Ben Onosko Thesis #2

onoskb

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:05 PM New!

Child support laws should be changed so that fathers have equal rights with mothers.

liuy2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:38 PM New!

I'm not too familiar with the specifics of divorce law. But I have to agree. I think both parents should share their responsibility of supporting the child equally.

mkb5

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:24 PM New!

I agree. Both parents should have equal opportunity to spend time with their children (as long as both parents are responsible, well qualified, have good intentions, etc). Often times, the father is a better parent than the mother. However, the woman will be awarded more time with the child simply because she is the mother. I don't think this is fair.

choballs

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:52 PM New!

I agree. There are plenty of bad mothers that can hurt the child. The father can be just as good a parent as the mother can. I've personally seen some amazing father-child relationships that you just can't find in a mother-child relationship. Both parents should have equal rights and share custody.

nreuter
I agree but then again this depends case by case and which parent have the best interest of the child/children.

I don't know enough about this issue.

I don't know enough about this topic.

The Washington law which bans smoking indoors should be abolished.

I disagree. Smoking in public space would affect
nonsmokers. Even though the smoker him/herself gets to preserve their rights of freedom, it consequently takes away the rights of others.

mkb5

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:36 PM New!
I STRONGLY disagree. People have the right to choose if they want to smoke or not, and this choice shouldn't affect others. A non smoker in the same room as a smoker is put in a situation where his/her health may be affected by someone else's decision. This is not fair. Also, many people can't stand being near cigarette smoke. This law should be kept in order to be considerate of non-smokers.

choballs

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:47 PM New!
I strongly disagree. 2nd hand smoking is as deadly as smoking itself. Not only that, but the smell can get in people's clothes. A smoker can easily step outside for a smoke. They shouldn't have the right to affect non-smoker's health.

nreuter

Posted Jan 11, 2007 9:41 AM New!
I disagree, why should a smoker have a choice to smoke and infect others but non smokers cannot to protect their health?

cooppawg

Posted Yesterday, 9:12 AM New!
I agree. The marketplace should make this decision.
jes0610

Posted Yesterday, 1:15 PM New!
I strongly disagree b/c thousands of people die each year from second hand smoke

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Yi J Liu's Thesis #2

liuy2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:24 PM New!
UW students should be allow to make mid-quarter evaluation to ensure the quality of courses.

zapp89

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:51 PM New!
I disagre, since we are on the qtr system wouldn't be too late to make any relvent changes to a class? The qtr system is too fast.

FRED MacD

mkb5

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:01 PM New!
At first i had no clue what your thesis meant, but i think now i understand it, and i agree. Students should be allowed to tell their professors what they
like/dislike during the middle of the quarter so that the teachers can make positive changes that will help improve the quality of the course. Many students are happy to fill out course evaluations at the end of the quarter, but many also don't like to do so because it is too late for any of these changes to be made to positively affect the person who is making the complaints in the first place.

---

**choballs**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:03 PM New!*

I agree. I've had some crappy professors before (one told me to put my thesis statement at the END of my paper, not the beginning), and I wish I can uppercut them in the jaw. If we had these mid-quarter evaluations, we would be able to tell the professor how his/her teaching skills are and how effective they are. Then they can adjust to the feedback and shape the course differently.

---

**nreuter**

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

I disagree because most professors have lesson plan laid out and I don't think they have the time to change them.

---

**onoskb**

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:24 PM New!*

I disagree, quarters are very short and 5 weeks isn't enough time to evaluate a class.

---

**coopdawg**

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 7:25 PM New!*

I don't think a midquarter evaluation makes any
jes0610

Posted Yesterday, 1:09 PM New!
I disagree b/c I think the evaluation process the UW has now is sufficient

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Yi J. Liu's thesis #1

liuy2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 3:19 PM New!
The City of Seattle should help the Sonics remain in town by renovate Key Arena.

onoskb

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:12 PM New!
I agree, sports teams are something that help bring a city together.

mkb5

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:46 PM New!
I agree. i am not from seattle, so i dont know much about the sonics, but i think it would be extremely upsetting for the fans to lose this baseball team.
choballs

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:49 PM New!
I agree. Sports teams not only bring the city together, but they can bring families closer too.

nreuter

Posted Jan 11, 2007 9:43 AM New!
I agree, sports teams bring community amongst people who wouldn't normally be in contact with each other.

shcase

Posted Jan 11, 2007 9:48 AM New!
I agree, a good sports team can help generate revenue for the city. Sports teams give everybody a common ground.

jes0610

Posted Yesterday, 1:07 PM New!
I agree b/c culture is important to a city's livelihood and sports bring people within a city together, just think about the seahawks making it to the suerbowl last year.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:
Marc Cooper Thesis #2

coopdawg

Posted Jan 9, 2007 5:27 PM New!
The Federal government in conjunction with state governments should assist students in failing public schools by giving their parents vouchers, which they could use on private schools or tutors.

jeattw05

Posted Jan 9, 2007 8:56 PM New!
I agree. There should be limits on this, obviously. But for kids who were trying but still struggling, this is a good option.

choballs

Posted Jan 10, 2007 12:55 AM New!
I agree. Some kids try their hardest to succeed in public schools, but they fail because of personal issues that they have to deal with outside of school. The voucher will help the cost of a private tutor and may motivate the students to try harder.

wiggsf

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:10 AM New!
I disagree if vouchers redeemable at private schools or tutors were given to all children who were failing a tremendous strain would be put on our governments finances. Which would in fact weaken our public school systems even more. Controversy would also be created over which children deserved the vouchers or not.

shcase
I agree, this can help teach kids that there are different ways to succeed. Just because you struggle in something doesn't mean that you will fail.

liuy2

I disagree. There are already many nonprofit organizations and projects set up to provide additional help, such as after school activities, tutoring sessions, and etc. So it is up to the students and their parents to make use of these programs.

onoskb

I agree, parents should have the choice of where their children go to school.

mkb5

I disagree, parents can choose where their students go to school based on where they choose to live. If vouchers were given out for parents to use on private schools, obviously everyone would send their kids to private school and there would be no one left at the public schools. Also, where would all this money for the vouchers come from? This idea does not make sense to me.

nreuter

I agree, some parents just don't have the capabilities to help out their children because their working and
having vouchers may aid in thier child's progression into college

jes0610

Posted Yesterday, 1:01 PM New!
I disagree completely that vouchers isn't the answer but working to improve the public school itself. this idea sounds like it's encouraging people out of the public schools rather than fixing the problem at its source.

Marc Cooper's Thesis #1

coopdawg

Posted Jan 9, 2007 5:23 PM New!
Congress should limit damages in medical malpractice cases.

jeattw05

Posted Jan 9, 2007 8:58 PM New!
I haven't heard two sides of this argument, so I don't know a lot about it. Although, from the sounds of it, I think I would most likely agree.
I don't know much about this topic, but it sounds like it's helpful, so I'll say agree. Minimizing damage can never be a bad thing.

I really don't know anything about this topic either. Umm I guess I would agree, but I would need to hear both sides before I could give my reasons why.

I'm not familiar with this topic either. If by "limit damages" you mean putting more pressure on the person/doctor who is liable, I would say I agree.

I disagree, if a doctor does 10 billion dollars damage to you, he should owe you that much.

I'm sorry, I am really lost on this subject so I have no comment about the thesis.
I agree to some extent, I believe there should be at least a cap on awarded damages.

I agree to some extent, I believe there should be at least a cap on awarded damages.

I agree because it put some really great doctors out of business.

Criminals convicted of child molestation and pedophilia should receive long jail terms and stiffer penalties.

I agree.
I agree and disagree, for many it's a mental disease and if we convict people and put them in jails then all our society is perpetually doing it putting all those who are mentally ill in the jail system and the burden will be put on tax payers who are paying for their jail sentence. Then I agree because I have a strong interest in protecting those in our society from being victims of sexual assault.

onoskb

Posted Jan 11, 2007 1:03 PM New!

You definitely need to be more specific with regards to what crimes and special circumstances. But in general I agree with you.

humphv86

Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:53 PM New!

I agree but what do you mean by long jail times and stiffer penalties. Also pedophilia is very fluid concept so be explicit when explaining to the reader what this is.

cooopdawg

Posted Jan 11, 2007 6:13 PM New!

I agree. These people usually commit the same crimes once they're released.

mkb5

Posted Jan 11, 2007 8:47 PM New!

I agree, those creepers shouldn't be out on the streets.
to harm children. If they do it once and get off easy, they'll prob do it again.

choballs

Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:49 PM New!
I agree. They should seek counseling while in jail, and the jail sentence should be longer so it won't be as tempting to commit the crime again.

liuy2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 11:13 PM New!
i agree. These crime are so severe in nature that i believe they should deserve higher degree of punishment. After all shoplifters don't receive the same punishment as murders.

jes0610

Posted Yesterday, 12:53 PM New!
I agree that such crimes should be taken seriously

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Michael Kiter's Theisis # 2

runner8k

Posted Jan 11, 2007 1:36 AM New!
The United States should allow the use of stem cell research.

nreuter

Posted Jan 11, 2007 11:13 AM New!
wow what a popular topic but again I don't really know enough about this subject.

onoskb

Posted Jan 11, 2007 1:05 PM New!
I think like 10 other people are doing this topic. I disagree with you in general.

humphv86

Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:49 PM New!
You should narrow your thesis down and tell the reader why you believe this is a good idea.

coopdawg

Posted Jan 11, 2007 6:18 PM New!
The US does not prohibit the use of any type of stem cells for research. The issue related to federal funding.

mkb5

Posted Jan 11, 2007 8:07 PM New!
Im sorry, i dont know enough about this topic to
comment on the thesis.

**lluy2**

*Posted Yesterday, 12:13 AM New!*

the topic is a bit too broad and similar to other people's post on this subject. Again i agree. I think allowing stem cell research will help medical advancement on curing disease like cancer, parkinson, and etc.

**jes0610**

*Posted Yesterday, 12:45 PM New!*

I agree that this could help a lot of people

**Maryann Boosalis Thesis #2**

**mkb5**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:27 PM New!*

College athletes should only be allowed to train 20 hours a week.

**choballs**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:12 PM New!*
I was not aware that they weren't allowed train 20 hours a week......

nreuter

Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:41 AM New!
I am unaware on how many hours they typically train...so i have no idea about this topic but in general it's an athletes choice to train as much as they want but again I don't know if their are minimums to their hours or what.

onoskb

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:36 PM New!
I disagree, the athletes should learn how to balance their own time just like everyone else.

coopdawg

Posted Jan 11, 2007 6:58 PM New!
I disagree. They should be able to train as much as they want.

liuy2

Posted Yesterday, 1:47 AM New!
i disagree. It is a personal choice and effect for how many hours they would like to spend on practicing. It would be too difficult to monitor for the purpose of fairness. It would also discourage students who would like to work hard, spend more hours, and get better at the sports.

wiggsf
I disagree I don't believe the twenty hours a week would allow time college athletes to reach their optimum potential for the sport they choose. Twenty hours wouldn't allow for enough mental, physical, and spiritual training.

I disagree because people should be able to improve the craft as much as they want.

The tuition rates for public universities should be the same for all students, regardless if the student is from in state or out of state.

I agree. Out of state students pay a ridiculous amount, especially international students. The universities only use this extra money for construction to make the campus look prettier. There's always a building being renovated somewhere on campus. If not, there's a new yard that's being built that nobody
nreuter

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:20 AM New!*

I agree, universities want to maintain revenues that should be passed onto donors not inflicted upon students.

onoskb

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:31 PM New!*

I agree, tuition should be the same rate for everyone.

cooopdawg

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 7:12 PM New!*

I disagree because state taxes support state schools. So, the children of those tax payers should receive a discount.

liuy2

*Posted Yesterday, 1:41 AM New!*

I disagree. The amount of tax came from the student or the student's parents are contributions to the state. That money should go toward the education of these contributors.

wiggsf

*Posted Yesterday, 3:00 AM New!*

I disagree if tuition fees were equalized the entire economic plans of public universities and their contributors would have to be restructured, which in turn would take away even more taxpayer dollars and
derail the ultimate purpose of these universities; education.

jes0610

Posted Yesterday, 12:35 PM  New!
I disagree our state taxes should go to our state's kids

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Shandra Case These #1

shcase

Posted Jan 10, 2007 1:25 PM  New!
Women should have the right to choose to keep their baby or get an abortion

choballs

Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:52 PM  New!
I strongly agree. Abortion is one's decision, and it doesn't affect the community except for moral reasons. If a woman was sexually assaulted, she should be able to make a decision on whether the baby is aborted or not. It's messed up to force someone to keep a baby that they don't want.
I disagree, for the following reasons. Once a baby is conceived, (whether by accident or intentionally) a woman has the right to choose to keep that baby or to abort it. A man does not have a choice once a baby is conceived, (whether by accident or intentionally) whether or not he wants that baby. This is called sexism, women are given rights men are not, and therefore abortion should be illegal.

I disagree. I think a woman has a choice to get pregnant or not, and in fact I think it’s the couple’s responsibility, not just either one, to ensure if pregnancy is a step they are ready to take. Once a child is conceived he/she should be protected by law, similar to the rights of a minor, which establishes that minor cannot fend for themselves thus they require protections. Thus it is not up to either parent to decide the fate of the child.

I agree, but I wouldn’t touch this subject with a 10 foot pole. 😂

FRED MacD

I agree. Having a child can change someone’s life in so many ways, it should be the woman’s choice as to if she would want to have the baby or not. I also think it’s important to consider the possibilities of a woman getting raped, having a one night stand, etc.
Obviously, having a one night stand was the woman's choice, whether she was under the influence or not, but I still think that she should be able to choose whether she wants to keep the baby or not.

I could also disagree and say that if the woman can't keep the baby, then she should put it up for adoption.

nreuter

Posted Jan 11, 2007 9:28 AM New!
I am still deciding on this topic, on one hand were killing innocent souls on the other were granting free choice to a women.

humphv86

Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:09 PM New!
What do you mean by this question? I think you are trying to get at abortion laws so if that is your intent you should state that and I think that your thesis would be stronger.

coopdawg

Posted Jan 11, 2007 5:15 PM New!
It would say it depends. I think they should limit it only to the first trimester.

jes0610

Posted Yesterday, 12:28 PM New!
I strongly agree b/c unwanted babies lead to problem filled lives, and will likely need support from the government b/c if they aren't wanted in the first place they likely won't be getting support from family. I support a planned parenthood and the organization that protects it.
Ryan Terasaki Topic 2

terar

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:57 PM New!
University of Washington Professors should not be allowed to require Text Books that they have written because of the conflict of interests it creates.

choballs

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:45 AM New!
I strongly agree. These professors will become bias with their own work, and a lot of the times, these professors tend to lecture as if the students are familiar with the text already. They don't explain anything, and just lecture at his/her own pace as if the text is easy to understand.

nreuter

Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:52 AM New!
I agree, I believe professors should be providing their students an eclectic range of topics, writing their own books damages this process by influencing students to their own ideas.

onoskb

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:45 PM New!
I agree, its a conflict of interests.

coopdawg

Posted Jan 11, 2007 6:46 PM New!
I agree. It's a conflict of interest.

mkb5

Posted Jan 11, 2007 7:39 PM New!
I disagree. I think its ok as long as long as the professor supplies the class with other sources (ex: a course pack) that provide other views of the subject.

jes0610

Posted Jan 11, 2007 8:04 PM New!
I agree that professors shouldn't require students to buy textbooks they wrote b/c it's a scam just so they can guarantee that hundreds of people will buy their book.

runner8k

Posted Yesterday, 9:48 AM New!
i strongly agree. it does create a conflict of interests.

humphv86

Posted Yesterday, 12:20 PM New!
I agree as well. It creates a strong conflict of interest and students many times are required to read into things that overall do not have much importance
Those who believe there should be a salary cap on professional sports to make all teams equal and reduce greed have reasons for their beliefs.

I disagree. By setting a salary cap it is unfair to the athletes since no one else in the franchise is affected. Salary difference promotes competition, which is a driving force in sports.

I agree, maybe if salaries are the same maybe ticket prices would go down.

FRED MacD
I disagree...as someone said in class, why should there be a salary cap on pro athletes if there isn't one people of other professions?

choballs

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:00 PM New!

On 1/10/2007 4:37 PM tchidiac said:

Those who believe there should be a salary cap on professional sports to make all teams equal and reduce greed have reasons for there beliefs.

I don't wanna sound like a prick, but that isn't really a thesis. We know these people have reasons, it's a fact and it's not arguable. Are you saying there should or shouldn't be a salary cap?

nreuter

Posted Jan 11, 2007 9:56 AM New!

I agree, then maybe we would have less issues with players trying to show off to earn more money and they would play more for the love of the game, in addition prices may go down and allow for other people to attend these large community events.

onoskb

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:21 PM New!

You didn't give a real thesis, but i think that i agree with what you ment to say.

coopdawg

Posted Jan 11, 2007 7:34 PM New!
I salary cap will not reduce greed or necessarily make teams equal. But it can make a league more competitive, like the NFL.

jes0610

Posted Jan 11, 2007 8:19 PM New!
yes there are valid reasons but ultimately I don't think anyone's salary should be capped.

runner8k

Posted Yesterday, 9:52 AM New!
i agree, the fact that someone gets 150,000 for swinging a bat is ludicrous.

humphv86

Posted Yesterday, 12:17 PM New!
Your thesis is kind of muddy what are you trying to get at? Anyway I would disagree as long as people are supporting athletics the way they are there should not be a cap. Its a cause effect sort of deal.

Derek Gossler's Thesis # 1
The death penalty is desirable to have in a society because it deters violent crime.

choballs

I agree. I feel that the death penalty prevents some people from committing a lot of crimes. If criminals know that they won't lose their lives for any crime, then they won't be afraid. A few years in jail, and they'll be back out again. But I think that the trials for the death penalty should be more in depth in this case. It would suck being put to death for something you didn't do.

nreuter

I disagree I don't believe persons who commit violent crimes are thinking about their consequences, I don't see how it will deter these crimes at all.

onoskb

I agree, the point of punishing people is to give them what they deserve. An eye for an eye.

coopdawg

I agree but I think it's desirable because it's just.
I agree that we should have the death penalty, but I disagree that it deters violent crime. Generally, people who commit crimes aren't thinking about the consequences before they take action.

jes0610

I agree that the death penalty is important to have because some people are so evil that they are a risk alive even in jail and don't deserve to live. Timothy McVey of the Oklahoma bombing needed to die. I only believe in the death penalty for extreme cases like this and think it may be used to often currently.

liuy2

I agree. Death penalty would be an effective method to warn others not to repeat the crime that was committed. It is a very ancient method in human history, and it works. If a murder is put to death, others would have to think twice before committing the same crime.

tchidiac

I agree, as long as there is a 100% proven guilt.

humphv86
I disagree, how does this deter violent crimes and the death penalty is given for a variety of reasons and there is always the possibility of a person being found innocent years later.

Minimum Wage should be increased for all students

I agree. It should be $25 an hour. It's extremely hard trying to pay for college yourself if you're only getting minimum wage or less than $10 an hour.

I disagree, being a student is a choice not a requirement. No one should get paid more just because they make different life choices than another person.
Iluy2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:10 PM New!
I agree. While have to go to school full time, tuitions and expenses are often overwhelming. By providing more income to students who choose to work and who needs to work, it helps them to be more focused on studying.

zapp89

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:57 PM New!

On 1/10/2007 2:50 PM choballs said:
I agree. It should be $25 an hour. It's extremely hard trying to pay for college yourself if you're only getting minimum wage or less than $10 an hour.

Lol I agree as well, but even I don't make that sort of cash, and i work for King County.

Fred Macd

mkb5

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:40 PM New!
I disagree. The point of the minimum wage is that it is a minimum standard set for all people. Many students are still receiving some financial support from their parents. The students that arent need to toughen up and realize that its a hard world. We shouldnt be sheltered just because we are students.

mkb5

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:42 PM New!
Also, where do you draw the line as to what a student is? i could see people finding loop holes and enrolling in one class at an inexpensive community college just because they would end up with a higher income.
choballs

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

I wanna rephrase my comment. Maybe students who work can get extra financial aid for school from their job. That way, the extra money won't be abused, and no loop hole.

nreuter

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:09 AM New!*

I disagree, minimum wage should be increased for all, what privilege do we have that other's cannot attain?

humphv86

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:39 PM New!*

I disagree, minimum wage raises hurts small businesses and many students that chose to work do so for pleasure and not out of necessity so they should not get more.

coopdawg

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 6:25 PM New!*

I disagree. Raising the minimum wage hurts low wage workers, who lose their jobs.

runner8k

*Posted Yesterday, 9:22 AM New!*

i disagree, the fact that we are students is a choice, and if you choose to work you could be making more then min wage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jes0610</td>
<td>Posted Yesterday, 11:57 AM New! I disagree because to say all students is a really large number which strongly affect our economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUR NAME:</td>
<td>YOUR REPLY:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred MacDonald's Thesis #1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zapp89</td>
<td>Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:42 PM New! Grizzly Bear living in the Yellowstone National Park should not be taken off the Endanger Species List.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liuy2</td>
<td>Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:55 PM New! I don't know much about the specifics, but from what it sounds like I would agree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mkb5</td>
<td>Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:52 PM New! I agree. I also dont know much about this topic, but i know that the numbers of wildlife in america are dramatically decreasing with time. We should do everything we can to help keep the wildlife that we have alive and reproducing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
choballs

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:13 PM New!

I disagree. Can't they put some grizzly bears in a cage from other locations and move them to the Yellowstone park? I don't know much about grizzly bears, but I think there are plenty of them somewhere else in the world. But keeping them on the list would be cool, cuz then Smokey won't die.

nreuter

Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:15 AM New!

I have no idea about this thesis, it sounds like a bad idea though.

onoskb

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:26 PM New!

I don't know anything about this topic at all, sorry.

coodawg

Posted Jan 11, 2007 7:19 PM New!

I don't know about this topic.

runner8k

Posted Yesterday, 9:45 AM New!

unfortunetly i don't know enough about about the species and the conditions

jes0610
Sounds good but I don't know anything about this topic

I do not know much about this topic or the status of the grizzly bear expound a little bit more

People should not give money to panhandlers.
FRED MacD

I disagree. People should have the option whether they want to give money to panhandlers or not. Although it isn’t true for all, some panhandlers actually do need help and would use the money for something other than alcohol or drugs. It should be up to the person to decide whether they think the panhandler would use the money for the right reasons, and then decide whether he/she would like to help out the panhandler or not.
choballs

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:05 PM -- edited Jan 10, 2007 10:07 PM by choballs

New!

I disagree. I agree with what mkb5 (maryanne?). People usually hand out money because it makes them feel good. It makes them feel like they're helping someone in need. Whether these pan-handlers use it for drugs or not, it's up to the giver to decide. Instead of giving money, people can also just hand out value meals from McDonalds. $5 can get the panhandlers 4 double cheeseburgers after tax. There are free microwaves in By George so they can nuke the burgers when they want to eat them. With the 65 cents that they have remaining from the $5, they can spend it on a can of pop at By George.

nreuter

Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:39 AM

New!

I am in between on this topic to me it's a case by case situation but regardless its a persons choice to give money

onoskb

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:35 PM

New!

I disagree, people should give money to whoever they want.

coopdawg

Posted Jan 11, 2007 7:01 PM

New!

I disagree. I think people should use their judgement and make a decision on a case by case basis.

runner8k
i agree. if you wish to help, please donate to a shelter

I disagree that it should be the giver's choice but I also think that homeless shelters should be searchers for these people and taking them in

I disagree, this thesis should provide a reason why and that might help it out some. People should be able to give to who ever they want and some people actually use the money for good causes.

Purchase of energy-efficient products in the U.S. should have tax breaks (i.e. Hybrid cars)
I agree. This would bring people more incentive to buy energy-efficient products, rather than SUV's or other stylish products that cause a lot of pollution.

Yes! Not only will it help the environment, but it will reduce the amount of work needed to clean up the community (which is what the tax is spent on anyway). Oh yeah, I agree.

I agree. Anything helping the environment is good. People get tax breaks for donating to charities why not get a tax break in helping out the environment.

I agree. Government promotes products that benefit the environment and by doing so it lowers the price of these products (cars) thru tax-break, what can i say, it's a win-win situation.

I agree, this could help boost sales of hybrid cars.
I definitely agree. This would encourage people to use energy efficient products, which would help our environment. It would change things around and help improve the conditions of our environment rather than worsening it.

humphv86

I agree, this would benefit everyone and help our world. There would be less exhaust in the air and this is a great topic.

coopdawg

I disagree. The energy efficiency should save consumers money and a subsidy is an unnecessary waste of money.

runner8k

I agree. When the government says they want to end foreign dependency on oil and not provide alternatives.

jes0610

I strongly agree b/c not only will it reduce pollution but it will save our country money when we have to pick up the pieces after global warming caused events.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YOUR NAME:</th>
<th>YOUR REPLY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| nreuter   | **Natalie Reuter Thesis #1**

**nreuter**

*Posted Jan 9, 2007 6:50 PM New!*

Marijuana should be legalized in the United States

---

**jeattw05**

*Posted Jan 9, 2007 8:54 PM New!*

I strongly disagree. Our country needs to uphold its morality. There are specific reasons marijuana is illegal, and marijuana would only increase crime rates, not to mention the amount of stupid decisions made by those who were 'high'.

---

**choballs**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 1:02 AM New!*

I disagree. Some people have marijuana prescriptions for medical reasons, and that's about as legal as it should get. Marijuana does the body no good. Not only does it weaken the user's memory, but it affects the user on decision making, and it also makes the user's response rate much lower. Legalizing marijuana would only cause more problems resulting in violence and death.
Haha i would probably say i agree. I am not a smoker but marajuana has a lot of the same medical effects as cigarettes but their still legal. Obviously there should be limits such as alcohol.

onoskb

I agree, why would anyone care what people do in their own houses on their own time?

liuy2

I disagree. Marajuana's additive and hallucinative nature would cause long term physiological damage. Legalizing marajuana usage would cause negative impact on community. More DUI, and etc. I think it would cause far more damage than does any good.

mkb5

I agree. Obviously, the fact that marajuana is illegal isn’t stopping people from using it. Maybe if it was legal, it would seem less exciting and less people would use it.

I also disagree because if it were legal, probably more people would be comfortable using it. We don’t need any more crazy people under influence of drugs running around than we already have.

humphv86

I disagree, this drug has hurt many families because
of its abuse and this would just be an avenue for people to hurt themselves and advance into more stimulating drugs.

coopdawg

Posted Jan 11, 2007 6:29 PM New!
I agree. I think this drug is no more harmful or addictive than alcohol.

runner8k

Posted Yesterday, 9:27 AM New!
i agree, it should be decriminalized and then taxed they hell out of.

jes0610

Posted Yesterday, 11:05 AM New!
Strongly disagree b/c this would only promote the use of it due to people justifying it b/c it would be legal. If a large number of our people were always high than we would have a very unproductive society and a return of a hippie-like era. Also pot has even more chemicals in it than cigarettes making it even more harmful for your lungs and entire body.
Tabacco should be illegal in public areas because public health should have a higher priority than the tabacco companies' profits.

I disagree. It's true tobacco is unhealthy, but so are cars. The crap that comes out of the exhaust is worse because it's so much stronger and so much more. People use tobacco because they want to. And the term public area is so huge. Anything outside of your home or office is considered a public area. If the thesis was in a specific public area (like a restaurant), then I would say that I'd agree with it. But since your wording of public area is so broad, I'd have to say I disagree. I don't even know if what I just said made sense.

I am not sure, public areas is such a large portion of everyday life and it would separate those who smoke from those who don't and I just don't see how we have the right to tell people where they can go to be with their community.

I disagree, this is a matter of freedoms. We have the right to smoke is we want, it is our own choice and despite what the propogandists say, there is almost no evidence of second hand smoke.
I disagree, maybe you should reword your thesis to say that you would like a ban on smoking that would make more sense. Also what about chewing tobacco?

If people want to smoke. Let them smoke. I disagree.

I personally think that if you reword the thesis statement. but if fixed i agree if it is fixed.

I agree but I never see this ever happening b/c tobacco companies are so strong.
Human embryonic stem cells should be used to advance medical research.

choballs

I agree. There was a thesis like this one posted by someone else. I said something about Trauma Center. It was cool, go find it and read it.

nreuter

I really don't know enough about this subject to give a good answer.

onoskb

I disagree, personally i am against technology which is designed to lengthen human life. I think that we should just let nature run its course and if we die then we die.

humphv86

Many people like this subject but if you give the reader a little bit more to go off of that would be nice.
I depend on the type of stem cells. I don’t think that human life should be created with the intention of destroying it. However, like donating an organ, I think that excess stem cells should be used.

mkb5

Im sorry, I don't know enough about this topic to make a comment on the thesis.

derekg24

I agree and disagree, perhaps for an organ it is ok but not for cloning.

derekg24

I agree and disagree, perhaps for an organ transplant it is ok but not for cloning.

derekg24

I agree and disagree, I think it could be ok for organs, but not at all for cloning.

terar

I agree and disagree depending on the use and the
origin of the stem cells harvested.

**iluy2**

Posted Yesterday, 12:18 AM New!

lol, it must be a popular topic. I agree, enabling stem cell research will help speeding up the process of curing life threatening diseases.

**runner8k**

Posted Yesterday, 9:56 AM New!

i agree. i believe that is should be legal and funded

**jes0610**

Posted Yesterday, 10:40 AM New!

I agree that such research could lead to many ways to prevent suffering and lengthen lives

YOUR NAME:  

YOUR REPLY:

---

**Charles Smith-Thesis Statement 1**

**csmith6**

Posted Jan 11, 2007 8:57 AM -- edited Jan 11, 2007 9:00 AM by csmith6 New!
The state of Californias' gang injunction law should be abolished because it unlawfully groups young males with gang affiliation.

nreuter

I have no idea about this subject probably because it pertains to the state of california.

onoskb

Posted Jan 11, 2007 1:09 PM New!
No idea what this topic is about, maybe pick something that pertains more to the state of washington or the UW.

humphv86

Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:41 PM New!
I have no clue what this law is so maybe you should reword it so that the reader has a better idea what it entails.

cooopdawg

Posted Jan 11, 2007 6:20 PM New!
I don't know anything about this issue

liuy2

Posted Yesterday, 1:56 AM New!
I don't know much about the topic either. You could maybe draw connection to gang-related issues more locally by providing more evidents/details.

wiggsf

Posted Yesterday, 2:30 AM New!
I must say I know nothing about gang related activities; I grew up in North Seattle next to a stream.

choballs

Posted Yesterday, 8:09 AM New!
I’m clueless on this topic. I don't know how gangs function, and what this rule does, or if it's even doing anything.

runner8k

Posted Yesterday, 10:01 AM New!
i have no knowledge of this subject..

tchidiac

Posted Yesterday, 10:04 AM New!
I have no knowledge on this topic therefore it is hard for me to comment on it

tchidiac

Posted Yesterday, 10:05 AM New!
I have no knowledge of this topic therefore it is hard for me to comment on it
tchidiac

*Posted Yesterday, 10:06 AM New!*

*I have no knowledge of this subject*

jes0610

*Posted Yesterday, 10:38 AM New!*

*I am uneducated about this law and topic*

YOUR NAME:  
YOUR REPLY:

---

Charles Smith-Thesis Statement 2

csmith6

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 8:59 AM -- edited Jan 11, 2007 9:01 AM by csmith6 New!*

*All professional athletes should be tested for performance enhancing drugs before, several times during, and after their respected seasons.*

nreuter

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 11:21 AM New!*

*I agree, if they have nothing to hide this shouldn't be a problem*

choballs
I agree. It's not fair for the athletes that don't use performance enhancing drugs. This way, it'll keep the games fair and prevent drug abuse.

I agree, Its an unfair advantage for any sport.

I agree, how can we judge how well our athletes are doing and induct them into different hall of fames if we don't know how well they are doing with out drugs.

I agree. I think performance enhancing drugs ruin the ability to compare athlete in different time periods.

I agree. To keep the game fair and safe, it is crucial to maintain it in a drug-free environment. It also teaches others the importance of fairness in competition.

While, I think that is a noble things to ask, Gm's
worldwide would privately discourage that because sports need the money the huge mounds of steroids produce. Sad, but True.

runner8k

Posted Yesterday, 10:03 AM New!
i agree, lets keep things pure and simple

tchidiac

Posted Yesterday, 10:14 AM New!
I agree partially, several times is a lot and the cost to test is not cheap, maybe learn more about this topic before posting a thesis

jes0610

Posted Yesterday, 10:36 AM New!
I agree that the use of such drugs is unacceptable

YOUR NAME:   YOUR REPLY:

Derek Gossler's Thesis #2
derekg24

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:25 PM New!
President Bush's new plan of sending more troops to Iraq is ill-conceived and does nothing to fix the mess
we are already in.

choballs

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:27 PM New!
I agree. Iraq is not our country, we should not try to control them. Imagine another country invading us and trying to change our government because they think it's wrong. It's absolutely rude. Sending in more troops is almost mocking them by saying that America is a better nation, and that they can't run a country smoothly without our help.

nreuter

Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:50 AM New!
I agree, I think he is being pressured by his party to act in this manner. Sending more troops to Iraq will do nothing but create more violence in Iraq, if it hasn't worked now why would sending more troops be better?

onoskb

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:44 PM New!
I agree, we should probably just leave Iraq

coopdawg

Posted Jan 11, 2007 6:42 PM New!
If his plan were only to send more troops in, then I would agree. So, I disagree.

jes0610

Posted Jan 11, 2007 7:52 PM New!
I disagree b/c if we are to deal with the chaos over there we need more troops. The thing is we should've had more troops in the beginning when it would've been more effective than now after chaos has been happening for so long. The question isn't about the number of troops anymore, it's about whether it's actually possible for us to come out of Iraq with a "victory" and how long we're willing to try.

**liuy2**

*Posted Yesterday, 1:01 AM New!*

I disagree. Current situation in Iraq is dangerous to let alone without continued effort. It is as if a doctor decides to treat a patient, and gives up when things go south, and hoping the patient would recover on himself. If Iraq is left alone, surely anarchy will take place and we will face more terrorism threat from those who we are fighting now and those we left behind. Thus i support Pres. Bush's decision even though he faces many oppositions.

**runner8k**

*Posted Yesterday, 10:10 AM New!*

i agree. the increase will put troop totals close to 150,00 in iraq. but if we wanted to increase we should have done it in 2005 when we had 165,000 in iraq. This doesn't do anything.

**tchidiac**

*Posted Yesterday, 10:12 AM New!*

I disagree, in order to complete our goal we need more troops to gain complete control of the situation over there.

**humphv86**
I agree, how can you win a war on a concept anyway? It is not plausible to win a war on "terror" so basically he is doing this to save face and also out of pride.

Professional athletes should be able to make as much money they want regardless of the sport. There should not be a cap on how much athletes make even if it is seemingly a great deal.

I agree. If they have the skill and people are willing to pay to see it, there shouldn't be a reason why they need to be capped. If teachers made that much money, nobody would complain and say they should have a salary cap.
nreuter

Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:34 AM New!

I disagree, it will only push younger adults into athletic drugs to make themselves larger in the hopes of being the best and making more money

onoskb

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:32 PM New!

I agree, people should be allowed to earn as much as the free market will allow.

coopdawg

Posted Jan 11, 2007 7:07 PM New!

I agree that professional athletes should be able to make as much money as they can. However, salary caps make a league more competitive. So, I don’t think that salary caps should be prohibited.

jes0610

Posted Jan 11, 2007 7:18 PM New!

I’m split on the subject b/c I think the government or who ever shouldn’t limit someone’s salary but at the same time the gap between the rich and the poor is getting extreme. The very wealthy are idolized and have absurdly large amounts of money. These people should just be taxed accordingly or get a tax deduction for giving to charity.
I agree. Professional athletes earn the money with their own skills and abilities just like everyone else. Some say it's unfair that they make so much money, but it is a profession that rewards high salary.

runner8k

I disagree, most of these athletes aren't worth that there being paid.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Tony Chidiac thesis #1

The Parking system that we have at the University of Washington works to the best of its ability.

liuy2

I agree. Although I wish it doesn't take 3 IDs to park under Odegaard.
zapp89

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:54 PM New!
I disagree. The student parking need to be situated so some parking is close to all 4 corners of the campus.

FRED MacD

mkb5

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:57 PM New!
I disagree. Parking at UW is extremely expensive and inconvenient. You can only buy a parking pass for one lot. This is a pain for someone like me because i go to class and to the swimming pool everyday. My classes are on upper campus but the pool is on lower campus with the rest of the athletic facilities. If i am going to pay $230 per quarter for a parking pass, i want to be able to park where it is most convienent for me at the time. This isnt necessarily always going to be in the exact same lot. I think that if nothing else, students should at least be able to buy a pass that allows them to park wherever they want on campus.

choballs

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:08 PM New!
I super disagree. They can change it to make things more convenient. Maybe students who are taking 15 credits or more can have access to free parking or something. That way, not everyone will drive their cars. I also think it's stupid that you HAVE to have money on your husky card in order to pay the student price at parking lots. Example, this morning, we had to pay $11 to park in Odegaard because one of my friends didn't have money on her husky card. It would have only been 80 cents with the card. The money works the same, it's not like it has special tax free value or anything. The parking validation people refuse to make any exceptions, and that gets very annoying especially if you're in a hurry.
nreuter

Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:05 AM New!
I don’t really care that much about this topic so I don’t have much of an opinion, I walk to campus so it doesn’t affect me.

onoskb

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:29 PM New!
I think you should reword your thesis so that it says what you want done. I am assuming that you want nothing done with the parking and I agree.

humphv86

Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:25 PM New!
I disagree very much with this thesis. I commute everyday to school and I dislike paying for parking so I am forced to park by the freeway and then I have to walk to class. The parking expense should be included in our tuition and those that don't need it just like the U-Pass can send it in and disregard it.

coopdawg

Posted Jan 11, 2007 6:37 PM New!
I don’t care about this topic.

jes0610

Posted Jan 11, 2007 8:47 PM New!
I agree the UW has a good parking system but think a parking pass should allow you temporary parking in certain places other than your main full time parking garage assigned to you.
runner8k

Posted Yesterday, 9:54 AM New!

I disagree. The parking system is actually rather inefficient.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Fred Wiggs Thesis Statement 2#

wiggsf

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:05 AM New!

The U.S. economy cannot offer proper support of any more illegal immigration

shcase

Posted Jan 10, 2007 1:31 PM New!

I agree, illegal immigration needs to be controlled. People take it lightly but it could become a serious matter

choballs

Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:58 PM New!

I'm not sure how I feel about this. The illegal immigrants escape their country for a reason. It's difficult to survive there, and it may potentially lead to death. The Americans spend a huge amount of their income on entertainment purposes. They can easily take out a small part of that and help these people
start a new future. So I guess I disagree.

**onoskb**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:14 PM New!*

Your thesis is poorly worded, are you saying that the U.S. should not support illegal immigration? or that we dont have the ability to support illegal immigration? they are 2 differant things.

**liuy2**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:44 PM New!*

I’m indecisive. I agree with that the government should enforce immigration law. However, I don’t believe illegal immigration has too great of an effect on the economy.

**mkb5**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:21 PM New!*

I agree. isn’t our country in debt? if we dont have enough money for ourselves, how could we have enough money for illegal immigrants.

**nreuter**

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 9:34 AM New!*

I disagree, who gives us the complete right to turn away people, it’s called a privilege that many Americans take for granted when many of our ancestors were given an opportunity long ago.

**humphv86**

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:17 PM New!*
I agree we must do something about illegal immigrants. We have enough on our hands right now with legal citizens so we must regulate this.

coopdawg

Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:39 PM New!
I think the thesis is too broad. The US economy over the last twenty years grew enormously and simulataneously with massive illegal immigration. However, illegal immigration has put strain on our resources, especially social services and hospitals.

amb129

Posted Jan 11, 2007 5:09 PM New!
On 1/10/2007 4:14 PM onoskb said:
Your thesis is poorly worded, are you saying that the U.S. should not support illegal immigration? or that we dont have the ability to support illegal immigration? they are 2 different things.

Word choice is key. But I am indifferent on the topic. Our country is based on freedom, and illegal immigrants are coming here because their country is in some sort of turmoil. However, with more and more coming, it is harder to find money to support them.

jes0610

Posted Jan 11, 2007 7:07 PM New!
I completely agree. I studied immigration a bit in high school and the numbers are crazy for the amount of money (in the billions) the US spends on taking care of illegal immigrants such as schooling etc. There are many things the US needs to focus on for the people who are actually citizens or took the time and effort to apply for citizenship.
runner8k

Posted Yesterday, 9:35 AM New!
i really don't care about this subject. yes they're illegal, however america is the land of the free.

YOUR NAME:  

YOUR REPLY:

jes0610

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:11 PM New!
The U.S. drinking age should be lowered to 18 from 21 years of age.

liuy2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:52 PM New!
I agree. I see no problem with younger people drinking as long as it is not associating with driving. In fact in some culture parents don't mind and even encourage their kids to drink at young age. It's fun and probably an aged tradition.

zapp89

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:06 PM New!
I agree as well, 18 year olds are considered adults in every other aspect of our society, why not this as well?
I agree. Many teens drink just because they know they are not supposed to, and this makes it seem more exciting to them. Also, hopefully teens will be able to get the excitement of drinking out of their system while they are still living at home and have the opportunity to drink in a safe environment.

I disagree. I'm tempted to say that I agree, but I don't think less teens are going to drink from the lack of excitement of breaking the law. Our culture in the US is different than that of other countries. People drink in Europe when they're still young teens because it's not a big deal over there. They don't drink to make a statement. Teens here drink to make a statement; to show that they are capable of handling alcohol, to be cool, to fit in, that they can party, etc. In this country, I don't think lowering the drinking age would be beneficial, but indeed, will make things worse. At least for now.

I totally just used a semi colon, that's awesome. Hopefully I used it right.

I agree if you can go to war and kill someone then you
should be allowed the same right to drink in a bar. If the government thinks you're mature enough to kill then you are mature enough to drink.

onoskb

I disagree, 18 year olds are still just kids, and like other kids they make irrational decisions. They definitely aren't smart enough to regulate their own drinking.

coopdawg

I don't really care anymore because I'm 21.

runner8k

i disagree. i had to wait that long, and so should everyone else.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Jane Sander thesis statement # 1

jes0610

I disagree, 18 year olds are still just kids, and like other kids they make irrational decisions. They definitely aren't smart enough to regulate their own drinking.

I don't really care anymore because I'm 21.

i disagree. i had to wait that long, and so should everyone else.
Stem cell research should be legalized in the U.S.

**iluy2**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:42 PM New!*

I agree. Stem cell research would lead to the cure of many disease that are taking away the lives of millions. Legalizing it would allow the research to proceed at faster pace.

**zapp89**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:45 PM New!*

I also agree for pretty much the same reasons, but the caveat to this is it should be heavily regulated by the governement.

FRED

**zapp89**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:47 PM New!*

Fred Mac

**mkb5**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:07 PM New!*

I don't know enough about stem cell research to respond to this thesis.

**choballs**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:56 PM New!*

I agree. Stem cell research will only increase the possibility of finding cures for many diseases. The
crazy surgeries in the game Trauma Center might be possible in the future with stem cell research.

nreuter

Posted Jan 11, 2007 9:53 AM New!
I don’t know enough about this topic, all I know is that this is huge debatable topic.

onoskb

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:18 PM New!
I agree, but you should be specific about where the stem cells are coming from because that is what the debate is really about.

coopdawg

Posted Jan 11, 2007 7:44 PM New!
Stem cell research is legal.

runner8k

Posted Yesterday, 9:24 AM New!
i agree, however it is legal. it should be expanded from it's current restrictions, and more gov't funding.
Fred Wiggs Thesis Statement 1

wiggsf

Posted Jan 10, 2007 9:00 AM New!
Catholic priests should be allowed to get married.

shcase

Posted Jan 10, 2007 1:32 PM New!
I am not sure how i feel about this. I am not a religious person. I would probably disagree because according to laws their not allowed to. They know that going into it

choballs

Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:55 PM New!
I don't know too much about this topic, but if a person is a Catholic priest, he chose that for a certain reason and knows that he will not be able to be married.

onoskb

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:15 PM New!
I agree, they have historically been allowed to marry, so why not just bring that practice back.

liuy2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:54 PM New!
I disagree. I personally don't think it would have any complication of priests getting married. However if they choose to believe catholicism the religion and they choose to follow the rules and guidelines, I would have to respect their choice.
zapp89

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:10 PM New!

On 1/10/2007 4:54 PM liuy2 said:
I disagree. I personally don't think it would have any complication of priests getting married. However if they choose to believe catholicism the religion and they choose to follow the rules and guidelines, I would have to respect their choice.

I agree with the OP, but the Catholic faith, just like any organization, can go through changes of their customs and beliefs.

mkb5

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:22 PM New!

I agree. Marriage is a big part of life for many people, and these men shouldn't have to choose between being able to get married and start a family or becoming a priest.

nreuter

Posted Jan 11, 2007 9:17 AM New!

I disagree, there are legitimate reasons as to why a catholic priest should and cannot get married, it has to do with sin, faith and temptation.

nreuter

humphv86

Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:06 PM New!
I agree marriage is a great thing and maybe this would help drive down priest perversion.

amb129

Posted Jan 11, 2007 5:15 PM New!
I agree. I don't believe that marriage will interfere mentally, physically, or socially with priestly duties.

jes0610

Posted Jan 11, 2007 5:28 PM New!
Personally I think it woud be a good thing and prevent them from the molestation of young kids as heard about in the news but I'm not so sure the Pope would agree.

runner8k

Posted Yesterday, 9:13 AM New!
I agree with the op, but i thought the catholic priest can't marry on religious belief.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Vincent thesis #2
College tuition should be lowered so that it is more affordable and easier to manage without loans or other forms of aide that must be repaid.

I agree. See my comment for the tuition for the out of state student thesis. It applies to this as well.

I agree, everyone should have a fair opportunity to attend college.

I disagree b/c although this sounds nice the quality of education would be lowered without the money flow to support good teachers and have up to date supplies and equipment for students. There are lots of scholarships out there just waiting to be given away to those who make the effort. My fig leader this past quarter has spent barely any money on tuition b/c she constantly applies for scholarships.

I agree. Lowering tuition costs would enable students to be more focus on studying and be less stressful about lack of money. It would further improve the
quality of their lives.

Nolan Cho's thesis statement #1

choballs

Posted Jan 10, 2007 12:46 AM -- edited Jan 10, 2007 8:44 PM by choballs

Mature rated video games should not be banned from the market.

shcase

Posted Jan 10, 2007 1:41 PM

I agree. If video games are banned, they better ban violent movies, tv shows, magazines, and books. There is already a lot of "mature" movies and everything else, it would seem pointless to ban video games.

onoskb

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:23 PM

I agree, people have freedom of choice.

liuy2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:14 PM
I agree. Playing video games of whatever type is a choice of an individual. As long as the person is over 18, he/she should have the rights to choose their own entertainment.

mkb5

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:13 PM New!*

I agree. The labels are put on the games for a reason. A child and often even their parents are fully aware of what they are buying and may choose based on what they deem suitable. If anything, they should put an age limit on how old you have to be to purchase a mature rated game (similar to going to an R rated movie).

nreuter

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 9:30 AM New!*

I agree video games are choice and shouldn't be limited to those who wish to play them and they are also labeled which helps parents protect kids if they chose to

humphv86

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:13 PM New!*

Depending on the content certain games might need to be banned. What do you mean by mature is there violence, rape, etc. please explain.

copdawg

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 5:05 PM New!*

I agree. It's up to parents to regulate their kids.
jes0610

Posted Jan 11, 2007 5:11 PM New!
I agree because video games are a form of entertainment and other mature entertainment isn't banned from the market. I just believe in warning labels.

choballs

Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:56 PM New!

On 1/11/2007 4:13 PM humphv86 said:

Depending on the content certain games might need to be banned. What do you mean by mature is there violence, rape, etc. please explain.

Any game with an "M" rating given by the ESRB. It can be any of the ones you mentioned. As long as the game was rated "M" by ESRB, it qualifies in my thesis.

YOUR NAME:          YOUR REPLY:

Ryan Terasaki Topic #A

terar

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:56 PM New!
The "No Child Left Behind" program should be immediately abandoned, and the associated funds should be put to better use within our education system.
choballs

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:43 AM New!
I agree. The "No Child Left Behind" program isn’t helping high school kids graduate. In fact, it’s even tougher to graduate now. Without passing the WASL, you are not eligible for a high school diploma. Unless this program is modified, it should be abandoned because it's not doing anything.

nreuter

Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:54 AM New!
I am in the middle, I believe the intentions behind this program were in the best interest of children but lack of administration implementation has led this program down a wrong path.

onoskb

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:47 PM New!
I dont know the exact text of the "NCLB" program, but i think that i support it.

humphv86

Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:26 PM New!
I agree but unless you know a lot about this issue you can't make an educated decision. Either way it is poorly funded and not well thought out.

coopdawg

Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:46 PM New!
I agree because I think parents, teachers, and local governments should control our education system.
I disagree. I just think that the program needs to be more organized and it needs to execute its sought out plans more effectively.

I disagree. I just think that the program needs to be more organized and it needs to execute its sought out plans more effectively.

i can't respond well to this b/c I'm not educated well enough on this topic.

The federal minimum wage should be higher in order to maintain a normal living for an average citizen.
choballs

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:47 AM New!
I disagree. Minimum wage jobs aren't meant to fully support a family. It's enough to get by if you're living alone. Minimum wage jobs are there for high school students to earn some extra money. If minimum wage keeps increasing, then the cost of living will also go up.

nreuter

Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:56 AM New!
I agree, if there are adults who are working and still on welfare because they can't make enough to be above the poverty line then their is a major problem with our minimum wage.

onoskb

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:51 PM New!
I agree, i think that these companys are rich enough to pay their workers more.

humphv86

Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:24 PM New!
I agree but this is a tricky issue, maybe there should be a provision for inflation rates because once it goes up you are right back where you started.

coopdawg

Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:51 PM New!
I disagree. The minimum wage hurts low income workers. It makes investments in machines that would replace those workers more attractive. The result is lost jobs for low income workers.
jes0610

Posted Jan 11, 2007 5:24 PM New!
I disagree b/c they're minimum wage jobs for a reason and not full paying jobs to support a full time career. And Washington state actually has the highest minimum wage in the US.

shcase

Posted Jan 10, 2007 1:40 PM New!
I do not agree with this. If you have been driving for 5 years, then you should be able to keep driving without taking a test. I could agree with the road exam but not the written. Half the stuff in the written exam you don't need to know to know to be able to drive safely.

Nolan Cho's thesis statement #2

choballs

The D.O.L should make it a mandatory rule where each driver is required to re-take both the written and the road exam (free of charge) every five years in order to maintain his/her license.
I disagree, The DMV sucks and i would not wish going there every 5 years on my worst enemy.

mkb5

I disagree, there are too many drivers and this would just be an extra hassle for people to deal with. Generally, most people become better drivers with experience, not worse.

nreuter

I partially agree, maybe every ten years but I believe it's a good idea to ensure we are safer drivers and gives the government an opportunity to update citizens on new laws and such.

humphv86

I disagree the DMV already takes such a long time to navigate through so this would just make the waiting issue worse.

coopdawg

I disagree. It won't make people better drivers. It will only hassle people.

jes0610
I disagree because it would cause the DOL to be over loaded everyday even more than they already are currently.

---

André Bayard Thesis #2

**amb129**

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:37 AM New!

Smoking on the University of Washington campus should be banned.

---

choballs

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:50 AM New!

I'm going to have to disagree on this one. There are too many smokers that attend UW. Just stand outside of Odegaard during peak hours and see. It's not fair for the smokers to have to go off campus to smoke. This campus is way too big to have this be a mandatory rule. Smoking is also not illegal, it's a choice. The campus is open enough where smoking won't affect anyone unless they're exhaling the smoke in someone's face.

---

nreuter

Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:59 AM New!
I disagree, as long as persons are abiding by state rules on smoking then let them smoke on campus it's their choice not ours to make.

onoskb

I disagree, we still live in a free country and peoples personal choices are no one else's business.

humphv86

Unless smoking is made illegal I do not think that this is constitutional.

coopdawg

I disagree. In general, I think people should be free to do what they want unless it directly harms others.

jes0610

I disagree only because smoking is legal and not because I believe smoking should be supported in anyway. What might be another way to address this would be to say that all smoking must be 25 ft away from any of the educational buildings which would be similar to the Seattle law with public businesses.
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