There should be a physical education requirement to graduate to help maintain America's obesity issue.

Agree. It greatly improves the overall health of the population and sets a good standard of health for you to live by. The high school I came from had strict PE requirements. We were all required to participate in at least 2 different sports throughout high school and take PE classes. In order to graduate you had to be able to tread water for 5 minutes and run a 12 minute mile. You come out taking notice to what you eat, how much, and the amount you exercise.

Do you mean graduate from college or high school? Try to be a bit more specific, especially if this is going to be your topic.

I agree. For both college and high school. Our obesity problem is ridiculous, and we need to take the necessary measures.
I disagree. When I was in high school I disliked this requirement strongly at my school because I was already involved in other sports and I wanted to take other classes that were of more interest to me than learning how to shoot a basketball when I already know how to. I think that if you play other sports you shouldn't have to take this class.

laural2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 5:51 PM New!
I agree. Its important to stay active. Most high schools and colleges that I have seen have a wide enough variety of options that there is some physical activity for every type of person.

bstence

Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:19 PM New!
i mean both.

and also if you are in sports you can have it count as PE credit

does that satisfy all areas?

hkn

Posted Jan 11, 2007 11:13 PM New!
I agree. Physical education has already been a requirement in most public schools. I think it's an excellent idea! This type of class will encourage students to participate and be active.

mrose2

Posted Yesterday, 9:15 AM New!
NASA should continue full exploration of space in an attempt to prove or disprove the existence of non-human life forms.
I agree. It's always good to do a bit more exploration. Humans are intelligent creatures. We've created this world through discoveries with our hands and knowledge. We built amazing technology that enable us to travel to space! I think that humans should advance and continue their search. Maybe they'll discover something and it could benefit us all.

bstence

I agree. I would love to be friends with something on another planet. Haha but forreal, I believe that by doing this research it could possible help us make our own planet better.

celmsn

Nasa is going to lose a lot of credibility if they specifically are exploring in hope of finding non-human life forms. I'm definitely in agreement with further exploration, but let's not dangle a carrot in front of ourselves with finding other life forms.

jeattw05

I agree. There should be no limits to beneficial scientific exploration.

jml35

I agree. I think that it is important to use our technology to look at things outside of our planet.
agree. The ultimate goal is find out whether or not we are alone in this universe. If we are alone, it's a very lonely place out there. But in the process of space exploration, many technological advancements are made. We also learn a lot about the world we live in and our surroundings.

at the moment im gonna have to disagree with you... because the gov is spending way too much money

Police presence in the U District needs to be drastically increased.

I agree. This would scare the criminals, and probably prevent shootings, robberies, cases of sexual assault, etc. You see these issues in the newspaper
everyday. I know as a female, I would feel a lot more secure at night, or when I'm by myself if I saw more officers around!

bstence

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:43 PM New!

I agree. the presence of police officers creates a more secure environment especially in such a sketchy area like the U district. i know that i personally walk everywhere and most of the time i am forced to do it alone, and i would feel ok passing two or three cop cars on my 14 block trek home from Greek Row. some people may disagree cuz they want to party and not want to deal with the cops. but the cops dont care if you party. as long as you keep it in the privacy of your own place..dont bring it out on their public streets.

pmn2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:23 PM New!

mixed feelings about this. true it would make the u-district safer, but i think the police need to stay in downtown seattle where there is more crime and would therefore be more effective and would have the greatest impact. maybe more uw police instead of seattle police.

celmsn

Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:40 AM New!

On 1/10/2007 9:23 PM pmn2 said:
mixed feelings about this. true it would make the u-district safer, but i think the police need to stay in downtown seattle where there is more crime and would therefore be more effective and would have the greatest impact. maybe more uw police instead of seattle police.
Though SPD is active in incident prevention, I specifically mean UWPD presence

jml35

Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:14 PM New!
I agree. From what I've seen so far, I haven't seen that many police officers on campus especially at night when they are need the most. I think that in order to ensure the safety of the students there needs to be more police officers.

ashleyl

Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:34 PM New!
I disagree. No matter how many police there is in a given area there is always going to be some threat or sense of crime. There are a lot of police that patrol the area and attempt to make the area secure and safe. Downtown Seattle i think is where the concentration needs to be focused. The crimes within the city are I'm sure more serious and detrimental.

hkn

Posted Jan 11, 2007 11:25 PM New!
I disagree. There's lots of business and people on U-district. There's so many other places such as quiet neighborhoods or areas like South Park that are in more need regarding safety issues.

pmn2

Posted Yesterday, 12:25 AM New!
my bad... in that case... idk. how far does uwpd patrol? i guess i disagree. i live on 8th and i've never really had a problem with safety. police respond quickly and i think their presence is already felt adequately. people should know not to be walking
around alone at 2 o'clock. it's common sense. if you're alone at that time you're in danger no matter where you are.

mrose2

Posted Yesterday, 9:09 AM New!
i think that there is an enormous amount of u district police already... i feel if a crime is going to happen no matter how many police are around it will still happen. so I disagree

YOUR NAME:    YOUR REPLY:

Hoang Nguyen's Thesis #1

hkn

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:36 PM New!
"Drug and pharmacy stores should pose stricter policies on un-prescribed diet pills."

jeattw05

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:41 PM New!
I disagree. Our nation is grossly overweight, and putting a restriction on anything that could help people lose weight would not help. If people can't abuse diet pills, they'll turn to drugs, or anorexia. Only self-destructive people will abuse diet pills, and they probably won't stop at that.
mavesm

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:53 AM New!
People are free to make their own choices and their own mistakes when it comes to choosing how they wanted to use (or abuse) their body. The best and most effective way to lose weight is to eating a proper, balanced diet and have a regular exercise routine--however, we live in a free-market society that allows for consumers to purchase whatever goods they feel like, and people should conduct their own research before taking a pill that might do harm to them.

bkruss

Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:02 AM New!
I agree with this statement. I have known individuals who have OD'ed on these so called miracle weight loss pills that are not approved by the FDA and sadly have died because of it. We need a stricter policy because these pills can in fact cause serious health problems in the long run. And also, for some individuals it doesn't even take OD'ing in order to have serious consequences...they can be very dangerous in general so it would make sense that companies would regulate how much can be purchased.

jml35

Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:18 PM New!
I agree. I think that there are too many people out there that don't know how to lose weight properly and would do anything to get diet pills to lose weight, even though it may not be the best thing for them. I think that stricter policies would make it safer to diet with pills and people would be refrained from making hasty decisions.
i agree. diet pills don't work unless you are committed to losing weight through eating, exercising differently. if you find a pill that does make you lose weight without changing your lifestyle, you may look better on the outside but your arteries, liver, and what-not are still in bad shape. your body produces certain chemicals in certain amounts for a reason. adding more chemicals can harm you. besides there are no long long term studies. who know what they may do to you when you 70.

im really not sure

"Public schools should not ask students to recite the pledge of allegiance."

Because none of us are in high school anymore, there is no reason that this issue is applicable to myself nor
anyone else in this class. I couldn't be indifferent.

bkruss

Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:03 AM New!
I kind of agree with Maves on this one...although I feel like it should not be required if it makes a student uncomfortable.

jeattw05

Posted Jan 11, 2007 2:13 PM New!
I disagree. There's nothing wrong with asking students to recite the Pledge of Allegiance that represents the morality and unity for which our country was founded and built on. Teachers should not force students, but there's nothing wrong with asking.

jml35

Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:50 PM New!
I disagree. I think that asking students to say the pledge of allegiance should not disrespect other religions because it is what the nation was established on a long time ago. The nation was built on Christianity and out of respect to the foundation of the country, it should be said. Also where would it stop? Would people also say it's not okay to make religious references and learning about religion is also not okay?

laural2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 8:00 PM New!
I disagree. It's kind of traditional. I don't think it should be required-- at my schools, people were allowed to pass on it and remain seated, or stand and remain silent. I know it's a "hot issue" in the news, but I'm rather indifferent.
pmn2

Posted Yesterday, 12:56 AM New!
is this about the under god? i have no problem with the pledge with or without it. but it's either all kids do it or none. if you leave god in and kids don't say it, they'll be alienated. if you take god out all kids can say it without protest. it's good to have something that everyone in the country has in common, brought up the same way, equally. yes the pledge is a tradition in classrooms, but the under god part isn't. that's only about 50 years old. kids were reciting the pledge fine without the inclusion of god for the first 50 years.

mrose2

Posted Yesterday, 9:02 AM New!
im in the middle for this topic

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

kkurlon

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:30 PM New!
All individuals over the age of 70 should be required to re-take their driver's test (both written and driving) or they will forfeit their driver's license.

jeattw05
I agree, but there should be an alternative for those who don't pass that won't cost them an arm and a leg. They still need to be able to get to the doctor, grocery store, etc, anytime they want and with ease.

I agree. A lot of the time, people over this age don't know how to drive safely anymore, or they drive too carefully and causes road rage from other drivers that can drive the speed limit. Elderly people also have a hard time reacting and driving defensively which endangers others.

i disagree. i think the elderly would pass the driving test easily since it's a set route that they're already familiar with. it's when old people are driving around somewhere they haven't been before or under a lot of pressure and stress. that you can't simulate that in a driving test.

The problem with this idea is the pressure it would put on the DMV. that place is already ridiculous, pack in a hundred or so old people, wow.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YOUR NAME:</th>
<th>YOUR REPLY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**michael houston** Thesis # 1

mdh33

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 1:02 PM* New!
Any type of sexuall relationships between a human and an animal should be banned as well as legally punished.

jeattw05

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:22 PM* New!
I strongly agree. Isn't this already really illegal?

bstence

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:40 PM* New!
i strongly agree...i dont even think this should be something that should be going on...sick.

pmn2

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:16 PM* New!
wow... um... agree. but bestiality is already illegal. i
think it's also considered cruelty to animals and is punishable.

jml35

Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:26 PM New!
I agree. I think that this is disgusting and yes it should be illegal and banned.

celmsn

Posted Yesterday, 8:53 AM New!
I dont think this is a very realistic topic to debate, and i'm worried for the websites you'll accidently find when you're searching for opposition views...

mrose2

Posted Yesterday, 8:58 AM New!

mike cuh.... i dont know about this one. i agree with your statement but im really not trying to hear someone talk about that

Ellen Stone 2

ellens2
The UW should abandon the wholistic application process.

This is a difficult statement to fully agree or disagree with. I feel like it would need to be a more specific thesis like, for example, add in more detail such as "because UW requires students who can cope with an intense academic life".

I agree with this statement because I have found from personal experience that those students that I know did well gradewise in high school and were not very involved are finding that UW is a good fit school for them whereas other kids I went to school with are finding that they now want to transfer to a school where the class sizes are smaller to help with their ability to learn while still being fully involved.

Even though I feel very torn about this issue because I don't always think grades and test scores are the best indicators of one's intelligence, UW is a very difficult school and the only thing that matters here is your GPA. Nobody here cares if you're an athlete or active on student body---the expectations are the same for everyone. I worry that people who are getting admitted to UW based off of their clubs, sports, teams, activities, etc will not be adequately prepared for the academics at UW.

I agree. The workforce and Business world are not looking for graduates who just receive good grades.
They're looking for people who can communicate well, think out of the box, work quickly, stay motivated, work as a leader or with a team, etc. Starting early like in grade school and high school will make people amazing at these tasks, so accepting students into the UW who are very well rounded will make it easier to produce well-rounded graduates.

jml35

Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:10 PM New!
I disagree. I think that it is important to see the other achievements that a student does in high school. When comparing a student with a 3.5 GPA that was involved in leadership and other activities and sports and a student with a 4.0 GPA that had no other extracurriculars to some extent are equal. If a certain school were not to have holistic admissions, then the 3.5 student (obviously able to manage many commitments and maintain a good grade) would not get admitted.

ashley1

Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:20 PM New!
I disagree. UW prides their selves off of diversity and accepting students from all spectrums. It is important to look at the whole potential students life and aspects that characterize that particular person. Some student are very intellegent but arent great test takers or arent able to justify their intelligence through their grades.

pmn2

Posted Yesterday, 1:09 AM New!
i agree. gpa, ACT, and SAT scores are the fairest measure of evaluating students. more so ACT and SAT scores since all tests are the same. gpa can be subjective since not all schools are the same. if someone can't take tests well, then it means they can't handle high pressure, strenuous situations.
ideally you want all around student athletes or those involved with other extracurricular activities. those activities would be an excellent way of deciding between two students with equal gpa or SAT scores. and why punish good academic students just because they lack the size and skill to compete in sports.

mrose2

Posted Yesterday, 8:55 AM New!
im really in the middle, i think any way it is argued would make a good topic

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

ryanj3

Posted Yesterday, 2:18 AM New!
I agree that we should reform the policies towards election contributions to decrease corporate or lobby influence on candidates.

mrose2

Posted Yesterday, 8:53 AM New!
not familiar with the subject

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:
Ellen Stone 1

Ellens2

Posted Jan 9, 2007 8:50 PM New!
First idea: The drinking age in the US should be lowered to 18. Let me know your position please that'll greatly help.

mdh33

Posted Jan 10, 2007 1:07 PM New!
I disagree. If the drinking age is lowered it would mean more liquor in the classrooms as well as more liquor related problems.

jeattw05

Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:15 PM New!
I disagree. When you're 18, you're still in high school, living with your parents, and still pretty sheltered. I think 20 should be the drinking age, because you've had 2 years out in the real world, whether you're working, or going to school. 21 is just a little too long to wait.

pmn2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:55 PM New!
I disagree. Kids drink throughout high school even with the current drinking age at 21. If it were to be lowered even kids would begin drinking at an even younger age. At 18, teenagers are just learning how to drive.
can they handle to responsibility of drinking and driving? however... european and asain nations have low drinking ages. they've been able to manage very well so it is possible, but i think it has to do with their cultures.

bstence

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:10 PM New!
i also disagree. if the drinking age were lowered there would just be more immature mistakes made, such as drinking and driving, and also isnt there some medical reason the drinking age is that high? liver development rings a bell, but i could be wrong.

kkurlon

Posted Jan 11, 2007 8:47 AM New!
Disagree. 18 year olds aren't mature enough to have the right to drink legally. They'll abuse the right and it would lead to more alcoholism in young adults.

bkruss

Posted Jan 11, 2007 9:42 AM New!
I disagree as well. Despite the fact that we are considered "adults" at the age 18, many of us are still rather immature. And also, crucial development of the brain is still occurring at this age (a huge part dealing with memory and logic) and it has been proven that the younger kids drink, the more deleterious of an effect it has in the long run. It would also increase the alcoholism rate in society.

jml35

Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:25 PM New!
I agree. I think that it should be lowered to 18 becuase it would be safer for people to start drinking
responsibly at home rather than at college around more experienced college students which can lead to other problems such as alcohol poisoning. This is also the age where they are responsible to gamble and smoke and drinking should also be allowed at this age too.

celmsn

Posted Yesterday, 8:49 AM New!
Europe has set an impressive example for us to follow on this topic. The drinking age being 21 makes it a game of sorts to underage people trying to get alcohol, which in turn makes it even more fun. I never really had problems getting it, but having to sneak around my parents, etc, made it all the more fun to drink. Lowering the drinking age might disperse some of the allure of drinking

mrose2

Posted Yesterday, 8:52 AM New!
i think im gonna have to disagree because it is too dangerous and 18 year olds are not responsible yet.

YOUR NAME: | YOUR REPLY:

ryanj3

Posted Yesterday, 2:23 AM New!
I believe that Washington state should allow hard
alcohol of all kinds to be sold at normal markets; from QFC, to Safeway, to the local gas station, much like California.

hkn

Posted Yesterday, 6:26 AM New!

I disagree. It'll be handy for age drinkers, but if alcohol is carried in more markets, it may not be a good idea for young teenagers because they will have easier access to purchase alcohol. At this age, teens drink underage anyways and because alcohol is more exposed in markets, they can find a way to buy it easier than if they only are sold in specific stores. Allowing this contribute to more auto accidents and violence.

mrose2

Posted Yesterday, 8:49 AM New!

i agree. with me being from california i think this is a good idea... and maybe you can through in what time they close also.

YOUR NAME: 

YOUR REPLY: 

Jeatt Walker Thesis #2

jeattw05

Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:10 PM New!

Intelligent design should be taught along
with Darwinian evolution to students in the science classroom

pmn2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:42 PM New!
i honestly had no idea what intelligent design was so i had to read up a little on it. it's actually really interesting. however i disagree with your statement. intelligent design implies the presence of a supernatural being. you would basically be teaching faith in the classroom. also there is no experimental or historical evidence supporting intelligent design other than observing how incredibly complex nature is and saying... "wow, no way that could have happened on accident."

kkurlon

Posted Jan 11, 2007 8:41 AM New!
I disagree, because darwinian evolution has evidence that can be seen in bones, etc. Intelligent Design seems to be more of a faith-based theory rather than evidence based theory.

bkruss

Posted Jan 11, 2007 9:48 AM New!
I disagree as well. Darwinism is scientifically based and usually by the time students are exposed to Darwin's theories, they are of an age where they are aware of the idea of a biblical creation. Although I think it would be pretty cool to bring something else into the classroom because more and more people are preaching that we want our kids to be exposed to different ideas in order to be more informed, I'm not sure if this is a good way of doing it.
I agree. I don't know what intelligent design is, but I think that it is important to know about Darwinian Evolution. It should be carefully taught as to not offend anyone's religious beliefs, but it is important that this is taught because it is part of scientific history and what some of our ideas are based on.

I disagree with you, but sure would like to hear how you plan to persuade your audience, so i guess its a good topic! I think its good for people to learn about the debate, moreso than the theory. Personally, i would have darwin taught in the science classes, and the debate taught in a history class, or a senior issues, etc. The argument is very interesting, and touches on a dynamic rift in the US.

I disagree
College football should stop using the BCS (Bowl Championship Series) and switch to a playoff type tournament for the end of the season games.

very strongly agree! football is the only sport without a playoff system. this is because the BCS is all about money. school presidents and corporations are unwilling to give up the millions they make through BCS games. so school can make money but players cant? that's not what college football is about. the only way to find an undisputed champion is to beat everyone.

I dont know anything about this topic, and I cant say that I really care about it. It doesn't directly affect me at all.

I agree. This would make it more fair and it would also bring in more revenue for the NCAA because people would watch more. All other sports have some type of playoff system.

I agree that college football should have a playoff type tournament. In doing so, maybe a college from Washington would actually get to play! It would be more fair for teams that aren't as good.
**whitleet**

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

I would have agreed with you last year but after seeing the awesome games that played out this year I think that maybe its not so bad. We actually had teams that deserved to be there.

---

**bstence**

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

i disagree. a playoff type system would take like 4 months to finish. football teams play one game a week unlike the other sports that can play back to back to back days. also the bowl series is tradition and it allows team that deserve to be there, be there. but yes, the biggest reason is the amount of time it would take to finish the playoffs.

---

**hkn**

*Posted Yesterday, 6:33 AM New!*

I’m not familiar with football and it's indifferent to me either way.

---

**mrose2**

*Posted Yesterday, 8:43 AM New!*

your idea couldnt have been better... by seeing all these upsets in these bowl games why shouldnt a team like boise st. who went undefeated have a chance at the national championship?????
The United States should step up and take responsibility for its own actions by ratifying the Kyoto Protocol.

Sorry I don't know about the Kyoto Protocol.

not the slightest idea of what your idea is
Laws prohibiting abortion endanger a woman’s physical and mental health.

bkruss

I disagree with this statement. There are studies finding that women who have abortions are actually endangering their health and many have dealt with depression and strong feelings of regret after having an abortion. Rather you could say that laws prohibiting abortion are against a women’s right to control her own body and that the government should not have that much control.

jeattw05

I agree. Even though I know abortion would never be my choice, because I don’t believe in it, I think each individual woman has her right to choose. Yeah, they should’ve taken more precautions, but accidents happen, and some people are just not suitable for pregnancy and/or motherhood.

jml35

I agree. Although I don’t agree with the idea of abortion, I think that it does in fact endanger a woman's physical and mental health when she is not given the choice to make that decision. In the case of rape it is unfair to not give the woman a choice when it was not her fault.

laural2
I agree. However, this looks like a belief/value statement, not a "should" statement.

hkn

Posted Yesterday, 7:14 AM New!
I disagree. Abortions can disrupt women's menstruation cycle. I knew a person who made an abortion in high school and her period cycle becomes irregular every month. I think is a disadvantage for women who decide to make an abortion.

celmsn

Posted Yesterday, 8:05 AM New!
Abortion is a really hard topic. I think you'd have a lot easier of a time if you were more specific, for example, saying that in the first semester, etc etc.

mrose2

Posted Yesterday, 8:38 AM New!
not too familiar with the subject
Washington State should legalize gay marriages.

pmn2

Agree. Declaration of Independence gives you right of the pursuit of happiness. If this means gay marriage... so be it. Constitution gives equal rights and protection. Government is discriminating against gay individuals. Look back at America's history of granting women and african-americans equal rights. This is the same situation.

bstence

i'll agree even tho it goes against everything i believe in as far as the bible goes, stating that marriage should be between a man and a woman. but as far as being lawful, i will agree. it doesn't harm me in any way and i feel that if the prusuit of happiness is someone of your own sex, go for it.

kkurlon

Agree. We tend to be seen as a progressive, open-minded and accepting state, and I think that is in no way the right of the government to dictate who we can or cannot marry. Plus, all people should have the right to enjoy the perks of marriage regardless of their sexual orientation.

bkruss

I kind of am going along with Bailey on this one, I agree that we do not have the right to tell someone
who they should be attracted to. The only issue I wonder is that there are many problems with this and social security (I really don't know much about it...I just know that it raised some question...you might want to look into it!)

jml35

Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:22 PM New!
I agree. I think that same sex couples are just as capable as other couples to have a stable marriage and therefore should be given the choice to marry if they wish to. It is not fair that just because they don't fit the traditional standard of a married couple that they are not entitled to the benefits of marriage.

hkn

Posted Yesterday, 7:05 AM New!
I agree. I don't think there's nothing wrong with being gay. Though it's unacceptable in many cultures, but I don't see any harm to allow gay marriages. I think it's time to free these people from shame and guilt impression that people have on them. Same sex relationships occurred in history and at that time, gay people were forced to hide their true identity or get punish; therefore being gay was not exposed. However, life today is different because of freedom. Freedom is so powerful in this country, why not give freedom to the gay community? Gay marriages are ways that allow these people to express their feelings and true identity. I think we need to start looking deeper into our human body and except that it's our minds that control our actions and feelings because of the same sex appearance.

celmsn

Posted Yesterday, 8:08 AM New!
A good thing about this topic is that you'll have a very easy time finding opposition views. It might be harder to find views specific to washington state though,
versus the country overall

mrose2

Posted Yesterday, 8:33 AM

im not too familiar with the topic

YOUR NAME:       YOUR REPLY:

Katherine Kurlon Thesis #1

kkurlon

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:30 PM

All High Schools in Washington should be required to
 teach an STD/HIV education class that is mandatory
 for all students to take.

bstence

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:34 PM

VERY STRONGLY AGREE. i believe that this education
 is a HUGE deal considering all the problems we have
 as far as STD's and unplanned pregnancies and what
 not go. i believe that sexual education must also be
 incorporated in this plan to help reduce the number of
 early pregnancy. it might not prevent it, and it might
 even seem as if it is encouraging it, but if kids know
 the risks and everything that comes along with it, the
 chances of them getting pregnant have lowered. Show
 pictures of the syph or clamidia (i dont even know
how to spell the damn disease NAMES! how am i supposed to keep from catching it....haha..alright...nevermind..see my point?)

jeattw05

Posted Jan 11, 2007 2:48 PM New!
I agree. I was taught in my high school, and I thought that every school had to have HIV/STD classes. The more someone knows, the least likely they are too screw up. It takes knowledge in order to be able to protect yourself the best that you can, and you aren't born with that knowledge.

jml35

Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:30 PM New!
I agree. I think that it's important that high school students know the consequences of not making smart decisions. This will also help deter students from making unsafe choices and hopefully reduce the number of STD's.

pmn2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 7:07 PM New!
i'm not sure if an entire semester should be devoted to stds. that's an entire semester you keep from learning math, science, or english. i do believe that it should be incorporated into the system though: in biology and physical education for example. school can maintain their normal curriculum while effectively educating their students on stds.

hkn

Posted Yesterday, 6:52 AM New!
I agree. It seems like people talk about STD/HIV a lot, but people actually don't know what it actually does
and how it was caused especially for the younger generations. I think this kind of education should be taught as soon as possible to prevent unnecessary risks and regrets. I also agree with bstence on this, STD/HIV education can be taught along with sex education. Since many people are afraid to talk about personal things, providing an education on it will definitely be helpful and much safer than doing nothing at all.

 celmsn
 Posted Yesterday, 8:14 AM New!
 I had to take a health class to graduate, and it covered stds and hiv pretty extensively. I'm pretty sure that requirement is state-wide.

 mrose2
 Posted Yesterday, 8:32 AM New!
 i agree, but don't schools already make health class a requirement???

 YOUR NAME:  
 YOUR REPLY:

 whitney thompson #1

 whiteet
 Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:05 PM New!
 The federal government should put into action a universal healthcare coverage plan.
I agree. Though it will cost a lot of money, but for better health for everyone, I think it's something the federal government should consider. I think this is provide a lot of benefit for the lower class and those in poverty, who are in need.

I agree, but I really don't think that would ever be able to happen in the US. I had a teacher in high school that talked about this topic, and he explained that he isn't for universal healthcare, because he likes how with our current system health care is a business, which creates competition, and therefore a higher quality product, even though its at a higher cost.

I agree. I think health care is something the gov should focus more on.
The U.S. should require all manufacturers to produce vehicles with 40 mpg or greater.

I disagree. I can't wait to make a lot of money and have a nice '69 Z28 Camaro restored...and that is not even close to a 40mpg vehicle. Plus, what about all the people who use their V8's for farming and hauling purposes? I think people should be able to drive what ever kind of vehicle they want, regardless of the horsepower or how many mpg it gets.

It seems like a good idea although I know that many people would be upset by this. I feel like we can't really tell people what they need to be driving...if they want to use a less efficient car and fill up more often, then let them.

I'm kind of halfway on this topic. I could lean either way. We need to be constantly doing new things to reduce pollution, but some people need bigger vehicles for work or family priorities.

I disagree. This seems like it would be a benefit to the consumers, but I don't feel like paying more than I
already have to for car payments in the future. It has
good intentions, but I don't think that it would be
successful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ashleyl</th>
<th>Posted Jan 11, 2007 8:04 PM</th>
<th>New!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I disagree. I believe energy and research should be concentrated on making vehicles more environmentally friendly rather than more efficient. The consumer would definitely benefit from this requirement but the environment wouldn't. I think it's a good idea but realistically I think automobile innovators are going to be looking into the effects of pollution on how to improve our environment before efficiency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hkn</th>
<th>Posted Jan 11, 2007 8:59 PM</th>
<th>New!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I disagree. I think it should be more on people's choice. We have to think about class as well. The working class may not have enough money to drive a vehicle with 40 mpg, but middle or higher class can be able to afford it. If they don't want to pay more, they can drive something less than 40 mpg compared to those who are capable of paying more.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>whitleet</th>
<th>Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:19 PM</th>
<th>New!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I'm not sure I have a great interest in this. It would be nice if they did but freedom of choice is what this nation is founded on.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| bstence | Posted Jan 11, 2007 11:10 PM | New! |
I'm not really worried about this right now. Not such a hot topic in my book.

**Laura Loesch #1**

laural2

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:00 AM New!*

The US should legalize gay marriage and extend the same rights to same-sex couples as to all married couples.

**bkruss**

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:14 AM New!*

I agree with this statement. Although it's kind of against the bible, I feel like we don't have the right to tell someone who they are allowed to be attracted to. And everyone should be protected equally under the law.

**celmsn**

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 11:04 AM New!*

I definitely agree with you on this. I've heard that there are somewhere around 4,000 rights that a married couple have that a gay couple cannot get presently.
jeattw05

Posted Jan 11, 2007 1:38 PM New!

I agree, I also had already posted this thesis. Our government is a democracy, not a theocracy.

jml35

Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:59 PM New!

I agree. I think that same sex couples should be able to have the same benefits as other married couples. Same sex couples are just as able to have stable relationships as those couples that are not same sex, and should thus be recognized as a married couple if they wish to be.

pmn2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 7:50 PM New!

I agree. Everyone should be treated equally and fairly. Gays the right to the pursuit of their own happiness. To deny them this right would be discrimination. Just as it was wrong to discriminate against women or people of a different race, it is also wrong to discriminate based on sexual orientation.

hkn

Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:20 PM New!

I agree. I think that all humans should have the rights to share their life with whoever they choose including same sex marriages. Gay couples are like any other heterosexual couples, they have emotions and feelings; therefore they shouldn’t be judged based upon their sex. There’s no harm to legalize same sex marriages.
i agree. yes it might be against the bible, but as said before, we are not a theocracy. same sex marriages need to be recognized just as heterosexual marriages. i have posted about this before..check out the other thesis.

Yes. This is an issue of rights, and who are we to say if one group of people aren't allowed the same rights that everyone else is.

The Legal age to drink should stay at 21

i agree. it doesn't matter what anyone does, people will still drink before they are 21. But i feel that this is a good target age to quit the binge drinking and become mature adults. by the time people turn 21
anyway they dont really drink to get drunk anymore. they mostly drink to be social. 16/17-21 are the ages where people just go nuts and experiment..if the drinking age was lowered it would just create more havoc at a younger age.

celmsn

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:45 PM New!
You're going to want to look at european examples for your informative, because they have set a very convincing example of how a society should treat alcohol. In the US we have this allure around it when we're growing up, which causes us to "Hey Mister", beer run, take stuff from our parents, whatever the case may be, and in turn make alcohol adventurous, make it a game and in turn, give it even more addictive properties than it already has.

jeattw05

Posted Jan 11, 2007 1:20 PM New!
I disagree, I think 18 is too young, but 21 is just too long to wait, and such a random age. 20 is honestly the right age. You've been out of high school and in the real world for 2 years and, and you still have time to binge drink, act stupid, and get your partying out before you need to settle down with a serious career and a family.

jml35

Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:07 PM New!
I disagree. I think that the legal drinking age should be brought down to 18 because I think that it would be more safe for people to start drinking when they still live at home rather than when they are at college surrounded by other college students that are experienced drinkers. This leads to more alcohol poisoning and other problems. I also think that having the drinking age so high gives a reason for high school students to rebel.
I disagree. Europe is a great example of how 18 can be a reasonable and manageable age for individuals to start drinking. European emphasis on alcohol is so much less than in American cultures. In having people wait until their 21 intensifies the degree of importance in being legal to drink.

I agree. Drinking too young may affect growth development. Brains are still developing during the teenage years and if young teens consume too much alcohol before their adult years may lose perceptions, emotions, and thoughts. Drinking alcohol is unhealthy, but it’s always safer to drink during the mature age where the person have more responsibilities about his/her actions.

The US DOT should put an age cap and tougher restrictions for obtaining drivers licences.
I agree. I believe that the driving age should be raised to 18. People are living longer, and staying younger longer. You hear people saying thirty is the new twenty and there is a lot of truth in that. This year, two separate fatal accidents have killed two high school students, and left one in a serious coma from my old high school. Its terrible, and unbearable, and something needs to be done about it.

I agree. I think that a lot of 16 year olds are not ready to drive alone and take on the responsibility of being behind the wheel. I think that 18 would be a better age to get a driver's licence because they are more mature and most likely will need it more for college and jobs. At 16 students are still going to high school and if they were able to get to school just fine when they were 15, what makes it different when they are 16?

I disagree. I don't think there should be an age cap. People all age at different rates. Some 80 yr old people have perfect eye sight and perception capability while other dont. There should be stricter restrictions for the elderly but i dont believe in a specific "age" that a license should be provoked. I do believe in tough restrictions when it comes to how many strikes a driver can obtain and how many warnings people get these days. I personally know of a person with 3 DUI's that is still driving with a valid license.
I disagree with the age cap, and I think that 16 years old is fine, however I agree that there should be tougher restrictions on getting your licence. there are some 16 year olds that are perfectly mature to be able to drive cars, however there are numerous kids that are not. If the DOT had tougher restrictions then the immature 16 year olds would have a harder time getting a licence. this also goes with the older people, they should have to retake the drivers test at a certain age just to make sure that they are still capable to drive.

whitleet

I totally agree that there should be an age cap. some senior drivers (my grandfather for one) are much more dangerous on the road than many newer drivers.

pmn2

Seattle should ban the use of trans fats from restaurants.
I disagree because I think it is the responsibility of consumers to decide which foods they do or don't want to eat, and that the restaurant should be able to cook however they like.

bkruss

I agree. We are becoming way too obese and thus health problems are occurring and medical expenses are getting higher. Many people don't even have adequate enough health insurance coverage as is and ultimately this is just causing more issues. It would be one small step in helping our nation become more healthy.

jeattw05

I agree, the obesity rate in our country is way too high. It's in the interest of the restaurant owners to jump on the bandwagon, and join this health fad. We have a right to know we're eating things that will help us and not harm us. We should also in my opinion be able to request nutrition facts for anything we desire to eat or order.

jml35

I agree. I think that America's obesity problem is getting worse and if foods sold at the grocery store are trying to get rid of the use of trans fat, then so should restaurants. This would also profit the restaurants too because society is starting move toward eating healthy.
I disagree. Trans fat is overall an unhealthy part of our diet; however, most food contains trans fat and those who are concern about their weight should make better judgement about what they should or should not consume. One's body is one's own responsibility and resturants should not be all at fault.

---

First-world (developed) nations should cancel the debts of the third-world (poorest) nations.

I disagree. If you fix someone's problem for them, they wont learn. What we should do as a first-world country is teach the third-world countries how to get out of debt, adn guide them along the whole way, and then help monitor them until they can run efficiently on their own.
I agree to a certain extent. I think that there should be some sort of aid to the third world countries, but it needs to be regulated and made sure that the money goes to the right places and will actually help the countries out, rather than just sending them money and not knowing the progress and results of it.

bkruss

Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:36 PM New!
I also agree to a certain degree. I feel that if we have the money to excuse the debts of poor nations that we know will never pay us back then it would be the good samaritan thing to do. However, it isn't really fair that because we are profitable we are responsible to bail out those who need it. So basically I agree with the point above :)

pmn2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 8:18 PM New!
I disagree. canceling debts would do no one good. first-world nations wouldn't get their money back and third-world nations would continue to limp along, eventually getting into debt once again. we need to aid the nations and help them to advance to a point where they can sustain themselves. the U.S. didn't leave germany and japan in debt after WWII. it helped the countries rebuild and reorganize to what they are today.

Laura Loesch #2
Use of antidepressants (SSRIs) by teens should be regulated much more strictly.

I agree with this statement. Anti-depressants are being used as a quick fix to many teen's problems when I feel like at times, there is a better solution to a problem than just prescribing a drug. They can also have dangerous side effects.

I agree. Some doctors are too quick to try to solve problems with drugs, when in many instances, it can be solved by exercise, seeing a chiropractor, changing your diet, etc.

I agree. A lot of the time teenagers go through phases when it comes to their emotions and when they are feeling a little bit down for longer than usual, they think that there is something wrong with them and are depressed.

disagree. I'm not sure how big of a problem this is. it makes sense, but i've never heard this topic come up
before. antidepressants have to be prescribed by a doctor right? if a doctor prescribes it to an individual he must have very good reason because they are powerful drugs that are addicting.

YOUR NAME: YOUR REPLY:

Peter Fleischman These #1

pfleisch

Posted Jan 10, 2007 1:53 AM New!
Reinstate the military draft

mdh33

Posted Jan 10, 2007 1:05 PM New!
I disagree with the idea of the reinstatement of the military draft. I do believe we can find enough ppl to join the military without the enforcement of forced enrollment. In addition can cause bittter pple in our armies

jeattw05

Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:19 PM New!
I strongly disagree. Not everyone is physically and/or mentally strong enough to be in the military. The military should be a personal choice, not one made for you by the gov’t. I know if my brother or boyfriend, or even someday if my son was sent against his will, I would be devastated. Everything they had worked for and planned for in their lives would be turned around.
**pmn2**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:16 PM New!*

I'll agree for the hell of it. In the words of Kennedy, "ask not what your country can do for you- ask what can you do for your country." This will strengthen the military while exposing people to the outside world. Show people how fortunate they are and give them more pride in their country. Personally, I disagree. Both of my grandparents served in the WWII. Veterans know first-hand that war is a terrible thing.

---

**celmsn**

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:47 AM New!*

The draft was one of the most polarizing parts of US history, due to the class warfare it spurred. Throwing that at our already troubled times could easily break our country in a lot of scary ways.

---

**jml35**

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:16 PM New!*

I disagree. I think that there are enough volunteers that are willing to go into the military to fight for their country and I don't think that it is fair to make people that don't want to go have to when there are enough people that would willingly go. And a lot of the time, not everyone is mentally or physically capable of the demands of fighting in a war.

---

**hkn**

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 7:58 PM New!*

I disagree. I don't believe people should be force to join the military against their will. If drafting occurs, there will be more rivalries and people will disable themselves to avoid serving the military. Those who are draft may not put a great effort to the military force and more of these people will weaken the army.
Soldiers who are not dedicated or prepared for war may not be the kind of people the military wants to use.

hkn

I disagree. I don't believe people should be forced to join the military against their will. If drafting occurs, there will be more rivalries and people will disable themselves to avoid serving the military. Those who are drafted may not put a great effort into the military force and more of these people will weaken the army. Soldiers who are not dedicated or prepared for war may not be the kind of people the military wants to use.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Jessica Lee's Thesis #2

jml35

Cheating in schools needs to be regulated more strictly.

jeattw05

I agree. It's too easy for kids to cheat their way through public school. I knew a kid who had straight
A's, only because he knew how to cheat and talk his way out of anything. I work my butt off and grades are really important to me, so I hate it when I know someone is cheating! When kids get to college it should be virtually impossible for them to cheat on anything, because it will catch up with them sooner or later!

bstence

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:50 PM New!
I agree. Even though at times i myself find that i have cheated and i find that it would help a person to actually learn the material instead of depending on some one else to do their learning for them. I definitely would know a lot more if i hadn't have cheated a time or two.

pmn2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:40 PM New!
disagree. teachers are meant to teach, not babysit. it is not the teachers responsibility to instill ethics, it is the parents job. teachers can promote honesty but in the end there's not much they can do about cheating. it'll always happen and students will always find ways to cheat the system. those who are cheating are only cheating themselves.

mavesm

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:17 AM New!
I have to disagree with this statement. Teachers cannot afford to waste their time by trying to stop the few bad apples in their classes. Students who have tendencies to cheat are very unlikely to change such tendencies even if teachers were breathing down their necks--in some instances, I believe this might actually increase cheating if the students want to spite their teachers.
bkruss

Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:10 AM New!
I disagree as well. Although its very unfortunate that students need to cheat their way through at times, most likely it will catch up to them in the future. I agree with the idea that teachers are there to teach and not babysit.

ashleyl

Posted Jan 11, 2007 7:52 PM New!
I disagree. Cheating in definitely a problem that is present in public schools, but as in life there are always ways to cut corners and it is those that dont that succeed the most. Time and energy should be better focused and concentrated on those that need assistance with their studies or those that are serious about education and learning.

YOUR NAME:    YOUR REPLY:

mavesm

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:08 AM New!
There needs to be more action taken towards combating homelessness within the United States.

jeattw05
I agree. Some people have just gotten themselves so far in a hole, they can't get out alone. Some people need help with psychological, physical, and/or drug-related problems.

I agree. I think that there needs to be more places for people to turn to when they are faced with rock bottom. Although a lot of the people that are homeless are people that have faced financial problems and actually don't want to feed off of free food and government aid, there needs to be more attention on helping these individuals.

agree, however i think your thesis is too broad. u might want to consider suggesting an answer to homelessness. like investing into vocational school to teach them skills. setting up places to live for several months until they can get back on their feet. of course you want to combat homelessness, but how to do it will make it controversial.
State government should be required to pay all teachers a competitive salary which will at least match the cost of living for the designated state.

(For example, if the average cost of living in WA is $50,000 a year including food and shelter, the government should be required to pay teachers this salary per year when currently teachers are only making on average around $35,000)

Absolutely. Our government had over 2 trillion dollars a year at its disposal, and increased funding for schools, particularly in the area of faculty and staff. My mother was a teacher for 30 years, and the day she retired was 3 weeks before any other year because the school district she was teaching in simply didn’t have enough money to keep the school running any longer.

I agree. It only makes sense. Teachers have such an important role, and their salary should reflect it.

I agree. I feel that some teachers, especially professors in college do not get paid enough. A lot of teachers have gone to a lot of schooling to get their degrees and they should be paid more. They are the people that are teaching the future and should be a more competitive field.
agree. I originally wanted to be a teacher but they simply don't make enough to live comfortably. Teachers have a huge impact on our lives, almost as much as our parents. Their pay should reflect their importance and the effort and stress of their job. It's only since the amount of education required to teach in lower that they get paid so little.

'Under God' in the pledge of allegiance is a violation of the separation of church and state written in the constitution and should be removed.

I disagree. I view the pledge of allegiance as a representation of the circumstances for which our country was founded, and represents the unity and morality for which it was built on. It is common knowledge that the majority of pilgrims were Christian or Catholic. If you moved to China and went to school, if they had a pledge that was said daily that said something about Buddha, you probably wouldn't be offended, but would accept it as a cultural tradition and hold your own views regardless.
bstence

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:45 PM New!
i disagree and i strongly agree with Jeatt's statement. it is a part of america to recite 'Under God' when saying the pledge and shall forever remain this way.

pmn2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:47 PM New!
i agree. it does violate the constitution. the pledge of allegiance originally did not included the words "under god" and had been recited that way for decades. it wasn't until after WWII did those words appear. is our nation any less strong, proud, or religious without those words? i don't think so.

mavesm

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:34 AM New!
First of all, you need to adjust your thesis statement--"the wall of separation of church and state" originated from Thomas Jefferson in a letter to the Danbury Baptists in 1802, and appears nowhere in the Constitution. Second, while I'm not extraordinarily religious, I do believe that saying the Pledge of Allegiance isn't forced in schools, nor are you required to say "Under God". So I don't see how this is part of the 'state' if it's not being forced to say.

bkruss

Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:05 AM New!
I disagree. Its part of our history and the foundation of our country regardless of an individual's religious affiliation or lack thereof.
I agree. The reason many people came to the US is because of freedom; the freedom that they can never have within their own country including their religious beliefs. In the US, people are free to choose what they believe in and the religion they want to follow. If the pledge of allegiance contains the words "under God," non-believers have the rights to not recite the allegiance. America is the country of diversity, which means that no constitution should expect all people to accept the pledge of allegiance.
Restaurants in the United States should be required to provide nutrition facts on the menu in order to make America more aware of what we are eating in attempts to help combat the growing obesity rate.

bstense

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:17 PM New!
i disagree. this would create too much work for the restaraunt owner or whoever, who is already doing the cooking for us. they are saving US the time to cook a yummy meal, they shouldnt have to hold our hand and tell us what's in it. this would also make the menu's unbeleiveably (i butchered that word) long and totally unmanageable. if people are so worried about the calories in their food at a restaurnat, they need to go work out anyway.

jeattw05

Posted Jan 11, 2007 2:57 PM New!
I strongly agree. I have to know what I'm eating, and I feel like its my right to be able to request ingredients and nutrition facts. We all have a right to know what we're eating is helping us, as opposed to harming us.

jml35

Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:10 PM New!
I agree. I think that since all other foods that you buy in the store are required to have nutrition facts, shouldn't this also apply to restaurants and the food they serve? I also think that this will encourage people to eat healthier and make restaurants serve healthier food.

pmn2
i disagree. especially for fine dining. it's supposed to be an enjoyable experience. you've made a choice in the first place to indulge yourself with that type of food. if they you want to eat healthy you can go to a vegetarian buffet. i might feel differently about fast food restaurants. i wouldn't mind having nutrition facts posted at mcdonalds or taco bell like subway does.

I disagree, but I do think that they should be made available upon request. It would crowd up the menu and make it really unattractive! However, it is really important to know what you are eating.

The use of illegal drugs needs to be more harshly punished.

I agree. The US has a huge drug problem, which means the punishment must not be harsh enough.
Obviously the effect that drugs have on addicts outweighs the risk and severity of punishment. There are too many drug-related crimes and deaths.

bstence

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:53 PM New!
I agree. I have so many friends who have been nailed for drug usage but they continue to do it anyway. Nothing has gotten through to them that it is not such a good idea. Just sending them to jail for a little bit then making them take drug classes and rehab is not good enough. Find a way to abolish the crime all together...eg. HARsher PUNISHMENT :]

celmsn

Posted Jan 11, 2007 11:17 AM New!
I think that you're overlooking the aspect of chemical addiction. Plus, drug use is punished with an extreme amount of bias in america. Look into rehabilitation programs for criminals and funding for that branch of the "war on drugs" compared to total spending, I think you'll be pretty disappointed.

pmn2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 5:38 PM New!
I agree. Drugs are so readily available that jail time isn't enough to deter addicts. The government could adopt drug testing. My uncles and friends who work in construction and transportation are requires them to fulfill random drug tests. This is very effective. Lots of people quit drugs because they have no choice. It's either that or no job.

bkruss

Posted Jan 11, 2007 6:49 PM New!
I agree. If the punishments were harsher than people might cut back on usage. Drugs are illegal for a reason...its in order to protect people and their lives and thus the punishment should be severe. I feel like this thesis needs to be a bit more specific.

**YOUR NAME:**

**YOUR REPLY:**

---

**Bailey Stenson 2**

bstence

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:36 PM New!*

Parking on campus needs to remain the same and people need to rely on different modes of transportation to get to school.

my ideas on this are if parking prices go down, tuition would probably go up to cover for its losses in the free parking. and no one wants that. also if parking was free, people would probably die fighting for a good parking spot. there is no doubt in my mind that here in seattle someone would get shot over a good spot.

---

**pmn2**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:53 PM New!*

agree. if parking was free there would be too much traffic coming into the u-district. the u-district was not designed to hold that much people. everyone would be late coming into and out of school not to mention the increase in accidents. faculty and staff need first priority over parking since they run the school and teach the classes.
jeattw05

Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:00 PM New!
I agree with this. Although, it would be really convenient for me to be able to park on campus anytime I want, I wouldn't get as much exercise as I do now walking to school. Also, there aren't enough parking spots for everyone, and free parking would encourage driving, as opposed to buses and walking, which boosts pollution and laziness.

jml35

Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:07 PM New!
I agree. I think that if parking on campus were to be free, there would not be enough parking spaces available for all the people that drive and this would make more people drive and polluting the air, rather than finding ways to carpool or ride the bus.

laural2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 6:08 PM New!
I agree. It wouldn't be safe for pedestrians if traffic were increased. Seattle has an excellent bus system.
The government should devote more money to solar energy research.

I agree. I don't know a lot about this topic (like the current spending rates and such) but I feel like we need to start preserving energy and finding alternative sources to fuel our lives and economy.

I don't know a lot about this topic, but I agree with the comment above mine!

I agree. I don't know a lot about this topic, but I think that it is important to give aid to research different ways of providing energy that would help us from using up all of our resources on land.

I don't know much about the topic, although I agree that the government needs to fund clean energy sources!
Ashley Leimgruber: Thesis #2

ashleyl

Posted Jan 11, 2007 8:37 AM New!
Seattle should eradicate the use of trans fats from restaurants.

bkruss

Posted Jan 11, 2007 9:51 AM New!
I agree. As much as I agree with the argument that we shouldn't cater to society's needs as far as "babying" them goes, this would be in attempts to look out for our nation that is already extremely obese and being weighed down by health problems that could be easily prevented by a healthy diet and exercise. I feel like most people would in fact agree and most often I feel like as consumers at restaurants, we are unaware of just how much trans fat is being used in the food preparation process.

jeattw05

Posted Jan 11, 2007 2:28 PM New!
I agree. The US has a huge obesity problem, and we need to take the necessary measures to fix this problem. We have a right to know that what we're eating is helping us, not hurting us.

jml35

Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:44 PM New!
I agree. Because of the problem with obesity, it would only benefit everyone. The food tastes pretty much the same and the business can only benefit from joining in on this new craze for healthy eating.

laural2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 5:23 PM New!
I disagree. The government does NOT need to have that much control to a point where they control even what kind of fat is in our food. America is obese because it consumes massive portions, an excess of not just trans fat (which is trendy right now) but all fats, proteins, and carbohydrates.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Ashley Leimgruber: Thesis #1

ashleyl

Posted Jan 11, 2007 8:32 AM New!
Sex education in public schools should inform students on how to practice safe sex rather than abstinence.

bkruss

Posted Jan 11, 2007 9:58 AM New!
I agree. Although at what age are we talking here? I feel like its very important to expose students to safe sex education because it would create less issues as long as we aren't taking this program to 3rd graders...
jeattw05

Posted Jan 11, 2007 2:17 PM New!
I strongly agree. Young people are curious, so they should be very well-educated. The more educated they are, the less likely they are to screw up.

jml35

Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:43 PM New!
I agree. I think that telling students to be abstinent will not work and has not work. It is important to realize that teenagers will do what they want, but to educate them on how to have safe sex. This will prevent kids from making unsafe decisions and know the consequences of them.

laural2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 5:08 PM New!
Hmm I agree, but I think its most important to teach both. It sounds like you're excluding abstinence which is still the only way to 100% avoid pregnancy and STDs.
The U.S. Should abolish manned space travel

bstence

While i agree...i also disagree at the same time..i feel that i dont know enough about this topic to give you any reasonable ideas...

i agree because of Bridgett's speech in class today about how families are uncertain of what is going to happen to their loved ones in space and how we should spend money trying to figure things out on THIS earth before worrying about the going ons of our fellow planets..

celmsn

Before you decide we should abolish space travel, think about where the world would be if we had abandoned exploration prior to Magellan's Voyage, Lewis & Clark, etc.

Plus, a lot of kids grow up dreaming of being astronauts. Crushing dreams, man.

jeattw05

I disagree. Yeah, space travel is dangerous, but so is race car driving, deep sea diving, sending men into war, etc. Also, we need to continue the exploration of our universe, to help us better understand our planet, ourselves, and the space around us. The possibilities are endless.

jml35
I disagree. I think that it is important to realize what else is out there using the technology that we have. It is important that we consider things that go on outside of our planet. However, I do think that it is necessary that we take more precautions when sending people on space flights.

The US government should move to support a vegetarian diet for Americans. By this I mean tax breaks for vegetarians, farmers, restaurants, etc, and higher taxes on meat.

I disagree. My mother is a vegetarian, and I was for a long time, but I found it easier to get the nutrition I needed by eating meats. I think its important to have a balanced diet, so if vegetarians get a tax break, so should vegans, and people on diets, and then people who exercise regularly, etc.
i disagree. meat is a necessity in one's diet in order to function properly. that is not fair the people who eat meat to have to pay more because they are properly nourishing their bodies.

pmn2

disagree. this will greatly hurt the business of restaurants, animal farmers, groceries, slaughter and meat-packing industries. what you eat should be a choice, not one forced upon you. there are other, less drastic steps the government can do to support better health.

jml35

I disagree. By eliminating meat from a person's diet this will keep essential proteins from entering their bodies and can lead to other health problems. And I don't think it's fair that certain people based on their food choices get a tax break.
The prison system is unfair and fallible therefore a new system should be implemented to replace the modern day idea of punishment distribution and prison.

jeattw05

Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:21 PM New!
I'm really not sure what I think about this. This is very broad. I probably feel differently about each individual punishment and crime. I think it would be better if you chose a specific punishment and crime!

pmn2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:32 PM New!
as jeatt said, it's too broad right now. for now i'd have to disagree. the justice system has flaws, but it was created fairly. you are assumed innocent until proven otherwise. it is the prosecution's responsibility to prove otherwise without a reasonable doubt. so those is jail supposedly deserve to be there. there is a 3 strike system in place. i think that's quite lenient considering how you're allowed to screw up twice before.

celmsn

Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:52 AM New!
Prison reform is a huge issue, and definitely an important one for the coming years. As for saying that the 3 strike system is 'quite lenient', that seems like a pretty large misunderstanding of human nature. People don't only commit crimes because they are villainous.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YOUR NAME:</th>
<th>YOUR REPLY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kelin Swanson Thesis #2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>swanson7</em></td>
<td>Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:47 PM New! Marijuana should be legalized or at least penalties for possessing it should be relaxed, or decriminalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>pmn2</strong></td>
<td>Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:11 PM New! disagree. marijuana is a hallucinogen and is dangerous when used. people in construction and transportation are prohibited from using marijuana for a reason. it is already easy to find marijuana, imagine if it was legal! could do something like amsterdam where there are marijuana bars and what not. it would be a controlled outlet for people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>mavesm</strong></td>
<td>Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:25 AM New!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Absolutely. Legalization, regulation, and control of marijuana would drastically reduce the number of current problems we have with the drug (namely, the multi-billion dollar a year waste of taxpayer money that's currently being used to fight it). There has never been a single death that's been directly caused by marijuana, versus the 50000+ deaths per year caused by alcohol or the 200000+ deaths per year caused by tobacco. Marijuana has way more benefits than negatives, and the only danger resulting from its use are poor decisions that stupid people make anyways.

bkruss

Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:09 AM New!
Although I don't know a ton about the violations as far as drug use goes, I disagree with this statement. People always brush it off like it is not a big deal but really, it was illegalized for a reason in the first place. Our society is progressing and slowly catering to each person's needs like lowering this or legalizing that to the point where our nation might as well become a free for all. I think that although the drug might be relaxing or helpful to some, there are plenty of individuals out there (on the streets, drug dealers) who would abuse this and ultimately more problems would occur.

jeattw05

Posted Jan 11, 2007 2:09 PM New!
I disagree. Drugs are bad. There is nothing good about drugs. People who are high are more likely to do something ridiculously stupid, rather than do something brilliant. Marijuana is a gateway drug. If you legalize marijuana, next people will be asking for more leniency on heroine, cocaine, meth, etc. Bad idea.

jml35
I disagree. I think that a lot of people are beginning to think that it is okay to use marijuana and are thus using it more frequently. I think that the laws need to be more strict to keep the illegal drug usage down.