Teen Privileges

burghm

Posted Yesterday, 11:33 AM -- edited Yesterday, 12:08 PM by burghm

Teenagers should earn privileges, drivers licenses for example, rather than just being given to them because they reach a certain age.

toriq

Posted Yesterday, 11:54 AM

In my oppinion, teens do have to earn privilages, such as drivers license, by going to drivers education and passing a driving test. They also need to earn the trust of their parents to be allowed to drive.

kylyo

Posted Yesterday, 1:05 PM

I agree with the above post. Taking a test and doing a class is earning their license. What did you have in mind?

tns2

Posted Yesterday, 2:21 PM

I think this topic is rather broad. Will you be focusing on the privilege of driver licenses, or is that just one topic? Narrow your thesis.

jdunn08

Posted Yesterday, 2:23 PM

Do you mean like have good grades, etc? I agree with the idea that teenagers should earn it, but, like the
first two posts, I feel like they already do. I think it would be hard to define a system with more standards.

---

### hfoskett

**Posted Yesterday, 7:06 PM New!**

I think you have a good idea in mind with making the youth earn privileges rather than just being given them, but I think you need to flesh out your idea a little more.

---

### sci3

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

This is an interesting choice - I'm not sure your audience would really relate to this, or be passionate about this.

---

### awang93

**Posted Today, 2:12 PM New!**

You thesis is kinda broad. what are the standards for students who earn more privileges than others? Who is in charge of making those decisions? Narrow it down to specific privilege you want to focus on.

---

**YOUR NAME:**

**YOUR REPLY:**
"Life without parole is a reasonable alternative to the death penalty."

I disagree. Capital punishment is justice being served. I think this is an extension of victimization, which is occurring more and more today. Victimization is when people basically sympathize with the criminal because they can "justify" their actions.

I disagree with your thesis. The death penalty is appropriate for those who have conducted immoral crimes. The idea is that the punishment should be based on the crime. Therefore, I believe giving someone life without parole who have conducted an immoral crime wouldn't be justified.

strongly disagree. It is more expensive to house the convict than it is to execute. And these expenses come straight out of the tax payers pockets. Do you want to pay more more taxes to so a murderer can live?
I disagree, when a criminal is put in a place where they basically get free education, free meals and free housing (I understand not always comfortable) for life, I dont think there is any justice being done.

thatguy6

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:48 PM New!
In theory it sounds good. I hate to jump on the bandwagon but it would be very expensive

daharris

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:50 PM New!
I agree. A good point you may try and work into your essay is that lets say someone is given the death penalty and Killed. Then later we find out he didn't commit the murder, so an innocent person was murdered.

rscott16

Posted Yesterday, 10:30 PM New!
I disagree i feel the punishment should fit the crime that was commited

jmvan

Posted Today, 10:23 AM New!
agree, life in prison would be pretty crappy, so long as it is made sure that it is crappy, and they don’t get all sorts of luxuries.

sci3

Posted Today, 1:52 PM New!
but the problem is that we pay SO much money to keep people "rotting" in prison. the tax payers, which is all of us, should have a problem with this. But I do not agree with the death penalty.
I agree I think, someone else had a similar topic.

I agree, from the little I know about it. We should make the biggest effort to reduce pollution if we are the biggest contributor.

I agree. As the heaviest polluter and as the world super power, we should take responsibility for our actions. Our environment is worth more than making money for big businesses.

I'm not sure what the Kyoto protocol entails, but I do agree that the U.S. needs to recognize and take action against global warming.

I agree. While I do question some of the findings about global warming, I really think we'd be way better off reducing our country's footprint on the environment.
i have no knowledge on this topic

cwm10

i disagree. the kyoto protocol is too restricting and could penalize our economy. there are other ways to improve our situation without committing to kyoto

awang93

I agree, as far as I know, the U.S. and Australia are the only 2 countries who need to ratify the Kyoto Protocol, but have not ratified it. So I think we should really do something about it

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Ryan Scott thesis 2

rscott16

The legal drinking aged should be lowered from 21
daharris

Posted Yesterday, 12:42 AM New!
I can go both ways with this age 18 no. Maybe an age like 20.

whitleet

Posted Yesterday, 12:44 AM New!
I honestly am not sure I care a whole lot about this. Like daharris I don't really see a problem either way. Except that 18 is too young since it's still in highschool.

kylyo

Posted Yesterday, 12:14 PM New!
I disagree, there is no benefit in drinking and younger kids would abuse it.

toriq

Posted Yesterday, 12:16 PM New!
I think no lower than 19 bc 18 year olds are still in highschool and will buy alcohol for class mates, making it even more accessable to kids as young as 13.

hfoskett

Posted Yesterday, 9:10 PM New!
I agree, if we can send people off to war at 18, they should be able to pick up a six pack.

jmvan
agree, first of all, I was out of highschool at 18, also I know alot of people who are friends with 21 year olds at an age lower than 18, but maybe thats a small town thing. finally, we can vote and die fighting at 18, we should be able to drink. when I turned 18 I started drinking alot because I was able to, now, being 20, I don't actually drink that much anymore. I think thats a pattern at any age, once you are able to drink, you do because its been taboo, or maybe still is. once you have been able to for awhile it becomes just another thing.

yeah, I don't really think about this. I'm 21 so it doesn't effect me, but it might be of concern to other people

The federal government should take global warming seriously.
I agree 100% our government really doesn't take it seriously. We are just leaving a huge whole in our O Zone for future generations to deal with. There is so much they can be doing right now but I think they figure it's not their problem.

whitleet

I'm not sure if there will be a whole lot of people that will disagree with you on this statement... a way to get mixed views would be to add something to your thesis stating what the government should do to take global warming seriously.

kylyo

I agree. Narrow it done by saying one or two specific ways they could narrow it down.

hfoskett

I don't really know enough about this to say anything useful.

awang93

I agree, but can you specify the changes or actions the gov. should take? This statement is too broad, but a good direction though.
I agree, but can you specify the changes the government should make? I feel this statement is too broad.

I agree, but I think your thesis is too broad.

I think this needs to be more specific...

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Casey's Thesis # 1

caseyn3
The US should enforce stricter vehicle fuel emission policies.

I agree. I think a good argument along these lines is saying that more diesel fuel cars should be made because they get better gas mileage and emissions are less damaging.

I agree. Even though it might be an expensive move at first, I feel like it would force automotive technology (etc.) to become less damaging to the environment, in such a way that it would be available to everyone, instead of really rich people.

I agree, a solution needs to be started sooner or later. Echoing "jdunn08," cost may be an issue at first, but it needs to be done.

I agree, cutting down on man made pollution is always a good idea.

I agree. However, I worry about how expensive this move will be. Then again, there needs to be a change and if it means less pollution to the environment then I'm all for it.
This is a good topic by the way!

cwm10  
Posted Yesterday, 6:14 PM New!
i don't really know why we should enforce a policy. my car works with the gas it has, how could it be better? i am interested and am unfamiliar with the topic.

awang93  
Posted Today, 12:27 PM New! 
I agree, we should definitely do something about the environment, enforce a stricter policy would help.

sci3  
Posted Today, 1:40 PM New!  
Good topic idea, I agree

YOUR NAME:  
YOUR REPLY:

Informative #2

cwm10  
Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:06 AM New!  
The Light Rail is not economical and a waste of the tax payers dollars.
whitleet

Posted Jan 10, 2007 3:44 PM New!
I disagree. I think that for how much traffic already exists in the surrounding areas that anything that will help minimize it should be invested in. Also the convenience is something that many people are willing to pay for.

thatguy6

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:03 PM New!
I disagree, its another mode of transportation which is needed. If it helps some of the traffic problem then it isn't a waste of tax payers dollars.

heygoa

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:56 PM New!
I disagree as well. Traffic is horrendous during rush hour so having the light rail will decrease traffic. I believe using the tax payers dollars for the light rail was a smart move!

daharris

Posted Yesterday, 12:31 AM New!
Disagree, I don't really think anyone cares.

kylyo

Posted Yesterday, 12:05 PM New!
I disagree. I went to Melbourne Australia where it is highly integrated into the city and it is awesome. No traffic, you can get anywhere very easily, and it is cheap.

toriq

Posted Yesterday, 1:05 PM New!
I think that the light rail has wasted money in how it has been executed, but Seattle does some form of public transportation. Traffic is ridiculous and we are not keeping up with other major metropolitan areas

**tns2**

*Posted Yesterday, 2:17 PM New!*

I agree with "toriq" in that the light rail has wasted money up to this point, but that Seattle is in need of some other means of transportation. Traffic is ridiculous, and wastes everyone's time. We need to find something of a solution.

**jdunn08**

*Posted Yesterday, 2:30 PM New!*

I disagree with the thesis. It would be amazing to have a light rail network in Seattle. I think it would be a good means of planning for the future growth of the city.

**hfoskett**

*Posted Yesterday, 5:09 PM New!*

I agree, it will not get used enough to be worth the cost.

**caseyn3**

*Posted Yesterday, 5:15 PM New!*

I disagree. I think that the bringing it to Seattle would make traffic better since it is so bad and something needs to be done about it.

**awang93**

*Posted Today, 12:15 PM New!*

I disagree. The traffic in Seattle is terrible, and as the
population grows, I think light rail is an alternative for Seattle.

sci3

Posted Today, 1:38 PM New!
I agree with the above statement, however I woiuld be curious to see your point of view

YOUR NAME: YOUR REPLY:

Jordan VanWyhe's Thesis #2

jmvan

Posted Yesterday, 11:10 AM New!
Flag burning should not have a negative bias against it, raising a flag in a way in which it is damaged should.

toriq

Posted Yesterday, 11:57 AM New!
? I do not understanding what you are saying. Are you saying that there is nothing wrong with flag burning, but that you shouldn't be able to damage a flag in another way. What is the difference?

klyyo

Posted Yesterday, 1:03 PM New!
I am a little confused as well.
I don't know what you mean either. I think that it's ok that flag-burning has a negative bias.

I think most people are against flag burning. I don't know how controversial this topic would be. Were you thinking that raising the flag in a way to bring damage to it was intentional? If so, I think this is odd. Flag burning is most often intentional v. making a mistake raising a flag (why should this one be worse?)

If the topic is whether or not we should be able to burn the flag, I believe it should be illegal to burn. If someone tried to burn a cross or a stack of books, no one would say that they are exercising freedom of speech, so why is it ok with our nation's symbol?

I don't really have much of an opinion because I'm not sure that issues concerning our flag has much affect on my current life and other current affairs. I don't think that it's okay to burn a flag but I'm not sure there would be a lot on this issue to talk much about. Maybe be more specific about what you want to talk about if you are leaning towards this thesis.

not really following what you are trying to say. I couldn't really put a sentence, sorry for the lack of help.
I am kinda confused here. Can you clarify? However, I don't think this topic is controversial enough, because I don't think there is a rational reason for flag burning.

I think flag burning is controversial, so this has potential to be good, but I'm confused as to what you mean?

My other thesis may be something like this...Seattle Restaurants should ban the use of trans fats because trans fats have been linked with heart disease.

I agree. I think more restaurants use it then people think and most people do not understand the harm they do. I think it would be difficult to come up with a good thesis from this for your first speech.
I agree. I believe that the public is unaware of how harmful the use of trans fats are. If restaurants can ban the use of msg then they can most certainly ban the use of trans fat.

yeah it causes disease, but so does a bunch of other things. something unique would help accent your case. i don't really know what the affects are but naming a single affect limits the material that you have to talk about. instead talk about maybe the most significant health issues that may arise.

yeah I think it would be easier to expand upon if you left the effects to a broader range. You could definitely use that as one of your main arguments though.

i agree but when i go out to eat the last thing on my mind is how much transfat is in something, then again im no that big of a health buff

disagree, why seattle? Thats going to bring down the seattle economy considering its a college town. People will find away to get it, so there really isn't any use unless you ban it from the whole country.
toriq

Posted Yesterday, 1:20 PM New!
i don't find this topic that interesting plus we already talked about it in class

tns2

Posted Yesterday, 1:41 PM New!
I disagree. While trans fats obviously can lead to heart complications, it's ultimately up to the customer to decide what goes into their body. I think this argument is correlated to the teenagers who sued McDonald's for becoming fat. If you don't like the effects of unhealthy substances such as trans fats, then don't eat it.

tns2

Posted Yesterday, 1:42 PM -- edited Yesterday, 1:48 PM by tns2 New!
I also don't know how controversial this topic would be. Would you have enought information to cover all three topics?

tns2

Posted Yesterday, 1:43 PM -- edited Yesterday, 1:51 PM by tns2 New!
Deleted

jdunn08

Posted Yesterday, 2:37 PM New!
I disagree with the thesis. It should be people's responsibility to monitor their food intake. If restaurants want to offer more foods without trans fat, it's their own decision. Plus it will cost them financially to do so.
hfoskett

Posted Yesterday, 4:44 PM New!
i disagree, it's a person's own responsibility to keep themselves from eating foods that are unhealthy.

caseyn3

Posted Yesterday, 5:05 PM New!
I disagree. I think that people will find a way to get it. I'm not that big on health issues either so I don't really understand the overall negative effect of trans fats on one's body. I don't think that this is a topic that would be very controversial to do this assignment on though.

awang93

Posted Today, 11:58 AM New!
i disagree. Ban the use of trans fat is just not the way to prevent people from unhealthy eating habits. However, I think restaurants should provide nutrition facts.

awang93

Posted Today, 11:59 AM New!
i disagree. Ban the use of trans fat is just not the way to prevent people from unhealthy eating habits. However, I think restaurants should provide nutrition facts.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Jocelyn Dunn's Thesis idea #2
jdunn08

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:15 PM New!

The US should have universal health care.

(but would quality decrease? Is there a trade-off between quality and quantity?)

daharris

Posted Yesterday, 12:20 AM New!

I agree, someone else picked this topic too. I think there is to many other things to consider. What if the sickness was caused by them being on drugs?

whitleet

Posted Yesterday, 12:57 AM New!

is there a trade-off between quality and quantity? I honestly would rather have more people able to recieve care than 20 extra unnecesssary minutes tacked on to my appointment.

kylyo

Posted Yesterday, 12:25 PM New!

I don't know. I really don't think it is feasible.

toriq

Posted Yesterday, 12:28 PM New!

i think this is an excellent question (obviously since I chose it as well.) the biggest problem with this question is that about 4 people chose this topic, so, as it is a controversial issue there seems to be a consensus in the class

hfoskett
I disagree. Once health care become universalized, the general quality will diminish. That is why Canadians come across the border to American doctors so frequently.

While that's an interesting secondary subject you brought up, I still agree that it would be a plus. Though the point of being on drugs causing sickness is a good point too, lots of facets in this one.

this is a good topic. I think quality would decrease, however this country is in a health care crisis and millions of Americans are not covered.

Intelligent design (creation) should be taught in schools instead of Darwin's theory of evolution.
cwm10

Posted Jan 10, 2007 12:22 PM New!
this is a very personal subject to approach. you'll have plenty of controversy to deal with and handful and plenty of attention. but controlling a group of college minds that have already formulated their opinions on this subject may be a difficult task.

whitleet

Posted Jan 10, 2007 3:42 PM New!
I'm not sure there will be so many people that will want creation to replace darwin's theory but I think the controversy over whether or not either should be taught in schools is a good question to look at.

thatguy6

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:01 PM New!
there is definite controversy to the topic, but im not sure how much interest an audience would have.

heygoa

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:59 PM New!
I really don't know much about this topic. However I would have to disagree. I don't think we should just replace the theory of evolution. Maybe as a compromise, both topics can be taught.

daharris

Posted Yesterday, 12:24 AM New!
I agree in a sense, but I also disagree, you can't really teach intelligent design. It's more of a faith thing.
rscott16

I don’t think that it should be taught instead of Darwin’s theory but maybe in addition to.

jmvan

disagree. it might be argued that it can be taught in addition, but definitely not to replace it.

sci3

there is concrete evidence that evolution exists...things you simply can not argue

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Kyle Young’s Thesis: #2

kylyo

Relativism should not be taught in the University classroom.

cwm10
I don't agree. It is the job of the University to teach unbiasedly. No matter what truth that theory may hold, it is the responsibility of the UW to teach us about it.

I'm not sure you will have too many people agree with you on this...at the college level I think everyone is mature enough for it to have a significant effect on them. Also when attending college these are the things you come to expect to learn about.

I disagree, if you don't like what is being taught your not forced to take the class. that is an option that you have, nothing is forced upon you.

Not sure, are you talking about all forms of relativism?

not sure don't really have an opinion on it
disagree, college students are mature enough to accept learning about it and not take it on as their own belief.

sci3

I do not agree with this topic and also think it is a poor topic choice.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Alisha Heygood's Thesis 1

"Women should have the right to choose if she wants an abortion"

kylyo

I disagree. Over 47 million babies have been killed in abortions. My girlfriend is a nurse and she said during later stage abortions the baby will squirm when stuck with a needle because it feels pain. People should not be able to "chose" to do that.

cwm10
agree. sort of. i think that this is a very touchy situation. there is always going to be a scenario that puts doubt in my mind. you'll have to be very strong with your position.

whitleet

I agree. No one has the right to decide what is best for you except for you. Also if you are looking at the physical health of the mother it is actually safer for a woman to have an abortion than to carry the child through pregnancy.

thatguy6

Yes and no. The father should have some say in it as well because he will have to support and take care of the child as well, but on the other hand he doesn't have to deal with the pregnancy.

daharris

I'm gonna have to disagree considering one of my topics is anti abortion. I just think it murder.

rscott16

i agree in some situations. its a really touchy subject tho

jmvan

agree for 1st or early 2nd trimester abortions. By the way, its possible to activate nerve endings such that your muscles twitch, it can easily be done with a needle and is
typically fairly painless, so just because something 'squirms' doesn't mean that is feeling 'pain'. Then you could also get into a lot of philosophy and talk about at what time something becomes conscious, or maybe the definition of pain. Also if you choose this as your topic PLEASE don't quote a whole lot of numbers and statistics, they don't mean much.

sci3

Posted Today, 11:02 AM New!

I totally agree with jmvan- some great points. Women have to have the choice to get an abortion or not- this is America and it is the year 2006, women have rights. Not only is it unconstitutional to tell a woman she has no say in this, it's un-American.

YOUR NAME:             YOUR REPLY:

KC Cowen's thesis #1
cowenk

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:03 PM New!

The University of Washington's admission office should not adopt the proposed new application.

daharris

Posted Yesterday, 12:38 AM New!

I'm not sure what position to take on this, what is the new application? How is this controversial?
whitleet

Posted Yesterday, 12:47 AM New!
yeah id have to ask the same question. I dont know what proposed application your refering to.

kylyo

Posted Yesterday, 12:12 PM New!
Never heard about it. I would say I would agree...the one I filled out was pretty good.

toriq

Posted Yesterday, 12:18 PM New!
ditto to everyone else

hfoskett

Posted Yesterday, 9:04 PM New!
i dont know anything about the new app, so I can't say anything useful

jmvan

Posted Today, 10:39 AM New!
no idea what this proposed new application is

sci3

Posted Today, 10:53 AM New!
No idea what the proposed new application is...

YOUR NAME:  

YOUR REPLY:
toriq

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:12 PM New!

The United States should have socialized health care.

daharris

Posted Yesterday, 12:15 AM New!

I agree, but I think this is hard to implement.

whitleet

Posted Yesterday, 1:14 AM New!

I agree. good topic, there is a lot of controversy and questions surrounding it.

kylyo

Posted Yesterday, 12:45 PM New!

I don't know much about this.

cwm10

Posted Yesterday, 7:37 PM New!

I love the idea, but how on earth can we finance. aren't we already in a huge debt and pumping more money into Iraq?
I agree but again I worry about the cost if the US does have socialized health care.

I don't really know that much about this subject.

I think this is a good topic. The problem is if health care is universal the quality of care would do down.

I agree. However I don't think that it will ever happen. There are so many aspects to take into consideration with this topic. It would be interesting and very controversial.

I agree. It must be possible since other countries are doing it. Obviously, there is a lot of opposition but I think it would be a better way to improve the nation's quality of life than some of the other ideas.

I agree. Good topic since it's controversial. But it's kinda an Utopian idea. The cost is huge, and I've heard there are countries who have universal health care have huge debts on health care.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your Name</th>
<th>Your Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| jmvang | Posted Today, 10:09 AM New!  
i agree, and most people probably would, not many are going to say NO i want some people to pay more for medical treatment than me! grrrr. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alisha Heygood's Thesis 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| heygoa | Posted Jan 9, 2007 7:45 PM -- edited Jan 10, 2007 6:38 PM by heygoa  
"All types of racial profiling is still an issue in America and the government should do something about it." For example, adopt a policy to address the issue. |

| kylas | Posted Jan 9, 2007 8:03 PM New!  
I really don't know what I think. I do think that would be a good topic. |

| Whitleet | Posted Jan 10, 2007 3:52 PM New!  
I think you would have to expand on that a little, what kind of racial profiling are you talking about? in the workplace, courtroom, schools? Im not sure I understand what you mean. |
thatguy6

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:10 PM New!
i see what your saying but it would be very hard to enforce this and how would it really work. profiling is something that is done on people's own free will in their own heads.

daharris

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:57 PM New!
I think it's an issue but I think you should word your thesis a little better.

rscott16

Posted Yesterday, 11:09 PM New!
I don't really understand your thesis that well but it is an issue that could be talked about

jmvan

Posted Today, 10:05 AM New!
probably a good topic, but i agree with everyone else, reword it, make it a bit more specific. however I imagine I might disagree with where you are going with it. it depends on how the policy is worded, just to limit negative racial profiling and not give any extra benefits.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

KC Cowen's thesis #2
cowenk

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:07 PM New!
The US should not lower the drinking age from 21.

daharris

Posted Yesterday, 12:35 AM New!
I agree, I think people who are still in high school shouldn't be able to drink

whitleet

Posted Yesterday, 12:39 AM New!
I agree. If you have even a few highschool students who 18 it would just be that much easier for younger highschool students to get alcohol.

kylyo

Posted Yesterday, 12:06 PM New!
I agree, I think it would create a lot of problems.

toriq

Posted Yesterday, 12:11 PM New!
i think this isnt the best topic since we already talked about it in class. I would advocate an age of 19 or above. about 25%of all alcohol drinken in the US is by minors. If the age were 18 there would be high school kids who would buy for younger students which would increase even younger drinking

rscott16
I think 19 or above would be good but 18 wouldn't be good cause they are still in high school

Disagree, we can vote and die but we can't drink? Also, having been able to drink since I've been 18 I can vouch that yes there was an influx of drinking when I was first enabled to drink, but nowadays I don't drink much. (I'm still 20) I think that probably happens at whichever age you start drinking. The whole taboo thing.

Intelligent design should be taught alongside evolution in the classroom.

Intelligent design is the idea that we were created by an intelligent Being instead of evolving. Teaching both ideas would concede that some people don't believe in evolution because of their religious beliefs. The monotheistic religions (Judaism, Islam, Christianity) fall into a category whose creation story does not fit with evolution.
I agree, but intelligent design is more faith based, it would give students a better perspective on what is out there though.

whitleet

I think the reason that teaching evolution is relevant in schools is because of the science behind it. There would be no reason to teach intelligent design unless it is relevant to a class, which the only one I can think of would be in a literature class or something to that nature. but it should not be taught just for the sole reason that evolution is.

kyiyo

I agree. There is a lot of science to back it up.

awang93

I agree. I think it's ok to teach both ideas in school, because this way the student can have a chance to know the other perspective regardless what they religious views are.

jmvan

disagree, you or your children can learn that topic elsewhere.
hugh foskett's thesis #1

hfoskett

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:54 PM New!
Is the death penalty immoral and should it be banned?

thatguy6

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:15 PM New!
i feel a punishment should reflect the crime done. i like the topic very relevant and controversial

heygoa

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:41 PM New!
I think the death penalty shouldn't be banned. I believe that the punishment should fit the crime. For example, I think those that have committed numerous first degree murders should deserve the death penalty.

daharris

Posted Yesterday, 12:26 AM New!
I agree, but you don't sound like your sure about what your saying. Is you thesis a question or do you firmly believe that.

whitleet
this is more like a question than a statement, but honestly i'm not sure i'd call it immoral, its a punishment that has been used for thousands of years and i think it gets the job done. Those who have committed multiple murders no longer have the ability to.

kylyo

I think it should not be banned.
toriq

This isn't a thesis statement. You need to pick a side.

jdunn08

I don't think it should be banned, I think that it is appropriate for a person who has plotted and then committed multiple murders.
tns2

I'm against the death penalty. I don't think we have the right to say if someone should live or not.
caseyn3

I am against the death penalty. I don't believe that taking a life can be justified no matter what that
person does. It is also racist a black person is three times more likely to be sentenced to the death penalty than a white person for the same crime committed.

**cwm10**

*Posted Yesterday, 6:29 PM New!*

I am not really a fan of the death penalty, it's unmoral and I don't see how it can offer resolution those affected the crimes. I think it is more of lesson to be put in a small box for the rest of their lives.

**sci3**

*Posted Yesterday, 8:02 PM New!*

This is a good topic. I think main problem with the death penalty is that many people are wrongly convicted, and this is horrible.

**rscott16**

*Posted Yesterday, 8:25 PM New!*

I don't think the death penalty should be banned the punishment should fit the crime

**jmvan**

*Posted Today, 9:32 AM New!*

I think being locked in prison your whole life is a pretty crappy life, death might be a nice release but I don't really have an opinion on this other than that.

**YOUR NAME:**

**YOUR REPLY:**
hugh foskett's thesis #2

hfoskett

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:55 PM New!

Should intelligent design be taught along with evolution in our public school system?

heygoa

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:43 PM New!

I really don't have an opinion for this. I don't know or think too much about this issue and I think it doesn't matter if it is taught in our school or not.

daharris

Posted Yesterday, 12:34 AM New!

I agree in away, but intelligent design is based on more faith than fact, evolution is more theory and some fact. It's hard to teach about, let's say god if they don't teach the bible as well.

whitleet

Posted Yesterday, 12:42 AM New!

I think the reason that teaching evolution is relevent in schools is because of the science behind it. There would be no reason to teach intelligent design unless it is relevent to a class, which the only one I can think of would be in a literature class or something to that nature. but it should not be taught just for the sole reason that evolution is.
I agree, intelligent design is not only based on faith, I also think it takes faith to believe in evolution because it is a theory. There is a lot of Science behind creation. Don't take my topic!

I didn't go to highschool in Washington, but in California you must discuss both sides of the topic. Because of the separation of church and state and the fact that it is taught in biology class, evolution is covered much more in depth. Intelegent design, by law, must at least be acknowledged. I dont see why people who want this taught in school are the ones who already know the theory. Why would you need to learn something you already know

I think they should be taught together in schools

I agree. Teaching both ideas gives students a chance to understand both side of story as long as the schools dont emphasize on the Intelligent design too much, because to me , the intelligent design is more faith based.

disagree, there is a place for that if you want your children to learn it.
or if you want to learn it for yourself

ToQuyen Nguyen’s thesis #2

The internet should be more tightly regulated by the government to ensure the security of its users.

I agree to much identity fraud.

Absolutely! there is not enough education or good parenting out there to keep children safe on the internet. excellent topic!
I agree. It would be difficult though and I am sure money would be one of the big issues to discuss.

toriq

I disagree. I don't believe in censorship. It is still technically illegal to not allow freedom of speech or press even though the current government is trying to change this through the patriot act.

rscott16

I agree for the fact to try and keep children safe on the internet.

jmvan

disagree, it would be too hard of a project to undertake without a worldwide unified government, and even if we did too many people would be pissed about it. Children being safe.. well, I think that's a parenting problem and having been one of those 'unsafe' children I can confidently tell you that I'm ok with it. Identity theft however is a pretty serious matter, if there is something we can do to eradicate that I say go for it.
Dorthya's thesis topic # 1

**daharris**

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:19 PM **New!**

Affirmative action should be implemented in our higher education school systems.

**whitleet**

Posted Yesterday, 1:11 AM **New!**

I'm pretty sure it already is implemented in a lot of universities but you could use something about how it should remain in use.

**kylyo**

Posted Yesterday, 12:37 PM **New!**

I don't any opinion/knowledge of this.

**toriq**

Posted Yesterday, 12:41 PM **New!**

I think this is a good topic because I am torn between both sides. I think that affirmative action was an excellent idea initially to give minorities an opportunity to level out the playing field. I do not think that everyone is currently given the same opportunities, but we are getting closer. Reinstalling Affirmative action allows for complaints of "reverse racism"
I don't really have an opinion for this one. It's controversial and relevant. But I don't think the affirmative action is carrying out by university admission nowadays. It's true that the affirmative action is one reason when they consider the admission, but they lean more towards the performance and ability of the students, not base on their race.

jmvan

Posted Today, 9:18 AM New!

I'm pretty sure they already do, and I don't think more steps need to be taken, as someone quasi-mentioned already, I know more asian/hispanic/black people that are more racist towards white people than I typically see directed back at them, and you can quote me salary polls all day, my opinion won't change.

 YOUR NAME:  

 YOUR REPLY:  

Taylor Simpson's Thesis #2

tns2

Posted Jan 9, 2007 5:12 PM New!

"Smoking should be banned in public places."

kylyo

Posted Jan 9, 2007 7:45 PM New!

I completely agree. I don't think many will disagree with you!
I'm against smoking so I strongly agree with you. Secondly, second-hand smoking causes lung cancer so it wouldn't be fair to those who don't smoke to be exposed to smoking.

I think that this is very relative to our public today. A lot of people smoke socially but are limited to certain public places. You should have plenty of interest from the audience, I would approach smoking in the bar if you were looking for something more specific.

I completely agree... I would even say that smoking should be banned anywhere where children might be present even if this includes the privacy of their own home, cars, etc. Violators should be turned in and punished.

Yes it should. Very relative. I agree fully.

I agree, there is no reason why people need to be out making fools of themselves. That law would not only protect the drinker but the rest of the people around them.
I agree, but I don't think this is very controversial. There are already so many laws limiting where one may smoke, this is pretty much already in action.

jdunn08

I agree, but there's a ton of people who smoke, so I don't know if it will ever happen.

hfoskett

I disagree, let smokers smoke. Last I heard, there is still no evidence that connects second hand smoke to causing cancer in non-smokers. Of course, I could be horrifically misinformed, in which case, no one has the right to cause direct harm to others.

caseyn3

I disagree. I think that there are so many restrictions on smoking that the very limited places people can still smoke shouldn't bother non-smokers that much. If a non-smoker doesn't want to breathe in the smoke then they shouldn't go around the places where the smokers are allowed to do so.

awang93

I agree, and I think this topic is not too controversial. There are not many counterarguments for this topic, this might be a little difficult for you when you do your informative speech.

jmvan
agreed, stinky habit that. and as for all the limitations that are placed on smokers, a lot of them don't pay attention to the unenforced ones. My apt elevator probably smells like smoke right now.

**Angela's thesis statement #1**

awang93

**Posted Yesterday, 9:44 AM New!**

The U.S. should legally recognize same sex marriages

kylyo

**Posted Yesterday, 12:50 PM New!**

I disagree. I think the original purpose of marriage is family, not just love which is usually the argument for gay marriage.

Also, an argument is gay people should have equal rights. Straight people cannot marry the same sex, so everyone IS under the same laws. Even though I know that sounds weird do a search about it, it is a common point made.

toriq

**Posted Yesterday, 12:59 PM New!**

i agree. First and formost, gay couples should be able to share health insurance as married straight couples are allowed. Many people advocate a separate but equal policy,
this didn't was unethical when applied to African Americans why should it be allowed to be applied to gays. When people claim that the point of marriage is to produce children, where to couples not intending to have children fit in? should they not be allowed to marry? Lastly, many people have religious reasons against gay marriage. Where is the separation of church and state? So... basically I agree with you

jdunn08

Posted Yesterday, 2:58 PM New!

I disagree with the thesis, however I do think that church and state should be separated in this area: Gay couples (or anyone who is committing to be together) should be allowed to get the legal benefits that marriage today provides. I don't think they should be punished by the country for being gay. However, churches could perform their own ceremony for the marriages that they approve. So if a church doesn't want to perform gay marriages, then it's the church's decision. If it does, fine.

(well the idea made sense in my head, but when I wrote it out, it doesn't really...)

tns2

Posted Yesterday, 3:03 PM New!

I don't have a solid opinion on this thesis. I could be persuaded either way. My religion says that marriage was not intended to be between people of the same sex, but I have a hard time opposing this notion without religious support.

hfoskett

Posted Yesterday, 4:06 PM New!

I believe that gay couples should be allowed to receive all the benefits that married couples do, I'm just not a fan of re-defining marriage to included same sex relationships.
I agree. Same sex marriage is just recognizing the love between two people which the soul purpose of marriage to begin with. I don't believe that discriminating homosexual people by not allowing them to legally express their love and partnership is wrong in itself.

Give them the rights of married couples but let's not change the definition of marriage.

I agree, not because I feel strongly about it one way or another, but because I don't. I'm not gay and as long as I'm not hit on by some guy incessantly I don't particularly care what they do, it's their life who am I, or anyone else, to say they can't get married?

Penalties and consequences for juvenile delinquency should be stronger.
toriq

Posted Yesterday, 11:51 AM New!
I think you should be more specific as to what you think consequences should be. Are you advocating putting minors in prison?

kylyo

Posted Yesterday, 1:00 PM New!
I think I agree. Juvenile crime does seem to be on the rise, so I think something should be done. I think the focus should be on rehabilitating - not just putting them in prison.

jdunn08

Posted Yesterday, 2:48 PM New!
I don't know what the status is on punishment right now. But I'm all for more effort being put into penalties and rehabilitating.

tns2

Posted Yesterday, 3:12 PM New!
I don't know if punitive measures is the best solution. While I agree that juvenile crimes is an important issue, teens make mistakes...i don't know if having harsher punishments would get them back on the right track. Maybe some better counseling/treatment programs.

hfoskett

Posted Yesterday, 3:53 PM New!
I don't know anything about the consequences for juvenile delinquency, but I'm in agreement with the idea that we need to treat juvenile crimes with severity.

caseyn3
Posted Yesterday, 4:31 PM New!
I'm not really sure how to respond because I'm not really sure which delinquency laws you are referring to. Laws regarding drinking/drugging? or laws regarding driving? age limits? Maybe focus more on MIP laws or some specific delinquent act that should receive stronger punishment.

heygoa

Posted Yesterday, 4:35 PM New!
I don't really know what to say. I could go both ways with this statement. However, I think you could be more specific about the penalties and consequences so that could help your audience make a decision to agree/disagree.

awang93

Posted Today, 12:11 AM New!
I don't really know the current penalties for juvenile delinquency, I think you need to specify the penalties now and maybe emphasize on the consequences to persuade your audience.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

ToQuyen Nguyen’s Thesis #1

tqnguyen

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:48 PM New!
Fetal stem research on human embryos should be banned.
daharris

Posted Yesterday, 12:12 AM New!
I agree, it's almost like abortion.

whitleet

Posted Yesterday, 1:01 AM New!
I think there is too many details about this that I dont know enough about to have a position on this topic. Im sure there is plenty of controversy though!

kylyo

Posted Yesterday, 12:32 PM New!
I agree. I think this would be a very good topic.

toriq

Posted Yesterday, 12:52 PM New!
i disagree. I don't think people who advocate this understand the topic. I think you are prolife, but in the case of fetal stem cell research fetus' aren't being aborted specifically for research. These are fetus' aborted for other reasons that research is then being done on. Stem cells could an amazing source of cures for many diseases. No one is "prodeath" but if a fetus is aborted for some reason, there is no reason some good cant come out of it

jdunn08

Posted Yesterday, 3:11 PM New!
i agree. this is a very controversial topic and i think it is one that is very relevant to our generation because we will be making more decisions about it than the generations before us.
I don't know the details behind this topic, thus I don't really have an opinion.

Yea, sorry I'm no help to this topic either.

I disagree. I also think that the purpose of fetus stem cell research is beneficial to the health/medicine fields. The fetus' are not being made for this purpose they are used in the abortions already performed for other reason's hence pro-choice.

Sorry, I don't really know enough about this to comment.

Sorry, I don't know enough about this topic so I don't have an opinion on this one.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Username</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cwm10</td>
<td>Jan 10, 2007 10:47 AM <strong>New!</strong></td>
<td>Mark McGuire should be accepted into the Hall of Fame.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whitleet</td>
<td>Jan 10, 2007 3:50 PM <strong>New!</strong></td>
<td>False! I love that he wasn't accepted. It shows that at least some of the country has some moral expectations of sports players. We shouldn't glorify those who have not only set poor examples for the masses but cheated also. The hall of fame, like sports in this country, is something that we can all enjoy but it would be a shame to link his name with something that is meant to be used for the good of our country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whitleet</td>
<td>Jan 10, 2007 3:51 PM <strong>New!</strong></td>
<td>p.s. good topic! very current!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thatguy6</td>
<td>Jan 10, 2007 6:07 PM <strong>New!</strong></td>
<td>good topic. He was a good baseball player no matter what people say about steroids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heygoa</td>
<td>Jan 10, 2007 6:54 PM <strong>New!</strong></td>
<td>the issue that I have with this topic is that I don't think this topic relates to the whole audience. Not everyone watches baseball or may even not know who Mark McGuire is.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, I know who he is and I think even though he was a good player, he shouldn't be accepted into the hall of fame if he cheated his way there. He decided to use steroids so consequently, he lost his acceptance to the hall of fame.

daharris

*Posted Yesterday, 12:03 AM New!*  
I disagree, if the reason why he didn't get in is because of the whole steriod thing, but I don't know if this is a very good topic to discuss.

kylyo

*Posted Yesterday, 11:58 AM New!*  
I disagree. There has got to be an absolutes when it come to integrity in the sports arena. Steroids are against the rules of the game.

toriq

*Posted Yesterday, 12:04 PM New!*  
I think that this is a controversial topic that goes beyond this one person. It has to do with moral integrety. Should celebrities, politicians, and other public figures have to follow the law. I personally do not think that he should be allowed in the hall of fame. Whether he wants to be or not, as a pro athlete he is a role model for children. Not only has he let them down by cheating and using steroids, if he were let into the hall of fame he would be saying that these things are ok

awang93

*Posted Yesterday, 11:15 PM New!*  
This is a current and somehow controversial topic, but I don't think it's relevant to me. I am not a big fan of baseball, and I only know a little about McGuire. So I don't think it's not a topic that relates to the audience.
I thought he already was in the hall of fame, so I guess I truly know nothing about this topic.

hi guys, so I'm thinking I might do this thesis statement, I would love your feedback:

The United States should not adopt the Kyoto protocol because this would negatively effect the U.S. economy.

I don't know what this is, I did a quick search and my first reaction is I disagree.

I'm not that familiar with this topic but I would have to disagree with you because global warming in my opinion is an important issue. I think the United States should adopt this protocol to target the reduction of greenhouse
gases. I believe it would be more of a benefit to adopt it despite the claim effect of the U.S economy.

cwm10

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:50 AM* New!
i agree. the terms seem a bit futile and easy to manipulate. but i do believe that the untied states is responsible to take some sort of action to help the cause.

whitleet

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 3:45 PM* New!
I think this is a great topic! lots of information is out there are there is definately an international as well as national debate on this.

daharris

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:44 PM* New!
I'm really not sure what your topic means a 100%, but if it is what I think it is I agree.

jdunn08

*Posted Yesterday, 2:13 PM* New!
It is a little vague. I think it's a good topic also because of the global impact. I disagree though with your statement- what's more important, the future of the environment or US economy?

caseyn3

*Posted Yesterday, 8:47 PM* New!
I also disagree with your statement putting the US economy as the major focus of the controversy. I think the environment is the overall reason for the kyoto protocol. I agree that something needs to be done about our global
warming situation. I also don't know much about the Kyoto protocol but would like to learn more about it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YOUR NAME:</th>
<th>YOUR REPLY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**whitney thompson thesis #1**

**whitleet**

Posted Jan 10, 2007 3:19 PM New!

The federal government should put into action a universal healthcare coverage plan.

**thatguy6**

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:47 PM New!

That would be nice but it would be very expensive. I question how the cost would be covered and how the system would work in remote areas.

**heygoa**

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:06 PM New!

I would love for a universal healthcare coverage and would like to agree but like what thatguy6 says, I worry about how expensive it would be. If this were to happen, I could see prices on products going up and wages getting lowered just to cover the cost of healthcare.
I agree. This is a very good topic, but I think there would be too many loopholes in this type of program. Should people who make themselves sick get healthcare or people who are on drugs?

I really don't know. It does not seem feasible to me.
	his is a controversial issue, but not in this class because many people have proposed the same topic

I'd like to hear more information on this topic. But to echo what everyone else has said, you would have a challenge addressing issues such as cost, and feasibility.

I agree with the thesis because at least some health care in life is a necessity. Having access to health care would remove a great burden from a lot of people's lives.
I disagree. There is a reason why Canadians who can afford to, come across the border to see our doctors. Once you socialize healthcare, the quality is going to diminish.

so, I think this is a very hot topic right now, maybe you should clarify this a bit just by adding a "because" in there. Good idea.

I think this is a good idea in theory, I just don't see it ever taking place or being very successful. I think that the quality of our health care would drop significantly and prices of other things, taxes, and lots of other factors would go up. I'm not sure that this topic would be clear enough for this particular assignment.
Physician assisted suicide should be legalized in the U.S. for special cases in the elderly.

I think that this is a good topic. What are you suggesting to be "special reasons" and what is considered "elderly." One argument you will come up against is the "slippery slope." once suicide is legalized where do you draw the line?

I disagree. In any case. I also agree with the above post. Legalizing it for special cases would be too hard to maintain the boundaries that would be established.

disagree, i dont think doctors should be killing people

I like the twist at the end- only pertaining to the elderly. You could make some good arguments for this and it could be controversial.

I disagree,if this is especially for the elderly often times they are depressed there are other ways to treat depression.
rscott16

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:51 PM New!*
All US states should adopt a method of capital punishment.

---

daharris

*Posted Yesterday, 12:18 AM New!*
Disagree, what if the person ended up being innocent?

---

whitleet

*Posted Yesterday, 12:58 AM New!*
honestly i have no thoughts on this. I dont condemn those states who have it but I wouldnt feel the need to acquire it for all states.

---

tylo

*Posted Yesterday, 12:27 PM New!*
I agree. It would be good to address the issue of someone being innocent as stated above because that issue seems to come up a lot.

---

toriq

*Posted Yesterday, 12:36 PM New!*
I dissagree with this statement. I think that capital
punnishment should be made illegal in all states. Not only is there the issue of accidentally killing an innocent person, it is much more expensive to have someone killed that to keep them in prison for the rest of their life.

cwm10

*Posted Yesterday, 7:50 PM New!*

i disagree. capitol punishment is expensive and offers nothing more than another death. our society would be just as safe with that same man behind bars for the rest of his natural life.

caseyn3

*Posted Yesterday, 8:28 PM New!*

I disagree. completely I think it is completely immoral.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Dorthya's topic #2

daharris

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:22 PM New!*

United States should make abortion illegal in all stages of pregnancy.

whitleet

*Posted Yesterday, 1:06 AM New!*

I disagree. It is not only near impossible but also morally wrong to try to decide what is best for another person. Also
look at all the poor parenting out there...you think someone who is not ready for a child is going to make a good parent...it's not even fair to the child.

kylyo

Posted Yesterday, 12:36 PM New!
I agree. Over 47 million babies have been killed in abortions. This would be a very controversial topic!

toriq

Posted Yesterday, 12:45 PM New!
I dissagree with you. Not only to I believe in a woman's general choice of what to do with their own body, you are giving no options to rape victems. You would need to put yourself in one of these womens shoes. It can also be deadly for some women to give birth because of their size or health. Also it is sometimes possible to detect horrific birth defects early and families could be spared.

jdunn08

Posted Yesterday, 3:24 PM New!
I don't think abortion is ever a good solution for anyone. Society says it will solve the problem of the unplanned pregnancy- but the issues in the woman/girl's life are more intricate than just the pregnancy. Abortion has emotional and physical repurcussions for the woman/girl that don't go away overnight. It is anything but the "quick fix" it's intended to be. I worked at a pregnancy clinic where i saw a lot of the abortion aftermath.

But I would have to disagree with the thesis- I don't think making it illegal is a good solution either (people would still go out of their way to get one, and an underground abortion system is not safe at all). I don't think the US should ban abortion. It is the woman/girl's decision.

hfoskett
I do not think that abortion should be made legal because I don't think the federal government should have any say what so ever. I believe that abortion should be dealt with on a state government level letting each state decide whether or not it should be legal.

caseyn3

I disagree. I think that a woman has the ultimate choice, depending on circumstances, whether or not to bring another life into this world. There are definitely some situations where an abortion is the best and most appropriate decision a woman must make. It can't be easy to decide to abort a part of you but I don't think that our government has the right to take that freedom of this decision away.

cwm10

this is a tough one. there are so many situations that can occur. in general i feel like it should be illegal, but then there is the question of rape. what should we do. so it will be tough to approach this, but i agree it should be illegal.

sci3

The day abortion becomes illegal I am moving to Canada. I completly diasagree and can not believe this is still such a huge topic of debate in this country

YOUR NAME:  

YOUR REPLY:
James Johnson thesis statements

thatguy6

 Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:41 PM

The U.S. should raise the minimum wage.

The U.S. should not drill in Alaska for oil.

heygoa

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:49 PM

I can go both ways when it comes to increasing minimum wage. I'm afraid that if we do increase it, there will be repercussions. But then again, people today are struggling to survive because of how low the wage is. Thus, I would agree that the raise should be higher since people are struggling today.

I think the US should drill in Alaska for oil. It's better to use our own resources than to get it from another countries.

daharris

Posted Yesterday, 12:01 AM

Yes, I agree but if they increase min. Wage then everything else is going to increase as well.

I disagree.

whitleet

Posted Yesterday, 1:04 AM

well these two things have actually already been done but using a past tense would be an easy fix. Also you'd want a lot of facts for the drilling but make sure you get it from a
credible site, not just a propoganda site, the national geological survey site is a good one to use.

kylo

*Posted Yesterday, 12:33 PM New!*

I disagree. I don't know much about it, but I do not see a benefit in raising it.

I disagree, as long as the environmental impact would be minimal.

toriq

*Posted Yesterday, 12:48 PM New!*

i agree about the minimum wage. You should read the book "Nickled and Dimed" as a resource. It is a quick read and a really good book about a journalist who poses as a displaced homemaker and tries to live off of minimum wage.

I also agree about not drilling in alaska. More oil is not the solution. it just prolongs the problem of dependency

jdunn08

*Posted Yesterday, 3:15 PM New!*

I agree that the US should raise it's minimum wage, although I'm not sure how relevant that is to us in Washington.

I agree about not drilling in Alaska. It's so beautiful.

hfoskett

*Posted Yesterday, 3:50 PM New!*

I disagree, raising the minimum wage doesn't suddenly help everyone out. From an economists standpoint, it actually
ends up hurting the economy.

I disagree about drilling in Alaska as well. We have oil fields just sitting untouched and whether people like it or not, it is a simple fact that we use lots of oil and have no reason to not look to our own sources.

caseyn3

Posted Yesterday, 4:39 PM New!

I disagree. I believe that the minimum wage is high enough in most places to make a living. It is not going to be easy to live off of minimum wage but it can be done.

I disagree with this as well. I believe that there is enough technology now to begin to dwindle our complete dependence on oil alone. I really believe that alternate fuel sources should be utilized rather than drill more oil.

cwm10

Posted Yesterday, 6:50 PM New!

i can't disagree with more money.

I think we should drill. the value of the oil is worth the risk. we'll have to drill there eventually anyways

sci3

Posted Yesterday, 7:36 PM New!

I am VERY concerned about the drilling in Alaska, and would love someone to do a speech on it- do it!

rscott16

Posted Yesterday, 7:50 PM New!

I agree the US should raise the minimum wage, i think
washington is pretty good compared to some other states
I think that we should drill in alaska we will probably have to drill there in the future anyways

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

**Angela's thesis #2**

awang93

Posted Yesterday, 9:51 AM New!
Voluntary active euthanasia should not be legal in the U.S.

kylyo

Posted Yesterday, 12:56 PM New!
I agree. I think this is a very good topic by the way, lots of controversy around this.

jdunn08

Posted Yesterday, 3:01 PM New!
I agree. Many doctors may not want to be in the position where they would have to perform euthanasia.

tns2

Posted Yesterday, 3:05 PM New!
I'm leaning towards disagreeing, but I don't have a solid opinion.
I agree from the standpoint that I think it is hypocritical for a doctor to take the hypocratic oath and then help in assisted suicide.

I disagree. If someone is in pain and terminally ill and would rather end their life with dignity and self respect no one should stop them. People should not be able to make it illegal for that to happen.

Aren’t doctors supposed to keep people alive instead of intentionally killing them? I don’t think this sort of thing should be legal.

I disagree. There are some people who are severely sick and would rather die peacefully then to suffer and wait till they die. It shouldn’t be illegal and people who are sick should have the right to choose!

i disagree. there is point where i think that dragging some one along is greedy. i know that if i where that person, i couldn’t live with the fact that all the people cared about were constantly worrying about me.
I agree with this, and I think it's a controversial topic.

The US should implement policies allowing those living in Latin American countries to come to the US and work without receiving full citizenship --> a 'blue card' system.

I think that this is an interesting topic. I believe that the American economy depends on cheap labor, but that some think foreigners are "stealing jobs." Would people with "blue cards" receive minimum wage?

I agree, but I do think it would make it easier for people to stay in America that are not supposed to.
I agree with "toriq's" opinion. Is this an idea that you thought of yourself? Would you have enough information to support this idea? It might be hard to find controversy in idea that isn't well know to the public. Otherwise this topic is very interesting. I'd like to hear more about it.

jdunn08

I agree with this thesis, but I'm not sure how relevant the material is to our audience.

hfoskett

I think that the blue card system is a good idea but I really not familiar with any of the details of how the system would work.

sci3

I really like this idea- it's very different than anyone else's. I'd be interested in learning more about this.