Today, 6:44 AM New!

I disagree. Sometimes parents staying together to "work things out" is much harder on the children involved than if the parents got divorced immediately. Children are much more aware of tensions between parents than many people realize.

dakid07

Posted Today, 7:51 AM [New!](#)

I think that this is a very loaded topic, but that there are instances, particularly when there is an abusive spouse, when an immediate divorce is necessary and probably more beneficial than continuing on in a bad situation.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Erin Whittington Thesis #1

[esw6](#)

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:54 PM [New!](#)

The Washington State smoking ban should not be overturned.

[mlicata](#)

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:57 PM [New!](#)

I completely agree. Smoking is disgusting, and when people do it in a bar I will probably not go back. Smokers can stand to go outside...the bar cannot stand to lose the business of numerous students like me.

[abenak](#)

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:52 PM [New!](#)

agree. this habit, that has negative health risks whether you do it or not, should not be in the public sphere, especially where non-smokers wish to be. i think smokers should have to go to designated places to stink, definitely not where i am at.

[mikami](#)

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:28 PM New!

i agree. anything to discourage this very bad habit is a good thing. The ban reduces the risks of second hand smoke in places that are largely populated.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 4:25 PM New!

Definetely agree. For smokers, they can smoke in the permitted area, not in public area like stores and restaurant where people is crowded all the time. Secondhand smoke can be even more harmful than what smokers expect.

droppd

Posted Yesterday, 4:29 PM New!

Agree. While non-smokers may argue that it is their right to smoke, it is our right to breath clean air.

mev776

Posted Today, 6:47 AM New!

I agree. Smokers can ruin their own health at home or in the car. I would even go as far to say that smoking in outdoor public places should be banned.

dakid07

Posted Today, 7:49 AM New!

I agree, people should be able to keep the right to smoke, but that doesn't mean that they should be able to take aways others' right to breathing air free of carcinogens.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Rushawn Darden Thesis # 2

shawny08

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:20 AM **New!**

The education system should require teaching of race as a social construction to kids in high school. Starting out with showing that its not biological, and it has diferent meanings around the world. The US is black and white but other places have completely different customs of race for example places is africa have black, colored, and white. plus britian does things different as well. This awareness can push forth a better understanding that just because people look different doesnt mean that they will not have more in common with you biologically than some one who looks more similar to you.

(i wanted ideas on if i should say middle school instead of highschool because may it should be younger. What do you think?)

atg3

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:45 PM **New!**

I think this is a great concept, however it is a little to broad. Try and narrow it down a bit.

Andrea True-Garcia

mlicata

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:04 PM **New!**

I agree, but it should be specific. Are we talking about equality on a genetic level or just in general (i.e. we live in the same city ergo we are similar)?

abenak

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:00 PM New!

agree. same reasons as the previous, i am a little unsure of what you are saying, but this concept could prove very useful to many people.

mikaml

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:23 PM New!

i agree. the issue on the differences of race has always been a public topic. but i also agree that the topic is a bit broad.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 4:02 PM New!

Good suggestion. Even I didn't know how various races are living in the same region because I've just lived in South Korea for 20 years which consists of the same races. To see what it's like in the U.S., I think race education based on that all races equal except their appearances

mproctor

Posted Yesterday, 4:05 PM New!

I have mixed feeling about this idea, but at this point I am more inclined to disagree. I had a Race and Politics class in high school and it was a waste of time. Even though the teacher had the best intentions, their wasn't a real curriculum so I didn't get anything out of it. I would agree with you if there was a clear idea about how this would be implemented.

droppd

Posted Yesterday, 5:36 PM New!

Kind of on the same page as everyone else, a little confused about what you're saying. Specify. Otherwise,

great concept, but I don't know if you would have much opposition from students from a diverse university.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 5:47 PM **New!**

This is kind of confusing, but I think it is because it is so broad. I agree with the general concept, but try narrowing this down.

bpcliu

Posted Yesterday, 6:00 PM **New!**

The way you worded your thesis is very confusing. Furthermore, I don't think this topic can stretch and expand enough to fill an entire semester's worth of teaching. It can be a sub-topic incorporated into a larger course of sociology.

mev776

Posted Today, 6:54 AM **New!**

This is a great idea, but how would it be initiated? What would the criteria be? I could see a class like this taught by an unenthused teacher being a huge waste of time and actually making students hostile to the idea.

dakid07

Posted Today, 7:48 AM **New!**

I think this is a great topic, my only concern being that this might be a little too much for kids at the Middle or High School level. It is very important, but it also seems to be particular enough in its scope that it would not fit into a historical or biological curriculum as well in high school as it would at the university level.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Matt Schmidt thesis #2

mas8

Posted Yesterday, 12:46 AM -- edited Yesterday, 12:46 AM by mas8
College football should adopt a 16 team playoff format.

droppd

Posted Yesterday, 8:58 AM New!

I really don't know that much about sports, and can say that I don't know anything about college football playoff format. Just be sure that this is a topic that you can stretch through 3 speeches.

atg3

Posted Yesterday, 9:15 AM New!

I agree. I think that would be fantastic. Kind of like a March madness for football.

Andrea True-Garcia

bpcliu

Posted Yesterday, 9:59 AM New!

I have not the slightest idea what that means. But it seems like if it would bring more revenue for schools and states, then it could potentially be a good idea.

mikaml

Posted Yesterday, 6:28 PM New!

I agree if this would settle many of the arguments over

who gets to play who.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 6:34 PM **New!**

I am indifferent, because I don't know very much about football at all.

abenak

Posted Yesterday, 6:36 PM **New!**

agree. this would end all the BCS drama and bs. this would ensure that the best team in the end of the year has a legit shot at being national champs, and also all of the on-the-edge teams.

mev776

Posted Today, 7:01 AM **New!**

I'm not sure. How would the 16 teams be determined? Just 1-16 in the rankings? There are just so many school teams - not like the fairly limited number of pro teams. Isn't the BCS drama part of the fun?

dakid07

Posted Today, 7:42 AM **New!**

Definitely....I mean come one...Boise State. It should have been the two undefeateds in the championships. This political crap needs top stop.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Matt Schmidt thesis #1

mas8

Posted Yesterday, 12:42 AM

The primary role of the university is to educate students in their chosen fields, not to prepare them for the workplace.

droppd

Posted Yesterday, 9:02 AM **New!**

I guess it depends on what they want to do. If by workplace you mean a job, then I do believe that the University's role is to prepare students for a job, and that may be educating them in their chosen fields. I believe that the University may assume, and rightfully so, that a student's chosen field, typically, is the field that they would want to continue for their career. For example, I am majoring in Environmental Science and Resource Management with an emphasis on wildlife, through the College of Forest Resources and minoring in Quantitative Sciences. My career plan is conserving, preserving, restoring and protecting wildlife habitat, and the outdoors will be my workplace. That is what my major and the classes are preparing me for.

atg3

Posted Yesterday, 9:15 AM **New!**

I agree. It is up to us to be ready to enter the workplace. With a good education it should be relatively easy.

Andrea True-Garcia

bpcliu

Posted Yesterday, 10:04 AM **New!**

This depends on the major you choose to follow. In Graphic design for example, students are taught the ins and outs of design theory, history, and actual practice. In this case, "educating in the chosen field" is exactly the same as "preparing for the workplace."

mikaml

Posted Yesterday, 6:23 PM **New!**

i agree that the university should prepare students for their chosen field but also to prepare students to enter the workplace as well.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 6:29 PM **New!**

I totally agree. I know a lot of people who felt totally unprepared when thrown into the workplace after university.

abenak

Posted Yesterday, 6:36 PM **New!**

agree. the universities role should be to teach students what they decide to go into.

mev776

Posted Today, 7:05 AM **New!**

I disagree. It's not like a degree guarantees you to a decent job anymore. Anyone who graduated right after the dotcom bust can tell you that without the right contacts, a degree is not worth the paper it's printed on.

dakid07

Posted Today, 7:40 AM **New!**

I would tend to agree, but in intances like the business school, the main focus is to allow students to enter a work environment, with stress on internships and job fairs.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Billy Holdsworth's Thesis #1

dakid07

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:22 PM New!

I think the the Pledge of Allegiance should be re-written to exclude the reference to God because it goes against the seperation of church and state.

mikaml

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:52 PM New!

i disagree. the pledge of allegiance has been something that helps define our country and i think it should be kept as written. If people don't want to say it, then they don't have to.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 4:29 PM New!

I disagree. Founders of USA raised this U.S based on the holly spirit of the Church, Pledge of Allegiance should include God.

droppd

Posted Yesterday, 4:33 PM New!

While I may not believe in God, I don't think that the Pledge of Allegiance has to be rewritten (honestly believe people are being a little too sensitive these days). However, I think people should have the right to not say it if they don't want to.

mlicata

Posted Yesterday, 6:06 PM New!

I disagree. The pledge has always been that way since the beginning of this country. People who don't like the SINGLE word "God" need to get over themselves. There are far more pressing matters to worry about in this country....like how bloody cold it is.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 6:15 PM New!

I disagree. The pledge of allegiance is historical and should not be changed, because of one word that may offend people.

abenak

Posted Yesterday, 6:29 PM New!

disagree. no such change needs to be done, far larger issues need much more attention than something like this.

mev776

Posted Today, 6:58 AM New!

I agree. The "under God" was added in the twentieth century, so it was never part of the original pledge.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

David Droppers' theses 1 & 2

droppd

Posted Jan 9, 2007 5:30 PM **New!**

Two theses I am considering:

Congress should revoke/ban oil drilling from the 1002 area of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR).

The U.S. should adopt the Kyoto protocol to address global warming.

Yes, I know that the second one is of the sheet of examples but it is something that I am passionate about and can turn into an 8 min speech.

mev776

Posted Jan 9, 2007 5:42 PM **New!**

I agree about banning oil drilling in ANWR. It's not worth the detriment to the environment for the relatively small amount of oil that may be there.

~Elaine Vote

mlicata

Posted Jan 9, 2007 5:57 PM **New!**

I agree....There are too many questions and chances for something to go wrong in the 1002 area.

The Kyoto protocol, I do not agree. This is on the basis that developing countries do not have to follow its guidelines. But where does most of the world's pollution come from? developing nations.

schuetzc

Posted Jan 9, 2007 9:58 PM **New!**

I agree with your first statement. There other places to drill for oil FIRST without endangering animals. The 1002 area should be a last resort. I disagree with your second statement. If all the other nations are doing it, then we

don't have to! =)

markvh

Posted Jan 10, 2007 12:52 PM New!

David,

Could you put your theses in two different posts?

Thanks,

Mark

atg3

Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:36 PM New!

I agree with the 1020 area and about banning oil drilling in ANWR.

I disagree with your second statement. Very much so.

Andrea True-Garcia

abenak

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:14 PM New!

1 agree. i dont think we have any business drilling for these reserves.

2 i guess agree, i dont know all the stipulations of the kyoto protocol, but if it could begin to correct some of the wrongs we have done pollution wise super.

mikaml

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:20 PM New!

i also agree about the ANWR subject because we need to

protect our wildlife.

i will have to disagree with the kyoto protocol subject even though i don't know much about the details.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 3:58 PM **New!**

I agree with your both two thesis.

First, U.S should spend a lot more money on developing alternative energy than drilling more. That is just endangering earth.

Second, U.S should radify and join the internatioal movement for keeping the earth. U.S should be the leader of the world and the good role model of other nations.

mproctor

Posted Yesterday, 4:09 PM -- edited Yesterday, 4:12 PM by mproctor
New!

I agree with you on both. If we stop drilling we'll be forced to look for alternative energy sources, which I fully support. As for the Kyoto Protocol, we are one of the world's richest nations, thus we should be doing our part to lead the way and make a pledge to stop global warming.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 7:05 PM **New!**

1. I agree. We need to protect the wildlife more than we need the oil at this point in time.

2. I have never heard of the Kyoto protocol, so I am indifferent on this and would need to know more about it.

bpcliu

Posted Today, 2:44 AM [New!](#)

1. I agree. We should be spending our time and resources on cultivating alternative energy sources, such as hydro-power or biofuel.

2. I am not completely familiar with the protocol, but I think the US should take part in protecting the earth and its natural environments.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Ian Crofoot Thesis #2

icrofoot

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:30 PM [New!](#)

The pledge of allegiance should be removed from the public school curriculum.

abenak

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:49 PM [New!](#)

disagree. i dont believe this should be removed from public school curriculums, people should have the right to not participate if they choose, but i see no reason to remove it. you are in the US, you enjoy all the freedoms of the US, you should be able to respect that and do this small gesture if you so choose.

mlicata

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:29 PM [New!](#)

I disagree. The pledge has been a part of our country for years and only recently have people become annoyed by it.

The pledge stands for our commitment to the country and our appreciation for living in a place like this.

mikaml

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:03 PM New!

i also disagree. the pledge is something we all learned as kids and it is important to the ideals of our country. It should be up to every person, whether they want to say it or not.

dakid07

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:17 PM New!

I disagree, it is a fundamental part of being an American citizen and is something that kids should at least come to an understanding of. Althou I would be wary of calling it part of the "curriculum."

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 3:48 PM New!

I also disagree. It is the least duty as an American citizen. someone have to recognize where they live, who they are, and how their country is precious for them.

mproctor

Posted Yesterday, 3:56 PM New!

I disagree, as well. Students do not have to participate if they so choose. It's a simple act of patriotism that educates students on the ideals of this country.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 7:31 PM New!

I very strongly disagree. The Pledge of Allegiance is a part of our country's history, and I think it is important to show respect for our country as well....especially in state and

federally funded institutions.

bpcliu

Posted Today, 2:36 AM **New!**

I think the pledge should be taught in school, but whether or not students choose to participate in the ritual every morning should be up to them to decide.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Elaine Vote's Thesis #1

mev776

Posted Jan 9, 2007 5:45 PM **New!**

Washington State should eliminate the death penalty.

schuetzc

Posted Jan 9, 2007 9:54 PM **New!**

I disagree. I think that the death penalty should be restricted, but not eliminated all together. If there is a certain amount of proof and evidence against a person that requires the punishment of the death penalty, then it should be allowed.

shawny08

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:54 AM -- edited Jan 10, 2007 9:55 AM by shawny08 **New!**

I agree. The jury who make the decision to put a person to death is playing part in killing someone they have never had any connection with. Who really wants to live with that

on there hands especially when the proof is a debate over which lawyer can come up with the stronger argument. Plus there are tons of court cost that cost more than just having the person spend life in jail.

atg3

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:48 PM [New!](#)

I disagree.. I Am totally for the death penalty in certain situations such as premeditated murder and mass murder. Punishment should fit the crime.

Andrea True-Garcia

mlicata

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:01 PM [New!](#)

I disagree. In fact I would say it should be easier for prosecutors to achieve capital punishment. Ted bundy wasn't even tried here and the Green River Killer is still alive. Are you kidding me!!!

abenak

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:46 PM [New!](#)

disagree. certain crimes are definitely worth while to try and rid people from this earth. maybe make the process more efficient.

mikaml

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:21 PM [New!](#)

i disagree. Even though the death penalty can be seen as inhumane, the people who deserve it have made a choice to take other peoples lives. I think that the process to decide who receives the death penalty should be altered to reduce the risk of error.

mproctor

Posted Yesterday, 2:23 PM New!

I disagree. I agree with the others who've raised the issue that mass murderers take the lives of others and therefore should receive an equal punishment.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 2:26 PM New!

I agree. No matter how vicious a thing a criminal committed, nobody has a right to kill him/her. We'd better let them know what was wrong by putting them in prison for the rest of their lives and processing a counseling treatment.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 8:01 PM New!

I disagree. Some crimes are so heinous that the perpetrator has absolutely no right to continue living.

bpcliu

Posted Today, 2:20 AM New!

I agree. I think life sentence in jail is enough to punish an individual while keeping him or her away from the innocent public.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Lisa Mikami's thesis #2

mikami

Posted Jan 9, 2007 11:38 PM [New!](#)

The University of Washington should reduce its out-of-state tuition or make it easier for out-of-state students to gain residency.

schuetzc

Posted Jan 10, 2007 12:16 AM [New!](#)

I AGREE! I think once a student has attended the UW for a year, they should be considered an instate student.

atg3

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:54 PM [New!](#)

I agree. It should only take one year to be considered instate.

Andrea True-Garcia

mlicata

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:56 PM [New!](#)

I disagree. The whole point behind in-state tuition is an incentive for high school students in each specific state to go to in-state schools. The price is not high to keep out of state people away but to entice in state people to stay. It is in the best interest of the University of Washington to keep tuitions where they stand.

abenak

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:24 PM [New!](#)

disagree. for the same reasons as mark.

mproctor

Posted Yesterday, 1:43 PM [New!](#)

I disagree with the first point, but agree on the second part. Reduced out-of-state tuition could potentially mean

more out-of-staters would apply, leaving fewer admission spots for state residents. I do, however, think that residency requirements should be made somewhat easier.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 2:08 PM **New!**

I agree. Paying tax does not justify the reduced tuition for resident in WA. When it comes to the residents in WA, the 1-year resident in WA paid less tax to WASHINGTON STATE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT than 10-year resident in WA did, but they paid the same amount of money for tuition.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 11:23 PM **New!**

I disagree. Washington residents pay taxes to ensure their children will have spots open at in state universities.

bpcliu

Posted Today, 2:16 AM **New!**

I disagree. The taxes that WA residents pay should come back to benefit the in-staters when the time comes to pay for school.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Jonathan Lee's thesis #1

jonlee7

Posted Yesterday, 10:07 AM **New!**

One should be able to purchase alcohol at the age of 19.

mikaml

Posted Yesterday, 6:11 PM New!

i disagree. it just seems like a lot of negative consequences could come from this change. why did you choose age 19 instead of 18 or any other age?

mlicata

Posted Yesterday, 6:18 PM New!

I agree, but I worry that you won't have enough support to make this kind of a change.

droppd

Posted Yesterday, 6:19 PM New!

I disagree. As we discussed in class, this may lead to the cycle of drinking and purchasing alcohol for minors to be pushed back a couple of years. Instead of many 19 and 20 year olds being "busted" at a party for underage drinking, it will be 17 and 18 year olds. And as we discussed, drinking and driving will happen, and with how little driving experience these teens have, it would be a bad idea to have that many more people that could get them alcohol. It just seems like too many consequences could come about just so someone could get alcohol a couple of years earlier.

abenak

Posted Yesterday, 6:23 PM New!

disagree. for many reasons, one, does this also mean you can consume alcohol at 19? if so, like we said in class, it will just make younger and younger people drinking, which will lead to far more issues mainly because of the fact that those people will be in high school.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 6:24 PM **New!**

I disagree. I remember in class we talked about 21 possibly being the age your brain is being done developing, but I am pretty sure it was chosen because 21 is the age your LIVER stops developing.

jonlee7

Posted Today, 1:27 AM **New!**

If 21 is the age one's brain stops developing, then that should also be a deciding factor in raising the age limit of people enlisting in the military. If one can die for his/her country at the age of 18, why shouldn't one be able to consume alcohol? I chose 19 as an age because that's the age most people get out of highschool, therefore it wouldn't be as easy for HS students to obtain alcohol through the seniors.

bpcliu

Posted Today, 2:13 AM **New!**

I disagree. 19 seems like an arbitrary number. Furthermore, since alcohol is a mind altering substance, the later that it is legally accepted in society the better.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Elaine Vote's Thesis #2

mev776

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:55 AM **New!**

The Federal Government should fund and ensure access to comprehensive sex education.

atg3

Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:37 PM [New!](#)

Oh yes. I totally agree and it should begin at a very young age.

Andrea True-Garcia

mlicata

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:36 PM [New!](#)

I agree....but isn't this already present in society. Planned Parenthood???

abenak

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:51 PM [New!](#)

agree. this is an issue that should be focused on for sure, but i dont know if it is the most important of issues in public schools today. definitely think you could make a great speech of this.

mikaml

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:17 PM [New!](#)

i agree. The more this issue is forced into the public eye the more possibility that it will have an affect our society.

mproctor

Posted Yesterday, 2:13 PM [New!](#)

I agree. Kids are going to have sex, so teaching abstinence-only sex education isn't realistic.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 2:16 PM [New!](#)

I agree. The opponent's idea that the sex education encourage students to get interest and stimulate to have sex relationship is totally untrue according to many literature and research. Correct knowledge about sex will enable students to have mature attitude in doing and thinking of sex.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 8:05 PM **New!**

I agree. Teenagers are going to have sex, so I think we should educate them on how to be safe instead of just telling them to say no.

hmp5

Posted Yesterday, 8:10 PM **New!**

I agree. Education and access to information is key in making wise decisions. Population "control" is important for the US to keep tabs on and to be the leader in this topic.

bpcliu

Posted Today, 2:02 AM **New!**

I agree with your main idea because the more an individual knows about a topic, the better he/she is able to act on it. However, I also think that your thesis is too broad. You should be more precise by indicating whether this access would be provided within school, within the community, etc.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

mikaml

Posted Jan 9, 2007 11:33 PM **New!**

The state of Washington should implement a recycling program that would increase the incentive for its residents to recycle waste.

For example, Hawaii has a program called "HI 5" that returns 5 cents for each bottle/can or recyclable item that someone turns in.

schuetzc

Posted Jan 10, 2007 12:15 AM **New!**

I agree. The program in Hawaii is especially effective because when purchasing recyclable materials, you are charged an extra 5 cents so in order to get the money back, you are required to recycle it. I think this is a positive idea!

atg3

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:55 PM **New!**

I agree. Oregon does this as well and I believe it is used efficiently.

Andrea True-Garcia

mlicata

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:54 PM **New!**

I agree. I don't really know anything about the subject but hey we're all broke college students right? My house always has a lot of cans/bottles going away from it. We could probably use the 5cents!

abenak

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:19 PM New!

agree. i think this is something people would go with, i like it, and this way it would allow those who wish to not participate do so with no penalty.

mproctor

Posted Yesterday, 1:32 PM New!

I disagree. The system in Hawai'i requires citizens to haul recyclables to a recycling center themselves, thus some people aren't going to bother to recycle because the effort isn't worth the amount of money they'd make. I believe Seattle's system is more effective because citizens face a fine if they place recyclables in the garbage.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 1:46 PM New!

I agree. Actually, the law in seattle is not effective because no one knows who put recyclables in the garbage. Therefore, it became nominal act. I think voluntary recycling for money is more effective than compulsively imposing a fine which can rarely conducted unless the owners of the recycables put their names on it.

jeterc

Posted Yesterday, 8:14 PM New!

I agree, I wouldn't mind receiving an incentive for recycling all of the bottles and cans I go through.

bpcliu

Posted Today, 1:44 AM New!

I agree. In the early stages of ensuring that people do recycle, it is a good idea to give the incentive of pay in exchange for work.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Becky Liu Thesis #2

bpcliu

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:07 PM **New!**

All households and businesses should be mandated to recycle by law or face a fine as punishment.

atg3

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:23 PM **New!**

I think this is a great idea. Especially if it is made easily accessible.

Andrea True-Garcia

abenak

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:26 PM **New!**

agree. isnt there some form of this being imposed in seattle? i think this is a good idea, especially for larger corporations which have tons of waste that can be recycled. i think this would be very hard to regulate though.

mlicata

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:33 PM **New!**

I agree. There is however a lot of flack to go through in order to really enforce this law.

mikaml

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:50 PM New!

i agree. recycling is important and any incentive to get people to recycle is good. However, i also agree that it would be hard to enforce.

mproctor

Posted Yesterday, 2:39 PM New!

I agree. A fine is a great incentive for people to recycle, which we all know we should do to keep the environment from getting too messed up.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 8:23 PM New!

I disagree. A fine would be going too far. If you want an incentive for people to recycle it should be some kind of reward.

jhk86

Posted Today, 1:17 AM New!

I agree. Recycling is now in practice around the world. That shows how important the recycling is. It is obligation for us and for our next generation to keep our environment clean.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

mlicata

Posted Jan 9, 2007 5:44 PM **New!**

The United States government should not allow outsourcing of jobs because it dammages the homeland job market and forces other competitors to follow their lead.

mev776

Posted Jan 9, 2007 5:47 PM **New!**

Is it really implementable to ban outsourcing? Wouldn't companies simply leave the country all together? Maybe some sort of tax incentive for companies that do not outsource, or a tariff system for companies that do? Just some thoughts...
~Elaine Vote

schuetzc

Posted Jan 9, 2007 9:52 PM **New!**

I disagree. To me, it seems like the whole reason companies outsource in the first place is because people in the United States do not want the jobs that companies outsource for.

atg3

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:00 PM **New!**

I agree. I think that if a company chooses to do business in the United States, it should hire it's employees and talent from the United States. If they want cheaper labor then they should do business in another country.

Andrea True-Garcia

abenak

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:54 PM **New!**

agree. to a certain degree. i believe our companies in the US should hire US workers to do their work, but, if this

causes american business to move elsewhere it should not be implemented.

mikaml

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:14 PM New!

I agree because this would probably better the employment market in the U.S. However, this could have a backlash in that some companies with the desire to be competitive would leave.

mproctor

Posted Yesterday, 1:54 PM New!

I disagree. Businesses outsource to make more profit. The more profit the businesses make, the better it is for the U.S. economy, thus stimulating job growth in different business sectors.

hmp5

Posted Yesterday, 2:08 PM New!

i agree with the point that banning it would be very difficult if not impossible to control. Once the business is out of the US its out of it's jurisdiction. however more incentives for businesses would be a big encouragement and a good point to touch on in your speech to see if incentives are already being enacted.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 8:58 PM New!

I agree. US corporations should only be allowed to hire people within the United States as employees.

bpcliu

Posted Yesterday, 10:15 PM New!

I have mixed feelings about this topic because. It would be

nice to increase work opportunities within the U.S., but that only happens if the companies decide to stay in the country after outsourcing becomes banned. I fear that many companies may just relocate to foreign countries because they would be able to make the most profit that way.

jeterc

Posted Yesterday, 11:34 PM **New!**

I disagree, outsourcing allows those in other countries that maybe aren't as well off make a living.

jhk86

Posted Today, 1:09 AM **New!**

I disagree. In market economy system, the cheaper labor cost is preferred and one cannot interrupt this mechanism. And outsourcing jobs for this reason is unavoidable.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Chris Jeter Thesis #2

jeterc

Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:27 PM **New!**

Collegiate Student-Athletes should continue to be "paid" with a scholarship, rather than both a scholarship and additional payment for playing as some have suggested.

atg3

Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:30 PM [New!](#)

I agree with this statement. Their reward should be their education, room & board, etc.

Andrea True-Garcia

[vxn](#)

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:56 PM [New!](#)

I dont know to much about how much they get compensated, but i dont believe that they should have a free ride through college. And becuase most likely they did not get in becuase of their merits, then that pushes someone who is acutally qualified out of the possibility of getting in. Getting into the university based on their talents is a big reward in itself.

[abenak](#)

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:41 PM [New!](#)

agree. they should not recieve anything additional other than the scholarships that cover tuition, books, room and board. potentially, these student-athletes can bring massive amounts of money into the university if they perform well, so i believe it is definitely worth while to aid them in their endeavors. not to mention the fact that athletics are a key point in most universities history, and to continue the traditions means a lot to current students and alumni.

[mlicata](#)

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:32 PM [New!](#)

I don't know how I feel about this one. I definitely feel that mr sports star should not get his way paid through school the whole time. I only know a handfull of athlets who work hard enough to really deserve a full ride.

[mikaml](#)

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:54 PM [New!](#)

i agree. A free education is a great reward for student

athletes. There is no need for the additional payment.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 3:12 PM **New!**

I agree. Athlete-students should do both study and playing for UW. They do more than regular, so more advantages are acceptable.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 8:16 PM **New!**

I do not know much about this subject, but I agree that collegiate athletes should not receive more than a scholarship for school.

bpcliu

Posted Yesterday, 11:16 PM **New!**

I agree. The suggested "pay" money should be used to help students who are facing financial difficulties paying for school.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Jon Brooks' Thesis # 2

brookj4

Posted Jan 9, 2007 8:01 PM **New!**

The Seattle monorail should be shutdown as the costs outweigh the benefits of the aging Seattle visitors

attraction.

schuetzc

Posted Jan 9, 2007 10:13 PM [New!](#)

I agree. The monorail is really just a shortcut, allowing visitors to sit and ride instead of walking. Inventions like this, while making life easier, also contribute to the reason why the United States has so many obese people. I also disagree with this topic. The monorail is a great form of transportation for handicapped people. While most places are wheelchair accessible, the distance covered by the monorail is extensive to handicapped.

shawny08

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:38 AM -- edited Jan 10, 2007 9:39 AM by shawny08 [New!](#)

I Disagree. The monorail is still a great attraction for tourist. It does not matter that it only covers a short distant it is still being used frequently. Plus its no burden to keep it going since its already paid for.

atg3

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:52 PM [New!](#)

I agree. The monorail and the efforts the city of Seattle has put into it is ridiculous. They were to have extended it years ago to make it actually helpful for commuters. That is never going to happen and frankly I don't think it is a very efficient.

Andrea True-Garcia

mlicata

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:58 PM [New!](#)

I disagree. The monorail, though extremely expensive, is a cornerstone that people look for when they visit Seattle. Granted it's not the best looking landmark but why don't we get rid of gasworks park, the central fountains, seattle

center, or even the space needle?

abenak

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:41 PM New!

disagree. i dont know a lot about it, think i have been on it once.. but i see no real reason to get rid of it, i see seattle wasting money in a lot of places that i dont agree with but they shouldnt necessarily be rid of it.

mikaml

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:25 PM New!

I disagree. I also don't know much about this topic and I don't think I've ever ridden on it, but I do think that it is still a good tourist attraction.

mproctor

Posted Yesterday, 2:33 PM New!

I agree. As a tourist attraction it's nice. But the tourists aren't paying the upkeep taxes for it. Even if the monorail wasn't there, the tourists would still come to Seattle and spend money.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 2:43 PM New!

I agree. It's been 4 months since I came to seattle. I heard about monorail but most of my friends didn't recommend to ride monorail because it's too expensive at short distance and we can see more directly the seattle by bus or by walk!

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 8:36 PM New!

I agree. More money should be spend on buses and light rail. The monorail is such a waste of money.

bpcliu

Posted Yesterday, 11:10 PM **New!**

I think the monorail is fairly useless since it hardly covers any distance, probably requires a large amount of money to maintain, and does not contribute much to the revenue brought in from tourism.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Mark Licata Thesis #2

mlicata

Posted Jan 9, 2007 6:03 PM **New!**

The University of Washington should supply their Department of Technical Communication with funding for a new building and better accommodations. This department's accommodations hinder its graduates from maximizing their learning experience where graduates are hired into the top companies in their field.

schuetzc

Posted Jan 9, 2007 10:01 PM **New!**

I disagree. If the Department of Technical Communication needs money for a new building and better accommodations, they should receive SOME money from the UW, but they should fundraise or find sponsors on their own. It should not be the University's responsibility to keep all the building up to date, but rather the department's own responsibility.

atg3

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:58 PM New!

I think the each department should be up to standards in all areas. We all pay the same tuition and no matter what our major is, we should be having accomodations that are cutting-edge and preparing us to enter the work world.

Andrea True-Garcia

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 1:11 PM New!

I agree. Every UW student has the right to have great condition for their education. They paid tuition for that and nobody wants to be left out in terms of educational environment. If any building or accomodation is old enough to make hindrance to keep up their good work, UW should offer better facilities for their convenience. Otherwise, only people with luck will study in well-equipped building at a same tuition fee with others.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 8:47 PM New!

I am indifferent. The UW has alimited amount of money they can spend annually. It takes time for new buildings to be approved and then built. Maybe it is already in the process?

bpcliu

Posted Yesterday, 10:53 PM New!

I too do not feel strongly for either side. Lots of buildings on campus are old and under-accomodated (the Art Building for example). It would take time and lots of money to remodel them all. Why should the Department of Technical Communications receive special treatment over other departments with the same need? Furthermore, a student's inability to succeed in the working world should not be blamed on the condition of the classrooms in which the education took place.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Chris Jeter's Thesis #1

jeterc

Posted Jan 9, 2007 4:45 PM

The baseball writers should vote Mark McGwire (and others in the future) who have been suspected, but not proven to use steroids into the Hall of Fame.

schuetzc

Posted Jan 9, 2007 9:50 PM New!

I agree with your thesis. Not inducting a player simply because he is suspected of steroid use is like failing a student because a teacher heard that he or she cheated, but has no proof.

atg3

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:02 PM New!

I agree. Innocent until proven guilty. That is what our legal system is created on and so should we treat people that have not been proven of any wrong doing.

Andrea True-Garcia

mlicata

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:49 PM New!

I agree, just like andrea said. Innocent until proven guilty. Maybe the reason they were never convicted is because they never did it. We shouldn't let an accusation tarnish their record.

abenak

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:32 PM [New!](#)

disagree. if these people deserved to be in the hall of fame they would be voted in by their fellow peers in the hall of fame already. these individuals have obviously tarnished their names by doing things that arent part of the game, even if they are not proven guilty they have been given the reputation for a reason, a very solid reason.

abenak

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:33 PM [New!](#)

wow, my bad

mikaml

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:32 PM [New!](#)

i agree that those like McGwire who were never found guilty should be able to receive the rewards of their achievements. However, the induction of McGwire and others like him might tarnish the reputation of the hall of fame.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 3:22 PM [New!](#)

I don't agree with your thesis. Every suspect has its own cause. Hall of Fame is the honored place for 'legend' players. Of course, he is a great player, but that is not everything for being legend. Being on the suspect list, whether it was true or not, could be enough reason to drop him on the list.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 10:14 PM New!

I agree. I do not know much on the subject of athlete's and drug testing in regards to the hall of fame, but if nothing has been proven then I believe he has no reason not to be in the hall of fame.

bpcliu

Posted Yesterday, 10:33 PM New!

I agree. He is innocent until proven guilty.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Marian Proctor's thesis # 1

mproctor

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:22 PM New!

Teachers and professors should keep their political opinions out of the classroom.

mikaml

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:27 PM New!

i agree. Teachers/professors are there to educate their students about the world so that when it is time the students are able to make their own decisions or create their own opinions.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 2:48 PM New!

I agree. When it comes to lecture in the classroom, their role is to deliver their knowledge about the topic and lead

the students to have their own opinions.

hmp5

Posted Yesterday, 3:18 PM **New!**

I agree. Courses should not be influenced by personal opinion. During interactive debate or conversation is one thing, but instruction or lectures should not be biased or formed around the personal beliefs or views of the instructor.

abenak

Posted Yesterday, 6:52 PM **New!**

agree completely. i dont need to know anything about their political views, they are there to teach me and paid to do the same. inform me on your class, not you political views.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 9:05 PM **New!**

I agree. I think it is rude when instructors discuss their views on the world. We are paying tuition to have them teach us and prepare us for our careers, not to have them rant about how they feel the world should be.

bpcliu

Posted Yesterday, 10:07 PM **New!**

I agree. Everybody has differences in opinions. For a figure of authority to discuss his or her political views in the classroom is most uncomfortable because there is the idea that you are "supposed to" take in what your teachers tell you.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Mark Licata Thesis #2

mlicata

Posted Jan 9, 2007 6:03 PM [New!](#)

The University of Washington should supply their Department of Technical Communication with funding for a new building and better accommodations. This department's accommodations hinder its graduates from maximizing their learning experience where graduates are hired into the top companies in their field.

atg3

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:03 PM [New!](#)

I agree. I think that all departments should be competitive. We all pay the same tuition \$\$.

Andrea True-Garcia

abenak

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:58 PM [New!](#)

agree. although, the same could be said for many of the departments and halls on campus. i dont see where this particular department deserves it more than others.

mikaml

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:10 PM [New!](#)

I also agree because students in the different departments at the UW deserve equal opportunities for the best education. Although, I don't know how each department gains their funding, some of them might have resources outside of the UW, which is possibly what this department could do as well.

mproctor

Posted Yesterday, 2:03 PM **New!**

I agree that the UW should provide funding for the Tech Com department for better resources. However, I don't agree that the department needs a new building. I don't see a connection between how a crappy building hinders a person's ability to learn.

jeterc

Posted Yesterday, 8:39 PM **New!**

I agree, the more advanced resources and an updated building could help the program by providing them a better opportunity of its own. I also think it would be useful for the department to help out the university by doing some fundraising efforts of their own to try and help with funding.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Vi Nguyen's Thesis #1

vxn

Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:30 PM **New!**

Under the 2nd Amendment to the Constitution, United States citizen should have the right to keep and bare arms for protection against tyranny from the federal government and the congress of the united states.

atg3

Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:32 PM **New!**

How is this different from what the U.S. Constitution already says?

Andrea True-Garcia

abenak

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:26 PM **New!**

i agree with that, but kind of confused with what you are saying. maybe reword it and make some sort of new claim.

mlicata

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:38 PM **New!**

I disagree. What do you plan on doing? Overtaking our own government? To keep and bear arms is the right to own a gun so what does our government have to do with this statement?

mikaml

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:32 PM **New!**

i agree because it is part of our right but I am also not sure about where you are going with the government part of your thesis.

vxn

Posted Yesterday, 10:12 AM **New!**

yea sorry the wording could be better organized but basically im what im saying is due to the increase in gun control im pro for upholding the 2nd amendment.

bpcliu

Posted Yesterday, 10:20 AM **New!**

I think the average citizen is too far removed from actually

coming in contact with the federal government and congress to require the use weapons in case of possible tyranny.

mproctor

Posted Yesterday, 7:16 PM **New!**

I agree that citizens should continue to have the right to bare arms. If we take away that right, what's next? Is our right to free speech going to be taken away some day, too?

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 7:18 PM **New!**

I agree that citizens have the right to bare arms, but I am confused by your thesis.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 12:49 PM **New!**

I can't understand what is tyranny from the federal government and the congress of the U.S. but Whenever they they use the violence to non criminal-citizens without any specific reasons, I think we should have the right to keep arms for protection as a self-defense.

jeterc

Posted Yesterday, 7:56 PM **New!**

I guess I'm not really understanding what you are getting at. But I do think we should have the right to bear arms for protection.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Vi Nguyen's Thesis #2

vxn

Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:39 PM [New!](#)

Capital Punishment must be abolished for it is ineffective and not economical in the judicial system.

mlicata

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:05 PM [New!](#)

I disagree. Capitol punishment is a solid sentence if the crime permits.

abenak

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:33 PM [New!](#)

disagree. i think the issue with this topic should be to make the process cheaper and easier to convict. though, i think this would be hard to do fairly.

mikami

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:47 PM [New!](#)

i also disagree. capital punishment should be kept as an option in those rare cases that it applies to. The way to determine who receives this punishment should be altered to reduce errors.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 3:08 PM [New!](#)

I disagree. Actually, for criminals who committed inhumane crimes, death will not be frightening. They knew they would deserve it. But what is more frightening to them will

liveing in agony for the rest of their lives in jail, reflecting how immoral they were. Also, if it is possible, they can be used for any public benifit.

hmp5

Posted Yesterday, 3:29 PM **New!**

i disagree. the death penalty should be an available option for any cases that are found to deserve that sentence. It's not used often but that doesnt mean it should be abolished because an occasion could arise where it is suitable.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 7:50 PM **New!**

I disagree. Some crimes are so heinous that the punishment should be death.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Andrea True-Garcia's Thesis #1

atg3

Posted Jan 10, 2007 1:54 PM **New!**

The Washington State Department of Education should adopt a unified dress code for all Washington State Public Schools.

Andrea True-Garcia

vxn

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:44 PM **New!**

I disagree, being a public school it seems to be a little bit controlling that they can force students to wear uniforms and I don't see any significant benefit doing so.

abenak

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:03 PM [New!](#)

agree- assuming that the state also provides the uniforms so that families with financial issues don't have any additional problems. I think this could cut out a lot of the social problems associated with cliques in schools, essentially make the public school environment a more friendly place for everyone.

mlicata

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:24 PM [New!](#)

I disagree. Only because I don't know for sure what you are proposing. Are you talking about uniforms or rather a more strict dress code policy???

mikaml

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:09 PM [New!](#)

I agree that a stricter dress code would solve some of the social issues that come with attending school. However, if uniforms are what you are proposing, then the state would have to come up with a fair way to determine the cost for each family.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 3:35 PM [New!](#)

agree. Firstly, school uniforms solve both student's financial hardships and some social issues that come from wearing as long as they want. Also, if school uniforms are decided by students themselves, may they have sort of pride on their school uniform and their school.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 7:44 PM New!

I agree. It would help eliminate fashion discrimination and competition among students, which are distractions in an institution of learning.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Megan Lally's Thesis #2

lallym

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:02 PM New!

Physician-assisted suicide should be legal in the U.S.

droppd

Posted Yesterday, 9:05 AM New!

Absolutely it should be legal. However, I think that there should be some guidelines and regulations restricting it (like the laws now), like the example that we used in class. I do not believe that someone should be able to have physician assisted suicide if they are depressed, but if they have a confirmed terminal and painful illness, I believe that it is their right to choose.

atg3

Posted Yesterday, 9:11 AM New!

I really do not think it should be legal. There are far too many aspects to be addressed and the family should not

have to be left to that decision.

Andrea True-Garcia

bpcliu

Posted Yesterday, 10:10 AM **New!**

I do not agree. The margin for error could be large in this scenerio, especially when human lives are concerned. Some individuals could have temporary illnesses that are mistaken for longterm incurables. There is also the issue of severe mental depression... does that count as a terminal, painful illness on the same scale as, for example, aids?

mikaml

Posted Yesterday, 5:43 PM **New!**

i am against this because so many things could go wrong such as misunderstandings and judgement errors.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 5:51 PM **New!**

I am indifferent, because I see it being useful for people with terminal illnesses, but I also believe it has the potential to be greatly misused.

mikaml

Posted Yesterday, 5:52 PM **New!**

i dont really agree with this topic because so many things could go wrong with any number of situations such as misunderstandings between the patient, the doctor and the family, as well as accidental mishaps.

abenak

Posted Yesterday, 6:41 PM **New!**

agree. i believe it should be a persons right to end there

life because of some disease if they so choose. if not for a terminal disease, i disagree with this.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 7:37 PM **New!**

I agree. Biologically, living a life can be referred to the state of heart beating, but to some people, living a life implies the state of doing activities what they want to do as a human (Reading books, meeting people, eating food...). If a patient who thinks a life is latter one but cannot do what they want due to their physiologically disabled body, s/he is not living anymore. They can choose the direction of their future life.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Ian Crofoot Thesis #1

icrofoot

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:29 PM **New!**

Marijuana should be legalized.

atg3

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:44 PM **New!**

i AGREE HOWEVER I THINK IT SHOULD BE HEAVILY TAXED JUST LIKE CIGARETTES.

Andrea True-Garcia

abenak

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:45 PM New!

i disagree. marijuana is not legal for a reason, it is a drug. i know some disagree with these facts, mainly because of the legalization of alcohol (which people think is a drug, and that may be true, but not the issue here), but just because some other wrong is legal does not change the fact marijuana is a wrong. just like other drugs, marijuana has the potential to ruin lives, maybe not as often, but still holds this to be true.

mlicata

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:30 PM New!

I disagree. It's illegal for a reason. Plus most of the people who use this drug are not the brightest crayon in the box. Look how alcohol affects some members of society and think of how much worse marijuana could affect it.

mikaml

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:58 PM New!

i disagree. I come from hometown where marijuana has affected a lot of lives and possibly decreased a lot of potential in many people.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 3:22 PM New!

I disagree. It is obviously a drug and make people out of control. Cigarette, legal product by government, doesn't cause a serisous problem concerning with people's consciousness than Marijuana.

hmp5

Posted Yesterday, 3:37 PM New!

Actually, I agree. Marijuana is a substance that disorients the reactions of the body and influences your decision making but so does alcohol. There should be taxes on it to

discourage it getting out of control though..

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 7:37 PM **New!**

I agree. A lot of tax revenue could be generated from its legalization.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Megan Lally's Thesis #1

lallym

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:01 PM **New!**

Amniotic and adult stem cell research should be legal in the U.S.

droppd

Posted Yesterday, 9:11 AM **New!**

Yes, it has the great promise of possibly curing/reducing illnesses and diseases, such as cancer and Alzheimer's disease. I think that your main opposition argument will be that it uses stem cells from fetuses and/or that it is playing the role of god. But the vast majority (if not all) of the stem cells used are from already aborted fetuses. So you will have to delve into the realm of abortion for part of your speech(es). As for playing god, my main argument would be that if he did create us, then he also created us with the ability to solve these kinds of ailments.

atg3

Posted Yesterday, 9:14 AM New!

I don't believe that this is right. I think science can go too far.

Andrea True-Garcia

bpcliu

Posted Yesterday, 10:06 AM New!

I agree. stem cell research can lead us to medical advancements in the future.

mikami

Posted Yesterday, 5:59 PM New!

i also agree that the benefits of stem cell research can solve many problems.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 6:08 PM New!

I agree. Stem cell research has the potential to help a lot of people and in the long run it could lower the cost of healthcare, and it would also provide more jobs for research.

mlicata

Posted Yesterday, 6:32 PM New!

I agree. The bennefits far outweigh the opposition.

abenak

Posted Yesterday, 6:40 PM New!

agree from what i have read above, i dont know much about this field of research. sounds like it is a worth while investment.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 7:13 PM **New!**

I agree. Study on stem cell has a lot of potential for many patients in the world. Science should keep going on for letting human kind be free from deases.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 7:23 PM **New!**

It sounds fine. Studying stem cells should be good for incurable patients in the world. Scinece is allowed to keep going on. We should debate on how to stop those who misuse them.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Andrea True-Garcia #3 ??

atg3

Posted Yesterday, 1:17 PM **New!**

Washington State should adopt a year round school schedule for all Washington State Public Schools.

Andrea True-Garcia

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 7:17 PM **New!**

I don't know exactly what you mean by year round school schedule. Sorry.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

brookj4

Jon Brooks' Thesis # 1

Posted Jan 9, 2007 7:12 PM **New!**

Public money should be used to fund a new stadium for the Seattle Supersonics in Washington State.

schuetzc

Posted Jan 9, 2007 10:03 PM **New!**

I agree. By raising taxes just a little, tons of money could be raised to fund a new stadium, benefitting the Seattle community as a whole (increased revenue in the city, entertainment, etc.)

shawny08

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:00 AM -- edited Jan 10, 2007 10:01 AM by shawny08 **New!**

I disagree. The Key Arena is fairly new. I remembered it being built in my life time. Plus the seattle has had to many major projects like safeco and qwest field plus they taxed cars so much for the monorail.

mev776

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:49 AM **New!**

I disagree. Seattle residents already pay way too many taxes. I'm still angry about the monorail car tax. The Sonics are a private organization. Why should public money go to fund them?

atg3

Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:39 PM [New!](#)

I agree. I am a huge sports fan and feel with a very small tax increase even a use tax, we can keep the sonics here and enjoy them for many years to come. Renton would be an excellent area.

Andrea True-Garcia

mlicata

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:21 PM [New!](#)

I disagree. Key arena is far too new to warrant a new stadium. We are still paying for the monorail but I doubt any of us will ever see it.....

abenak

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:36 PM [New!](#)

disagree. public money can be much better spent elsewhere. if the sonics want a new stadium, one that could potentially increase revenue in the future, tell them to pester their owners

mikaml

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:36 PM [New!](#)

i agree. keeping the sonics in seattle would be good for the city. But I don't really know about the present condition of the stadium, and if they could do without an entirely new stadium that would be better for the cities tax situation.

bpcliu

Posted Yesterday, 9:46 AM [New!](#)

I disagree. Recent spendings on public projects have already consumed large amounts of revenue from the city. Especially since the Key Arena is fairly new, this extra

expenditure seems highly unnecessary. There are greater public issues out there that need to be addressed with our tax money than a new stadium.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 7:04 PM **New!**

I don't know much about stadiums in seattle, but if there is a stadium already built few years ago and the condition of it is good enough, why do you think a new stadium is needed?

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 7:12 PM **New!**

I disagree. Key Arena is very new and enough money is already going towards stadiums in Seattle (i.e. Safeco and Qwest field)

mproctor

Posted Yesterday, 7:15 PM **New!**

I disagree. I think the money could be spent more wisely, such as giving more funding to schools. While a totally new arena is something I'm opposed to, a renovation might be something I'd support.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Jeongha Kim's thesis #1

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 1:46 AM **New!**

Commercials about product including alcohol (wine, beer....) should be banned on TV.

droppd

Posted Yesterday, 8:52 AM **New!**

Although I do believe that alcohol does far more damage than it does good (and that it is hypocritical to speak against cigarettes but still use alcohol), I don't think that the commercials should be banned. It may take alcohol to be banned from places such as cigarettes were until some TV commercials go off the air, such as happened with the cigarette commercials. You don't see them anymore. However, good luck of that happening, since the U.S. has already tried to ban alcohol once and it failed miserably.

bpcliu

Posted Yesterday, 10:15 AM **New!**

Since alcohol is not an illegal substance in the US, it would violate the rights of alcohol producing companies to deny them of a spot on TV. The same logic can be used for junk foods that create high levels of fat and cholesterol: they are not good for you, so should they be banned on TV?

abenak

Posted Yesterday, 1:00 PM **New!**

disagree. for the same main reasons as the previous. i dont believe you should be able to single out alcohol from using commercials to sell their products. this would make the marketing of new products very hard for alcohol companies to do, i don't know about you, but i am always up for another choice in the liquor store.

mikaml

Posted Yesterday, 4:56 PM **New!**

i also disagree. i agree with all the other points made that alcohol commercials should not be banned.

mlicata

Posted Yesterday, 5:21 PM **New!**

I disagree. There are far worse things to get off of TV than alcohol. Besides the types of alcohol that appear on TV are usually middle to upper brands. Not the choice of underage drinkers or transients.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 6:52 PM **New!**

I disagree. Every company has a right to advertise their products on television if they have the money for it.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Heather Panian- Thesis #2

hmp5

Posted Yesterday, 9:17 AM **New!**

Regulations should be enstated that discourage or limit single women from engaging in the process of vitro fertilization.

hmp5

Posted Yesterday, 9:25 AM **New!**

Sorry guys... it's In-Vitro* Fertilization-

Regulations should be enstated that discourage or limit single women from engaging in the process of vitro

fertilization.

mikami

Posted Yesterday, 5:34 PM New!

i just think that the selection of certain people to have this operation should be thoroughly checked against a criteria that match a person who can best take care of the child.

mproctor

Posted Yesterday, 5:35 PM New!

I disagree. Single women may have good reasons to have in-vitro fertilization. For example, they might be widowed or have reservations about getting married/being in a relationship. Plus, plenty of single women get pregnant by accident. This way at least the woman is making a choice.

bpcliu

Posted Yesterday, 5:40 PM New!

I disagree. If married couples do not have to ask for permission to have kids, why should single women? Whether or not a person wants children is her choice.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 5:42 PM New!

I agree. Giving a birth maintains a true meaning when a man and a woman consented to have a their baby. Single women's children born by in-vitro fertilization will be in trouble after knowing the fact that they are not the one from the love between their mother and father.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 6:00 PM **New!**

I agree. I think there is nothing more important than a child being raised having both a mother and father.

abenak

Posted Yesterday, 6:51 PM **New!**

disagree. if a single woman chooses to do this its her business, not mine.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Marian Proctor's thesis #2

mproctor

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:34 PM **New!**

Smoking should be banned inside public places and workplaces, including bars.

mikaml

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:44 PM **New!**

i agree. smoking is a nasty habit that should be banned from places where a lot of people congregate.

droppd

Posted Yesterday, 9:14 AM New!

Yes, and as you can see by the recent law against smoking, the majority of the public also believe so. If someone wants to smoke, fine, but do not hurt other people in the process. While smokers may argue that it is their right to smoke, it is our right to breath clean air.

atg3

Posted Yesterday, 9:16 AM New!

Yes I agree. I think Washington state already has that in place.

Andrea True-Garcia

bpcliu

Posted Yesterday, 9:57 AM New!

I agree. Second hand smoke is just as deadly as first hand. A smoking ban may not reduce the number of smokers, but at least it protects the health of those who do not engage in such an activity.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 5:26 PM New!

I agree. Medical scientists reported that intake indirect smoking is much more danger than direct smokers. So, it should be banned.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 6:43 PM New!

I agree. If it weren't for the smoking ban I would neve go to the bar. Cigarettes smell so disgusting.

abenak

Posted Yesterday, 6:48 PM **New!**

agree. this already is in effect in washington, every state should adopt some form of this law.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Jeongha Kim's thesis #2

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 1:50 AM **New!**

The U.S should establish a law which determines what is unnecessarily published new edition of a book to punish any publishing company which attempts to gain improper profits by publishing a new edition at much more expensive price after changing just a little bit from the previous edition (changing few pictures, design of the book...).

droppd

Posted Yesterday, 8:48 AM **New!**

Oh my god, YES!!! Unfortunately, I don't believe that the UW has that kind of authority, but they can choose not to make that book the required textbook, or deny a certain professor's request for that same book. I am sick of the tricks that publishing companies and authors use to make an old book new. You should probably research some of the known "tricks" that they use to drive prices higher (e.g. hardcovers, CD's, slightly new text, etc.). But make sure that your sources are credible.

bpcliu

Posted Yesterday, 10:26 AM **New!**

I think that law would actually violate the constitution.

However, the idea that teachers are not allowed to request for new additions, unless there are dramatic changes, should be considered.

mikaml

Posted Yesterday, 5:09 PM New!

i agree. having to purchase the newest edition of a book always makes it more expensive for us students. Sometimes they only have one new section in it. But there are always books like in the science fields that always need to be updated because new information has been revealed.

mlicata

Posted Yesterday, 5:15 PM New!

I agree. It's a great idea but I'm worried about support and where you plan on getting it from.

abenak

Posted Yesterday, 5:36 PM New!

agree. i think you need to reword and refocus your claim a bit with what has previously been posted, but it is a great idea.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 6:41 PM New!

I disagree. These publishing companies are private businesses and should not be regulated on what products they choose to release. Should apple be prevented from releasing new models of ipods?

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

Heather Panian- Thesis #1

hmp5

Posted Yesterday, 8:51 AM **New!**

Extended assistance and care for the homeless, beyond temporary shelter is lacking.

droppd

Posted Yesterday, 8:56 AM **New!**

That I will agree with, but this statement leads me to question how this will be funded. I don't believe that taxpayers will support government funding for the homeless, but not 100% sure on that.

atg3

Posted Yesterday, 9:17 AM **New!**

I agree with that. However where could money come from. Private sources? I don't believe our tax payer dollars can be stretched much further.

Andrea True-Garcia

bpcliu

Posted Yesterday, 9:53 AM **New!**

Instead of providing long term housing, which could encourage homeless individuals to remain homeless without making efforts to initiate change, I think it would be more wise to suggest free seminars, workshops, or related programs to help the homeless get back on their own two feet. I think people would be more open to paying tax dollars for that.

jhk86

Posted Yesterday, 4:51 PM **New!**

I disagree. Being a homeless isy not only society's reponsibility but also their own fault. So, U.S governmnet try to offer a chance to be a normal citizens who own their family and home. To do that, offer a chance of education and temporary shelter is enough.

mikaml

Posted Yesterday, 5:02 PM **New!**

I agree. however i also think that the funding issue would be a problem and i think that some people would take advantage if all things were given freely. We would have to create some program to help these people get back to supporting themselves.

abenak

Posted Yesterday, 6:04 PM **New!**

disagree. i believe many homeless, not all but many, dont help themselves get back on their own feet. they just want a free ride through and dont care to better their own situations. society does a lot for these people, maybe its not enough but maybe they should take more responsibility upon themselves. if something was to be done i agree with what bpcliu said.

esw6

Posted Yesterday, 6:38 PM **New!**

I disagree. These people should take more responsibility for themselves. There are other areas that are in more need of tax payer dollars.

YOUR NAME:

YOUR REPLY:

