Katie W's #1 Thesis

willik2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:31 PM New!

Gay Marriage should be legal in the United States.

schuetzc

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:58 PM New!

I agree. I think it shouldn't matter what gender two people are to be in a binding contract of marriage.

anna1122

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:45 PM New!

I agree. I think that church and state are of separate matter. Someone's religion may affect the way that they live their own life but it should not affect the lives of others. People should be given the freedom that this country was founded upon to make their own decisions.

kristj6

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:31 PM New!

I agree. I do see where a lot of people are coming from when they say that it should be illegal and their rational for this point of view as I do know some people who feel this way. However I know many and have many gay friends, many who have children etc. and they are just as much in love, if not more, than many straight couples that I know. They also love their children just as much as any other couple that I know and are amazing parents and role models, therefore I feel that they too deserve the benefits and privaledge of a sanctioned marriage.
I must also agree. The burden should be on opposers of this viewpoint to prove that same-sex marriage should not be allowed. This issue can draw correlations to restrictions on interracial marriage in the past. Banning each is unjust.

I agree. I don't think there's anything wrong with gay marriages.

I agree. Gays should have equal rights especially when concerned with legal matters (making life decisions, hospital visitation rights...)

There should be a salary cap for all professional athletes.
I disagree. Many professional athletes who have proven their abilities throughout the season and are becoming free agents at the end of the season often wait to see the kind of deals that they can get from different teams that want them. If their contribution to a certain team can bring about a championship then in the end the money that the teams are willing to pay is worth the player. These people are professional and it is through this job that they make their living. If we were to impose a salary cap for professional athletes than wouldn't it make sense that we impose a salary cap for all professions as well? It would be unfair to the players of professional sports.

I disagree. If there is a salary cap on the athletes then we wouldn't see as much competition and excitement from the sport. Better athletes would look for different careers that would be more benefit them.

Singling out professional athletes and imposing a salary cap on only this group would be unfair. How would such a restriction be implemented? If by the government, wouldn't other high-paying groups such as movie-stars or investment bankers be subject to a salary cap. Some money managers, for example, make more than many athletes. Top performing managers at Goldman Sachs each received $20 million in Bonuses for 2006.
I agree. The amount that professional athletes are paid is ridiculous, and just because other groups such as actors are paid a lot too doesn't make it right or reasonable. Maybe if the salaries of players went down, so would the prices of tickets, merchandise, food, parking, and so on would too. I also believe that student-athletes invest too much of their focus into "making it big," and not into pursuing other aspects of life. Perhaps if the salaries were less more athletes would put more interest in other things, like a solid major.

I disagree. There is a reason the Yankees are good and part of it is their incredible salaries. I see salaries as a part of the game, and not only that, so many people try to be professional athletes but they aren't good enough so why not pay them absurd amounts of money.

The U.S. government should not adopt universal health care.
I disagree. I think that some sort of healthcare should be implemented by the U.S. Other countries around the world like Spain, Sweden, and the U.K. provide a system that is geared towards the prevention and treatment of illnesses for its people. Many people in the U.S. can't afford some, even partial, sort of health insurance due to their job or salary. In 2002, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, 43.6 million people could not afford or have any sort of health insurance and those numbers seem to just keep rising each year. Universal health care can save many lives, especially those from low income families. Therefore I believe the U.S. government should start working toward making it accessible to everyone.

I also disagree. Implementing universal health care will make health care available for families that do not have health care and it will make it more affordable for low income and middle income families.

I agree. Making health care universal will lower the quality of care for everyone. However, I do believe that health care should be made more affordable in the US considering what a wealthy country we are.

I disagree. Universal health care would ensure that every citizen has access to health care. Everyone deserves a right to healthcare regardless of income.
amando

Posted Jan 11, 2007 8:14 PM New!
I agree. Health care should be more affordable to everybody, but universal health care is a bit too socialist for me.

schuetzc

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:42 AM New!
I agree. I think that if the US did adopt universal health care, the quality of medical service would go down since everyone can see doctors that are normally more expensive. However, I think that the US government should make health care more affordable.

amando

Posted Jan 11, 2007 11:50 AM New!
I'm sure countries such as Canada and the United Kingdom will be useful countries to research because they are first world countries that practice this type of socialized medicine.

dokah05

Posted Jan 11, 2007 6:10 PM New!
I disagree. I think that universal health care will help those that don't have health care because of low income.

malamr

Posted Jan 11, 2007 6:11 PM New!
I disagree, Canada's system provides citizens with a much more efficient means of providing health care because every citizen has health care.
I disagree, countries such as Canada are able to offer health care to all of the citizens instead of those who can afford it.

The U.S. should legally recognize same sex marriages.

I agree. It shouldn't matter if one person is female or one is male, if two people want to join in the binding contract of marriage then they should be allowed to. If the reasoning against is because the Bible says that marriage should only be between a man and a woman, then what happened to separation between church and state?

I agree. If two people love each other, regardless of
sex, they should have the right to have their relationship acknowledged legally. It's not like heterosexual marriages have proven to be more successful at marriage anyway...

laceyo

Posted Jan 10, 2007 3:49 PM New!
I agree. Homosexual should have the same rights to marriage just as they have the same rights to civil union.

willik2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:55 PM New!
I agree on one level, and disagree on another. I agree that every US citizen should have equal rights (such as the right to marriage) and all the legal privileges that come with that union. However, you must also contemplate the reality that marriage was originally a religious union under church, so there really isn't a clear division between church and state on the issue of marriage.

anna1122

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:56 PM New!
i agree. I think that who one chooses to be with is ultimately in the hands of those involved and even though i don't morally agree with it, I don't think what i think about this issue is really going to have any toll on who a person wants to be with. It is not up to the state to decide this either. People have the rights to freedom on everything else that is legal, why not this?

kristj6

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:37 PM New!
I agree. I do see where a lot of people are coming
from when they say that it should be illegal and their rational for this point of view as I do know some people who feel this way. However I know many and have many gay friends, many who have children etc. and they are just as much in love, if not more, than many straight couples that I know. They also love their children just as much as any other couple that I know and are amazing parents and role models, therefore I feel that they too deserve the benefits and privaledge of a sanctioned marriage.

malamr

Posted Jan 11, 2007 7:10 PM New!
I agree, same sex couples are entitled to a legally recognized binding

amando

Posted Jan 11, 2007 8:07 PM New!
I agree. It may be hard to present to the class about the opposing view seeing as we all agree that same-sex couples should be recognized.

YOUR NAME: YOUR REPLY:

Candy's thesis # 1

candy206

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:05 AM New!
THE US shOuLd ElimiNate tHe
**distribution of tobacco.**

**tylert7**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 12:20 PM New!*

I agree. Tobacco is disgusting and harmful to one's health.

**laceyo**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:04 PM New!*

I disagree. Tobacco can be harmful and disgusting, but it is chosen by its user. Besides second hand smoke, tobacco only harms its consumer.

**schuetzc**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:25 PM New!*

I agree. There are no positive effects that come from the use of tobacco.

**anna1122**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:07 PM New!*

I disagree. Although I agree with the idea that tobacco is bad, trying to regulate such a law is very difficult. Just think about the alcohol prohibition that was set in the 1920's. The prohibition of alcohol only caused dissaray and it never worked. Tobacco would have the same effects.

**kristj6**

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:47 PM New!*

I disagree. I agree that tabacco is extremly bad and
there are not really any good affects from this product, however it would be extremly hard to regulate this. Its every persons choice.

---

dokah05

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:56 PM New!
I disagree. I think that it is the user's choice.

---

willik2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:59 PM New!
I disagree, even though your thesis is so pretty in pink. Think about how many people would be put out of work if tobacco was banned. It would be a devastating blow to anyone in the tobacco business. Consider the effects on the agriculture spectrum, including all the farmers and workers. The thousands of people employed under the tobacco industries that would be out of work. The stock market would plunge, and investors would lose millions. The unemployment rate would increase. These are all reasons why our economy is not stable enough for such a drastic suggestion.

---

amando

Posted Jan 11, 2007 7:52 PM New!
I disagree. People should be allowed to govern themselves, and cigarettes have plenty of warning labels. People will ultimately do what they want to do anyway.

---

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:
Liz C Thesis #1

liz87

Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:16 AM New!
The US should lower the national drinking age to 18.

dokah05

Posted Jan 11, 2007 1:48 PM New!
I disagree. If it is legal at the age of 18 then high school student will drink; i dont think that they are responsible enough.

willik2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 1:59 PM New!
I agree. At the age of 18 we are legally adults, including all the rights that come with it. We can vote, we can work full time, we can live on our own, we can join the army. It's just ridiculous to say that you're mature enough to experience Iraq and not Coors Light.

candy206

Posted Jan 11, 2007 2:56 PM New!
I disagree... most people don't know this but having people wait until 21 and actually waiting it much better for your brain, until you are actually 23, the brain is still developing cognitively and drinking earlier than this is actually permanently stunting it's growth.
i agree because i think it sucks that people are willing to sacrifice their lives for the freedom of this country through the military and yet they are not allowed to drink at the same age.

kristj6

I agree. I know a lot of people my age from other countries who's drinking laws require people to be 18 years old in order to have alcohol and it seems that they are a bit less rebellious because of this law. I think that if people were able to drink a little bit earlier then maybe it wouldn't be such a rebellious move. Also, if at 18 you can vote and enlist in the military and buy cigarettes, then you should be able to drink too.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Candy's thesis # 2

candy206

The drinking age should be changed from 21 to 18.

tylert7
I disagree. I don't think young teens should be allowed to drink at that young of an age. Yes, young teens find ways to cheat the system, but the drinking age of 21 is fine were it is. Changing the drinking age would only spur more controversy over parents who wouldn't want to worry about their children going to clubs and drinking because they are of legal age to do so.

I disagree. I'm already 21 and I'd prefer it if there were less drunk people run around. 🍻 I think 18 year olds haven't always reached the peak maturity level and also still have a lot to learn before being allowed the responsibility of drinking. Drinking harms your body and you can potentially harm others while drinking.

I agree. Most college students drink regardless of the law already, and most times simply because the fact that they aren't allowed to is appealing. Lowering the drinking age will make it seem like not such a big deal and therefore, more underage drinkers will actually be drinking.

I agree. As a country, we are willing to enlist and send out troops who are willing to risk their lives at the age of 18 for the cause of freedom. They can die for our country but they aren't allowed to have alcohol???? That's pretty ridiculous!
kristj6

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:51 PM New!*
I agree. I have traveled a lot and seen how different cultures treat alcohol and it seems that many cultures where the drinking age is younger tend to have less of this rebelliousness that we see here. Obviously there will always be people who abuse substances like this but maybe people being exposed to alcohol at a younger age rather than sneaking it and making bad decisions with it because they can't have it until they're 21, there would be more responsible drinkers. Also, if you can vote for our country, enlist in the military and buy cigarettes then maybe people should also be able to drink alcohol.

willik2

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 1:06 PM New!*
I agree, simply for the fact that at the age 18 you are considered an adult. If you can vote, you can drive, you can have a full-time job, you can join the army, it seems ridiculous that you can't have a glass of wine with dinner. I also believe that if people are exposed to drinking more casually through life, it wouldn't be abused any more than it already is.

amando

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 7:43 PM New!*
I agree that if you can join the army but you can't order yourself a beer, that's a little backwards. However, it seems like no politician would be willing to approve such a change.
Candidates for the presidency in the US should not be limited to only people who were born in the US.

I disagree. I think the potential for the country to be ran in a way the citizens don't like would skyrocket with someone born in a different country in office. It is obvious that all citizens in the US aren't raised the same, but are still raised with the United States way of life in mind. In another country, a person can be raised completely different and therefore will probably run the US differently than traditionally.

I personally disagree, but I think you could make a lot of strong argument to possibly change my mind. I was born and raised in the US as well as my parents and feel that it has given me a greater appreciation and closer perspective on how our country is run.

i disagree. what about those die hard American patriots who came to the U.S. at a very young age? I think these people are just as qualified to lead our nation to success and prestige. i believe that any good
American citizen should be allowed to run for presidency.

kristj6

Posted Jan 11, 2007 1:01 PM New!
My mind could be changed with more information but my initial thought is that I disagree with that thesis. I think that being the president of a country should have certain stipulations and conditions and I think that being a natural born citizen is something that should be a qualification. I would not move to another country and try to become president. Although if a citizen of the US moved here at a very young age then I guess it is a tough call, again I could be swayed, that is just my initial reaction to the thesis.

dokah05

Posted Jan 11, 2007 1:05 PM New!
I disagree. I think that every one should have an equal chance for presidency. If they are competent, patriotic, and look out the country's benefits then I dont see why they cant be president.

willik2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 1:14 PM New!
I agree that candidates should not have to be born in the US to run for office (read the thesis carefully). If the United States is the "melting pot" that we claim it is, then we should embrace all of our citizens with equal rights. I don't see how being born in Texas makes you more qualified to be president of the united states than someone born in London.
Posted Jan 11, 2007 7:07 PM New!
I agree. It would be nice to think that people of any nationality would be qualified to lead the United States. However, I see too much national security risk. Call me paranoid, but opening the candidacy up to people born in any country could attract people with conflicting interests.

YOUR NAME:  
YOUR REPLY:

Tori Tyler, Thesis #2

tylert7

Posted Jan 9, 2007 8:05 PM New!
Extremely thin models should not be allowed to walk on the runway.

laceyo

Posted Jan 9, 2007 8:59 PM New!
I disagree. Models need to be thin in order to display very specific articles of clothing. A designer wouldn't hire an unhealthily thin model anyways.

And how would a model be classified as "extremely" thin?

mconde03

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:41 AM New!
I agree. Models should not have to starve themselves
in order to fit the clothes. Clothes are made to fit us, not the other way around.

**schuetzc**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:52 AM New!*
I disagree. I think that a model should only be banned from the runway if she is UNHEALTHILY (has an eating disorder etc). If restrictions are to be placed on models, I don't think it should be because she simply looks too thin. I think medical tests can be done before to determine the health status of a model, and then if found to be sick, and be removed from the show.

**anna1122**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:02 PM New!*
I also disagree. I agree with Carolyn in that models should only be banned if they are deemed unhealthy. Sometimes the type of models that the designers and agencies are looking for are thin models and they should not be condemned for the way they look and are.

**willik2**

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:17 PM New!*
I agree, but this thesis could be better stated. For instance, There should be regulations on the minimum weight and quality of health for models who walk the runway.

**amando**

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:26 PM -- edited Jan 11, 2007 8:21 PM by amando New!*
I disagree. And this thesis could be better stated to
address the real issue of eating disorders. Eating disorders concern not only models, but young teenagers across the nation. Are models the only victims of distorted self perceptions?

malamr

Posted Jan 11, 2007 7:04 PM New!
I disagree, fashion designers have a specific look that they desire for their clothes, they should be able to choose what models they want.

YOUR NAME:YOUR REPLY:

Lacey O’Connell, Thesis #1

laceyo

Posted Jan 9, 2007 8:35 PM New!
Embryonic stem cell research should be funded by the US government.

mconde03

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:38 AM New!
I agree with this statement because I believe that the research that is currently being done could really benefit the quality of life for the generations to come.

schuetzc
I agree. I think stem cell has the same benefits as cancer research (aiding in cures for medical problems) and therefore should also be funded the same, by the government.

I agree, I believe it will help mankind in all areas, and these are the types of life changing technologies that the government should fund.

I agree. The US government should fund more money into stem cell research because the funding can help improve the lives of those who need stem cell treatment.

I agree because the research of the embryonic stem cell research can help find cures for cancer. Having someone in my family with cancer i would want to know that everything could be done for them.

I strongly agree, stem cell research can increase scientists abilities to work on cures for diseases and cancers, that are considered terminal or incurable!
dokah05

Posted Jan 11, 2007 1:19 PM New!
I agree because this research will benefit society as a whole.

willik2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 1:26 PM New!
I strongly agree. I believe that embryonic stem cell research will eventually save millions of lives and millions of people from pain and suffering. I do wonder, though, if the government is actually funding this research, in a way is it ironic that abortion is illegal? Do the two go hand in hand, because you are killing embryos? I am not really educated on this topic enough to answer these questions, just something to think about!

amando

Posted Jan 11, 2007 6:59 PM New!
I disagree. Embryonic stem cell research should be strongly supported by the US government. However, actually funding and research should be conducted by private companies. The issue is too politically dicey and dividing for direct funding by the government. The potential benefits are so great though, the government should still not oppose it.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:  

Tori Tyler, Thesis #1
Smoking should be banned on the University of Washington campus in order to minimize its unhealthy effects towards the school's students, visitors, faculty, and environment.

I agree. I don't know where people are allowed to smoke since the smoking prohibition in public places law was passed, but I've had to follow smokers to class and it's irritating getting a face full of smoke.

I agree! The law was passed that you have to be 25 feet from a building in order to smoke, but I think it should be the UW campus all together. Not only is it unhealthy for the smoker, but the beautiful campus becomes nasty when there is smoke and cigarette butts everywhere.

I agree. UW should promote a healthy environment and do whatever it can to discourage smoking. Drugs and firearm are banned from the campus because they are a threat to our well-being. If we are subject to be exposed to second hand smoke, the administration should not have any problem with having students walk around with mini-portable nuclear reactors strapped to our backs.
I completely agree, but I believe it should be banned period... you might find some resistance in choosing only to pin point collage campuses.

I disagree because to impose such a law on public property is an infringement on human rights.

I agree, smokers still impose on nonsmokers, even when they are 25ft from the nearest entrance. Its unhealthy and irritating!

Even though i like the idea, i have to disagree because it is public property and so it is a right that cant be taken away.

I agree. Schools should be a drug-free zone and I think that should include smoking. Hopefully in the long run less people will smoke if it is so hard to find a place to do it.
I disagree. As much as I dislike smoking, smokers have rights too. It is not the University of Washington's place to preempt state law. Smokers are already banned from smoking in or near buildings. This alone minimizes the secondhand smoke dangers. Smokers, like it or not, should have the right to smoke smoke outdoors.

Dealth penalty in the United States should be abolished.

I disagree. The death penalty is reasonable for those who are determined to deserve it.

I agree. Almost all democratic countries have abolished capital punishment. Why does the U.S. still
have a policy that is not accepted by democracies everywhere?

I agree. The government does not have the power to decide who should live and who should not, especially when that decision can be subject to error (i.e. when a person was sentenced with the death penalty and is found innocent years later).

I disagree. A death penalty is necessary to punish those who have taken a life or many lives. It is too expensive to keep permanent prisoners alive, especially when they rightfully deserve to die.

Anabolic steroid use should be legalized in the US.
I disagree. The negative effects of steroid use (muscle growth too fast causing medical problems etc) outweigh the positive effects.

I disagree, I believe they do more harm to people than good in general.

I disagree. Anabolic steroids are unhealthy to use and users have an unfair advantage over non-users in sports.

Sorry, I don't know what anabolic steroids are or anything about them. Steroids generally have a bad wrap though, but there are ethical ways to use them as well. Such as treatment for medical problems (i think they can be used in treatment for stomach ulcers and such).

I disagree because there are huge health effects to using steroids. Especially if this about sports, people who use steroids have an unfair advantage over those who aren't using them.
I disagree. On the grounds that it would become easier for young adults to abuse the steroid; leading to many health issues throughout their lifetime.

I disagree completely. Not only does anabolic steroids turn men into women and women into men (bad for the user) but if it is legalize then sport would mean a competition to see who can take the most steroids.

I disagree. The more natural the athletes, the more pure and fair the competitions are, and that seems right to me.

I disagree. Although I believe in allowing the personal freedom to choose whether or not to use a drug, the dangerous potential of overuse motivated by competition makes this a bad idea.
Anna Park thesis #1

anna1122

The United States should lift the embargo on Cuba in hopes to build new relations with the communist country.

schuetzc

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:59 PM New!
I disagree. The embargo on Cuba is in place because there would be many problems without it.

amando

Posted Jan 11, 2007 11:55 AM New!
I agree. The Cold War is over. Trade sanctions should be in effect, but a complete embargo is archaic. The rest of the world doesn't have a problem, so why should we?

willik2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:31 PM New!
This is not a topic I am very familiar with, however with the state that our nation is in today, I would have to disagree with this. We have more important issues to focus all of our energy and time on.

malamr

Posted Jan 11, 2007 6:44 PM New!
I do not know enough, but the embargo was put in place for a reason, because Cuba is not an economic power or threat I think the embargo should stay in
A person's race should not be a factor during the college admission process.

I agree. The difficulty to get in shouldn't be affected by race.

I agree. I don't think someone's race should dictate whether or not they are more qualified over other students. I think other things such as grade, test scores, extracurricular activities, and the type of communities one comes from should be the deciding factors during the college admissions process.
I agree. All men and woman should be considered equal!

I disagree. Whether we realize it or not, there still exists a great amount of racism and discrimination in the US today. There are certain barriers for minorities that caucasians cannot understand, and I believe minorities should be encouraged to educate themselves and break through this cycle of ignorance and poverty that history has set up for them. Also, SATs are proven to be racially and culturally biased.

I agree... people should be accepted into college based on achievement, part of the admissions process is admitting people who are intellectually ready for the challenges college has to offer and race has nothing to do with how well an individual is prepared.

I agree. I was under the impression that race had no bearing on admission, but the data was collected for statistical purposes. Merit alone should be the determining factor in admissions.
Charles Cadwallader

Service in the US Military should be compulsory with exceptions.

Sincerely,

Charles Cadwallader

schuetzc

I disagree. Although I am a huge supporter of the military, I don't think it should be forced. When you start forcing people to do things they don't want to do, the level of effort decreases. If the US started forcing people, I don't think our military would be as successful as it is.

tyler7

I disagree. If the US military was compulsory then people who don't want to serve in the first place will be serving in the military. This situation of people not wanting to serve in the first place will lead to failure.

anna1122

i disagree. i think that whether one chooses to serve their country by joining the military is a decision that cannot be forced on someone. People can still serve
their country in other ways even if they aren't in the military.

kristj6

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:42 PM New!
I disagree as well. As I talked about in my impromptu speech on this subject, I feel that this would be complicated because some people would have trouble serving in the military for different reasons and therefore it would become a matter of opinion on who really can serve and who cannot, and who will make those decisions fairly. I also feel like you can serve your country in other ways than being in the military. We all will make an impact on this world, at least I hope to and I feel everyone will in some way or another, but I know for me being in the military is not a way in which I plan to do so. There are people in this country who want to serve and protect our country and I respect them more than I can even explain but for others, it is not the way for their lives to go, not even for a couple years.

willik2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 2:09 PM New!
I disagree. Forced service in the US military seems like an abuse on free will, something America values so greatly.

willik2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 2:09 PM New!
I disagree. Forced service in the US military seems like an abuse on free will, something America values so greatly.

candy206
I disagree, there are some people not capable of serving due to disabilities, and others who could serve but would do a horrible job.

I disagree. Compulsory military service would undermine the personal freedom citizens of the United States have long enjoyed. In addition, the country has no need for that large a military force and I would be scared to provide the government so many eager young soldiers.

The US should legalize and regulate the personal use of controlled substances among private citizens.

I agree. But I think if the US did legalize the use of controlled substances, they would HAVE to regulate it.
to avoid substance abuse.

**tylert7**

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

I agree that the US should legalize and regulate the personal use of controlled substances, yet they would use the regulation to prevent substance abuse.

**anna1122**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:04 PM New!*

I agree. However I think to do such a thing would a little too hard to regulate. I think it also depends on the substance that is of issue.

**kristj6**

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:44 PM New!*

I agree. I think that the US should legalize and regulate the personal use of controlled substances among private citizens. This would be extremely hard to regulate however so I don’t know how that would work out essentially.

**dokah05**

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:53 PM New!*

I agree. I think that legalizing controlled substances is a good idea; the value of drugs would decline tremendously causing the illegal drug market to dissipate.

**willik2**

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 2:06 PM New!*
I disagree with that thesis because there is no way to regulate such a thing; it would cause more problems and funding than what already exists for drug control. Legalizing controlled substances without strict regulating is possible, if you think that would better society.

candy206

Posted Jan 11, 2007 2:52 PM New!
I agree.... BUT it would be so hard to do, I don't see where you can go with this thesis.

amando

Posted Jan 11, 2007 6:31 PM New!
I disagree. The line has to be drawn somewhere. Would all substances be legalized? Just those deemed safe enough? I think if the thesis were restricted to a specific substance, it would be more debateable.

Katie W's #2 Thesis

willik2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:27 PM New!
Regulated physician-assisted suicide should be legal in the United States.
schuetzc

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:57 PM New!
I disagree. I think the room for error is too great if this was legalized.

anna1122

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:52 PM New!
I agree. People die everyday. Of course doctors don't want to kill their patients but when medically speaking there is no chance for that patient who is in an incredible amount of pain, they should be the ones to decide whether or not pulling the plug is what they want.

tylert7

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:04 PM New!
I agree. If the patient is in a state that he/she doesn't want to live through anymore, then the physician should be allowed to pull the plug or inject the needle so the patient no longer has to suffer.

dokah05

Posted Jan 11, 2007 6:12 PM New!
I disagree. The patient state of mind is too confused. I dont think that he/she will be able to make this decision.

malamr

Posted Jan 11, 2007 6:27 PM New!
I agree but I am anxious as to what stipulations you will use insofar as eligibility
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dokah05</td>
<td>Universities should focus its resources (classes) to prepare students for a job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mconde03</td>
<td>I agree. I'm tired of fending off all our friends who are already working from telling us that we are wasting our time and resources! It's time that we get what we pay for...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schuetzc</td>
<td>I am partial on this topic. I agree because I think that preparation for a job is probably the main goal for students who attend the university. I also disagree because I think that the main goal for a college education is just that: to learn and further a student's education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tylert7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I agree. Colleges need to prepare students for the work force, because once they graduate they need to find a job in order to survive. Getting a good job is crucial for a student's future.

laceyo

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:16 PM New!

School already teaches you how to do the things you would be faced with with a job. The point of college is to educate you and you will be employed according to the knowledge you retained.

anna1122

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:13 PM New!

I disagree because although education is a way in which one can get a job, it shouldn't be the focus of the university. it should help but not focus. like CHarles said in class, the university is meant to be a learning environment.

kristj6

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:56 PM New!

I can see both sides to this argument very easily. However I do agree. I think that although university students are attending school to learn and further educate themselves for life, not just for a career. However with that being said, students attending universities are paying an awful lot of money to just learn for fun. I think that essentially, through all of the learning and the college experience that we all enjoy, the university should potentially be educating us for a future career so that we can be successful in something that we enjoy (which is why we learn and explore here, so we can find something we are passionate about).
I disagree. School is a place to educate yourself and expand your mind. If we only focus on getting jobs, there will be no improvements to our society! No new ideas! Just people memorizing skills.

I don’t see much debate in this topic, I believe they already do… it is up to you to find the right teachers to prepare you for the field of work you want to do.

I disagree. Although preparing students for jobs is very important to their post-college life, it is not necessarily the job of a university to accomplish this. Many students take classes purely for personal enrichment. A job-oriented curriculum might jeopardize the quality of education by commercializing the institution.

Carolyn Schuetz's Thesis #1
Cheerleading should be considered a sport by college athletics.

I disagree. Though I commend the amount of skill it takes to be a good cheerleading squad, we should not forget the main purpose of cheerleading: Leading the audience in cheering for the team.

Sure, why not. Cheerleading is no different then gymnastics in a lot of ways. Both sports require high demands of work and skill.

I'm kind of on the fence with this, but I'm going to say I disagree. I think it takes a lot of skill to be a good cheerleader, but I don't think it can compare to other sports.

It depends. It depends on whether or not they are competing. if they are just there to lead the crowd in a few good cheers than no, i don't think it should be considered a sport. but if they are practicing high quality routines to compete with other schools than i think its as valid as any other sport out there.
kristj6

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:58 PM New!
I also think that it depends. If it is a cheer squad who is competing then yes I guess it should be considered a sport. But if they are merely cheering the teams then no, I don't think that that should be considered a sport.

dokah05

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:58 PM New!
I agree. Cheerleading is very intensive and can be very competitive. If people consider ping pong a sport then I dont see why cheerleading can't be a sport.

willik2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 1:49 PM New!
I agree if it's a team that competes. If it is just a group leading cheers, then that is not a sport because a sport by definition must involve competition.

candy206

Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:05 PM New!
I really don't know, I was a gymnast for 10 years and I know how much work it takes to be a cheerleader... but you are cheering for the SPORTS team, I believe it could be a sport though, if you competed against other colleges strictly in cheerleading competitions, but at you UW for example, that's not the case.

amando

Posted Jan 11, 2007 6:20 PM New!
I disagree. Cheerleading is intended to cheer for
sports. It seems like that precludes cheerleading from actually being a sport.

**YOUR NAME:**  

**YOUR REPLY:**

**Tyler DeBarthe Thesis #2**

debart

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 9:19 AM New!*  
Seattle should increase public funding for mental health in the area.

dokah05

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 1:09 PM New!*  
I don't know too much about this subject to give a definite response. But isn't there a lot of other health conditions that can take precedence.

kristj6

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 1:10 PM New!*  
I agree. I do not know a lot of statistics or information regarding this but I agree that it should be increased. My mom works in the healthcare field and I have worked a lot with coaching special olympics and so through personal experience I have gained this opinion in agreement with your thesis.
If I had to give an opinion, I would disagree because I would like to see funding go to general health care for all people in Seattle, before specialized groups. I am ignorant to this subject, I have no idea how much public funding there is already and how much more is needed. I think this would be an interesting topic for you to speak about, though it may be hard to research.

I didn't know the current funding was a problem.

I agree. Currently our state is economically doing pretty well and I know that the governor is trying to pass some new proposals because we have current surplus of $1.9 billion. It would be nice to see some of that to go toward mental healthcare.

I disagree. I want to see our hard-earned money go toward a decent public transportation system. Forget the buses, we need a Monorail! Every major city has a more efficient transportation system. New York has the Subway, San Francisco has BART, etc. How can we call ourselves a city? Let's help the entire city before spending on the few with mental issues.
The U.S. should not build a fence along its entire border with Mexico to deter illegal immigration.

I agree because to build a fence across the border would financially be too costly especially during a time when the U.S. is in debt 8.6 trillion dollars. Besides a fence would not prevent illegal immigration. It might slow it down but it won't stop it. A fence would only make these people find other ways to get into our country illegally.

I agree. I don't think that a fence would be able to efficiently stop illegal immigration. I also think the benefits (slowing illegal immigration) would not outweigh the cost of building the fence.
Building a fence seems like an archaic solution to the problem. Patrolling such a fence would prove impossible, and would become inadequate. Revamping our immigration policy and imposing more restrictions on violators would be more reasonable responses.

**willik2**

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:48 PM New!*  
I agree, and I support amando's claim as well. Building a fence will do nothing if it is not adequately patrolled. The amount of money that the government would have to put into first building a fence and then regulating it could be spent in other ways to deter illegal immigration.

**candy206**

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 5:57 PM New!*  
I agree, I think it is not fair how easily immigrants can come to the US.

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

**Liz C Thesis #2**

**liz87**

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:18 AM New!*  
The three strikes law needs to be abolished.
willik2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 2:13 PM New!
I agree. I think that this is too harsh and too general of a law. I do believe that sentencings should become more grave with each additional crime, but the crimes and their circumstances should be evaluated individually.

candy206

Posted Jan 11, 2007 2:45 PM New!
I agree, I believe the punishments in general should be more harsh so that after about three strikes you will be in jail for life anyway.

anna1122

Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:25 PM New!
i agree. i feel like people can change even though it doesn't seem likely. if a person had a troubled life at young age but has shown that he has changed when he is older i feel they deserve another chance but the three strikes law doesn't allow for that.

amando

Posted Jan 11, 2007 5:55 PM New!
I agree. There should be support programs for people that have repeated offenses. Three strikes fails to address each individual case and circumstances.
Ryan Malama Thesis #1 & #2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 5:51 PM New!

Topic 1: Student Conduct Code

Thesis 1: The student conduct code should not apply to students when they are off campus as well as to students that live off campus.

Topic 2: The Port Orchard NASCAR Track

Thesis 2: Building a NASCAR track in Port Orchard would have greater overall negative effects than positive effects.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Brad Holly Thesis #2

bcundiff

Posted Jan 11, 2007 9:44 AM New!

I strongly oppose the idea of higher tuition at the University of Washington.
I agree. Tuition is already very high and is difficult for many students to pay as it is.

I agree, in fact I think college should have free tuition. In the long run, the more educated Americans are the more advanced and prosperous we will be as a nation in the future.

I agree! I believe that tuition is high enough already and its becoming harder to pay for school each year.

I agree. But I wonder where exactly our tuition money goes. It has always been "hard" to pay for college. For a highly accredited institution like UW I think people expect to pay more and feel it is worth it.
I think the U.S. should immediately withdraw its military from Iraq.

I disagree. I think that there are still some people that are dependent on the US troops in Iraq. Maybe US should slowly withdraw their troops out.

I disagree. I do think that our military strategy needs to change, with an emphasis on pulling our troops out soon. However, I believe that pulling our troops out immediately would result in a bloody civil war for Iraq, and they'd be right back where they started. Rebuilding a nation takes time.

I disagree. I don't think we should do it immediately but I think we do it gradually. Immediately pulling out would do more damage to Iraq because it would leave the country in chaos and all the soldiers that already died in combat would have died in vain.

I disagree. The U.S. may have opened a can of worms, but it seems we are responsible for the civil war that could begin in Iraq if we do pull our troops
immediately.

The ICE should extend the same level of tutoring and out-of-class help to all students, disregarding race or financial status.

I honestly know nothing about this so I am not partial either way. Sorry.

I don’t know what the ICE is sorry.

I also do not know what ICE is either but i think when it comes to tutoring, i feel that some sort of out of
class help is good but usually tutors are paid by the hour and often times only those with money can afford them. i don't think race has anything to do with this.

candy206

Posted Jan 11, 2007 5:22 PM New!
I think this topic is TOO general, not enough people know what it is.

amando

Posted Jan 11, 2007 5:29 PM New!
I too, cannot offer an opinion as I don't know what ICE is. However, this can be used to your advantage to inform all of us. If you will use this topic, your thesis could be more detailed because most of us don't know what ICE is.

YOUR NAME: your reply:

Amanda Owens Thesis #2

amando

Posted Jan 11, 2007 11:38 AM New!
The U.S. should not have universal health care.

willik2
I agree. Implementing universal health care would lower the quality of health care for everyone. However, I do believe that health care should be more affordable for all citizens.

I disagree. I think that some sort of healthcare should be implemented by the U.S. Other countries around the world like Spain, Sweden, and the U.K. provide a system that is geared towards the prevention and treatment of illnesses for its people. Many people in the U.S. can't afford some, even partial, sort of health insurance due to their job or salary. In 2002, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, 43.6 million people could not afford or have any sort of health insurance and those numbers seem to just keep rising each year. Universal health care can save many lives, especially those from low income families. Therefore I believe the U.S. government should start working toward making it accessible to everyone.

I DISAGREE, all people need health care whether they can afford it or not, those who are struggling to pay rent and don't have health coverage shouldn't be left to suffer.
amando

Posted Jan 11, 2007 11:37 AM New!
There should not be a salary cap for professional athletes.

willik2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:38 PM New!
I disagree. The enormous amount that professional athletes are paid is ridiculous. I would rather see athletes paid less and the prices of tickets, merchandise, food, and parking go down.

anna1122

Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:49 PM New!
i agree. we don't have a salary cap for any other profession, so why should we have one for sports. i don't think people realize that yes although these people make a lot of money during their career, their career is usually very short-lived considering most professional athletes retire before the age of 37. and fact is they are professionals, meaning that this is their source of income.

candy206

Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:32 PM New!
I agree, they are talented individuals and people are willing to pay good money to watch them.