Brent Larson Thesis #2

uwbrent

Posted Yesterday, 12:27 AM New!
Minimum wage in Washington should not be raised.

naughj

Posted Yesterday, 1:13 AM New!
Would Washington’s increased minimum wage be in response to a nationally increased wage or would there be other reasons for doing so?

laurenef

Posted Today, 11:07 AM New!
i agree that in washington the minimum wage shouldn't be raised b/c i feel its already pretty high

YOUR NAME: 

YOUR REPLY:

James Fredrickson Thesis #1

jamesf6

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:40 PM New!
Affirmative action should be practiced in the workforce throughout the United States.

fysician

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:09 PM New!
Upon reading the thesis, I am not quite sure whether you meant that affirmative action must be enforced by the government or people should recognize the
benefits and implement it voluntarily. I think the topic can be either controversial or rather uncontroversial depending on the strength of your assertion.

This thesis begs a further question. What kind of affirmative action should be practiced in the workforce? Would this kind of affirmative action be limited to hiring or would it also act in regards to promotion? Still a controversial topic though.

Posted Yesterday, 5:00 PM New!
This would be very interesting, especially here. Though usually considered a very liberal region, we are one of only two states not to enact AA anymore. And certainly the matters of it being just a hiring issue or a promotional issue as well need to be dealt with. Never the less it would be a great thesis and controversial as well.

Posted Yesterday, 5:15 PM New!
i don't really understand what you are saying here so i can't really agree or disagree. if you are saying that positive actions should be practiced in the workplace then yeah i agree

Posted Yesterday, 5:59 PM New!
I agree that your thesis statement could be controversial but needs to be narrowed a bit

Posted Yesterday, 7:37 PM New!
I agree. However, most of the people I know would not, so I think this would be a controversial issue.
jake10

Posted Today, 10:53 AM New!
i dont really understand what u r saying specifically but i think the topic has good potential

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Kwang Kim's thesis #1

fysician


I am not sure if I am allowed to do this, but I am going to modify this thesis also. It was originally "Genetically modified food should not be approved in the US.", now the modified version will be "Genetically modified food should not be approved for production and sale in the US, as well as importation from any other countries, except for research purposes."

naughj

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:06 PM New!

It appears that your thesis could go in several directions. It could either mean that US residents should not approve of genetically modified food. The FDA should not permit the sale of genetically modified for. Perhaps finally that genetically modified food is unsafe.
Same with the BGH, the market may take a hit temporarily but I think it's something that's necessary for us to do.

i don't really have much knowledge on this topic so i can't really agree or disagree.

I agree that it would be nice if we went all organic but the process would have to be gradual to maintain sufficient supply for demand.

I'm not sure how I feel about this.

i agree with this statement food should be natural and not altered in any way

YOUR NAME: thesis 2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:24 PM New!
(Based off thesis 1: EPA's Duwamish Cleanup proposal)

The EPA is proposing that once toxic sediment is extracted from the Duwamish Waterway it will be loaded onto trucks that will transport the sediment to Roosevelt in a Waste Disposal Facility in Roosevelt, Eastern Washington. Included in this proposal are details on the planned route these trucks will take to get to the Waste facility—a route that requires these trucks (that will weigh tons) to go over the South Park Bridge. Although this bridge has received a safety rating of 7/100 and can barely withstand normal day traffic, this route has been chosen because the only alternative route will require the trucks to travel through the business district in South Park—an option that was ruled out to prevent the highly probably chance that toxic sediments will spill onto business district streets. **My thesis statement is that the EPA should not chose the route that includes the South Park bridge.** The bridge is unsafe and if it collapses with a truck on it all of the toxic sediment will go back into the Duwamish where it will cost millions of dollars to extract again.

**fysician**

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

I am wondering if this topic is indeed highly controversial. Maybe I have never heard about this issue because I do not live in South Park. For the assignment purpose, probably it would be better to find a topic that concerns the local people or somehow connect this to the audience, which will be your classmates. Otherwise, this topic might be just too uncontroversial.

**naughj**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:17 PM New!*

I appreciate the background information that you've provided but I still lack enough insight to really comment. It seems that this issue has both sides and the implications of decisions around could be controversial. One concern would be how to get enough information to an audience who knows nothing about this issue in 5 min or less.
It does seem a bit localized to the area, I had never even heard about this before.

I haven't ever heard of this topic before and am therefore undecided either way.

I don't think this issue is controversial enough, though if you somehow convince the audience that it affects a large group of people in an important way, maybe you will have a good case.

I have no idea about this topic.

Kwang Kim’s thesis #2

.
As John pointed out, my original thesis "Any kind of political agenda setting activities should not be allowed in the UW campus." is vague in its meaning and to be honest, upon re-reading, I feel that it does not even say what I intended to say. I hope I am allowed to modify my thesis anytime before it is due. Assuming that I am allowed, I am going to change my thesis to "Any kind of political propaganda or protest activities should not be allowed in the UW campus." by "political propaganda or protest activities," I mean activities such as handing out pamphlets that contain political issues, a certain politician's view, or information regarding legislation of certain laws.

It would be extremely helpful to know what you mean by "agenda setting." I actually act as one of two student liaisons who help create the ASUW legislative agenda and feel that what we do should not only be allowed but is actually beneficial.

I am confused on what exactly the thesis is about, but in terms of allowing people to hand our pamphlets and what not...it's just one of those civil liberties that people have and it's hard to make a good argument for taking them away without taking away other people's rights...like say our right to do our protest speech in red square. In fact if you think about it, you will be standing in red square protesting people protesting.

i agree. personally i wish they wouldn't hand out anything on campus except things involving school like things about homecoming week and school events. i think anything other than that ( election involved flyers) are a piece of litter waiting to be dropped and stepped on by hundreds of students in
red square.

**ejm4**  
*Posted Yesterday, 8:07 PM New!*

I disagree. This violates a basic right. If people aren't interested, they shouldn't be bothered, but people who are trying to be heard should have that chance.

**jake10**  
*Posted Today, 10:38 AM New!*

i disagree this university is a public school and america gives people the right of free speech so there is no reason why it should not be allowed

**YOUR NAME:**

**YOUR REPLY:**

**Kevin Merritt #2**

**merrittk**  
*Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:54 PM New!*

The U.S. should continue to launch manned space missions.

**naughj**  
*Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:05 PM New!*

Three arguments that might help bolster this thesis are; first, manned space flight has added prestige to the United States. Two, manned space flight allows continued study of the effects of space flight on the human body. Three, human space flight is at times absolutely necessary and if the U.S. wants to be
involved in space some portion of its resources must be spent on manned missions.

**tychiang**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:44 PM New!*

i agree. i think people on the moon is fantastic. even if we've already accomplished it a few times.

**trf**

*Posted Yesterday, 4:05 PM New!*

I totally agree. There are numerous reasons for space travel, and as Prof. Ceccareli mentioned in class the technology could be used to better humankind here on earth as well.

**ejm4**

*Posted Yesterday, 8:11 PM New!*

i agree. funding should come from a cut in military spending.

**becker10**

*Posted Yesterday, 10:42 PM New!*

the fact that you used the word 'continue' makes me wonder... many people are unaware that the space flight program is even in question. that should be brought into thesis

**ersoze**

*Posted Today, 3:15 AM New!*

Two things: trace of recent water activity on the surface of Mars has been discovered, as well as liquid methane lakes on Jupiter's moon, Titan. These suggest the possibility of current or at least recent life in our very solar system.

**iank2**

*Posted Today, 7:24 AM New!*

I’m not sure if this is a controversial topic, though.
jake10

Posted Today, 10:31 AM New!
i disagree with this because i believe it costs to much money and we have machines that could just as easily venture into space without the cost

laurenef

Posted Today, 10:37 AM New!
i disagree while at first it may have been necessary i believe that now our technology will allow us to send man made machines that don't need humans inside them to run but can run them from the ground instead.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Ben Yost’s Thesis Statement #1

yostb

Posted Jan 9, 2007 11:20 PM New!
The US government should not build a fence along its border with Mexico, but should instead come up with alternative solutions to the immigration problem.

naughj

Posted Jan 10, 2007 12:42 AM New!
This statement may be too "balanced" to be very controversial. It is absolutely arguable but if an opponent was not an ardent supporter of building a fence then most likely "common" not "controversial" ground would be found.
iank2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 1:32 PM New!
The statement is too unclear. We have a fence already, but your statement purports that we're building a new one, which isn't correct. You'd be better off just saying the U.S. should do "your idea".

honore

Posted Jan 10, 2007 3:38 PM New!
I agree with the first clause, which seems to make for a good umbrella topic. I don't think you need the second clause in your thesis, but it could work as a premise to support your conclusion.

laurenef

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:49 PM New!
i agree with the fence part but your thesis seems a little broad.

trf

Posted Yesterday, 2:57 PM New!
I agree. But you should come up with some broad outline or idea for a solution so as to narrow down your thesis.

mtp5

Posted Yesterday, 3:38 PM New!
I'll agree with everyone else. this thesis is really broad. try making it a little more one-sided.

fysician

Posted Yesterday, 11:38 PM New!
Probably, bringing up possibility of alternative solutions is not necessary in the scope of this assignment. It rather draws the reader's attention to the alternative solutions than whether the fence should be built or not.
ersoze

Posted Today, 2:58 AM New!
Focus on one thing: either why the government shouldn't build a fence, or the alternate solution.

jake10

Posted Today, 10:35 AM New!
i agree with this statement because it would cost a lot of money and still not guarantee to keep people out of america

YOUR NAME: YOUR REPLY:

Sam Almo Thesis #1

samalmo

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:04 PM New!
Governments should not restrict AIDS research in third world countries, because the benefits outweigh the ethical dilemma's associated with treatments that are unapproved for testing on human subjects.

naughj

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:07 PM New!
I have to say that I have never thought about this topic before. It has the elements of developed vs. undeveloped world and also has science vs. morality. Evidence may be difficult to come by for support. It may come down to scientists vs. underdeveloped gov'ts. Good luck.
tychiang

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:49 PM New!
I agree but only because I'm not exactly sure what kind of aid is available to those countries now, and I don't know what consequences are expected of human testing. I do know that there are advanced enough treatments/medications that allow some people who have AIDS to lead "normal" lives but I also know these treatments are very expensive. Anyway, if you do talk about this you should mention how these treatments aren't a viable option for people in third world countries.

trf

Posted Yesterday, 4:20 PM New!
Not really sure what to say because I wasn't aware that there was questionable testing going on. It certainly makes sense and I think it actually would be very interesting if you deem it controversial enough

ejm4

Posted Yesterday, 8:12 PM New!
I need to know more before I can voice an opinion.

becker10

Posted Yesterday, 10:23 PM New!
i don't have much of an opinion on this because I am unaware of this topic. I would probably agree but I need to know more

fysician

Posted Yesterday, 11:30 PM New!
First of all, which governments are the governments in the thesis? I think lots of drugs unapproved in developed countries are being tested in African countries, and it has been a hot issue. Before that, as a person who has never been to anywhere near Africa, I can't see myself being troubled by this issue. Also, there is not anything I can think we can do to rectify the situation. Probably, you could try to tie this to the
US foreign policy so we can feel more connected to the topic.

Posted Today, 3:11 AM New!
To give you an alternate avenue of thinking: it is far, far easier to try to prevent the spread of AIDS than to try to cure every infected person. Think about it: how much does a condom or a BC pill cost? Versus how much does it cost to treat one patient? Perhaps you might make an argument for how our "aid" should be in the form of educational programs for STD-awareness and prevention, instead of in treatment form which only reaches a very limited amount of people due to its costs.

jake10

Posted Today, 10:33 AM New!
i dont know to much about this topic but it seems to have a good argument

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Tim Fishel's Thesis #1

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:16 PM New!
All standardized testing should be abolished in our nation’s schools and replaced with portfolio reviews or performance evaluations.

naughj

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:22 PM New!
Very interesting. This thesis allows for a discussion of the values of education, meritocracy, race, socioeconomic status. Because it deals with so many substantial and controversial areas but is also specific to one topic it creates great opportunities for argumentation.

_tychiang_

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:00 PM New!
I'll agree with that. I think portfolios would be a much better assessment of a person's individuality amongst other things.

_jamesf6_

Posted Yesterday, 10:17 PM New!
i like this thesis statement alot. It is narrow but not too narrow. It leaves alot of space for discussion.

_b Becker10_

Posted Yesterday, 10:34 PM New!
this is a very good controversial thesis. you might want to also explore what types of performance evaluations. like, for the student as a whole or for individual basic subjects?

_i anK2_

Posted Today, 7:29 AM New!
What about the costs of doing this? Many profs hate mult. choice, but the resources simply don't exist for each student to be graded on this deep of a level. To do it on a national level would be mind-boggling in the amount of time and money that would take, comparatively.

_jake10_

Posted Today, 10:23 AM New!
i agree with this totally hands on presentations is the best way to prove whether someone grasps an idea
laurenef

*Posted Today, 10:32 AM New!*

yeah i agree with this. personally because i had standardized testing

YOUR NAME:  

YOUR REPLY:  


Brent Larson Thesis #1

uwbrent

*Posted Yesterday, 12:22 AM New!*

Supermarkets in Washington should be allowed to sell hard alcohol.

naughj

*Posted Yesterday, 1:11 AM New!*

I've never heard this issue be described as controversial but it is a worthy topic for sure. Government controlled monopolies probably should be more controversial. New York and California don't have gov't owned liquor stores and they seem to function reasonably well.

fysician

*Posted Today, 12:03 AM New!*

Actually, I don't even know what the definition of hard alcohol is. And I did not know that supermarkets are not allowed to sell "hard" liquors in Washington state. My question is except for the convenience factor, is there any benefit of selling hard liquors in supermarkets?
ersoze

*Posted Today, 2:50 AM New!*
Yes, liquor stores usually close much earlier than supermarkets do (most supermarkets are 24/7). This limits availability, which is good for "control", if you know what I mean.

iank2

*Posted Today, 7:28 AM New!*
You could make a good topic out of unnecessary gov. regulation of things the public obviously wants.

jake10

*Posted Today, 10:25 AM New!*
yes i agree with this statement because it is not illegal so sell so why not make it more convinient for the customer

laurenef

*Posted Today, 10:30 AM New!*
i agree with you also for pretty much the same reasons as people above me here in the posts

YOUR NAME: | YOUR REPLY:
---|---

**lauren fiedler thesis #2**

laurenef

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:11 PM New!*
the drinking age should be lowered to age 18.
- ok for this i was thinking i could maybe talk about how i think it should still be illegal for 18 year olds to buy alcohol but they would be allowed to drink it. only 21 year olds and up could buy alcohol.- let me know if this is just too confusing.

naughj

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:52 PM New!

Making the distinction between buying and consuming only obviscates the issue and muddies the argument. If 18yr olds should be allowed to drink alcohol than they should be able to legally purchase it as well. Limiting purchasing rights makes it seem as if there is a problem with 18yr olds having alcohol in the first place.

trf

Posted Yesterday, 3:00 PM New!

Yeah I would agree with John, it seems a little backwards. But on the other hand if it could be effectivenesslly enforced it could be interesting and I would love to hear your ideas on how this would happen.

fysician

Posted Yesterday, 11:52 PM -- edited Yesterday, 11:55 PM by fysician New!

Letting 18 year olds drink but at the same time not letting them buy does not, first of all, change the situation in any extent. The biggest preventive mechanism of underage drinking is not letting them purchase it, at least in my opinion. And as long as they get hold of alcoholic beverages, they drink it without getting in any trouble except when they cause a serious crime such as fatal car accident. So not allowing them to purchase would not be any different from keeping the drinking age at 21.

ersoze

Posted Today, 2:55 AM New!

If you lower the drinking age to 18 but the purchasing
age stays at 21, you run into the problem of 21+ year olds making money off of redistribution. This is lost tax money for the government.

**iank2**  
*Posted Today, 7:27 AM New!*

I'd say just stick with lowering the drinking age to 18, period.

**jake10**  
*Posted Today, 10:29 AM New!*

I agree with this statement because if your old enough to be tried as an adult then you should be able to make the decision to drink or not, it also takes the risk factor of being caught out of it for kids which I think would make a difference.

**Ian Kristensen's Thesis #2**

**iank2**  
*Posted Jan 10, 2007 12:59 PM New!*

"The City of Seattle should provide illegal drug users with legal, rationed supplies of drugs."

**laurenef**  
*Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:40 PM New!*

I disagree. Where would this money come from to support this program? Why should Seattle supply drug users with more drugs? Maybe I'm just uninformed on the topic.
tychiang
Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:34 PM New!
I both agree and disagree. I see how waning off of really hard core illegal drugs may be easier with legal prescribed drugs but the system just gets abused. People who are that addicted never really feel like the substitutes are the same and many people go right back to the drugs they were hooked to and sell their prescription drugs. I do think this is a controversial topic though.

fysician
Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:42 PM New!
I do not know much about this topic. However, this topic concerns me in a few ways, a couple of which might be a good question for you to ask to improve your thesis or prepare the speech. If "illegal" drug users will be provided with "legal" rationed supply of drugs, wouldn't that also mean that virtually drugs will be legal? And who are "illegal" drug users? In other words, who will qualify to rightfully claim the government-provided drug?

trf
Posted Yesterday, 4:00 PM New!
This thesis definitely is controversial, I would have to disagree but perhaps if you got the testimony of a current/former drug user would shine some light on it. I'm not quite sure how it would fix the problem of their addiction, but it would certainly curtail alot of violent crime caused because of the drug war.

ejm4
Posted Yesterday, 8:22 PM New!
I do not agree. There must be a better solution. Also, it seems like it would be costly and difficult to properly enforce this plan.

becker10
at the end of this thesis you could add that maybe this idea would help wean drug users off drugs in rehab situations. it's hard to understand why this is even a stemming idea.

iank2

My question to those that disagree would be what you think is more expensive: the economic aspect of our war on drugs, which literally creates a multi-billion dollar economy out of selling illegal drugs (which leads to many other types of crime), or destroying that economy by leaking out drugs to any user that needs it. Drug prices drop (except for, perhaps, the ultra-rich that want to buy massive quantities) and anyone addicted to drugs won't be out looking to buy when you can easily get them for free.

I think the thesis statement mind need tightening, as it sounds like there is some confusion over what I mean. Any suggestions?

drjake

i disagree with this statement because i believe by giving the users free drugs it will just increase the problem.
Digital Rights Management infringes on private property rights and should be eradicated.

DRM refers to technologies used by record companies. For example, those that limit what you can do with your music by making it so you cannot back it up.

---

**naughj**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:49 PM New!*

The counterpoint to this argument would be that intellectual property and copyright need to be protected and that DRM is in fact a compromise between consumers and producers of music/movies.

---

**tychiang**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:41 PM New!*

I really don't have much of opinion on this topic because I'm not that familiar with it. However, I can voice that I do enjoy file sharing though I can understand the arguments of every media artist out there...but there are WAY too many artists getting paid way too much for really uncreative shit. For example, how many times can you really stand fergie saying "my humps" within a four minute time frame and then probably twice more in every other song she's ever sung?

---

**trf**

*Posted Yesterday, 3:53 PM New!*

I agree, large record companies have so many advantages over the consumer already. They make money from record sales, performances, merchandise. They get to shove their artist down our throat 24/7 on MTV and VH1 and on countless TV ads. Now they won't even let us backup our files, or burn a CD for a friend. This is plain selfishness and I completely agree.

---

**ejm4**

*Posted Yesterday, 8:24 PM New!*

I don't know. I guess I disagree, esp. if music is being stolen from artists. But I don't know enough to stand by this opinion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Username</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>becker10</td>
<td>Posted</td>
<td>I am also not very familiar with this topic. I enjoy file sharing as well and I believe this would be a great theseis for a controversial topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iank2</td>
<td>Posted</td>
<td>I think this is a great topic. Many different types of people actually have passionate arguments for and against.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jake10</td>
<td>Posted</td>
<td>i have no idea what this is so i am unable to help u sorry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honor</td>
<td>Posted Jan 10</td>
<td>A woman's right to abort her fetus should not be grounded in the US Constitution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naughj</td>
<td>Posted Jan 10</td>
<td>Very unique phrasing of a highly controversial topic. Currently, this is a legal matter that has substantial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
differentiation in interpretation between state and federal courts/legislatures. It would be necessary to establish federal supremacy and validity in determining this matter. The advantages if those factors are established would then become more easily arguable.

**tychiang**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:57 PM New!*

honoré, you confused me with this one earlier today so I'm just going to repeat what I said before. This is a sticky issue that IS highly controversial and because of your statement, you will definitely need to define your stance on the types of things that are appropriate vs. inappropriate rights to amend in the constitution.

**trf**

*Posted Yesterday, 4:42 PM New!*

Obviously this a highly controversal issue, so that isn't a problem. But you would do well to phrase it a bit better, it is unique but also confusing.

**laurenef**

*Posted Yesterday, 4:48 PM New!*

I think what you are saying is "abortion should be legal"?

If that is the case I disagree with your statement b/c I believe it is murder to kill an unborn baby.

**ejm4**

*Posted Yesterday, 8:05 PM New!*

I agree. If a pregnant woman does not want to be a mother, she should not be forced into that role. It is bad for both sides. What about mothers who drink, smoke, or do other unhealthy things that harm a fetus? Should they be punished? Should taxpayers be forced to care for a child who comes from a family that is unable to support it? We certainly don't have a lack in population either, so less children is actually better. Finally, when abortions aren't legal, women and girls are likely to get them anyway, under
conditions that are not safe. This topic is of interest to me.

iank2

Posted Today, 7:36 AM New!

I think the legal side of the statement is great.

jake10

Posted Today, 10:15 AM New!

a very good topic i was a little confused with how u stated it i think u are in support of abortion, if that is true i disagree with that if u are mature enough to make the decision to have sex then u are old enough to have a child

YOUR NAME:  
YOUR REPLY:

Travis Honore's 2nd thesis

honore

Posted Jan 10, 2007 3:50 PM New!

The US government should never use torture as a means to gather intelligence.

naughj

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:21 PM New!

This is a murky but undeniably controversial topic. To argue you it one might first create operational definitions for "torture" and "intelligence." Without those definitions arguing that case would be far more difficult.
tychiang

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:59 PM New!
I agree that your definition of "torture" needs to be defined but I disagree with your thesis statement. I think it's quite an effective method and we're not the only nation that does it.

trf

Posted Yesterday, 4:46 PM New!
Just because we aren't the only nation that does it doesn't mean it's right, if I'm not mistaken it also violates the Geneva Convention which we did sign.

laurenef

Posted Yesterday, 5:02 PM New!
i think you should be a little more clear on this. first off, what is your definition of torture? that would help a bit in the misunderstanding of your statement. i disagree with torture but then again if you've tired every other way and have had no success...

ejm4

Posted Yesterday, 7:52 PM New!
I agree. However, I was under the impression that this sort of behavior is already outlawed. You will need to give examples to convince the audience that this is indeed a real problem in the US.

iank2

Posted Today, 7:37 AM New!
No, there are many ways around it, which we're currently using. We outsource torture to the Middle-East and other countries, which cracks me up.

jake10

Posted Today, 10:10 AM New!
i agree there are many other methods to gathering information with out having to torture people
 Jake Locker's thesis #1

jake10

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:27 PM New!
Professional athletes should have a salary cap.

honore

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:47 PM New!
I disagree. Let the market be their salary cap.

naughj

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:16 PM New!
Having the thesis be so broad as to encompass all athletes is probably its weakest feature. There is honest and good controversy around athletes salaries but those arguments are different for every field of athletics.

laurenef

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:08 PM New!
i agree. that way players would play for the love of the game instead of for how much they would be getting paid.

tychiang

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:04 PM New!
I agree that your thesis statement needs to be more specific. Maybe talk about baseball players specifically like how we talked about in class
I actually don't think it's too broad, I feel it is something that isn't often brought up as a proposal despite the fact that people complain about pro athletes outrageous salaries all the time. It would be especially pertinent considering the outrageous amounts of money thrown around during this baseball offseason for rather mediocre players (Zito, Gary Matthews Jr.)

I disagree. If fans are willing to pay outrageous prices to watch a game of sell-out players, they should. If it's too much, they shouldn't participate. Also, what about the owners? Don't they make far more than the players? Or maybe that isn't the real issue for most people.

The U.S. should stop sending troops over to Iraq.

Well after tonight you can be sure that President Bush disagrees with you. There is likely no more important issue than the Iraq war to be discussed right now and US troop levels are a key topic. Sending more troops in a "surge" is highly controversial and with the
Indeed, this is very relevant considering what Bush just announced. I think it would be good to expand this, maybe to discuss other solutions to the problem in Iraq.

laurenef

i disagree that we should pull out of iraq but i agree with not increasing the number of troops over there.

tychiang

I never knew what to think about this and I still don’t so I would find this topic to be very interesting.

ejm4

I agree. It is a decision that neglects to take in to account the feelings of the majority of voters, politicians and others in the United States.
Barak Obama should be the Democratic presidential candidate in 2008.

This thesis is definitely more controversial than the similar one involving Hillary Clinton. Surely, a discussion of race would occur and that subject is very sensitive and possibly controversial. With all the coverage Obama has been getting there are probably some polls that could support this thesis.

I’m so sorry I don’t know as much as I should about politics. I would love to hear about this topic tho.

Though I think discussions of gender are as controversial as race right now, I like the idea of exploring the idea of having any person from a minority represent the democratic party. I agree with your thesis.

Every American citizen should have to serve one year
in the military or a public service.

naughj

Posted Yesterday, 1:24 PM New!
A similar policy exists in Germany and has been met with some enthusiasm. Conscientious objectors would appreciate the alternative of public service to military service. However, the economic situation in the United States is different than that of many countries with conscription so looking into those implications would be helpful.

tychiang

Posted Yesterday, 6:58 PM New!
I agree with this. I like that there is an option between military and public service.

ejm4

Posted Yesterday, 7:27 PM New!
I definitely do not agree. I think we have enough professionals to handle conflicts. I think a requirement like this would cause more problems than it is worth. If you decide to make this argument, you will have to clearly state the benefits of it beyond, "it will increase a sense of national pride." What concrete benefits will we see from breaking apart families, disrupting jobs and forcing people to perform a service that might not lead to any positive change?

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Danielle's Thesis # 2
lawrid

*Posted Yesterday, 9:04 AM New!*

The city of Las Vegas should lower the gambling age to 17 in Casinos.

naughj

*Posted Yesterday, 1:19 PM New!*

I guess I will try to present some opposition to this thesis. First, 17yr olds have very little disposable income and that income they do have should probably not be spent on gambling. Second, casinos in Las Vegas allow the consumption of alcohol and cigarettes which 17yr olds are universally prohibited from purchasing and consuming in the United States. Being in close proximity to the consumption, sale and secondary effects of those products may be harmful to 17yr olds. Those are just two arguments this thesis may encounter.

tychiang

*Posted Yesterday, 7:02 PM New!*

I disagree and think that your thesis would be hard to argue. Given that, go for it! It’s definitely controversial.

ejm4

*Posted Yesterday, 7:20 PM New!*

I do not agree. This is not important to me. Teens have bigger problems than this.
lawrid  
 Posted Yesterday, 9:02 AM New!  
The U.S should legalize the playing of the National Anthem before the start of every morning at school for all ages.

naughj  
 Posted Yesterday, 1:12 PM New!  
Its interesting you chose the national anthem instead of the pledge of allegience. Was this to avoid the controversy of "one nation under god" or is the contention of this thesis that the National Anthem is superior in its purpose. Defining eithers "purpose" would be essential.

tychiang  
 Posted Yesterday, 7:07 PM New!  
In response to this, I almost think that the National anthem should replace the pledge of allegiance. If I remember the words to our National anthem I don't think it has any references to religion...might be a good thesis

 ejm4  
 Posted Yesterday, 7:16 PM New!  
I don't care. I guess the national anthem would cause less waves. Really, both are not necessary to the education of students.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Michelle Hannah Thesis 1
mlh26

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:13 PM New!
The United States should recognize not only black history month, but months to recognize all other races as well.

naughj

Posted Yesterday, 1:05 AM New!
I'm pretty sure there are other months or weeks that are covered. I know for certain that there is an Asian American month. Undoubtedly there would be a pretty heated debate over creating a White/Caucasian history month.

trf

Posted Yesterday, 5:23 PM New!
I think you could make a strong case for the need of a Native American month, considering about 90 of their race was killed off when the Europeans came over and those atrocities don't receive the attention they should. However we must keep in mind that African American's were subject to 500 years of slavery and much of America and the early American economy was built on the backs of those slaves. To say that Latinos, Asians, and Middle Easterns weren't subject to racist atrocities would be ridiculous, but African Americans in this country hold a unique position within our history of racial prejudices. Just something to keep in mind.

laurenef

Posted Yesterday, 5:41 PM New!
i don't really have an opinion one way or the other on this issue

ejm4

Posted Yesterday, 5:57 PM New!
I agree. However, ALL ethnicities should be recognized. That means, a European American month should be set aside as well. I think you will need to be clear about what the purpose of celebrating different
groups might be. Also, would your plan include the celebration of minorities that are not based on race?

ejm4

Posted Yesterday, 6:00 PM New!
I agree. However, when you mean ALL races I assume that means European Americans as well. Also, would your plan include the celebration of minorities not based on race?

tychiang

Posted Yesterday, 6:49 PM New!
I don't think that's a bad idea although it might be hard to have designated celebrations for every race. One reason why I do like the idea is that it would be really beneficial to have the opportunity to learn something about every culture—especially since the US is multiracial.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Sam Almo Thesis #2

samalmo

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:09 PM New!
Bovine Growth Hormone should be banned from use in the US due to the great number of unhealthy side effects associated with its use on cattle.

naughj

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:12 PM New!
I agree in principle but will take on the position of the devil's advocate. Bovine growth hormone not only makes US producers more profitable and helps provide living wages for us producers. BGH also has the benefit of making fitter cattle more capable of coping with the conditions that modern industrial meat production have created.

**tychiang**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:53 PM New!*
I agree with naughj. It's good to have the option of products without BGH but it would be hard to maintain production rates without it.

**trf**

*Posted Yesterday, 4:35 PM New!*
I agree, even though it would effect production rates it still is necessary for us to move away from using BGH. It would be a worthwhile sacrifice.

**laurenef**

*Posted Yesterday, 4:42 PM New!*
i don't really agree or disagree b/c i don't really know much on the topic.

**ejm4**

*Posted Yesterday, 5:30 PM New!*
From what I gather from the discussion so far, I agree, though I know nothing about the way production rates would be changed. It sounds like an interesting topic to me.

**ejm4**

*Posted Yesterday, 5:33 PM New!*
From what I can gather from the conversation so far, I think I would tend to agree, though I know very little about how it would hurt production, etc. It sounds interesting to me.
Emilie's 1st thesis

**ejm4**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:15 PM New!*

The federal government should raise the minimum wage by 50 percent.

---

**laurenef**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:21 PM New!*

well right now the federal government minimum wage is 5.15 and hour and if you are under the age of 20 you may be paid as little as 4.25 an hour. so i guess that i agree is should be raised but i don't think by 50%. what if your thesis was changed to something like "the minimum wage should be the same all over the country" since washington has one of the highest minimum wages in the country i guess ive never really thought about this issue.

---

**naughj**

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

Since more than 3/4 of the house of representatives voted to raise the minimum wage by about 45% this topic may not be that controversial. However, some small business orders and suppliers who rely on cheap labor are opposed to it passing.

---

**tychiang**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:27 PM New!*

If you do talk about this it would be interesting to me if you talked about how that would affect taxes since
we pay the salaries of federal workers.

**fysician**

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

In my opinion, raising 50% part would be a little too specific. Because I think someone could ask why it shouldn't be less or more than 50%, then the topic might become somewhat trivial. It seems the general meaning of the thesis statement is that the federal minimum wage is too low. If so, it might be better not to talk about how much part of the topic.

**trf**

*Posted Yesterday, 3:40 PM New!*

I agree, but John may be right that it is not controversial enough. Everyone knows you can't live on minimum wage and therefore it needs to change.

**YOUR NAME: YOUR REPLY:**

---

**Jake Locker's thesis #2**

**jake10**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:30 PM New!*

students should have to stand and acknowledge to flag during the pledge of allegiance.

**honore**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:46 PM New!*

I disagree. For some religious groups, saluting the flag is a violation of the tenet of monotheism. This
being true, students should not be forced to choose between their religion and education. Playing Devil's advocate, why should the US tolerate, on religious grounds, refusal to salute the flag, but reject other "extreme" religious practices, such as female genital cutting? Where do we draw the line?

naughj

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:19 PM New!
This black and white statement about mandatory participation during the pledge of allegiance will find plenty of opposition so in that respect it is a good thesis. However, only focusing on students could raise some controversy about what position students have in society.

laurenef

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:34 PM New!
i completely agree with you on this. it doesn't hurt a student to stand up and show respect for their fellow country men once in a while.

tychiang

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:29 PM New!
eh, I can see great arguments to both sides so it'd be really interesting to hear you talk about this.

trf

Posted Yesterday, 3:37 PM New!
This is a great topic. I feel that forcing anyone to do anything unless under extreme circumstances is itself rather Anti-American. That being said we do have many privileges living in this country and I could be swayed if you had strong arguments.
lauren fiedler thesis #1

laurenef

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:05 PM -- edited Jan 10, 2007 7:35 PM by laurenef New!
Puplic schools should require students to stand during the pledge of allegiance.

naughj

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:59 PM New!
I assume we're in fact talking about public schools. Since this has all ready been discussed on the board it might be worth re-stating it to be slightly differant than the previous post.

trf

Posted Yesterday, 3:07 PM New!
I disagree. However the reasons Jake mentioned in class and others mentioned during the subesquent conversation make a very good case for at least standing. I think it's more than controversial enough.

mtp5

Posted Yesterday, 3:24 PM New!
i agree with naughj. this is definately a controversial topic and you could perhaps come at it from a different angle.
**Emilie's 2nd Thesis**

**ejm4**

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:16 PM New!
The death penalty should be abolished in the United States.

**naughj**

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:46 PM New!
Some evidence to defend this thesis could include other nations such as Britain and France which have both banned the death penalty. In the United States though the death penalty still has broad based majority support.

**trf**

Posted Yesterday, 2:55 PM New!
I agree, I hear a statistic that 1 in 5 people put to death are innocent, even if this has a grain of truth it is very shocking.

**Becky Perry's thesis #1**

**becker10**

Posted Jan 9, 2007 9:45 PM New!
The U.S. Government should form a law against animal testing.
For a thesis statement, I think you'll need to be much more specific. What kind of law? Barring what specifically?

I've never had any large qualms with animal testing because 1) we butcher thousands of animals on a daily basis for food, and this results in far, far more inhumane animals deaths than animals testing ever has, and 2) I guess I don't feel that strongly about it. Humans gain quite a bit from animal testing, and there are many laws governing exactly how science can treat these animals humanely, while food processors are governed by few.

I think this could be a great topic, if boiled down.

As far as I am aware there is only one specie which is not protected in some way against animal testing and that is mice and rats. Further refining or limiting to say mammals might help.

I think this is a good topic because it is highly controversial. Where would we be today without the scientific discoveries animal testing has revealed for us...but there is also a significant moral dilemma associated with such methods.

I agree the government should regulate animal testing, but I do not think that animal testing should be outlawed. It isn't clear from your thesis what your view on this is. To help narrow the scope of your argument, you could target either certain types of testing or certain species. In any case, I think animal testing would be a good umbrella topic--it's nice and controversial.
laurenef  

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:43 PM New!
i disagree. i don't really have a strong opinion on the topic but i don't really see a problem with testing rats and mice, which are the only animals i've heard of on which we test.

laurenef  

maybe if your thesis was a little narrower it would help the argument become stronger and might help convince more people?

trf  

Posted Yesterday, 1:58 PM New!
I would have to hear the figures first, because it would seem that humane testing on mice and rats for the benefit of human health isn't so bad.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Ian Kristensen's Thesis #1  

iank2  

Posted Jan 9, 2007 7:21 PM New!
"The city of Seattle should provide free housing and drug treatment to all its homeless citizens."

naughj
The city of Seattle, if it were to implement a program, should look to other housing and drug treatment programs. If it does, it will realize that the homeless population is actually diverse and any aid must be specifically targeted so as to be maximally effective.

tychiang

While I do agree that a program like that would be a phenomenal service there are a few concerns I have regarding your proposal without more detail. They are: how would this program be funded? What would you propose to be a way to prevent people from taking advantage of such a program? Also, where would these facilities be located...would there be any resistance from local communities?

laurenef

i disagree. that would cost so much money and im not sure where the city would take the money from. maybe if you had a solution about where the money would come from i might sway the other way but as for now i stand in disagreement with your statement.

trf

It's a very idealist concept, but I really like it. If you had some examples of such a program's effectiveness in the past I'm sure it would be a great topic.
The University of Washington should extend the Student Conduct Code to students living off-campus.

An excellent topic. The ASUW Student Senate is creating resolutions regarding this very topic and there is support within the Washington State Legislature to implement some kind of expansion of the code.

I don't know very much about this topic but from my experience as a student that live off-campus I feel as if the full extent of my rights would be impinged by such an action. As a person who’s seeking more information on this topic, how would the boundaries of how far the code of conduct is extended be established? Who would be enforcing it? What kind of change is this action supposed to stimulate?

Whew! I'd certainly disagree with that one. I'm 26 and there's no way the UW is going to tell me what to do in my personal life. I think it's fine and appropriate for anyone living on campus, since they're on school property and the school is somewhat responsible for what happens to them and others there, but I couldn't come up with a good argument why the UW has any right to dictate what I do.

Very nice topic. I don't know what the Code requires, but it gives me the creeps to think the school could extend its policies to my personal life. Do I
agree, or disagree? It depends on the content of the Code and which parts of it would apply to students off-campus. For sure I’d want to know the process in which changes are made to the code. What would the benefits be?

laurenef

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:32 PM New!
i like the sound of this but im going to have to say i disagree because many older adults are students and i don't believe the campus should have the right to tell them what to do. but then again, im not very informed on this subject at all.

trf

Posted Yesterday, 1:46 PM New!
Yeah I would have to vehemently disagree, in fact I'm not sure that is even legally possible. How would it be enforced? Are they going to come to someone's house who lives in Ballard and make sure they aren't smoking pot?

YOUR NAME:  
YOUR REPLY:

EPA action on Duwamish River Cleanup

tychiang

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:15 AM New!
Presently, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is in the process of passing a proposal that details the process of removing toxic sediments from the Duwamish Riverbed and banks. The waterway is so polluted from nearby Industrial uses that it’s considered a serious health threat to the residential communities and ecosystem. Presently, the EPA’s
cleanup proposal addresses how toxic sediment from the waterway will be extracted and relocated. However, there is no mention of how to control or prevent the continuous flow of pollution into the river after or during cleanup to keep these areas clean. **My thesis statement is that the EPA should first invest their time and money in establishing and implementing pollution source control regulations on Duwamish Industries before attempting to cleanup the area.** Though this may be a lengthier process, and the delay may have serious health impacts on neighboring communities and Industrial workers, it is more cost effective and beneficial in the long term to focus on developing a pollution source control policy than cleaning up just yet.

**iank2**  
*Posted Jan 10, 2007 1:27 PM New!*  
I don't know much about this, but it sounds like a great idea, though I don't know how much argument you'll find over this.

**naughj**  
*Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:14 PM New!*  
This is an interesting argument and basically is relying on the ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure metaphor. Here time is being traded for long term sustainability and that makes a lot of sense in my opinion.

**honore**  
*Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:33 PM New!*  
Based on what you said above, I agree. No use spending buying Band-aids if the artery's still leakin'. Playing Devil's advocate, one could argue that clean-up efforts must start NOW, whether or not current legislation addresses the source of pollution.

**laurenef**  
*Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:30 PM New!*
it sounds interesting but i don't really agree or disagree since i don't know much about the subject.

Yeah I would have to hear your informative speech first because I don't really know much about the subject, but it's certainly interesting.

"Washington state should replace the state's regressive sales tax by implementing a progressive income tax"

I'm not that knowledgeable about this, so I'd have to hear info and an argument before I felt one way or another.

Sorry. I'm not exactly sure what the difference between the two types of tax are. If we followed through with your suggestion, would we have a tax system like Oregon's? If so, I think I disagree. I like
the spend-less-pay-less system currently in place in WA.

**naughj**  
*Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:28 PM -- edited Jan 10, 2007 8:10 PM by naughj New!*  
To address Honore's question. Yes, this proposed system could be be similar to Oregon's but not identical. The aim of such a shift in policy would be to correct the disparity between rich and poor in our state where the poor although they pay less sales tax in absolute terms are burdened by having to pay proportionally more of their hard earned money.

**laurenef**  
*Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:12 PM New!*  
im not really that informed on this topic so i don't really have an opinion.

**trf**  
*Posted Yesterday, 11:47 AM New!*  
I like it, I was always curious what the benefits and/or consequences would be if we paid an income tax like Oregon does.

**naughj**  
*Posted Yesterday, 1:36 PM New!*  
As another response to honore. The current system could also be characterized as "Make less pay more." I appreciate your comments its definately made me think about how to address this question.
Becky Perry thesis #2

becker10

Posted Jan 9, 2007 9:46 PM New!

The U.S. Government should recognize gay marriage.

iank2

Posted Jan 9, 2007 10:04 PM New!

This is a great topic, though you'll have to be more specific in your statement. "Recognizing" doesn't mean a whole lot legally.

naughj

Posted Jan 10, 2007 12:39 AM New!

This is certainly controversial but the term "gay marriage" could in itself be a source of controversy. The ACLU has come out with some specific language that is gaining acceptance within the GLBTCI community.

tychiang

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:19 AM New!

I agree. Something that would be good to talk about is how/what ways (if any) the present alternatives to marriage for gay couples lacks certain privileges that heterosexual couples receive with marriage.

honore

Posted Jan 10, 2007 3:33 PM New!

This is another great topic. However, I agree that "recognize" doesn't tell us much about your position. Do you want the Fed to treat gay marriage as a binding legal arrangement that entitles married gay couples to the same rights and duties as married straight couples, or do you want the Fed to simply learn how to recognize a gay marriage when it sees one? I would agree with the former, but I guess the latter would be a good place for the Fed to start;)
I disagree.

I agree, it is a violation of civil liberties to not allow homosexual couples to have the same benefits as straight married couples. The constitution says we will not make any law based on religious principles, though it is not fully supported in this democracy I believe it transcends such matters and is a basic human freedom. However we do define marriage as between a man and a woman, so perhaps you should mention it being a “civil union” instead so as to appease social conservatives.

The US legal drinking age should be lowered from 21 to 18.

For evidence one could use the fact that 3 Canadian provinces have a drinking age of 18. Those being Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Quebec.
tychiang

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:47 AM New!
This would be interesting to argue since it has long been said in complaint that people who are 18 are old enough to serve and die in the military but not old enough to drink. However, I feel that even at 21 many people are still very irresponsible when it comes to drinking....so what really is an appropriate age?

iank2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 1:29 PM New!
There are many angles you could attack this from, and most of them would probably create some argument, so I think it's a good one.

honore

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:26 PM New!
I disagree. I liked the point made in class today about how lowering the drinking age to 18 might encourage younger peers--15-year olds, for example--to take up drinking. After all, 15 y/olds and 18 y/olds really are in the same age group. On the other hand, 21 seems arbitrary. Maturity plays into it, but there's no clear correspondence between maturity and age. If 18 is cool, why not 16? Bust it...let's do twelve and call it good. Fun topic.

laurenef

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:23 PM New!
i agree somewhat. i just think that 18 years olds shouldn't be able to buy the alcohol. yeah, this most likely sounds confusing.

trf

Posted Jan 11, 2007 1:23 PM New!
I would agree with the point about 18 year olds having younger acquaintences than 21 year olds, and therefore making it even easier than it already is for minors to obtain alcohol.
Ege Ersoz Thesis #2

[New!]

All junk food should be taxed 15% by the government and the money generated should be used to combat obesity-related health problems.

P.S. A food's "junkiness" is determined by sugar, salt, fat, and trans fat levels.

---

Ege Ersoz Thesis #1

[ersoze]

[New!]

Ah the sin tax. Certainly taxes like this are nothing new. Cigarettes are a prime example but there is also the "gas guzzler" tax on automobiles. Giving criteria for junk food was helpful but it may be even more helpful to limit the tax to where the item is sold. Saying where the revenue generated would go establishes the goal of the tax.
The University of Washington should allow bars to be opened on campus.

This issue has come up in the ASUW student senate. I believe the title of it was "A Pub in the HUB." Somewhat catchy but it did not get a warm response and was voted down before it got to the floor. There currently rules against operating a business on campus that sells alcohol but there are parties and Alumni meetings which do serve alcohol.

"Washington state should not place a college credit limit on students receiving loans, scholarships, or need grants."

I have to say that I wasn't aware there was a limit on the number of credits a student can talk if they're receiving federal aid, so I don't have much of an opinion on it. I just don't know enough about it.
This is currently being talked about because the funding structure for the University of Washington is under review. Some people believe that students who have gone over and above 180 credits are taking valuable space and resources that other students could be using.

**tychiang**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:58 AM New!*

I disagree with your statement...which means it's a good topic since I think it's fairly controversial. The biggest disagreement I have as someone who doesn't have a scholarship, loan or grant is that I am essentially contributing to funding students who do. And while I am all for providing students with the opportunity to receive an education, I don't think it's appropriate to establish some limits that make students do it within a certain time frame. We all have to abide by that time frame and I think the pressure of a limit is beneficial in helping to maintain the circulation of students so that more people can come in and get out with what they need- hopefully. Also, any students can file a request for an extension if they have a good purpose/reason. But without the need to file that request some people might find it equally opportunistic to milk the system.

**iank2**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 1:28 PM New!*

I would agree with that. If they've enough credits to graduate, but haven't because they haven't focused their studies, I think that money should better be used on students that know what they're up to - to a limit, of course.

**honore**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:07 PM New!*

First, I think the thesis is somewhat unclear. Based on the responses to your thesis, I take it that your saying "WA State should not put a cap on the total number of credits taken by students receiving loans, scholarships, or need grants." I don't think there should be a limit for students taking loans.
Scholarships and need grants? Maybe. Good controversy.

**laurenef**  
*Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:16 PM New!*
i think i disagree because i don't think that scholarships and need grants should be given to students who have 180 and over credits. when the student earns that many credits i believe they should have to graduate. it isn't fair to keep giving them money that new students could be getting. but i guess if they wanted to keep getting loans (where they have to pay them back) then i guess they could keep earning credits. 
hmmm... maybe im a little up in the air about this.

**trf**  
*Posted Jan 11, 2007 11:51 AM New!*
I'm not terribly informed on this subject, but I would have to disagree. Lots of college students bounce around between majors before deciding what exactly they want to do. I don't think you should take that right away just because a particular student doesn't have the money other students might have.

**Rachel Obenchain's Thesis #2**

**obie1**  
*Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:35 PM New!*
The US government should support the UN in placing troops in Sudan
naughj

Posted Jan 11, 2007 1:08 AM New!
Is the question of whether UN troops should be the ones to take up peace keeping in Sudan been answered? That might be one area of controversy even within your thesis.

YOUR NAME:  

YOUR REPLY:

Michelle Hannah Thesis 2

mih26

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:16 PM New!
Punishment for DUIs should not automatically use mandatory sentencing, but go on a case by case basis.

YOUR NAME:  

YOUR REPLY:

naughj

Posted Jan 11, 2007 1:07 AM New!
Mandatory minimum sentencing's proponents see it as a powerful deterrent to prevent crime. MADD (Mothers against drunk driving) lobby for some time to create the laws that DUI offenders are prosecuted under today.

YOUR NAME:  

YOUR REPLY:
Every student in our country should have access to higher education regardless of their financial situation. (I'm not sure this is controversial enough so if you have any ideas on how to make it more so, please present them)

i like your idea and i think i agree but where would the money come from for those who can't afford higher education

I think the thesis statement would be more interesting if you proposed a way on how to do that.

Since you have asked for suggestions I'll offer two. First, higher education is not a necessary or desireable route for all students and citizens in this nation. For those students to each equality an alternate tract would be necessary or they may feel disenfranchised. Second, creating a fund so that all students who do desire and meet proficiency standards can go to institutions of higher education is a very good idea and I'm sure others will be able to add to that sentiment.

I agree on the condition that they are worthy (proficient enough) of going.

I think the thesis is a little too extreme. Making
college education absolutely available to anyone is virtually impossible if financial factors are considered. It will cause more harm than benefit. Especially, the overall quality of education will deteriorate significantly and the quality gap between private and public schools will get even bigger because private schools will not have to participate. Probably, you should research a little more and narrow it down a bit. By the way, I think even now everyone has access to higher education through loan, scholarship, or federal and state grants, as long as the person is determined to get more education. I haven't yet seen a case where the person could not go to college solely due to lack of financial support. Also, there's a reason why it's called "higher" education.