In the public school system, it should be mandatory that English is spoken in the classroom, provided that it is not a foreign language class.

I agree. It is very distracting to those that do know english because teachers will have to slow down or accommodate those that don't speak english.

I agree. Though the country soesn't have an official language. Near all people speak english and theis would only be a distraction in class if one person did not.

I agree. At least in our country english is the spoken language and it is only fair that those who come to America should have to speak the native language. Also for those that are from another country, speaking english would improve their fluency. If we were to accomidate them by speaking their language they would never learn english like everyone else has to.
I agree. I think it is important that in the classroom only English is spoken. It is a distraction and is unfair to English-speaking students when other students are carrying on conversations in other languages, as well as slowing down the learning pace because they don't understand what is going on.

shannw

I agree. English is our spoken language and we should try to teach it to our students, as it is the best way to get to know more about the country.

rbrown52

I agree, with the exception of foreign language classes and ESL classes.

lydiab2

I agree. Learning new material is already a difficult task, so adding a language barrier significantly increases the stress and confusion of students.

meidy251

I agree. By speaking one language in non-foreign language class, it would not cause distraction to other students. Also, it helps the foreign student to practice speaking English.

ioanec
QUESTION: when is a foreign language ever used in the classroom outside of a foreign language class? If this is directed at students whose first language is not english and they require the assistance of a translator in the classroom, then I disagree. Other than in immersion schools (in which case learning a foreign language is the intent) I cannot recall an instance when this has been an issue. Can someone give an example?

dshoes

I don't feel very strongly about only english being spoken in the classroom. I disagree because i would need extra help if i had to move to a different country.

sjd2

Students should use what ever language gives them the most advantages.

kchan4

Technically, it doesn't make sense to speak in more than one language in a classroom unless everybody understands them. Is your thesis trying to emphasize that non-native english speakers should not chat amongst themselves in their native tongue when in school? If that were the case, then I would disagree because the Bill of Rights grants freedom of speech. Or is the topic trying to ban non-English-based schools? I can't see where this thesis is coming from
Emily Slayton #1

emmy21

*Posted Yesterday, 9:28 AM New!*  
The US should sign the Kyoto Protocol

bjs25

*Posted Yesterday, 12:14 PM New!*  
I agree. I think this is a good solution to reducing greenhouse gases and pollution.

Ithiry

*Posted Yesterday, 1:22 PM New!*  
I do not know enough about the specifics of the Kyoto Protocol to agree/disagree on this thesis. I do agree that measures need to be taken to reduce pollution and global warming.

shannw

*Posted Yesterday, 2:21 PM New!*  
I agree. We need to start planning for the future and prepare for the damage that pollution has inflicted.

rbrown52
I agree. The U.S. is the largest contributor of greenhouse gases and should have been the first country to sign the Kyoto Protocol.

meidy251

I don’t really understand about Kyoto Protocol.

neotheta

I agree. The US should do its part to lower greenhouse gas emissions.

ioanec

I agree. Steps should be taken to reduce greenhouse gases and prevent further environmental damage.

dshoes

I agree because we need to have a goal for maintaining the health of our planet.

sjd2

I agree in principal, but there are massive political reasons for not signing the Kyoto Protocol. Basically, India and China are exempt while we must fully
comply. We need to take steps to cut greenhouse emissions, but we also need to make sure everyone does their fair share.

YOUR NAME:  
YOUR REPLY:

Bethany Strahan Thesis #2

bs25

Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:43 PM New!
More physical education and healthier food options should be implemented in schools to combat obesity.

wongjen

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:49 PM New!
I agree. It would be beneficial for students to learn how to exercise and eat right. Obesity is a serious problem that can be targeted at a young age.

Ithiry

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:11 PM New!
I agree. I think it is important for children to learn how to exercise as well as eat healthier at younger ages to combat the obesity crisis in the United States.
I disagree. The amount of exercise and the diet composition of children should be determined by parents not by schools.

emmy21

I agree, kids growing up do not know enough about good nutrition and how to take care of themselves. It’s not that the parents are to blame, because it’s likely they don’t know either.

shannw

I agree to an extent. Healthy food should be offered, but PE only at max once a day for an hour, maybe in place of recess to make sure all students are active.

rbrown52

I agree. Schools should offer healthier lunch options. I’m not sure about physical education. When I was in elementary school we only had P.E. three days a week and I think 1 hour every day is plenty.

gillan

i agree. The obesity in America is becoming a growing epidemic and it needs to be addressed.
I agree. Practicing healthy life from a very young age is really important.

I agree. People need to learn at a younger age how to take care of their bodies, and providing more options would help people be healthy.

I agree. With an increase in the popularity of such things as video games, children need to be taught the importance of physical activity and proper eating habits at an early age.

I agree, but I also think that healthy body image should be a part of it. Being healthy doesn't always mean looking skinny.

I agree. This is reasonable.
The drinking age in the United States should remain at age 21.

I'm torn on this one. I would argue that the US should act more like European countries by letting people grow up with drinking as part of the culture so it isn't abused or used as a means of rebellion as people get older. But if the US was just going to lower the age to, say, 18, that would create the same problems we face with alcohol now, but with a younger age group.

I would almost have to disagree with this topic. I think if the drinking age were under 21 then there wouldn't be as many problems with alcohol. I think part of the reason why possession of alcohol among minors occurs so often is because it is taboo. Also, you are allowed to vote and enlist in the military at 18 why cant you be allowed to drink as well.
I disagree. At age 18 you become an adult in all other ways. If you are responsible to vote for our government, die for our country, then you should be able to have a drink.

emmy21

I disagree, I think that it should be lowered, but not to 18 because you are still in High school, maybe 19.

shannw

I agree. Drinking is something that has been found extremely detrimental in people under 21 and it would be best for the country to allow for alcohol education before regular drinking.

rbrown52

I disagree. If you are considered an adult at 18 you should be given all rights as an adult and should be able to handle the responsibility of drinking alcohol.

meidy251

I agree. Drinking can be fun. However, it is also dangerous if people can't control it especially if they drive after they get a drink. People who are 18 usually can't really see the consequences of what they do. I think the drinking age of 21 is good.
I am on the fence. While the US gives you all other rights/public responsibility at the age of 18, I would say that we should leave well-enough alone. I don't think that maturity and sense of responsibility can be gauged by a person's age and lowering the drinking age might affect taboo status of drinking, but I don't think it's necessary.

I agree. It would be hard to change I think. Younger people who might suddenly have the right to drink may go over board.

I disagree. By making something taboo, we should ourselves in the foot. America's alcohol problem does not come from the drinking age, but rather our lack of education in responsible alcohol consumption by parents.
Media such as advertisements and magazines promoting unnatainable body images to young teenage girls should be censored and more idealistic.

I disagree because if you start censoring media then who's to say it won't get to actors and then to movies.

I agree that the media needs to be held responsible for the messages that they are sending young girls.

i disagree. what would be the "ideal standard". if you still don't fit the realistic image, it doesn't help.

I disagree. There should be no censorship of media especially if it involves prior restraint. If groups feel that companies are in fact creating harm in society through these messages they should bring legal actions against them.
I agree. All shapes and sizes should be included in the media as normal.

I disagree. I do think many of these images are harmful to young girls, however this is an issue where it would be very difficult to come to a consensus on where the line is drawn.

I disagree. All body types are beautiful. People can view other people everyday on the streets, and these same people can be in the magazines.

I agree. Magazines that portray an unrealistic ideal are detrimental to both men and women and should be censored.

I disagree. We can't be certain on where to draw the 'line' and which to be censored. Also, the images are real people. By looking at those images, it may encourages the young girls to have a beautiful body. It's not impossible to have a beautiful body. It just needs determination to exercise regularly and consume healthy food.
I disagree. Even with altered standards, a message is still being sent; it may just be a different message. Young girls may start thinking they're supposed to look exactly like these new advertisements, and they'll still feel bad about not having the "right" body image.

I disagree. While the media should be more responsible with the images it presents, censoring one aspect would only lead to more issues of censorship (i.e. in movies, on television, etc). It is impossible for the "ideal" body image to be presented as it is a subjective idea.

I disagree. It is a parents responsibility to make sure their children are able to build a healthy self image. It is not the media's job to raise our children.
**The United States should stop using the death penalty for criminal punishment.**

**neotheta**

**Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:31 PM New!**
I agree. I don't believe the death penalty is an effective deterrent for those who would murder.

**emmy21**

**Posted Yesterday, 9:42 AM New!**
I agree, I feel that death would be the easy way out for criminals sentenced to life without parole. I think more suffering would be in prison your whole life.

**bjs25**

**Posted Yesterday, 12:25 PM New!**
I agree. Although it would apply in cases such as Saddam where he posed a threat to the safety of the United States. I don't think it's right to kill.

**shannw**

**Posted Yesterday, 3:10 PM New!**
I agree. The death penalty is an extreme measure and we as humans should not have to make the decision of life or death for others.

**rbrown52**

**Posted Yesterday, 11:55 PM New!**
I disagree. There are some crimes committed that are deserving of the death penalty. Also, the tax dollars
spent to keep a person in prison for a life sentence are ridiculous.

**lydiab2**

*Posted Today, 12:03 AM New!*
I agree. The death penalty is unethical, but I also believe that prisoners who are currently on death row (and those who would be put there later) should face a harsher prison term, maybe a sentence without some of the niceties of prison (books, TV, weightlifting...)

**meidy251**

*Posted Today, 12:44 AM New!*
I agree. It is not human decisions whether a person deserve to live or die. Also, everyone makes mistake. I think he deserves a second chance.

**ioanec**

*Posted Today, 4:45 AM New!*
I disagree. On average, it costs $50-$60,000 of the taxpayers' money to keep a male prisoner in a minimum security facility and over $100,000 for maximum security. That money can be better spent. Also, some crimes are deserving of the death penalty and attempts at rehabilitation would be a waste of money.

**sjd2**

*Posted Today, 11:43 AM New!*
I disagree. There are some crimes that require ultimate punishment.
Lie Mei Njoo's Thesis # 2

mely251

Posted Yesterday, 12:39 AM New!
Parking on campus should not be free to faculty, staff and students.

kchan4

Posted Yesterday, 8:27 AM New!
I agree. Providing an extra parking space would incur maintenance cost and rent. To have an efficient market of perfect competition, products/services should be priced at their marginal cost. Since the marginal cost is greater than 0, they should not be provided for free.

bjs25

Posted Yesterday, 12:01 PM New!
I agree and disagree. I think if it were free it would create problems because there would be no place to park since everyone would be trying to find a space. I think if you were to park though the parking should be a reasonable price.

lthiry
I agree. However, I think parking should be significantly cheaper.

I agree. We have enough students with cars. We need to make revenue and the parking spots do generate a lot of money.

I agree. If parking was free, everyone would drive to school, traffic would be awful, and it would be impossible to build parking lots for all of the students. The bus system seems to work fine for most commuting students, and paid parking encourages carpooling and mass transit options.

I agree. While it may seem like a pain to pay for parking fees, the money made from it goes to benefit the university anyway. Without this money, the university wouldn't be able to do a lot of its maintenance.

I agree. Money made from parking fees benefits the university a great deal and without it, the school would look for more money elsewhere (i.e. raised tuition).
emmy21

I agree. I think that this would cause a problem of over crowding and everyone would try and drive to school.

katiegym

I disagree. we need the money and this would cause too much traffic.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Robin Alexander Thesis #2

alexre

Abortion should be legal in the United States.

emmy21

I agree, but only for certain cases, such as rape. I do not think it should be the easy way out for people who were careless, not to say those who get pregnant are.
I disagree. I do not think abortion should be legal because there are too many careless people who simply use it as a form of birth control. I do believe there are certain cases however that should allow for an abortion, ie rape victims.

bjs25

I disagree. It is wrong to kill an innocent life.

shannw

I disagree. It is wrong to take the life of an unborn child at the convenience of the parents. We should instead work on birth control, adoption and the personal responsibility to have sex.

rbrown52

I agree. Any pregnant woman has the right to choose whether or not she wants to keep the child.

meidy251

I disagree. The baby is innocent. It is not right to kill the innocent only because of a person’s mistake. Also, there are ways to get out of this problem other than abortion.

neotheta
I agree. I don't believe children should be brought into this world if no one is willing to love, care, and protect them.

I agree. While it is already legal in many states in the country, it should be nation-wide law. It's a women's right to choose.

I agree. I acknowledge that it may not be "right", but it should be the parents choice.

I am indifferent on this. Some people abuse this and use it as a form of birth control which is wrong but on the other hand if someone is raped they should be able to get an abortion.
alexre

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:00 PM New!
The United States military should not be able to censor the videos broadcast over the web by U.S. soldiers.

emmy21

Posted Yesterday, 10:14 AM New!
I agree. Otherwise what's the point. The government is only trying to hide the truth and wouldn't it be better for the country as whole if we knew more of the truth.

Ithiry

Posted Yesterday, 12:24 PM New!
I am indifferent on this subject. I really have no argument as to why this should or should not be allowed.

bjs25

Posted Yesterday, 1:01 PM New!
I agree. We as a country deserve to see what is going on in the military and it shouldn't be censored.

shannw

Posted Yesterday, 2:45 PM New!
I disagree. The US has the right to censor materials due to the secret nature of some files. We are in the middle of a war and having the leaking of important information like location could be detrimental in the wrong hands.
rbrown52

Posted Today, 12:35 AM New!
I agree. U.S. citizens have a right to see what is really going on in the military through sources such as video broadcasts of U.S. soldiers (unless it is top-secret, necessarily confidential information).

meidy251

Posted Today, 12:53 AM New!
I disagree. I think US has the right to make a decision on what to censored. There might be some information that should not be published. Especially when US is in the middle of a war, there might be a lot of spies.

ioanec

Posted Today, 4:37 AM New!
I am on the fence. While I do not believe in censorship because real life cannot be censored, there are some instances when information needs to be kept confidential.

sjd2

Posted Today, 10:04 AM New!
I agree and disagree. While the government shouldn't be in the business of censorship, the public may not be prepared for the images of war.

katiegym

Posted Today, 10:09 AM New!
I disagree. The government is doing this to protect the public and their soldiers. If a soldier said something on camera they may not want the whole world to be able
to see it. Also they may need to keep things private so the enemy doesn't have an advantage.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Lindsey Thiry Thesis #1

Ithiry

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:57 PM New!
Taxpayers should not have to fund the building/renovating of professional sports facilities.

neotheta

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:34 PM New!
I agree. I believe that funds of that nature could be used in different social venues that could benefit more people.

katiegym

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:40 PM New!
I agree. Why should we have to pay for professional sports facilities when they pay the athletes millions of dollars. If you can afford to pay your athlete millions you should be able to fund your own facility.

emmy21
I agree. It should come from ticket revenues or the individual/company who owns or sponsors it.

I agree. I think the money could be used for something more important.

I agree. Sports are for recreation. The money should come from the franchise itself since sports do not payback to the US government.

I agree, especially since they always seem to be building a bigger and better sports arena. It’s not the tax payers responsibility.

I agree. They should have enough money to build or renovate the facilities. The fund that comes from the taxpayers should be used for better purpose such as building roads.
I agree. The franchise should be financially responsible for the building or remodeling of its facilities.

sjd2

Posted Today, 10:07 AM New!
I agree. Fix the schools first.

Stephen Day's Thesis #2

sjd2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:37 PM New!
Intelligent Design threatens the co-existence of religion and science that has existed for hundreds of years, and should not be taught in public schools.

wongjen

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:25 PM New!
i agree. Intelligent Design would be a good supplement to the curriculum but should not be the main teaching.
I disagree. If you are going to teach one side of a belief, you must teach the other side as well.

I disagree. I think that if you are teaching one half of the spectrum you should teach the other too.

I agree. I think we should keep the educational views where they are at and have always been.

I agree. Schools should just stick with what has been working with darwins theory in addition to the religious beliefs of many americans. Intelligent Design should perhaps be mentioned, but should not be strongly enforced.

I disagree. Intelligent design is in our past and should be taught in schools. We should be aware of both sides of the spectrum to make our own opinion.

I agree. I am not very familiar with Intelligent Design.
but evolutionary theories have a huge amount of scientific evidence, which makes them more appropriate for educational purposes.

meidy251

Posted Today, 1:36 AM New!
I agree. We should just stick with the co-existence of religion and science. If we want to change it, we should change it to the theory that has a strong evidence. Intelligent Design doesn't seem to have scientifically strong evidence.

neotheta

Posted Today, 2:37 AM New!
I don't think intelligent design threatens the coexistence of science and religion though I don't think it should be in the main curriculum.

ioanec

Posted Today, 3:08 AM New!
I disagree. (1) religion and science don't co-exist; there has been a constant struggle between the two since the exile and condemnation of scientists by the Catholic Church centuries ago. (2) Each possible belief should be properly taught because in order for students to make up their mind they need to be exposed to all possibilities. True "education" does not occur if only only idea is taught.

katiegym

Posted Today, 10:04 AM New!
I agree. we should stick with what we have been doing but mention Intelligent design just don't strongly enforce it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bryce11</td>
<td>A salary cap should be imposed on all professional athletes to ensure economic stability among sport franchises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neotheta</td>
<td>I agree. Caps should make salaries much more manageable and give franchises some financial breathing room to weather the ups and downs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emmy21</td>
<td>I agree. I haven't though to much on this, but I think it would help regulate pro athletes salaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bjs25</td>
<td>I agree. I don't think athletes should all be payed differently but instead have a set salary limit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ithiry

Posted Yesterday, 1:19 PM
New!
I disagree. I think it is ridiculous how much money many professional athletes are paid, however it is the choice of their franchise to pay them that much - so more power to them.

shannw

Posted Yesterday, 2:26 PM
New!
I disagree. We as a government cannot regulate the salaries of non government officials. Pro athletes do get paid ridiculous amounts of money for their work, but we as a nation okay the high price by our attendance and love of the game. Also, the vast majority of athletes are unpaid, with only pro athletes being paid- pro athletes have to work unpaid for decades before getting paid for their practice and there is no guarantee that they will ever receive any money for their sport. Also, pro athletes often only go pro for a few years, so the ridiculous amount of money they receive is supposed to compensate for all their hard work.

rbrown52

Posted Today, 12:54 AM
New!
I disagree. Pro-athletes are not the only individuals that get paid ridiculous amounts of money (models, actors, singers, basically entertainers in general). If sports franchises want to pay the salaries that pros demand, why shouldn't athletes expect high salaries?

meidy251

Posted Today, 1:00 AM
New!
I agree. It motivates the professional athletes to practice harder. Also, it could encourage people to be professional athletes.
ioanec

Posted Today, 4:35 AM New!
I am on the fence. Professional athletes, models, actors, etc. today are being grossly overpaid for work that does little outside of entertain. It is not as though they are saving lives. But, on the other hand, their activities are contributing a great deal to the economic system of the country.

sjd2

Posted Today, 10:00 AM New!
I have no opinion. This should be the decision of the sports organization.

YOUR NAME: YOUR REPLY:

Justin Crane’s Thesis #2

jcrizzle

Posted Yesterday, 8:27 AM New!
Smoking cigarettes on the UW campus should be prohibited.

bjs25

Posted Yesterday, 12:03 PM New!
I agree. Smoking is bad for your health and by allowing it on campus people still get second hand
I agree. It is bad for your health and rude when people smoke on campus. People who do not smoke should not have to be exposed to the health risk of second had smoke when they are trying to attend school.

I agree. I hate cigarette smoke and walking behind a smoker. It is bad for your health and the environment.

Disagree. Campus is huge and for those who do smoke it would be completely unrealistic to walk off campus to have a cigarette. Also, there are many places on campus that are far away from buildings and and areas where there is a lot of foot traffic. Smokers wouldn't be bothering anyone in these areas. I just quit smoking so I guess I can relate to the smokers, but its harder for me to be around smokers than your average non-smoker.

I disagree. There should be specified areas to smoke cigarettes so that they are avoidable, but those who choose to smoke should be alotted that right, too.
neotheta

Posted Today, 1:00 AM New!
I agree. Smoking is detrimental to your health and the health of others as well. It also creates a great deal of trash with cigarette butts littering certain parts of the campus.

meidy251

Posted Today, 1:40 AM New!
I agree. Smoking doesn't bring a positive impact to your own body and other people especially in public places due to second hand smoke.

ioanec

Posted Today, 4:20 AM New!
I disagree. As long as smoking is kept outdoors (which it is), it does not need to be prohibited on campus. The area is large enough to cut the effects of second-hand smoke.

dshoes

Posted Today, 6:59 AM New!
I disagree and i hate smoking. I think there should be designated areas and people shouldn't smoke by doors.

emmy21

Posted Today, 9:58 AM New!
I disagree. I think this infringes on peoples rights and smoking is not illegal, therefore smoking on campus should be allowed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bryce11</td>
<td>The U.S. should adopt the Kyoto Protocol to reduce its annual amount of greenhouse gas emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alexre</td>
<td>I do not know enough about the Kyoto protocol to have an opinion about this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bjs25</td>
<td>I agree. I think this sounds like a good option to reduce pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lthiry</td>
<td>I really do not know enough about this issue to agree/disagree.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I agree, it will reduce pollution.

rbrown52

I agree. Many U.S. cities and states follow the Kyoto protocol and I think it is ridiculous that the U.S. is the largest contributor of carbon emissions AND one of the only nations that does not follow the Kyoto protocol.

lydiab2

I agree. The U.S. needs to take responsibility for its damage to the environment. Putting emission restrictions on companies would help the world fight environmental depletion.

meidy251

I don't really understand about Kyoto Protocol.

neotheta

I agree. The US should do its part to reduce greenhouse gases.
I agree. Steps should be taken to reduce greenhouse gases and prevent further environmental damage.

dshoes

I agree because it gives the US some responsibility in taking care of the planet.

emmy21

I agree. The US contributes, just as much if not more greenhouse gases, compared to other countries. While other countries have signed and are taking action, we still have yet to do so.

katiegym

I don’t know what the Kyoto protocol is...but I do know anything that will help our environment would be a good ideal. We need to make a change.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Adrian Hong's Thesis #1
neotheta

Posted Jan 9, 2007 11:54 PM New!
In order to prevent grossly distorted CEO compensation in relation to performance the SEC should require that compensation committees be filled with members who are not executives of any public company and that the CEO compensation package be voted on by shareholders.

mgd4

Posted Jan 10, 2007 12:44 PM New!
I don't know too much about this issue but I would tend to disagree because the idea of voting by the shareholders sounds great, I feel it would be difficult to get them together to make such decisions considering they could be all over the country.

dshoes

Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:21 PM New!
This should very complicated. I would disagree unless it would be explained so that it could easily be applied.

bjs25

Posted Jan 10, 2007 3:39 PM New!
I'm unfamiliar with this topic so I can't really agree or disagree with this statement.

lydiab2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:13 PM New!
I don't know enough about this topic to form an opinion.
Ive never heard about this issue, so i wouldnt have a valid opinion.

Im lost... This is a very confusing topic.

I agree, but I don't know much about this. Maybe the compensation committee could be mix of executives and non executives.

I disagree. Private corporations are on their own to determine salaries. Would this be in affect for all companies, no matter the size? Because plenty of small companies have huge grossing CEOs solely because the business is easy.

I know nothing about this topic (which seems to be a common theme in our class), so I wouldn't be able to give you any valid feedback.
I don’t really understand the issue.

I am somewhat on the fence. While I do not know much about this topic, I would lean somewhat toward agree because some system of checks and balances should exist that prevent CEOs from being unreasonably compensated at the expense of others.

I disagree. This is a capitalist nation and we don’t have a controlled economy. While CEO compensation is out of control, there are better ways of dealing with it.

Physician-assisted suicide should not be legal in the U.S.
bjs25

Posted Yesterday, 11:52 AM New!
I can see both sides of this issue. I would almost have to agree though because the suicide would seem to have more negative outcomes than positive ones. The physician and family members would have to live with this decision.

Ithiry

Posted Yesterday, 11:54 AM New!
I think this thesis is really broad so it is hard to agree or disagree; I think it should be legal if it is a terminally ill patient, however I do not think it should be legal for any other reason.

Ithiry

Posted Yesterday, 11:55 AM New!
....

shannw

Posted Yesterday, 4:01 PM New!
I agree. It is wrong to take the life of another person, suicide/ murder is never the answer.

rbrown52

Posted Yesterday, 8:12 PM New!
Disagree. Physician-assisted suicide for terminally ill patients should be legal. The actual definition for physician-assisted suicide is to give a patient pills or some other lethal medication that they can administer themselves in the privacy of their own home. This helps to take some of the pressure off of doctors,
since this method ensures that they will not actually take the life of another human being.  Good topic!

lydiab2

*Posted Today, 12:57 AM New!*  
I think this thesis is too broad to make a decision on. There are certain situations (painful terminal illnesses) in which assisted suicide should be made legal to put people and their families out of pain.

neotheta

*Posted Today, 1:47 AM New!*  
Disagree. I believe physician-assisted suicide for terminally ill patients should be legal.

ioanec

*Posted Today, 4:11 AM New!*  
I disagree. It should be an option especially when it can prevent pain and suffering on behalf of the patient and their family/friends.

sjd2

*Posted Today, 9:47 AM New!*  
I disagree. People should not be made to suffer for other’s moral agenda.

emmy21

*Posted Today, 9:54 AM New!*  
I disagree. I think that if someone is a candidate because they are terminally ill only, then they should have the option to die a more peaceful death.
Rachel Brown Thesis #2

rbdrown52

Posted Yesterday, 8:57 AM New!
The U.S. should adopt stricter vehicle emission standards.

emmy21

Posted Yesterday, 10:20 AM New!
I agree. Global warming is occurring and the US needs to take action, this would be one way of doing so.

lthiry

Posted Yesterday, 12:20 PM New!
I agree. I think this is a great solution to try and curb the global warming situation.

bjs25

Posted Yesterday, 1:12 PM New!
I agree. This would aid in preventing a lot of environmental issues.
I agree. We should take action against global warming and ensure that we are all working together on the issue.

I agree. The U.S. needs to step it up when it comes to environmental standards. We only get one world, and we need to do everything we can to protect it.

I agree. It is really important to protect this earth especially for the next generations.

I agree. The stricter standards should be implemented over time to allow industry and consumers to adapt.

I agree. Steps should be taken to reduce the emission of harmful gases and prevent further environmental damage.
I agree, but we need to be more careful. Requirements such as catalytic converters actually lead to horrid strip mining in Africa.

**YOUR NAME:**  
**YOUR REPLY:**

---

**Dani Schuster's Thesis #2**

dshoes

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:27 PM* New!

The US should not adopt universal health care.

bjs25

*Posted Yesterday, 11:49 AM* New!

I don’t know whether to agree or disagree with this one. I think it could be beneficial to provide universal health care since a lot of people are without it. However funding universal health care would also cost a lot of money.

lthiry

*Posted Yesterday, 12:04 PM* New!

I disagree; I believe that every US citizen has the right to health care.
I agree. Personal responsibility is needed with health care- I will not pay for the health care of some chain smoker's lung disease. Also abuse of the system could happen.

I disagree. All U.S. citizens should have health care. It might be expensive, but there is plenty of money that could be better spend on health care.

I agree. Universal healthcare would just make taxes higher and end up making those who make more money pay for other peoples health.

I agree. The logistics of managing universal healthcare would create a cumbersome and inefficient bureaucracy that would drain a large of amount of our nation's resources into non-value added activities. The government should focus on helping individuals obtain health care through other means.

I agree because that would raise everyones taxes,
even those who don't benefit from the health care.

**alexre**

*Posted Yesterday, 8:23 PM New!*

I agree I think it would decrease the quality of our health care to make it universal.

**danhahm**

*Posted Yesterday, 11:01 PM New!*

Ahh What do you mean by universal health care? Its too board to agree or disagree... sorry

**lydiab2**

*Posted Today, 12:54 AM New!*

I disagree. Health care is so important, and there are a lot of U.S. citizens who can't afford it. Maybe we could take some of the money being spent on the military to fund health care.

**meidy251**

*Posted Today, 1:44 AM New!*

I agree. By making the US health care universal, it would lower the US health care quality.

**ioanec**

*Posted Today, 4:15 AM New!*

I disagree. Everyone should be provided quality health care-not just those who can afford it. Quality health care for all would also help decrease the spread of preventable/treatable illnesses/diseases.
I don't know what to say. Caring for the universe is tough though.

I'm torn. While I think it is important for all people to have healthcare options. I have recently experienced through personal contact that if universal healthcare is adopted there will be many doctors who will lose their jobs. This coming from a doctor of 25 years in CA.

The Digital Millenium Copyright Act and Digital Rights Management, intended to impede internet piracy of copyrighted media, infringes on the rights of end users and jeopardizes the benefits that artists, musicians, cinemetographers and our entire society stand to gain from advancing technology.
I agree because if we take some benefits away from the people creating the media they will be hesitant to produce more.

I beleive that the most important things are protection of musicians' work and that people are able to enjoy it.

I think it is only fair that musicians and other artists works are protected.

I agree, the rights of the artists should be protected.

I agree. The rights of the artists should be protected and they should be paid for their works. Afterall, it is their job and you are cheating them out of their own money.

I agree. While, artists still are making money, they're
rights need to be protected as well.

Ithiry

Posted Yesterday, 1:40 PM New!
I agree. I think that artists' works need to be protected because it is their job, livelihood and source of income.

shannw

Posted Yesterday, 2:11 PM New!
I believe that the artists' work should be protected but that the act goes too far. It is near impossible to define how much we should protect the rights of sound when it can be so easily replicated.

rbrown52

Posted Today, 1:01 AM New!
I agree. Musicians depend on sales in order to maintain their careers and if their music is not protected they will not be able to sustain a career.

meidy251

Posted Today, 1:25 AM New!
I agree. Artists, musicians, cinemetographers have to be protected from the piracy. It is not fair for them if someone steal their money.

neotheta

Posted Today, 1:33 AM New!
I disagree. The DMCA is needed to protect the power of intellectual property rights in an ever changing
global environment.

ioanec

Posted Today, 1:52 AM New!
I agree. The fame and recognition that results from the advertising and sharing of media on the internet is greater than the "loss" that some are claiming occurs.

katiegym

Posted Today, 9:51 AM New!
I agree. Artists have to be protected because it wouldn't be fair for them to do all of that work and someone to steal it. If I worked that hard on something I would want to make a profit from it. The

YOUR NAME:  
YOUR REPLY:

Mason Dhanens Thesis 2

mgd4

Posted Jan 10, 2007 12:13 PM New!
Minors under the age of 18 must be required to notify their parents of an abortion.

bjs25

Posted Jan 10, 2007 12:31 PM New!
I agree because when you are under 18 you are not responsible enough to make serious decisions such as abortions.

**dshoes**  
*Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:05 PM New!*  
I agree. I might change it to 17 because a lot of 18 year olds are out of the house and are making all their own choices. 18 is still young though so I support this argument.

**wongjen**  
*Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:37 PM New!*  
I agree. Minors are not responsible enough to make that major of a decision themselves.

**neotheta**  
*Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:38 PM New!*  
I agree. Parents should be notified of serious decisions made by their children that will greatly impact their child's life.

**katiegym**  
*Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:48 PM New!*  
I agree. At the age of 18 you are still a minor and may not be responsible enough to make such a huge decision on your own. Parents may also be able to give the minor more options, for example a mother may offer to take care of the child if the minor is unable to support the child.
I disagree. Kids who are that age and want an abortion should get one. Although, I am really on the fence because I am not sure how I even feel about abortion alone.

shannw

I agree. Parents are responsible for their children and the choices they make.

rbrown52

I disagree. There are many teenagers who get pregnant and wish to have an abortion. If parents had to be notified, they might force their child to keep the baby, which could ruin their future. However, a big issue would be whether parents just had to be notified or if they had to give permission for their child to have the abortion. I would clarify that in your thesis.

gillan

I agree. Under the age of 18, you are still a child and under your parents supervision. If anything happened to the girl, the parents would not know what was going on. Also under 18, I believe that you cannot make decisions on your own of that amplitude.

danhahm
I agree... If you are under 18 you still need the support of your parents to make decisions for your life. Good topic!!

**Iydiab2**

Posted Today, 12:51 AM New!
I disagree. This is a hard issue because people under 18 aren't typically ready to have a child or make the decision to have an abortion. My concern lies with people who have a bad relationship with their parents. Some parents could be so unsupportive and misunderstanding that they could get angry with and mistreat a child who may have made a poor, life-changing decision.

**meidy251**

Posted Today, 2:02 AM New!
I agree. People who are under 18 years old are still under their parents' supervision. Abortion is such a big decision to make.

**ioanec**

Posted Today, 3:48 AM New!
I disagree. By not providing a safe option, girls under the age of 18, in an attempt to hide it from their parents, may seek alternatives. This could lead to an increase in back-alley abortions or self-abortion attempts.

**sjd2**

Posted Today, 9:36 AM New!
I disagree. While some parents have a very close relationship with their children and this would not be an issue, other parents may react irrationally, which will cause more harm than good.
I agree. I can't imagine anybody under 18 not telling their parents of their abortion/health condition. Family should be one's biggest support in life; they are connected by blood. One should let them know about important decisions (e.g., one that concerns one's health) so that they could help if anything happens. Imagine what would happen if one is near death during an abortion and only family members could make decision on treatment options?

Physician assisted suicide should not be legal for terminal patients in the U.S.

There are benefits on both sides, but, in the end, the risks are too great to make assisted suicide legal. I feel there could be large ramifications to making assisted suicide legal. Life is so precious to be handled. My heart really does go out to anyone in excruciating amounts of pain. If this were to pass, which I am still very weary about, I believe it should
only be considered when the patient is requesting is because of crippling pain.

bjs25  

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:58 PM New!*

This is a difficult thesis to agree or disagree with. In certain incidents putting someone out of their misery would make the situation easier. However, if the physician later regrets assisting the suicide they will have to live with this decision. I tend to agree with this statement.

wongjen  

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:32 PM New!*

I agree. It shouldn't be legal to help a suicide.

neotheta  

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:35 PM New!*

I disagree. Physician assisted suicide for terminal patients should be allowed so that the terminal patients do not have to suffer horribly from mental or physical pain.

emmy21  

*Posted Yesterday, 10:09 AM New!*

I disagree. I think parameters need to be set, but I think in the case of terminal illnesses it should be allowed.
i disagree. personally, if it was myself suffering through an inscrutable amount of pain and i knew i was going to die very soon anyways, i would rather die sooner than later so i wouldn't have to go through more and more pain and live the last days of life completely miserable.

I agree. It is wrong to take the life of another person, even if they have consent. Suicide is never an option. Miracles can happen and do happen- doctors are not always right.

I disagree. Terminally ill patients with unbearable pain have the right to decide that they no longer want to suffer. There are other duties in the practice of medicine that may conflict with a physician's personal beliefs (e.g. DNR orders, "pulling the plug," abortion, etc.) but that doesn't mean they should be illegal.

I agree. It is still not right to assist suicide.

I disagree. It should be an option for patients-especially when it could prevent pain and suffering on behalf of the patient and their family/friends.
I disagree. People should not be made to suffer.

The UW should move from its current quarter system to a semester system.

I disagree. The quarter system that we currently use helps to prevent students from getting bored and lackadaisical with their class work. A semester system could cause students to become burnt out and in turn negatively affect their grades.

I disagree. If you get in a class that you just cannot stand you're only in it for ten weeks as opposed to 15.
I agree! We cover material too fast. Terms should be longer so that students have more time to let the material sink it.

I disagree. I like having the quarter system because it keeps you refreshed since you have more variety and different classes during the year.

I disagree. The quarter system keeps a good academic pace for the year.

I disagree. The quarter system allows you to take a small load so you can focus on 3 or 4 classes instead of nearly 6 classes. This in turn allows it to be less stressful come finals time when you only have to prepare for 3 classes. It always prevents students from becoming too far behind in class, as it moves quickly.

I disagree I like focusing on three to four classes for a shorter period of time rather than six to seven classes for a longer time period.
shannw

Posted Yesterday, 4:14 PM New!
I disagree. We wouldn't be able to take as many classes and classes would drag on material. I like having a wide range of subjects and if I hate a class, it is only 10 weeks.

rbrown52

Posted Yesterday, 6:01 PM New!
I disagree. I really like the quarter system. If you don't like a class it is more bearable to stick with it for 10 weeks and the quarter system allows you to take fewer classes in one term.

lydiab2

Posted Today, 12:59 AM New!
I disagree. The quarter system keeps students on track by holding attention. With the semester system, it's easier to get burned out or distracted and let grades fall by the end of the term.

meidy251

Posted Today, 1:07 AM New!
I agree. It allows the students to learn the class material in more detail.

sjd2

Posted Today, 8:13 AM New!
I disagree. Although, the professors need to learn how to scale their material to the quarter system.
Posted Today, 9:43 AM New!
I agree. I think those in a semester system reap the benefits because they have more job opportunities, they have longer breaks and more frequent, and they have more time to cover material.

YOUR NAME: YOUR REPLY:

Jordan VanWyhe's Thesis #1

jmvan

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:41 AM New!
Physician assisted suicide should be legalized in the U.S. for special cases in the elderly.

mgd4

Posted Jan 10, 2007 12:22 PM New!
I disagree because it is still a form of suicide and it goes against human nature to not harm others.

dshoes

Posted Jan 10, 2007 1:07 PM New!
I beleive that only in cases where there is extreme amounts of pain that will not subside in elderly, that physicain assisted suicide could be applied.
bjs25

Posted Jan 10, 2007 3:02 PM New!
I have mixed feelings on this topic. Although it would make sense to put someone out of their misery. After the suicide is through, the physicians will have to live with their decision of helping kill a life.

wongjen

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:28 PM New!
I disagree. I just don't think there can be justification assisting suicide.

neotheta

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:37 PM New!
I believe in physician assisted suicide only when there is an extreme amount of mental or physical pain in those that are terminally ill.

emmy21

Posted Yesterday, 10:11 AM New!
I agree, but it shouldn't be for elderly, it should be for the terminally ill.

lthiry

Posted Yesterday, 12:31 PM New!
I disagree; I do not think just because someone is elderly that physician assisted suicide should be legal... there has to be some sort of terminal disease that they are suffering through in order to make it justifiable.
shannw

Posted Yesterday, 3:01 PM New!
I disagree. Old age is not disease.

rbr0wn52

Posted Today, 12:11 AM New!
I agree. I think that physician assisted suicide can be a reasonable option for terminally ill patients. If a doctor gives a patient a prescription for a lethal medication, it removes the physician from the situation to some extent, which might help to alleviate feelings of guilt.

lydiab2

Posted Today, 12:17 AM New!
I think physician assisted suicide should be allowed in only those with painful terminal diseases. Otherwise, it is difficult to decide where to draw the line. Deciding who is in need of physician assisted suicide on a broad case by case basis would be too hard.

meidy251

Posted Today, 1:48 AM New!
I disagree because it is still a suicide. It also put mental pressure to the physician.

ioanec

Posted Today, 4:03 AM New!
I agree. In some instances when quality of life is poor and suffering is great, assisted suicide should be an option.
I agree. Be people should not be made to suffer just so one can feel good about their moral agenda.

s jd2

With obesity a concern and rise for health care as an outcome, the US government should set up a program that requires citizens to exercise once a week.

danhahm

I completely agree. Physical exercises is so important for the health and this would be benefitting everyone.

bjs25

I disagree. I think it is unrealistic for the government to require people to exercise. What would qualify as exercise? Who would have to pay for it? I think in theory its a good intention but it kind of goes against "american freedom."

lthiry
shannw

Posted Yesterday, 3:56 PM New!
I disagree. It is a person’s own choice to take care of themself. Some people are not obese and yet thin, should they be required to work out. And how would they possibly regulate it?

rbrown52

Posted Yesterday, 11:35 PM New!
Absolutely disagree. How can you require people to exercise? This country is entirely built on freedom. It’s definitely controversial though.

meidy251

Posted Today, 12:06 AM New!
I agree. It is good to have a program that require people to exercise regularly. Exercise is not only good for people’s health. It also affect people to have a better mood.

lydiab2

Posted Today, 12:10 AM New!
I disagree. A program of the type suggested would be very costly to start and maintain, and it would be difficult to enforce. I do agree, though, that obesity is a serious concern and should be addressed through education and possibly easier access to exercise resources.

neotheta

Posted Today, 2:11 AM New!
I disagree. People should not be forced to exercise. It should be a decision that they themselves make and I
think this would set a dangerous precedent if enacted.

ioanec

I disagree. It's impossible to implement something such as this without infringing on individual rights.

sjd2

I agree, but disagree with the possibility of implementing such a law. People are simply too lazy. Also, sounds a lot like communism.

emmy21

I disagree. While I do think proper health should be addressed, I don't think exercising one day a week will accomplish anything.

Natalie Gillan - Thesis #2

gillan

Due to the rising obesity epidemic that our nation is
facing, mandatory physical education and nutrition classes should be implemented in the school systems.

emmy21

*Posted Yesterday, 9:45 AM New!*
I agree. I think so many americans have no idea how to take care of themselves, parents included. And everyone should have the opportunity to learn, even if they don't make that opportunity for themselves.

bjs25

*Posted Yesterday, 12:39 PM New!*
I agree. In requiring exercise and providing information about nutrition it would be very beneficial especially in elementary schools to combat obesity before it starts.

shannw

*Posted Yesterday, 3:07 PM New!*
I agree. We should work on maintaining a healthy population. Health and PE should be required in elementary through high school.

rbrown52

*Posted Today, 12:00 AM New!*
I agree, but physical education is already required in the school system and most P.E. classes include information on nutrition.

meidy251

*Posted Today, 12:28 AM New!*
I agree. It is important for people to practice healthy living especially when they are still young.

neotheta

Posted Today, 2:34 AM New!
I agree. Physical education and nutrition classes are usually part of a school's curriculum already. I don't see how more classes will solve the problem.

ioanec

Posted Today, 2:40 AM New!
I agree. With the popularity of video game systems, computer games, etc., kids aren't getting the proper excercise at home. It's a great idea to implement physical education programs.

sjd2

Posted Today, 9:21 AM New!
I agree. PE is awesome.

katiegym

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:54 PM New!
I agree. Nutrition and physical education is something you should be taught in order to stay healthy. This may save lives. A lot of students don't know how to eat and exercise and with it being manditory it may reduce this epidemic.

bjs25

Posted Yesterday, 11:38 AM New!
I agree. I think this is an important step our nation needs to take to stop obesity before it starts especially among grade schools.

Ithiry

I agree. I think it would be a great start in getting a handle of the obesity epidemic in the US.

shannw

I agree. It would be necessary to ensure healthy citizens since the students will be the future of our country.

rbrown52

I agree, but physical education is already required and I have had classes in nutrition in every P.E. class I have taken from junior high on.

lydiab2

I agree. People need to learn about health, and the earlier, the better. It’s much better that people learn about health from an accurate source rather than some new fad.

neotheta

I agree. Physical education is already required in
many schools and so are nutrition classes.

sjd2

Posted Today, 9:09 AM New!
I agree. PE is awesomme.

kchan4

Posted Today, 9:37 AM New!
This topic does not seem controversial enough. I couldn't find a strong argument to disagree and it seems like it is implemented in at least some schools. One of the few reasons to disagree may be from the gov't point of view: not enough budget.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Justin Crane's Thesis #1

jcrizzle

Posted Yesterday, 8:14 AM New!
Drivers should not be able to talk on cell phones while driving.

kchan4

Posted Yesterday, 8:24 AM New!
I agree. talking on the phone makes drivers distracted
and there are lots of accidents because of it. Meanwhile, I think "able" isn't quite what you mean since it implies capability. Perhaps you could reword it to "should not be talking on cell phones."

bjs25

Posted Yesterday, 11:58 AM New!

As much as I hate to agree on this one because I talk while driving I'm going to have to...I think it makes sense and would decrease the amount of car accidents.

lydiab2

Posted Yesterday, 10:51 PM New!

I agree. It is a fact that talking on cell phones while driving distracts drivers and causes more accidents. For safety purposes, talking on the phone while driving should be illegal.

lthiry

Posted Yesterday, 12:01 PM New!

I agree. Even though I am always on my cell phone when I'm driving, I know the roads would be a lot safer and traffic would run a lot smoother if cell phones were banned.

shannw

Posted Yesterday, 4:10 PM New!

I agree. It is a bad and unsafe habit. It causes many accidents that could be easily avoided.

rbrown52

Posted Yesterday, 6:29 PM New!
I would like to disagree because I am always on my phone in the car, but there is no good reason to be talking while driving except convenience, so I would have to agree.

---

gillan

Posted Yesterday, 8:09 PM New!

I agree. Although it would be very hard to enforce.

---

neotheta

Posted Yesterday, 8:13 PM New!

I agree. Cell phones distract drivers and can lead to accidents therefore people should be banned from operating cell phones while they drive.

---

katiegym

Posted Yesterday, 8:24 PM New!

I agree. Cell phones are very distracting and I've even been in a car accident that was caused because I was on my phone and didn't see the light change and had to slam on my brakes. The person behind me couldn't stop fast enough and hit me. This may be hard to enforce, but so is the seatbelt law. If your caught you get fined.

---

dshoes

Posted Yesterday, 8:46 PM New!

I agree. Talking on cell phones are very dangerous when driving.

---

mgd4
I would have to agree also because it's annoying to have drivers do weird things because they are driving on the phone. It would make the roads much safer.

danhahm

I disagree. If you have a blue tooth or a head set its fine.... plus it depends because if you're on the highway there is little thought process to drive ... also its usually the older people with cell phones that always cause trouble for me and bring out the road rage in people....

"Drivers should not "text message" or watch "videos/DVD" while driving might be something to think about"

lydiab2

I agree. It is a fact that talking on cell phones while driving distracts drivers and causes more accidents. For safety purposes, talking on the phone while driving should be illegal.

ioanec

I disagree. All drivers shouldn't be punished for others' inability to make responsible choices (ie: choosing to talk on the phone while driving down a winding road or during a heavy rain storm-some people cannot multitask and shouldn't try).
meidy251

Posted Today, 1:38 AM New!
I agree. It will reduce accidents.

sjd2

Posted Today, 8:34 AM New!
I disagree. We shouldn't legislate for the least capable person, who can't do two things at once.

emmy21

Posted Today, 9:35 AM New!
I agree. I witnessed wrecks that occur because someone is fiddling with their cell phone. I think it should at least be a state law.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Dan Hahm Thesis #2

danhahm

Posted Yesterday, 9:14 AM New!
Washington government should make it illegal for smokers to smoke while walking on the streets with people behind them due to health risks.
bjs25

Posted Yesterday, 12:12 PM New!
I agree. Smoking is bad for everyone's health not just the smoker but the people around them too.

Ithiry

Posted Yesterday, 1:25 PM New!
I agree. People in public should not be subjected to second hand smoke.

shannw

Posted Yesterday, 2:19 PM New!
I agree. Smoking should only be allowed in private places, like your own home or in your backyard. It is disgusting and unhealthy to consume second hand smoke.

meidy251

Posted Today, 12:08 AM New!
I agree. It harms other people on the streets.

lydiab2

Posted Today, 12:20 AM New!
I agree. Secondhand smoke is sucha health risk, and those who have to deal with it have no choice. There should be designated smoking areas outside so that if nonsmokers want to walk around the smoke, they are able to do so.

rbrown52
I agree. There is no need for smokers to walk along amidst non-smokers and blow smoke on everyone. Non-smokers don't really have any control over walking near a smoker, and they should not have to be exposed to second hand smoke in a situation they have no control over.

I disagree. This would make it almost illegal to smoke anywhere. I don't believe in smoking around buildings or in universities or schools but I think banning smoking in the streets is taking it too far.

I disagree. There's no way to implement a law such as this and if that situation occurs, the person behind the smoker can move- it's just as much their space as it is a non-smoker's.

I disagree. This would be impossible to enforce and just leads to the government making other laws to control even more aspects of our lives.

I disagree. It would be too difficult to implement and it would continue to streach to where the only places you could smoke are on your own property and smoking is not illegal.
Rachel Brown Thesis #1

rbrown52

Posted Yesterday, 8:56 AM New!
The U.S. should legalize same-sex marriages.

bjs25

Posted Yesterday, 12:06 PM New!
I disagree. I think marriage is between a man and a women.

Ithiry

Posted Yesterday, 12:17 PM New!
I disagree. Marriage is between a man and a woman. Civil Union? Sure. But not marriage.

shannw

Posted Yesterday, 3:30 PM New!
I disagree. Marriage is something of the church, a civil union is of the state.
I disagree because God created men and women to become one through marriage. Also, same sex marriage will cause diseases such as AIDS.

I agree. I see no reason why same sex couples should not be allowed to marry.

I agree. Same sex marriage does not effect the state of heterosexual marriage.

I agree. Marriage is a state institution and should not be mixed up with religious principles. It is there to encourage family-/-home-building by granting certain privileges, rights and tax breaks. In addition, if marriage is one of the bases for adoption, same-sex couples should be granted that right as well because they could potentially provide as safe an environment and as much financial stability as traditional couples could.

I disagree. I think marriage is for a man and woman, but a union should be recognized for same sex couples that would entitle them to the same benefits as a married couple.
Flag burning should not have a negative bias against it, raising a flag in a way in which it is damaged should.

I disagree; I think flag burning should have a negative connotation. The flag is the national symbol and it should for no reason be destroyed.

I disagree. Flag burning is disrespectful to the country and shouldn't be shown.

I disagree. Flag burning is unpatriotic- if you hate the US that much, move out.
rbrown52

Posted Today, 12:32 AM New!
I disagree -- flag burning is just a symbol of ultimate disrespect.

meidy251

Posted Today, 1:50 AM New!
I disagree. It doesn't seem right to do flag burning. It shows disrespect to the country.

neotheta

Posted Today, 2:27 AM New!
I disagree. Flag burning is a sign of disrespect to me.

ioanec

Posted Today, 2:33 AM New!
I disagree. The point of flag burning is out of protest, so it's supposed to have a negative connotation. And burning the flag is part of freedom of speech, so even though people don't like it, America is founded on our freedoms and you can easily list many things under the "unpatriotic" theme.

sjd2

Posted Today, 9:20 AM New!
I disagree. You cannot change people's connotation of a symbol; especially one of disrespect.

emmy21
I disagree. I think flag burning is done in protest and a negative effect is the desired outcome. I do agree with you on the damaged flag raising though.

Katie Boyko Thesis #2

katiegym

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:32 PM New!
Public Smoking should be illegal.

emmy21

Posted Yesterday, 9:44 AM New!
I disagree. I feel that in the right places (ie outside), it should be allowed, just in a considerate manner. It’s not illegal to smoke so why should it be illegal to smoke in public, I guess is where I stand.

bjs25

Posted Yesterday, 12:31 PM New!
I agree. Second hand smoke is harmful to everyone and it is only fair that we respect the rights of the people around the smoker.

Ithiry
I agree. I think smoking should be done in a private setting so that innocent people should not have to be exposed to second hand smoke. There is nothing worse than walking behind someone and catching the drift of their smoke.

shannw

I agree. Smoking has negative affects on people due to second hand smoke and its use should be barred in order to deter its use.

rbrown52

I disagree. Smoking laws have already been made much more strict -- the 25 foot rule. In certain places, such as your car or in a separate area that is far away from a building, I don't see a problem with public smoking. Also, there are certain places, like outside of a bar, where you just shouldn't go if you don't want to be around smoke.

lydiab2

I'm in the middle on this one. I think there should be designated areas for people to smoke in so that nonsmokers can navigate around them, but smokers do need a place to go, too. Until smoking is abolished, we can't take away all places for smokers to go.

meidy251
I agree. It harms other people's health due to second hand smoke.

I disagree. Smoking in designated areas is fine.

I disagree. While banning smoking from restaurants was a great idea, if in designated spots, there's no reason someone shouldn't be able to smoke in public. Plus, second hand smoke is lessened by being outside.

I disagree. While second hand smoke is harmful, its effects outside are greatly reduced. Politicians have won the battle inside of establishments and should leave it there. If they go any further, we would be infringing on smoker's rights (yes, they have rights too). There must be a line drawn somewhere.

YOUR NAME:  
YOUR REPLY:
wongjen

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:51 PM -- edited Jan 10, 2007 9:02 PM by wongjen

New!

Topic Change:

The U.S. should change to the metric system.

lydiab2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:08 PM

New!

I disagree. Even though the statistics say that the most accidents occur among young drivers, I think this is due to inexperience, not age. In today's society, people are getting involved in more activities at a younger age, and raising the driving age would create a major inconvenience for those who would be responsible for taking them to events. This, in turn, may dissuade youth from getting involved.

bjs25

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:05 PM

New!

I also disagree. Having your license at 16 helps out a lot in getting to school, extracurricular activities etc. Although it seems like a good solution to change the driving age to 18 I don't really think it would solve any problems.

alexre

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:03 PM

New!

I disagree I think the U.S. changing to the metric system would cause confusion among citizens of the United States.
I agree. Every other country uses the metric and it’s easier to learn and remember.

---

I agree. I think the change at first would be extremely difficult, however the rest of the world is using the metric system and it is a much easier system to use and relate to once it is learned.

---

I agree. We should switch to the universal standard. It would eliminate confusion.

---

I agree. The metric system is easier to understand and is already used by U.S. scientists. It might be awkward at first, but would be a beneficial change in the long run.

---

I agree. Switching to the metric system would make business and sciences easier because the U.S. would be using the same system of measurement as our allies.
I agree. It might be confusing at first but everyone in other countries are using metric system. It would be nice if US have the same system of measurement with other countries. People who come to the US will not confuse with the system of measurement and vice versa.

I completely agree. Not only is the metric system much easier (increments of 10), but every other country uses the it!

I agree. The metric system is a lot easier for everyone.

I agree. Woohoo for the metric system.
shannw

Posted Jan 9, 2007 4:48 PM

Congress should amend the law and require women to register with Selective Service, making women eligible for the draft.

lydiab2

Posted Jan 9, 2007 8:51 PM New!

I agree. Today's world is so focused on equal opportunity, so women should share the responsibilities of men, and vice versa.

kchan4

Posted Jan 9, 2007 9:01 PM New!

I disagree. If women were captured in war, they have a high chance of being raped. On the other hand, it may be reasonable to draft women to work at the base, while men (who are on average physically stronger) fights in the actual war.

ioanec

Posted Jan 9, 2007 11:48 PM New!

I disagree. I actually do not agree with the draft at all. I don't think anyone should be forced to enlist, regardless of gender. In equality terms though, I suppose Selective Service should be open to women...but should be optional, not mandatory.

mgd4

Posted Jan 10, 2007 12:30 PM New!

I agree with this thesis because in this world where women want to be considered equals with men they
should be forced to sign up for the draft.

**dshoes**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:02 PM New!*

I disagree. Women do have equality and should have it. However, men and women have different strength, weaknesses and abilities. If they want to draft women to do non-combative jobs, maybe I would agree. Equality doesn't mean that differences are ignored.

**bjs25**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 3:19 PM New!*

I also disagree. Although I think it is only fair that women should have equal rights and therefore register with Selective Service alot of women would not want to be drafted.

**katiegym**

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

I agree. Our country focuses so much on equal rights and enlisting should also be equal.

**emmy21**

*Posted Yesterday, 10:08 AM New!*

I disagree. I know as a woman I would not be an asset to this country's military.

**lthiry**

*Posted Yesterday, 1:06 PM New!*

I agree. Women want all of the other rights men have,
so they should have to take this one on too. However, I do think women should only be drafted for jobs in which they are physically and mentally qualified to handle.

meidy251

Posted Yesterday, 11:20 PM New!
I disagree. If marriage women are also going to a war, who will take care of the family?

danhahm

Posted Yesterday, 11:35 PM New!
I disagree. Females just do not have the physical capabilities and advantages that males have... so are men going to give birth then? get real!!

rbrown52

Posted Yesterday, 11:41 PM New!
I agree. If women and men have equal rights they should also have equal responsibilities. I would assume that factors such as children might exclude women from the service, however.

neotheta

Posted Today, 2:07 AM New!
I agree. Women should share the responsibility of being eligible for the draft.

sjd2

Posted Today, 8:49 AM New!
I agree. We are in an "equal" world and women should
have equal responsibility for the defense of our nation.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Shannon Westphal Thesis #2

shannw

Posted Jan 9, 2007 5:10 PM -- edited Today, 12:08 PM by shannw

New!

The United States should ban the use of animals in circuses due to abuse.

(NOTE- I have changed the thesis)

lydiab2

Posted Jan 9, 2007 8:53 PM New!

I disagree. I do believe that the use of animals should be avoided whenever it's possible, such as in cosmetic testing, but I would rather see a rat harmed than a human being when it comes to drug testing and other important scientific developments.

kchan4

Posted Jan 9, 2007 9:05 PM New!

I cannot agree nor disagree completely. I agree with
Lydia that I would rather keep human from harm at the expense of rats. Yet I also believe that animals should be protected from suffering. If only the law could be amended to assuring that animals would not suffer from testing.

Pto posted Jan 9, 2007 11:56 PM New!

I disagree. Similar to Lydia and Kimberly, I think animals are a better choice than humans. They should not suffer or be subject to unnecessary testing, but they are imperative in many types of pharmaceutical/medical tests.

bjs25

Poster Jan 10, 2007 12:22 PM New!

Although I would like to agree with this thesis, animal testing has enabled many products to be tested so that they do not harm humans. I would have to disagree with this statement.

mgd4

Poster Jan 10, 2007 12:27 PM New!

I disagree because I would rather test on animals than on humans. Also it is a way to test new medicines that could help the greater good.

dshoes

Poster Jan 10, 2007 1:51 PM New!
I agree and disagree. I think that I would rather not have animals used at all, but they do provide a lot of good research. I would compromise with not allowing the animals to suffer.

wongjen

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:15 PM New!

I disagree. Although the ethics are questionable, it is safer to test on animals then to have it not tested and distributed to humans.

gillan

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:47 PM New!

I disagree. If products were not tested on animals then how would they be tested? On humans? What's worse, a rat dying or a human?

katiegym

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:10 PM New!

I disagree. As long as it is controlled and safe this can teach us a lot. In the past people have found cures for deathly diseases from animal testing.

emmy21

Posted Yesterday, 10:01 AM New!
I totally agree. I think that at least with consumer products there are several other ways of producing items that are not harmful to humans without testing on animals. As for research, I think it could be done.

Ithiry

Posted Yesterday, 1:36 PM New!

I agree/disagree. Product testing ie beauty products and such shouldn't be tested on animals. however, i think using animals for research purposes is okay and even necessary in finding ways to cure diseases, etc.

meidy251

Posted Yesterday, 11:29 PM New!

I disagree. It is too risky if medical researchers uses human as their object. While the research has to be done to help to cure some diseases, either human or animals have to be the object.

rbrown52

Posted Yesterday, 11:39 PM New!

I'm on the fence on this one. Lab rats that are used for medical testing are all basically genetically identical and have been bred for testing purposes for years. I think that is okay, since we don't really have any other way of testing new medications or treatments. However, I definitely don't agree with using cats, monkeys, or more sophisticated animals for testing purposes.
I disagree. The use of animals for research is important in helping science help all of us.

I disagree. Animal testing helps us to better understand ourselves and the world, leading to saved lives.

Pre-packaged products containing caffeine should have a warning label identifying the amount of caffeine they contain and the potential harm results from caffeine consumption.

I agree. Caffeine is a drug that has a negative affect
on many people, and it can be addictive. It is important that people are reminded of this every time they pick up a caffeinated beverage.

ioanec

Posted Jan 9, 2007 10:31 PM New!

I disagree. It would not be very practical and labeling items would be a waste of money. Pre-packaged products with large amounts of caffeine are typically consumed for that purpose. Therefore, people who choose to consume them are at least somewhat aware of the effects. In the instance of caffeine-sensitive individuals, if they are aware of their sensitivity, it is very probable that they are aware of products that they should and should not consume so knowing amounts would be irrelevant. Along with this, particular items that usually contain caffeine, but are specialty and do not (i.e. caffeine-free soda), are always labeled.

bjs25

Posted Jan 10, 2007 12:13 PM New!

I agree. Even though caffeine plays such a key role in our society I think it would be a helpful reminder for people to think twice about drinking caffeine when the amount and harmful effects caffeine contains is posted.

mgd4

Posted Jan 10, 2007 12:39 PM New!

I disagree because it would be difficult to institute such a requirement of the companies producing the products.

dshoes
I agree because it could manageable and helpful. Parents should know how much caffeine is in products.

---

I disagree. It is impractical to have to label the caffeine content in products. It isn't a big enough issue for people to care about it to push the companies to make that possible.

---

I disagree. Caffeine is not a new product and thus many people are already familiar with the affects. Also, the costs associated with creating the labels for every product containing caffeine are too great and too time consuming.

---

I agree. Sometimes you will drink something never even knowing that it has caffeine in it because it says caffeine free, but even caffeine free products still contain some amount of caffeine.

---

I agree. Alcohol content is monitored on products and this drug should be on prepackaged products as well. You already have calories and vitamins in the prepackaged products, caffeine would just allow the eater to know what they are consuming.
rbrown52

Posted Yesterday, 5:16 PM New!
I agree for the most part. The only part of the caffeine labels which is not logistical is monitoring caffeine levels in coffee (although coffee shops could include estimated caffeine levels with the nutrition facts pamphlets that they carry). Caffeine is a drug which should be monitored with labels.

meidy251

Posted Yesterday, 11:24 PM New!
I agree. People should pay attention to food and drinks that they consume. By eating and drinking carelessly, it will be dangerous for their health. It would be nice if pre-packaged products containing caffeine have a warning label identifying the amount of caffeine they contain and the potential harm results so that people would be more careful and would understand the consequences of what they consume.

neotheta

Posted Today, 1:59 AM New!
I disagree. I believe that caffeine is relatively harmless.

sjd2

Posted Today, 8:45 AM New!
I agree because this is a sensible approach. It warns the user, but allows them to make the final choice. This is an excellent balance between safety and preserving the right of free will.

YOUR NAME: __________________________  YOUR REPLY: __________________________
Dani Schuster's Thesis #1

*New!
The US should ban the use of high fructose corn syrup in all food production.
(the debate is over real health consequences of the cheat product)

*New!
I completely agree. High fructose corn syrup is an unhealthy product that is in so many foods and we shouldn't manufacture it simply because it is cheap.

*New!
I agree. it is unhealthy and would benefit all individuals if it was banned

*New!

I disagree. I think the level of consumption needed to produce the negative health problems are many times higher than normal consumption. I think more careful study needs to be done to see the average intake of this product and if these levels are actually harmful to humans.

**katiegym**

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:16 PM New!
I agree. High fructose corn syrup is unhealthy.

**emmy21**

Posted Yesterday, 10:03 AM New!
I agree. It is so unhealthy, yet most products have it and it's hard to find certain products without it and therefore at times it's almost leaving us with no choice, but to consume it. I think there are other alternatives that are readily accessible.

**lthiry**

Posted Yesterday, 1:32 PM New!
I disagree. I think a normal level consumption of the product is fine.

**shannw**

Posted Yesterday, 2:16 PM New!
I disagree. We cannot regulate the use of a product solely because it is unhealthy- people drink alcohol, eat chocolate, smoke, and do other unhealthy habits while recognizing the consequences.
I disagree. High fructose corn syrup is a common ingredient found in many foods. It is the job of the American people to regulate their diets and control the amount of simple sugars they intake.

rbrown52

I agree. High fructose corn syrup is very unhealthy and there are much healthier substitutes that could be used instead.

ioanec

I am on the fence about this issue but am leaning toward disagree. This is an issue of consumption and banning the syrup seems to be an unnecessary step.

meidy251

I disagree. I think it is people's choice to consume it or not. There should be a note letting people know that it is unhealthy. However, if they already know it is unhealthy and they still consume a lot of it, it's their own responsibility to their own body.

sjd2

I disagree. It is not the government's job to control every aspect of our lives. However, the general public should be educated on the dangers and people should be able to make the choice for themselves.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Callet Ioane's Thesis #1</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Username: ioanec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

The United States should allow same-sex couples to adopt children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Username: kchan4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Posted Jan 9, 2007 9:23 PM New!*

I agree. Allowing same-sex couples to adopt means giving the children more options and the best family environment they could get. Same-sex couples may also be able to educate their children to not discriminate people of different sexual orientation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Username: bjs25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 12:03 PM New!*

I tend to disagree with this statement, I think children should be raised in a heterosexual environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Username: mgd4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 12:14 PM New!*

I disagree also because that would create a very
difficult life for the child at an early age due to the torment they will recieve from their peers.

**dshoes**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 1:56 PM New!*

Although there are so many kids out there was could benefit from having a larger number of people that could be potential parents, i think that having both a man and a woman as parents helps a lot with development and understanding what i have heard described as "sex roles."

**wongjen**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:39 PM New!*

I disagree, in the child's best interest, it isnt a good family enviroment for them to be raised in because of the criticism they would recieve.

**lthiry**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:26 PM New!*

I disagree. I do not think that society accepts same sex couples which in turn would create controversy around them adopting children. I believe that a same sex couple could be a potentially loving family and provide everything a child may need, however because of society's position the children could be open to a lot of ridicule and an unhealthy environment outside their home.

**emmy21**

*Posted Yesterday, 9:34 AM New!*

I am on the fence. I like to think I am liberal, but this topic is one I am still debating because I feel it may
influence the child's sexual preference.

shannw

*Posted Yesterday, 4:18 PM New!*
I agree that it should be allowed, but I would never let a child of mine be adopted by same sex parents when I could allow her/him to be adopted by a straight couple. It is against the norm and would make a harder life for the child.

rbrown52

*Posted Yesterday, 5:57 PM New!*
I absolutely agree. Same-sex couples have the same rights to adopt children as heterosexual couples.

meidy251

*Posted Today, 1:16 AM New!*
I disagree. Having parents that are the same sex confuses the children. In a family, dad and mom have different role.

neotheta

*Posted Today, 1:41 AM New!*
I agree. The children need homes and the the couples want parents it sounds okay to me.

sjd2

*Posted Today, 8:37 AM New!*
I agree. There is no good reason to now allow them to adopt children except for the hate of others. The hate of others is no reason change one's self.
Lydia Bylsma Thesis #1

lydiab2

Posted Jan 9, 2007 8:55 PM New!
Physician assisted suicide should be legalized in the U.S. to alleviate pain for patients with terminal diseases.

kchan4

Posted Jan 9, 2007 9:10 PM New!
I agree. When there is no cure for a patient, he/ she should be given an option to not suffer till death. I believe, under strict procedures, patients could be protected from unethical "suicides" and still be given relief when diagnosed with terminal disease.

ioanec

Posted Jan 9, 2007 11:03 PM -- edited Jan 9, 2007 11:06 PM by ioanec New!
I agree. Terminally ill patients should not be forced to suffer through their illness. Providing a safe and dignified alternative would prevent some suicide attempts as well ease pain on behalf of the patient and their family/friends. I have lost loved ones to terminal illnesses and I would have given anything to alleviate their pain and not have to stand by helplessly while they suffered.
bjs25

Posted Jan 10, 2007 12:17 PM New!
I don’t know where I stand on this issue. I think it is a good solution to put people out of their misery. However, if the physician regrets helping with the suicide they will have to live with this guilt.

mgd4

Posted Jan 10, 2007 12:35 PM New!
I disagree because the mental strain on the doctor who administers the medication and/or "pulls the plug" is too great for any person to have to deal with.

dshoes

Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:10 PM New!
Truthfully, i really do agree, but i think that allowing physician assisted suicide will cause more hurt than help.

wongjen

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:17 PM New!
i disagree. there is too much responsibility and stress for the physician. i feel like it is an "easy way out" for the patient.

neotheta

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:38 PM New!
I agree. A terminally ill person in great pain should not have to suffer.
emmy21

Posted Yesterday, 10:12 AM New!
I agree. It is important to allow the terminal ill to suffer the least amount as possible.

Ithiry

Posted Yesterday, 12:28 PM New!
I agree. Terminally ill patients should have the right to decide when they want to quit suffering.

shannw

Posted Yesterday, 2:57 PM New!
I disagree. Death is never the answer and doctors are not always correct with their assertions. You could easily kill a happy person due to lack of communication.

rbrown52

Posted Today, 12:14 AM New!
I definitely agree. It makes sense that a terminally ill patient in a great deal of pain might not wish to continue to live their life. Doctors know going into the profession that they will have to make difficult decisions that might contrast with their personal morals (e.g. DNR orders).

meidy251

Posted Today, 1:21 AM New!
I disagree. It is not human to decide the lifetime of a person.
I agree. Religious reasons aside, it seems much more cruel and inhuman to make some one suffer than to cater to our own moral agenda.

The US should decrease meat and dairy production for human consumption

I disagree. Meat contains alot of protein which is important in diets. Dairy is also very important because of the calcium it contains which prevents osteoperosis and aids in healthy bone development.

I disagree. What would be the reason for this? These two products are really important in maintaining your health.
I disagree. Meat and dairy are foods needed for nutrients and are staples of most US citizen's diets.

I disagree. Meat and dairy products are very healthy and are essential for a well-rounded diet.

I disagree. They are both part of a well-balanced diet and contain essential nutrients.

I disagree. Both are good for our health. There is no strong reason why the US should decrease meat and dairy production for human consumption.

Decreasing the production of meat in this country would only increase the imports of meat from other countries so I think the thesis may need some explanation on how the lower production would meet your goals.
sjd2

Posted Today, 8:29 AM New!
I disagree. This would solve nothing.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Lydia Bylsma Thesis #2

lydiab2

Posted Jan 9, 2007 8:59 PM New!
Affirmative action is perpetuating discrimination and should be abolished as part of the college admissions process.

kchan4

I disagree. Traditional discrimination has caused minorities and women to have less chance for education, employment, etc. That in turn gives those groups a lower income and social status on average. Affirmative action in college admission process gives those groups a chance to pursue further education regardless of their financial status, gender, or skin color.

ioanec
I disagree. Affirmative action is helping to decrease the gap in opportunity that historical and present-day racism have created. Underrepresented groups are disadvantaged in many aspects of society and with the existence of white privilege and institutional racism, these groups will never achieve equality across all lines without programs such as affirmative action.

mgd4

I agree because it shouldn't matter what race you are, if you're better for the position I feel you should be given the job/admission.

dshoes

I disagree because we need diversity in schools and this is a safe guard against discrimination of minorities.

bjs25

I agree. In a society where we believe that everyone should be treated equally affirmative action would only highlight discrimination and not accept students based on their qualifications for that particular college.

wongjen

I agree. People should be judges based on their qualifications not on their race.
I agree. Admissions to institutions should be based on merit alone and race shouldn't be any part of the picture.

I agree. It has gotten to the point where race is becoming a determinate on admission, especially here at UW.

I agree. We should not discriminate on the basis of race, religion or whatever, but rather on knowledge.

I agree. I think we as a society have come far enough to be able to assess people based on their qualifications and their character, not their race.

I agree. People should have the same opportunities without discrimination.
I agree. Fighting racism with more racism is a lazy solution and does not actually attack the root of the problem.

The state of Hawai'i should be granted sovereignty.

I am quite neutral on this matter as jurisdiction in Hawai'i does not really concern me personally. On the other hand, I may err more on the disagree side. I understand that Hawaiians may distinguish themselves from the general American population and have cultures and demographies different from the rest of the nation. Yet, given that the U.S. has been advocated as a "melting pot", I don't see why Hawai'i in particular should be granted sovereignty.

I believe that Hawaii benefits a lot from being part of the the US. They have all the rights of being an
American and are supported economically and militarily. I could understand that Hawaii has a lot of unique history and pride, but Hawaii adds to much character to the United States. I don't see why they would want to be on their own. And if they were on their own, Hawaii would still want the US's help when ever there was an issue.

mgd4

Posted Jan 10, 2007 12:41 PM New!
I disagree also because they are apart of the United States and being granted sovereignty would create more problems with other states wanting to break off from the rest of the country.

bjs25

Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:54 PM New!
I disagree as well. If we were to grant Hawaii sovereignty it would seem like they don't want to have anything to do with the United States. Living in isolation from the rest of the country doesn't seem like a reasonable solution especially when Hawaiian customs make the United States even more diverse.

wongjen

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:46 PM New!
I disagree. Im not really informed about Hawaii's political status, but i dont see why they would want to be disconnected with the the United States.

Ithiry

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:13 PM New!
I am indifferent on this topic; I don't really know any
reasons as to why Hawaii would not want to be a part of the US.

**neotheta**

 Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:25 PM New!
 I disagree. The logistical and social problems that would result from allowing Hawaii to become a sovereign nation would be bad for everyone.

**emmy21**

 Posted Yesterday, 9:31 AM New!
 I believe Hawaii should be part of the US because it recieves many benifits in doing so. It may be difficult for them to be their own entity.

**shannw**

 Posted Yesterday, 4:15 PM New!
 I disagree. Hawaii joined the US and cannot leave without a fight.

**rbrown52**

 Posted Yesterday, 4:24 PM New!
 I disagree but I can definitely see both sides of the issue. I think that the Hawaiian culture is quite different than that of the continental United States and brings a new level of diversity to our country.

**lydiab2**

 Posted Today, 1:02 AM New!
 I don't know too much about this issue, but I think I would tend to disagree. If Hawaii is granted
sovereignty, where does that leave other states, like Alaska? Also, wouldn't that leave Hawai'i with less military protection?

meydi251

*Posted Today, 1:14 AM New!*
I disagree. There is no strong reason why Hawai'i want to be part of the US.

sjd2

*Posted Today, 8:22 AM New!*
I disagree. Hawaii is as American as Apple Pie and Picket Fences.

**YOUR NAME:**

**YOUR REPLY:**

Katie Boyko Thesis #1

katiegym

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:31 PM New!*
The WASL should not be a graduation requirement.

emmy21

*Posted Yesterday, 9:40 AM New!*
I disagree on one condition, they get it right. Once they have found test that they see as a statewide
standard then they can implement that. What Gregoire is doing now, allowing schools to implement standardized curriculum before mandating WASL, will help to move towards a state standard.

bjs25

Posted Yesterday, 12:21 PM New!
I agree! Not every student does well with standardized tests it is not fair that a test should determine whether a student can graduate but instead should be based on other aspects.

lthiry

Posted Yesterday, 12:53 PM New!
I agree! I do not think a standardized test reflects a students knowledge and effort in school. Some students just don't test well.

shannw

Posted Yesterday, 2:53 PM New!
I disagree. There is so much disparity between schools that it would be great to have unity in what everyone is being taught.

rbrown52

Posted Today, 12:21 AM New!
I agree. The WASL is not necessarily a good measure of one's accumulation of knowledge, and not all students perform well on standardized tests.

lydiab2
I agree. The WASL causes teachers to teach to the test rather than actually teaching the material. It actually puts students at a learning disadvantage.

I disagree. The WASL is the standard test in the US. It is to make sure that every school have the same teaching material and is not behind.

I agree! Not only does it force teachers to alter their curriculum to accommodate the test material, and therefore not teach other important lessons, but it's not an appropriate or accurate representation of how much a student has learned.

SIDE NOTE- the WASL is NOT a national standardized test. It stands for Washington Assessment for Student Learning and has little creditability outside of our state.

I agree. Standardized tests are not always the best indicators of a student's knowledge or aptitude.
I disagree. The WASL test material is basic knowledge and should be simple to pass for any high school student on track for graduation.

---

**Kimberly's thesis #2**

**kchan4**

Posted Jan 9, 2007 8:55 PM New!
The U.S. should legally recognize same sex marriages.

**lydiab2**

Posted Jan 9, 2007 9:01 PM New!
I agree. Married couples are allowed many rights that gay couples cannot currently share, such as tax deductions and healthcare. These are rights that all couples should have.

**ioanec**

I agree completely. The government does not have the right to tell you who you can and cannot marry. Just like Lydia mentioned, same-sex couples are denied over 1100 rights granted to married couples, such as property rights and healthcare decisions. Along with this, in allowing states to NOT recognize same-sex marriages that have occurred in other
states is a violation of the Constitution. A legally obtained marriage license in one state is supposed to be recognized in all states.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mgd4</th>
<th>Posted Jan 10, 2007 12:37 PM New!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I disagree because in my opinion (for what its worth) a marriage is between a man and a woman and this clearly goes against that. I have no problem calling it a civil union but just dont give it the title of marriage. In the civil union they should be given the same rights as married couples.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dshoes</th>
<th>Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:15 PM New!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I disagree. I beleive that marraige was created for one man and one woman. I beleive this is what the family unit should look like.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>bjs25</th>
<th>Posted Jan 10, 2007 3:36 PM New!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I also disagree and also believe that a marriage is between a man and woman.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>wongjen</th>
<th>Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:45 PM New!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I agree. The rights that come with marrige should not be denied to a person because of their sexual orientation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ithiry</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I disagree. I think the US should recognize same sex couples, however I do not think those couples should get the title of marriage since marriage stems from the Bible and is ritually between a man and a woman.

I agree. People should be able to choose for themselves who they wish to spend the rest of their lives with. Gay couples should be able to marry and achieve the same kinds of social and legal benefits that marriage provides.

I disagree. Marriage is between a man and a women.

I disagree. Marriage is between a man and a women. This is what a family unit should look like and if not it may cause problems for a child.

I disagree. I think they should have the same rights, but not recognize it as a marriage, but a union with the same rights. I think that marriage should be between a man and a woman.
shannw

Posted Yesterday, 3:57 PM New!
I disagree. A marriage is between a man and a woman. It is done in the church and a civil union can be done between a same sex couple.

rbrown52

Posted Yesterday, 8:27 PM New!
I agree. Same-sex couples deserve the same rights and ability to make their relationship official through marriage.

alexre

Posted Yesterday, 8:42 PM New!
I agree. I think same sex couples should have the same rights as everyone else.

dshoes

Posted Yesterday, 9:06 PM New!
I disagree because i think that the family unit of a man and woman is so important to keep.

bryce11

Posted Yesterday, 10:07 PM New!
I disagree. Marriage is between a man and a woman. Period.

danhahm
I disagree. Humans know between right or wrong even though no one taught us... and for me it just seems wrong and not natural. I was at a concert with couple of younger kids and infront of us was a couple (same sex) and they were kissing in public ... and the kids were grossed out and asked me questions ... and i just didnt know what to say to them or explain it... I sure dont want my kids to see that in the future!!

I disagree because God created men and women to become one through marriage. Also, same sex marriage will cause diseases such as AIDS.

I agree. Same sex marriage does not affect the condition of heterosexual marriage. Telling people what they can and can't do is just not cool.

i agree. if two people are in love and want to get marries, who cares what sex they are.