The United States should illegalize abortion.

I agree, children should be given a chance to live a normal life, abortion takes away the right to live.

I disagree. I don't feel that abortion should be made illegal because there are so many situations where things happen and the government does not have the right to judge that situation. WOMEN should have the choice of an abortion. For example; rape and incest. I do feel abortion is over used and abused and I do not in any way feel it should be a form of birth control stemmed from irresponsibility. However, the law needs to be one way or the other. It can't accommodate those women that were raped and need an abortion, but then not let someone else have one because she just "made a mistake." Too many times babies are put in dumpsters or in back allies or even killed because of unfit mothers that can't handle it. This option needs to be out their for women.

I disagree, some people are not fit for parenting and an innocent newborn should have to be thrown into a bad situation from day one, if the potential parents were smart, they would have an abortion if they didn't think they could raise a child well enough.

I agree. Abortion is murder, and murder is wrong. I do understand abortion in two circumstances: 1. if a women was raped or 2. if there is danger to the
mother's life if she has the baby. Other than those two cases abortion should not be legal.

brianna2

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:51 PM New!*

I agree almost exactly with hassd. Their comment is completely right on, and I believe those two circumstances are the only reason to kill a baby.

davehunt

*Posted Yesterday, 10:43 AM New!*

I agree, it is a matter of the right of the child...no matter what stage of the pregnancy. It is murder in my opinion.

sktc

*Posted Yesterday, 12:03 PM New!*

I agree with hassd.

nhu04

*Posted Yesterday, 3:00 PM New!*

I disagree. A baby being born under circumstances where the parents are irresponsible or a family full of other various misfortunes is worse than not being born at all.

**YOUR NAME:**

**YOUR REPLY:**
Parents should not be allowed to have their handicapped children altered to make the care of the child easier for the caregivers.

I know its a scary thought and granted maybe a slippery slope, but wouldn't the world be a better easier place if handicaps or birth defects could be prevented?? Interesting stuff....

davehunt
From a religious standpoint i agree, if thats the direction you are taking with this.

I really don't know what this would consist of? So I don't know how I feel about it, I can't recall any examples.

What do you mean by altering handicapped children?

i agree. it is a miracle to have a baby in itslef, and altering it is like tampering in Gods work. THis is a really bad idea, and is very selfish.
I'm not sure how you are going to alter the children. In any case, if the alteration makes the child's life easier and everyone else's lives easier, then I think it should be okay. It's just like when we are sick, we get to see the doctor to fix it.

I don't know what is meant by altering the children. If everyone benefits from this and no one is hurt, then I'd say go for it. We go to the doctor whenever we are sick to get us to feel better, the children should deserve the same.

I don't really understand this.

I don't know what is meant by altering the children. If everyone benefits from this and no one is hurt, then I'd say go for it. We go to the doctor whenever we are sick to get us to feel better, the children should deserve the same.

Nhu (cindy) Tran's Thesis Statement # 1

Nhu04

Posted Jan 9, 2007 9:35 PM New!
U.S. should legalize same sex marriages.

keegan82

Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:12 PM New!
I agree, although same sex couples are afforded the luxuries of most married couples they are not protected in the instance of death and are left without a loved one and without any of their assets that they helped earn.

mkdipo

Posted Jan 10, 2007 3:11 PM New!
I disagree. Humans were meant to procreate with members of the opposite sex. Homosexuality is merely a sexual preference (or disorder as some would say) for people of the same gender. If same-sex marriage is legalized, people with a "sexual preference" for children or animals will eventually be allowed to marry as well.

banannie

Posted Jan 10, 2007 3:52 PM New!
It is very far-fetched to consider bestiality and/or pedophilia to follow the legalization of same-sex marriages. I think it should be legalized on the basis that they deserve equal rights, just as Keegan mentioned about a deceased partner's assets being lost in civil unions.

jspace

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:33 PM New!
Disagree...I agree that same-sex partners should be protected by law and given the rights they deserve. However, it gets complicated when you consider a marriage is a religous ceremony. Marriage is a religious ceremony and thus the said religion should decide if gays should get married. The state should not involve itself in religion since it should be seperated from religion to begin with. "Seperation of Church and State"
But marriage is also a legal union recognized and legitimized by the state so I guess for me if gays are afforded the full legal rights and recognized as so in the eyes of the state all would be fair and right. Do gays want to be married in church and walk down the aisle? I'm sure some do, but I would think that a rare circumstance considering their religion has been telling them there is something wrong with them their entire life...

I disagree. Marriage is meant for a man and a woman.

I agree. Everyone should have the same rights, and be given the same opportunities.

I agree, as long as they truly love each other there's no wrong.

I disagree. Marriage is a religious commitment. In the Bible, marriage is clearly between a man and a woman. However, I will compromise my feeling against gay marriage for civil unions. Therefore, gay couples could still receive the benefits of a married couple; insurance, loans, etc.

I agree. Why should a gay couples commitment to each other be considered any different than a straight
couple? I understand that marriage was traditionally between a man and a woman, but the times are changing. The public seems to be becoming more tolerant and accepting of sexual orientations different than their own, so why not adapt our laws to reflect this?

almighty

Posted Yesterday, 10:50 AM New!
Agree. People should have the freedom to marry whoever they want, especially if it does not affect anyone. People have the right to follow any religion they want, so we should not impose one religion on everybody and ban same sex marriages.

thai11

Posted Yesterday, 10:55 AM New!
I agree. Marriage is the union of two people who wants to spend the rest of their lives together. It should not matter based on gender since it's illegal to discriminate against sex so I don't see why it won't extend this benefit to marriage.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Jon Kolb's 1st Thesis

cliffb

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:21 PM New!
Major League Baseball should adopt a league wide salary cap.
brianna2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:41 PM New!
Agree. of course there is a hierarchy in other fields of work, but come on, it is just a sport, and why should they get millions a year, a lot with no education, and other people with their masters are trying to get by in society.

sktc

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:20 PM New!
I agree, I think baseball is the only sport that doesn't have a salary cap and that's why the teams that win keep on winning because of the money they are able to spend compared to other teams.

jspace

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:24 PM New!
I agree, money should not be the major reason a team wins a championship...you shouldn't be able to buy a title.

keegan82

Posted Jan 11, 2007 1:58 PM New!
I agree, this would make drafting and managing more important in the game. The rich (those damn Yankees) would not have an unfair advantage anymore and the rest of the league would be alot more equal. Each and every team would have the same opportunity at all players but would need to make intelligent scouting/drafting decisions that will produce good players in the long run. Plus, MLB players are severely overpaid already!

megan13

Posted Jan 11, 2007 2:48 PM New!
I agree, for the same reasons that it is unfair to be able to "buy" a championship based on the richest teams being able to buy the best players.
I agree, I hate the Yankees. And MLB players are overpaid.

I agree, and I think alot more than just pro baseball players should have league wide salary caps, what about all the other pro athletes?

The State of Washington needs to ensure that bottled water sold in the state must pass a higher standard of testing so that it is guaranteed safe to drink.

(Acceptable forms of bottled water have been processed to remove organisms known to cause stomach or intestinal infection. Bottled water labels reading "well water", "artesian well water", "spring water", or "mineral water" do not guarantee that the water is safe to drink.) Seattle Cancer Care Alliance.

I agree, someone told me that Dasani is tap water and I want to be sure that the bottled water I am drinking is really safe.
I agree, we need to know that what we put into our bodies is safe.

I agree, I wasn't aware that this is a problem, but the fact that they sell a product that isn't what they say it is, that's just plain messed up.

I agree, but I am not sure if this is really a state issue. I think this should be done on a national level. Bottle watered companies should not be able to be misleading to their customers and should guarantee that their water is safe to drink.

I agree, hassd had a good point that idea it be done on a national level. Are there not currently regulations for bottled water purity?

Healthcare should be provided to all American citizens.
brianna2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:36 PM New!
Agree. I think this is an important topic, and that all US citizens should get the same treatment. We are all living in the same land, and should get the same rights.

jspace

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:48 PM New!
Agree, people need the right to have healthcare and lead normal lives.

wkj2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:57 PM New!
On the fence...yes, health care is something that should be provided for everyone. But what will this do to taxes and where would this magical money come from?

keegan82

Posted Jan 11, 2007 1:39 PM New!
I disagree, this would cause income taxes to rise and when any kind of service is provided through taxation by the government, you never know if all the money is really going towards it.

hassd

Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:33 PM New!
I disagree. It would cost too much to provide everyone with healthcare and too many people would abuse the system.

heinj

Posted Yesterday, 6:01 AM New!
I agree that healthcare should be provided to all Americans, but what kind of system do you propose that we implement to do this? Is there a country which models a healthcare system you think would benefit the public better than that of the US?
Internet music sharing/downloading should be free and legal.

I disagree...artists wont be motivated to make innovations in music if there is no money...You get what you pay for, the less money that gets to the artist; the less quality of music they will give to the public.

I disagree. Although the amount of money musicians make makes me sick, I don't believe that downloading their music illegally over the Internet is fair to them. What is the point of even selling albums if everyone is going to download it illegally over the Internet?

I disagree, although I do it because I have a few friends who are up and coming artists, and their success depends on the sale of their albums. When one person buys the album and shares it with the rest of the world, they have no way to make any money, especially the unknown artists trying to get into the mainstream.
I disagree. I wish it were free and I feel artists make enough money as it is but I also believe that artists deserve to get paid for their work.

I disagree for the same reasons as everyone else. Artists are overpaid and as easy as it is to obtain free music from the internet, it is stealing. I think a more fair way to deal with this issue would be to reduce the price of music, although who knows how well that would go over with the artists and record companies involved.

The US government should stop providing subsidies to the US agriculture industry.

I agree. Even thought I dont know too much about the topic, I know that our government likes to get involved where they dont belong sometimes.
I disagree, without subsidies our American farmers will not have the money needed to maintain a farm. We would have to import our food making it more expensive...we need to make sure we take care of the people who put the food on our tables.

I disagree. I am from a farm town and I do feel these subsidies are needed. However, they definitely need to be reallocated in how much money is being given out. I know many very rich farmers, that are mainly wealthy because of the overpaid government subsidies.

I disagree, subsides are crucial to American farmers and our economy both within the United States and also our export economy, without subsides many farms would go out of business and the amount of goods we export would also reduce, causing a trade deficit.

I disagree, but this is not a very strong opinion because I really do not know how much they are subsidized. However, I do like being about to buy 2 gallons of milk for 5 dollars and red delious apples for 99 cents a pound. If the gov did not subsidize farmers I think I would probably have to pay more.

I am undecided. I understand Ag subsidies can help farmers when times are rough, but on the other hand, they can encourage overproduction, drive down crop
prices, eliminate many small farms, and convert much land to Ag, which often has severe environmental implications.

**YOUR NAME:**

**YOUR REPLY:**

**Bryce Mooney Thesis 2**

brycem22

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

The United States should implement the death penalty and make it mandatory to be enforced in every state.

jspace

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:37 PM New!*

I disagree, the death penalty should be a state decision. The government shouldn't make decisions reserved for the people...I do agree with the death penalty however.

wkj2

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

I agree. Then there would be a set standard that everyone was aware of and there would leave no room for justification.

keegan82

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:18 AM New!*

I disagree, I don't believe the death penalty is the most severe punishment for the heinous crimes some commit, they should be help in prison their entire lives without parole.
hassd

Posted Jan 11, 2007 11:57 AM New!

I do not have a very strong opinion regarding this issue. I can see both sides of the argument. Until I have more information I guess I think that the death penalty should be implemented. If you murder someone, then I believe the death penalty brings about justice. However, the jurors better be accurate in their decisions.

brianna2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:47 PM New!

I am in between on this issue. I think it depends on the severity of the crime committed. Also on whether or not a re-offense would occur if paroled.

heinj

Posted Yesterday, 5:39 AM New!

I agree, I think that every state should have the option of the death penalty, but whether or not it be carried out can be decided within the courts.

YOUR NAME:  
YOUR REPLY:

rubena2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:27 PM New!

The U.S. should utilize the popular vote instead of the electoral college when determining who its president shall be.
jspace

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:32 PM New!
I disagree. The electoral college protects small states and gives them a voice in the elections. If popular vote was the deciding factor, the winning candidate would be the one that spent the most money and time campaigning is LA and New York...they wouldn't care much about smaller states or cities. The minority should be able to express its voice.

keegan82

Posted Jan 11, 2007 1:52 PM New!
I agree, the electoral vote system puts way too much emphasis on campaigning in the larger states and leaving out the smaller ones, more or less saying their vote doesn't count. I think if a popular system were in place you'd see a much larger turn out at the polls on election day.

brianna2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:05 PM New!
I agree. The popular vote is the easiest way to show who a state wants to elect. much better than based on the electoral college voting.

hassd

Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:18 PM New!
I do not know enough about it to commit. Both jspace and keegan82 made two contradicting statements. Which ever one is accurate is the one I vote for.

megan13

Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:49 PM New!
Hmm, I would like to agree based on the issue of campaigning funds and where they are spent but I do agree that the electoral college protects the smaller states. I am undecided.
I agree, I think we the people should have directly vote for who we want to be president. I don't want elected officials to make the decision for me. The electoral college is supposed to represent the people, but how do we know we can trust they'll have our best interests in mind when casting a vote rather than a personal political agenda?

Brianna Crompe's thesis #2

A health/proper eating course should be taught in all elementary schools to help prevent the growing epidemic of eating disorders in American youth.

I agree, the best way to prevent these kinds of things is to educate the youth at a long age and really emphasis it throughout their public schooling.

I agree, kids need to be taught about health at a young age so it can hopefully stick with them.
I agree, we need to educate the American Youth at a young age. The obesity rate is ridiculous but it can be stopped if kids are taught early.

wkj2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:55 PM New!
I agree. Since parents aren't doing their jobs of teaching healthy habits, nutrition should be taught at the young age of elementary students. However, I don't think it should be taught with an eating disorder emphasis. Maybe awareness, but that is a young age to be teaching children about the seriousness of eating disorders. The idea shouldn't be put in their heads. Perhaps a proactive lesson about being healthy in general, rather than the negative effects of eating disorders.

hassd

Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:54 PM New!
I agree. I think this could be very beneficial for children and help to prevent eating disorders in America. I think it is important to educate kids at a young age about health/nutrition.

heinj

Posted Yesterday, 4:15 AM New!
I agree. Education is the key to prevention.

YOUR NAME: Keegan (2nd Thesis)
YOUR REPLY:

keegan82

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:50 PM New!
Professional athletes who violate the steroid policy should be immediately banned from the sport for life.

brianna2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:14 PM New!
I agree. If you break the rules, then you are out. Something as special and elite as playing professional sports should be something you appreciate, and by doing that to your body #1 isn't good, #2 not sending a good message to fans, #3 against policy. They shouldn't get any special treatment, just suspension.

sktc

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:24 PM New!
I agree, using steroids is almost like a way of cheating. There was a football player that allegedly used steroids and he was just tackling the other players like nothing. You could definitely tell and it shouldn't be tolerated.

jspace

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:29 PM New!
I disagree, people make mistakes...for many sports is their life and only means to make money. People should have second chances, losing your job for life is pretty harsh.

hassd

Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:10 PM New!
I agree. Not only is steroids illegal in sports but it is illegal in the U.S. They should be kicked out of their sports and thrown in prison. It is not fair to all of the other athletes who do not use steroids.

heinj

Posted Yesterday, 4:13 AM New!
Yes. These many professional athletes are working hard to succeed honestly. I dont see the point in giving athletes a second chance to fame and fortune if they abuse the opportunity the first time.
Whitney Jones: Thesis #1

wkj2


The United States should keep the Pledge of Allegiance in public schools.

keegan82

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:02 PM

I agree, to me this pledge is a pledge to being an American and everything our country stands for, it is absolutely necessary for young America to learn this pledge in school while growing up. Although I do not agree it should be mandatory, it should be optional because if you make someone say this pledge it is going against our constitution in that it is not freedom of speech/religion to say "under God."

brianna2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:22 PM

Agree. I think that every American should recite this allegiance. It is important to know and think about the words that our founders based this country on.

sktc

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:03 PM

I agree that it should be kept, but not required to cite it because they could believe in a different religion like Muslim where their god is Allah.
jspace

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:27 PM New!
I agree, they should have to recite it as well, people even if they are of different cultural ascent reap the benefits of this country...a few respectful words should not be an issue.

hassd

Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:15 PM New!
I agree. The pledge of allegiance is what we value as Americans: Liberty, freedom, justice, and unity. I don't think people should be forced to say it (because of the religious implications), but it should still be recited in schools.

heinj

Posted Yesterday, 4:10 AM New!
I agree. Even if you don't believe or support it, it is an American tradition, and you should at least respect that.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Whitney Jones: Thesis #2

wkj2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:51 PM New!
No female under the age of 18 should be allowed to have an abortion without parental consent.

keegan82

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:52 PM New!
I agree, but isn't this already the law in many states?
At the age of 18, you should be able to do whatever you want, you are a legal adult in every other case in the US. Why should making a choice about your body and future be restricted?

I agree because girls under the age of 18 are too young to make the decisions themselves.

I agree...parents have legal responsibility of children until the age of 18, they should help make a life-impacting decision for a minor.

I agree. Parents should be made aware of decisions like this. However, isn't this already a law?

I disagree. Some young girls are put in difficult positions in which their parents may be unsupportive of their needs and feelings. Imagine what it would be like to be a pregnant 15 year old who was forced to have a baby because your parents didn't believe in abortion. What if you had been raped or taken advantage of? I think if a woman is responsible enough to have a baby, she should be able to make the decisions that are going to affect her body and the rest of her life.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:
Jonathan Spatacean’s Thesis #2

jspace

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:24 PM New!
There should be a term limit for Supreme Court Judges (no life-long term).

hassd

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:26 PM New!
I definately agree. People are not always as alert and capable of performing the best job as they get older. Also, people’s opinions change over time. They were selected at one time because they held certain beliefs.

keegan82

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:10 PM New!
I agree, they have the freedom to take any side they want without the threat of any consequences, I think there should be long terms, but not life terms.

brianna2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:26 PM New!
Agree. this is a very smart idea. yes the longevity of someone in the same position is a good idea, but after a while them might become immune to decision making, or let things slide because they might be bored.

sktc

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:06 PM New!
I definitely agree because I think the president nominate them and sometimes they could lean more to one side than another which affects the decisions they make.
mkdipo

Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:28 PM New!
I disagree. The Constitution has significant controls to prevent crazy people from remaining Supreme Court justices. Presidents nominate the justices, but Congress has to approve the nominations, thus justices usually aren’t extremely biased.

heinj

Posted Yesterday, 3:57 AM New!
I agree, it’s good to have a diversity of judges rather than a single biased individual for their whole life.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Hunter Patterson Post #2

hkp

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:30 PM New!
The city of Seattle should collectively put public health above industry interest in banning the use of Trans-Fats in all restaurants.

jspace

Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:00 PM New!
I disagree, people should have the right to order food with trans-fats if they want it. We shouldn’t take away yet another right, especially since trans-fat hurts only the person eating the food. They should have the freedom of choice to eat what they want at a restaurant.
A good alternative to flat out banning could also just be putting nutrition facts on menus or some sort of "trans fat index".

I disagree for several reasons. First, I do not think transfats are bad enough to warrant a ban in all restaurants. I personally feel that transfats are definitely unhealthy, but that it is a fad that America is going through right now. Secondly, if you ban transfats where do you draw the line. I think alcohol is also bad. Should they ban alcohol too? Lastly, I feel consumers should have the freedom to choose what they want to eat since it is not harming anyone else. I agree with banannie and feel that a good alternative would be to have the nutritional facts on menus so consumers can be aware of what they are eating.

I agree. If a public health issue and widely spread information about such topics as trans fats were readily available, then people will be more inclined to not choose those food, or go to restaurants that serve them.

I agree, learning about this just today in section, I didn't even realize that trans fat was so bad for you. There are plenty of alternatives to using trans fat that are a lot less harmful, at least post a warning on the menu or label.

I agree, yes you have the choice to eat whatever you
want, but how can you eat healthy when many restaurants use trans fats and they don't care because no one else does except for your body? There are a lot of guidelines to the food we consume and it's because of the government. In wheat/cornflake type cereal, there can only be a certain amount of rat hair and other things inside it. Many people aren't aware of that and that's why it's important for the government control the food industry to an extent.

Alcohol was banned once in the early 1900s, "Alcohol Prohibition" and the law didn't last too long.

wkj2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:04 AM New!
I agree, America is outrageously overweight and this is one way to help make eating out a healthier option.

mkdipo

Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:59 PM New!
I disagree. Instead of banning, simple labels or warnings may be used for those who actually care. Or maybe requiring restaurants to at least offer menu items without transfats.

davehunt

Posted Yesterday, 12:27 AM New!
I agree, some restaurants are already exercising this idea. I think our country as a whole is overweight and this would be a great idea. There are many alternatives

heinj

Posted Yesterday, 3:54 AM New!
I disagree, banning trans fats in restaurants isn't going to stop people from eating. Like many other people have suggested, I think educating the public more effectively about nutrition and placing warning labels on foods and menus would be a better way to deal with the growing epidemic. If you saw a label that read "high in deadly trans fats", wouldn't you be more discouraged from eating that food more than if
As the world leader and single largest producer of greenhouse gases, the US cannot continue to fall behind the high vehicle fuel economy rating standards of other industrialized nations such as the EU and Japan. We must implement policy changes so that our nations vehicles meet the global standard we are already so far behind.

I agree, we need higher standards for our vehicles, not only is pollution a problem, but we dont have enough natural resources to continue this break-neck pace of gas usage.

Would you like us to follow the Kyoto protocol or a different/better policy?

I agree that we need to be environmentally responsible. However, what kind of policies are you talking about implementing? I disagree with something that is very extreme.
almighty

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:52 PM New!
Maybe you could elaborate more on the type of policy? I agree with changing the policy, but it also depends on the economic costs of doing so. Expensive policies might hurt the nation's economy and in turn hurt its people. We need to find a method that would create a balance between the two.

keegan82

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:55 PM New!
I disagree, I don't have a strong opinion either way, but thought I'd mix it up a little.

brianna2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:18 PM New!
I agree. I guess why not be as advanced as we can in something that is obviously important, because it is dealing with the air that we are breathing everyday.

sktc

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:16 PM New!
I agree, because there is too much pollution and the US should try its best to minimize it as much as possible.

mkdipo

Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:40 PM New!
I agree, depending on how extreme the measures are. I like my SUV and find that it comes in handy, especially on days like today when I need the 4WD, size, or towing. However, I think cars like the Hummer are freakin' ridiculous. No one needs that.

davehunt

Posted Yesterday, 12:37 AM New!
I agree but maybe in be more specific in the policy you wish to implement. We are using alot of our
natural resources fast and have to do something quick...

heinj

Posted Yesterday, 3:47 AM New!
I agree. The US is setting an example for the rest of the world, so we have to face this problem before its too late. What practical policy changes do you suggest that we implement?

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

rubena2

Fetal stem cell research that destroys human embryos should not be banned.

brianna2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:00 PM New!
I totally agree, no scientist has the right to destroy a possible human life, in the name of scientific research.

keegan82

I agree, fetal stem cell research is probably the most significant forms of scientific testing available for cures to deadly diseases such as AIDS and cancer, and is necessary for the advancement in medicine.
I don't know very much about stem cell research, but if human embryos are being destroyed like they are in abortion, then, yes, it should be banned.

I think that if someone is already going to have an abortion or for whatever reason is donating their embryo ... then why not put it to good use?

I agree, we need to ban harmful stem cell research because it destroys human life.

The scientific benefit to humanity far outweighs the costs (if any)

I don't know a lot about stem cell research and the process, but if the embryos are donated and have no other use because the full development can't be reached or whatever then it should be used for research.
hassd

Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:38 PM New!
I do not know very much about stem cell research. I guess I agree because it sounds a little like abortion and I think abortion should be banned.

davehunt

Posted Yesterday, 12:55 AM -- edited Yesterday, 12:58 AM by davehunt New!
I disagree, i think it should be banned. The benefit to society would be great. But when we can start curing diseases and deformities before the fetus is even born is like playing God to me.

heinj

Posted Yesterday, 3:43 AM New!
I agree, I think this research is essential to the future of medicine. It is not abortion. Many of the embryos were created in in vitro fertility treatments and are to be discarded, I think it would be a waste of a potential life not to do the research.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

cliffb

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:24 PM New!
Stores should be required to verify that anyone attempting to purchase violent video games is over the age of 18, and failure to do so would result in fines for the offending store.

sktc
I agree, when my brother was under 18, he would always buy really violent games that had the mature stickers on it but was never carded. The games out there today are pretty gruesome and the graphics make it even more real and it shouldn't be easily sold to people under the age of 18.

brianna2

AGree. Look at all the school shootings and violence that happen today. They have to be getting this image from somewhere, and video games are easily attainable. Look at the 1950s and 60s etc...not too many school shootings then.

jspace

Agree, but I already think the policy is implemented to some extent.

wkj2

I agree. I think the school shootings and child/teen violence has a huge co relation with these violent games.

hassd

I disagree, because how do you define violent? Also, parents will still just buy it for the kids. However, I do think that something needs to be done about the violence in the media.

keegan82

I disagree, just as hassd posted above, violence in general is really vague, if this thesis was a little more focused I might have a different opinion.
m kdipo

Posted Jan 11, 2007 5:46 PM New!
Violence isn’t so much the issue for me as is the theme. I’ve heard of some games where you’re some murderer trying to get away from the cops and stuff. I don’t think kids need to play stuff like that, although I’m also not entirely convinced that playing it leads to making the kids future serial killers.

davehunt

Posted Yesterday, 12:01 AM New!
I agree violence and school shootings have been linked to violent video games. But you should clarify your thesis a little more

banannie

Posted Yesterday, 12:59 AM New!
I think they’re still going to get it anyways and then they’ll just want to see them more, like R rated movies.

heinj

Posted Yesterday, 3:32 AM New!
I agree. Sometimes it’s as if video games encourage and glorify violence. I think the kids of today will see enough violence in their lifetime. So why make violent games even more accessible than they already are?

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Megan Keller’s Thesis 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Username</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>meghan13</td>
<td>Jan 11, 2007 11:07 AM</td>
<td>Washington state should offer a non-abstinence based in-depth sexual education begining in grade school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hassd</td>
<td>Jan 11, 2007 11:44 AM</td>
<td>I disagree. I think that having kids out of wedlock is one of the major problems with our society today. Absitinance until marriage should be taught in schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keegan82</td>
<td>Jan 11, 2007 1:18 PM</td>
<td>I agree, by educating children about sex before marriage it very well might scare them away from it, but at the very least it will teach them the knowledge they need to know to have a safe, non-abstinent teenage experience. Sex is not cruel, but children need to be taught how to deal with it and when it is acceptable (ie. only when the girl consents).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brianna2</td>
<td>Jan 11, 2007 3:09 PM</td>
<td>I agree. If knowing the correct information either means a kid having safe sex rather than unprotected, than that makes a difference right there. All areas of sexual education should be taught, maybe starting in the sixth grade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mkdipo</td>
<td>Jan 11, 2007 5:48 PM</td>
<td>I believe that kids shouldn't be taught in school how to be &quot;safely&quot; immoral. Teach kids to abstain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sktc</td>
<td>Jan 11, 2007 7:40 PM</td>
<td>I agree, it's important to learn how to be safe and know all about it instead of &quot;it's bad and wrong.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Username</td>
<td>Reply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>davehunt</td>
<td>Posted Jan 11, 2007 11:33 PM New! i agree, i think sexual education is important and kids need to be taught this at an early age. But having it be really indepth might not be necessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wkj2</td>
<td>Posted Yesterday, 1:01 AM New! I disagree. Children shouldn’t be taught that it is ok to have sex as long as you wear a condom in 4th grade. I think this would be a huge mistake.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heinj</td>
<td>Posted Yesterday, 3:27 AM New! I agree and disagree. I think so many kids are having sex at such a young age, that just teaching strict abstinence is not helping the situation. Maybe abstinence and sex-ed could be taught, but in a more informative than encouraging or discouraging way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nhu04</td>
<td>Posted Jan 11, 2007 9:09 AM New! U.S. should NOT have a Universal Health Care system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keegan82</td>
<td>Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:12 AM New! I agree, a universal health care system would only be possible through more income taxes, we already give</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
enough money to the government for them to waste, who knows where this money would go? Although I'm sure it wouldn't all go to health care...

**hassd**

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:05 PM New!*

I agree. I do not know a whole lot about this issue. My only reason for agreeing with this thesis is because I think that a Universal Health Care system would cost the government way too much money and I think too many people would abuse the system.

**brianna2**

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:14 PM New!*

I agree. To each person the job or service that they are working for will hopefully provide that for them. It is not fair that people without jobs get the same treatment that people who work very hard, and make good money recieve the same.

**wkj2**

*Posted Yesterday, 1:08 AM New!*

I agree. I don't think the people that work hard to barely get by should have to provide and pay taxes for others that are not working and don't have health care because of that.

**heinj**

*Posted Yesterday, 3:22 AM New!*

I also agree, although I believe everyone deserves healthcare, there aren't enough resources to effectively deal with such a system. Many people in serious need of healthcare would have to wait to be seen or treated behind the rest of the country.

**YOUR NAME:**    **YOUR REPLY:**
Professional athletes are overpaid due to the nature of their jobs and therefore their salaries should be reduced.

(Today athletes are the highest paid people in the country...) Quinnipiac chronicle 2006

Agree. Even though everyone cannot do what they do, it is still ludicrous that they get the amount of money they do.

I agree and disagree. Athletes do get paid a little too much, but their bodies go through a lot with injuries and the training is intense.

I disagree, due to Silverburg's Diamond-Water paradox...

I agree, although the amount should be significant because they are part of a very small population that excels at what they do, making $250 million in 10 years regardless of how you perform is ridiculous. It puts the wrong idea in many young people that they need to forget school and try to be athletes because of
how much money they make. When the truth is that less than .1% of athletes make it to that premiere level.

I agree and disagree. I think some athletes are overpaid and some are not. If people are willing to pay to watch them (and people do) then they deserve part of that revenue. Some deserve more than others. Also an athlete's job is very demanding. Just because everyone grows up playing sports for fun and desires to be a professional athlete doesn't mean that their job is always fun and easy.

I agree. I think professional athletes are very overpaid. It is almost sickening to look at their salaries and then look at so many struggling families all over the US trying to make ends meet.

I agree. Why should people in the profession of entertainment be paid more than people who risk their lives to save others?
megan13

Washington state should legalize prostitution.

(I am not saying I am pro-a bunch of hookers running the streets, with legalized prostitution it would be regulated in state approved brothels and have strict standards, therefore reducing the already illegal streetwalkers.)

hassd

Posted Jan 11, 2007 11:46 AM
I disagree. Prostitution is wrong. No one should ever sell their virtue.

keegan82

Posted Jan 11, 2007 1:15 PM
haha I disagree, we already have a big enough problem with AIDS in Africa, I'd be afraid that problem would spread here as well with prostitutes readily available.

brianna2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:11 PM
I disagree, I think prostitution is a very awful thing which only perpetuates the idea of woman as objects. Legalizing it would further that idea, and show that it is an option in lieu of going to school for instance.

mkdipo

Posted Jan 11, 2007 5:52 PM
I disagree. Prostitution ain't right and the state shouldn't support it.

sktc

Posted Jan 11, 2007 7:25 PM
I disagree, I think it would just cause too much mayhem and there are other jobs available than selling your body.
I disagree, I think that there are plenty of other ways to help the problem of prostitution. We need more police enforcement for example. Maybe a better topic choice is making it illegal in Nevada.

I completely disagree. This is just suggesting that it is ok....and it's not.

I agree. Really because I'd just like to see what would happen and if illegal prostitution would go down.

I'm not sure what I think about that statement. While I dont agree with prostitution, but atleast in the setting you propose, it would be safer for both the prostitutes and their clients.

Abortion should be legal.
hassd  
*Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:28 PM New!*
I disagree. Abortion is murder. And if you murder, you should be subject to the death penalty.

keegan82  
*Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:09 PM New!*
I agree, some people need to have abortions and it is actually better off for the child who would not be raised with one or no parents at all. It is unfair for a child to be stuck with no parents or bad parents, sometimes abortion is necessary for people who can’t afford to raise a child or are bad influences.

brianna2  
*Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:24 PM New!*
Only, in certain circumstances, it is a very VERY touchy subject and is really personal.

sktc  
*Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:59 PM New!*
I agree to a certain extent because there are situations when the person was raped.

jspace  
*Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:35 PM New!*
I disagree...a child has rights too, one of which is the right to live.

mkdipo  
*Posted Jan 11, 2007 4:57 PM New!*
I disagree. Abortion is murder. In cases of rape/incest or when the mother is endangered, an exception may be made, but not just because someone doesn't want to be held responsible for their actions.
I disagree but will say that my opinion is really religious based. This is a very emotional and very divided topic. I do feel that exceptions can be made in dire circumstances.

banannie

I think that abortion should always be completely legal. Furthermore, nobody, especially a male, should have the right to govern what I do with my body.

wkj2

I agree. Although I think abuse this right, it has to be an option. There are so many circumstances the government does not have a right to judge.

heinj

I agree. Sometimes having a baby is not an option (whether the mother was raped or cannot afford to have a baby, financially or emotionally). No woman should be forced to carry a baby against her will. Every woman has a right to a choice.

Morgan Dipo's Thesis #2

Affirmative Action programs in government, business, and education should be banned in favor of Equal
Rights policies.

banannie

Posted Jan 10, 2007 3:49 PM New!

This is a very good idea, especially if the policies really speak out to all minority groups.

jspace

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:44 PM New!

I disagree, although I also disagree with traditional affirmative action. Affirmative action based on race is wrong and should under no circumstance occur. Having said that I believe that affirmative action based on social-economic status is vital and should be allowed. It is unfair that a rich african-american be allowed into a University ahead of a poor white person (and vice-versa). The poor person needs help to get out of a generational cycle, whereas the rich person has benefitted from being wealthy and does not need the extra help. Thus affirmative action policy based on social-economic status (not on race) should be implemented.

hassd

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:49 PM New!

I agree that affirmative action should never be used. I think affirmative action is reverse discrimination and that other factors such as socioeconomic should be considered.

keegan82

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:58 PM New!

I agree, affirmative action was a very important law when we were dealing with equalizing rights for african americans and other minorities, but now the US is populated by more minorities than caucasians so obviously its time for another change.

brianna2
Agree. This should have been the case in everything for a long time.

I disagree. It should be based on social-economic status and race at the same time. In reality, a person not being Caucasian would have to take many more steps in getting the same position as a Caucasian would have to take one.

I agree, equal rights is the most important thing. To many young adults trying to go to college funded by themselves, who fall under a financial bracket where no financial aid is given, are screwed. Students and adults alike regardless of race should be rewarded for the hard work they have done.

Affermative Action was created to eliminate the present effects of past discrimination and to prevent discrimination. Because of the fact that it helps in eliminating discrimination (regardless of its effectiveness), it is a tool that indeed helps to restore equality in the society.

It can be said that affirmative action supports the Equal Rights act because it gives each person, regardless of their ethnicity and religion, to receive the same treatment and rights. Why then, should it be banned?

I agree. Equal rights is what our country was founded on. We need to keep to these ideals, and make sure that the America we want to see actually exists a
hundred years from now, and I think equals right will get us there.

keegan82

Posted Jan 11, 2007 10:08 AM New!
I agree, these laws were formed to create equal protection for all races, but instead they lead to more inequality. Now, instead of the protection for minorities, we need protection for caucasians who are now outnumbered by minorities in the US.

hassd

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:07 PM New!
I agree. Affirmative action is reverse discrimination. However, I feel in some circumstances socioeconomic considerations should be considered (not all situations though).

heinj

Posted Yesterday, 2:33 AM New!
I agree. I think creating a good workplace or school environment shouldn't depend on reaching specific ethnicity quotas, and thereby rejecting some highly qualified people. I think everyone should have equal opportunity to succeed based on their merits and accomplishments.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Tia Thai Thesis #2: Blood/Conflict Diamond

thai11

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:00 PM New!
American citizens should demand US retailers to have their diamonds certified for originating from conflict-free zones.

"A **blood diamond** (also called a **conflict diamond** or a **war diamond**) is a **diamond** mined in a **war zone** and sold, usually clandestinely, in order to finance an insurgent or invading army’s war efforts.⁴¹[1]: Source: [Conflict Diamonds](http://www.un.org/apps/dia_moments/1570368862.cfm) United Nations Department of Public Information, March 21, 2001, accessed online December 26, 2006

See [blood diamond from wikipedia.org](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Blood_diamond)
that they should be from areas in the world that are not struck with conflict.

hassd

Posted Jan 11, 2007 11:49 AM New!
I disagree. Diamonds are not what is encouraging violence. If we stop buying diamonds should we stop buying everything from countries that are engaged in conflict?

heinj

Posted Yesterday, 2:02 AM New!
I agree. I think the public as a whole should be more environmentally and socially conscious of the products we consume/purchase. I think that this is a great idea.

YOUR NAME: YOUR REPLY:

Keegan (1st Thesis)

keegan82

Posted Jan 10, 2007 1:41 PM New!
The city of Seattle SHOULD NOT agree to fund the construction of a new arena for the Seattle Sonics.

mkiipo

Posted Jan 10, 2007 3:21 PM New!
I agree. If the ownership of the Sonics can pay millions upon millions for players, they can buy their own arena. If they think a professional basketball team can generate revenue in the middle of nowhere
(Oklahoma), they are certainly welcome to try.

banannie

Posted Jan 10, 2007 3:58 PM New!
I agree. They're not even that good, so it seems like a waste of money.

jspace

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:23 PM New!
I agree, for the reasons posted on Danny Hass' page...we need new ownership.

hkp

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:48 PM New!
Whats so wrong with Key Arena?? I mean its not exactly falling apart right? Nor the reason the Sonics cant put the ball in the hoop...i totally agree.

hassd

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:38 PM New!
I have not done enough research yet to have a strong opinion. However, I do not think the city of Seattle should have to pay for all of it. I think that the Sonics should have to pay for a lot of it as well. I do however feel it is important to keep the Sonics in Seattle becasue they do bring a lot to the city. One final note, would everyone feels the city should pay for it feel the same way if the Sonics were currently the top team in the NBA?

brianna2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:07 PM New!
I agree. there is money to be spent elsewhere, that is greatly needed.

sktc

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:35 PM New!
I agree, the money for a new arena should be provided elsewhere.

wkj2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:56 AM New!
I agree. That money could be allocated elsewhere, to better benefit more people that the sports fans that go watch Sonics games.

heinj

Posted Yesterday, 1:46 AM New!
I agree. I don't think we need a new one. Money could be better spent elsewhere.

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Morgan Dipo's Thesis #1

mkdipo

Posted Jan 9, 2007 8:57 PM New!
Smoking should be banned from all public places.

keegan82

Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:15 PM New!
I agree, it should be banned entirely! My grandfather died from smoking and the lives of millions of others as well; it is truly a horrible thing and should be made illegal like the other deadly drugs on the streets. The government worries so much about marijuana and alcohol, but in a given year more people die as a result of cigarettes than alcohol and marijuana combined.
Do you think there should still be designated smoking areas?

I agree it should be banned from public places, but I disagree that smoking should be banned entirely. I understand people die from effects of smoking but making everything illegal that causes damage to people's health infringes on our rights, think about it: no alcohol (because it damages the liver), no fast food or fatty food (clogs up arteries leading to the heart), no football (paralysis). You are setting a dangerous precedent when you allow the gov. to take away things that they consider dangerous...you can make an argument that too much of ANYTHING is dangerous.

It seems to me that smoking is an interesting case because my smoking in public DOES negatively affect others, whom may not wish to be impacted by my cigarette. Other choices are personal only, such as eating trans-fats or playing football. I would support no smoking in public because if you can only smoke in private or in designated areas, you are only negatively impacting yourself with your behaviour.

I agree, but you have a lot of persuading to do. I do not think it is very feasible to ban smoking everywhere (although I wish it was).

I completely agree. I think smoking is a disgusting and deadly habit. It should only be done in the areas
where there is a name to a document showing you are paying to be there (house etc...). It is a free country, so smoking is one of those liberties, but my choosing to be at the same park as a smoker isn’t fair that I have to breathe the smokey hair, and as my rights I can ask him to move, or put out the cigarette.

sktc

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:02 AM New!
I agree, when people smoke in public places they could care less that the smoke they’re blowing and the ashes are falling right in front of my face. It has happened too many times and it should definitely be banned.

wkj2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:37 AM New!
I agree. However, I think that will take a ton of persuasion and would be a very hard law to enact.

heinj

Posted Yesterday, 1:24 AM New!
I agree, it is putting other people at risk by allowing smoking in public. Bans on smoking in public buildings aren’t enough to protect people.

YOUR NAME:    YOUR REPLY:

Joy Hein's thesis #2

heinj

Posted Jan 11, 2007 7:55 AM New!
All felons convicted of murder should not be eligible for parole.
I agree, if someone takes the life of another on purpose, they should serve their full punishment. Having good behavior after the fact doesn't change the outcome, so why should the criminal benefit from it?

I agree, but it depends what degree the murder is. If it is cold blood murder (which I think is first degree), then yes they should not be eligible for parole.

I agree. If you kill someone, then your life should not be given any more worth and you should sit in prison for the rest of your days. It is a commandment in the Bible, and shouldn't be given any special conditions.

I agree. In fact, if someone is convicted of murder, we should kill them.

I agree, taking someone's life away shouldn't give you a chance.

I agree murder is wrong and I think that what giving someone the ability to file for parole is like giving some of them a second chance. The person who was killed doesn't have any more chances to do anything in their life so why should the murderer.
banannie

*Posted Yesterday, 1:04 AM New!*

I agree, there shouldn't be murderers walking around.

---

**YOUR NAME:**

**YOUR REPLY:**

---

**Patrick Le's T.S. #1 - the death penalty**

almighty

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:21 PM New!*

The death penalty should be abolished.

---

hassd

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:24 PM New!*

I disagree. I think the death penalty is fair and just. I also feel that the death penalty is needed to prevent people from murdering.

---

keegan82

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:41 PM New!*

I agree, the death penalty is the easy way out of a brutal crime, personally I think they should rot in prison and dwell on their bad decision the rest of their life. For people like Saddam Hussein, they should give him the same form of torture he delivered to his victims.

---

brianna2

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

Agree. Too expensive and it is better for the person involved to sit in a lone cell for their life, and think about what they did for the rest of their lives, that
might be a brutal as death.

**sktc**

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

I agree for the same reasons as the others. It's worse to be in jail for life living in misery than just die.

**jspace**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:40 PM New!*

I disagree, it should be a state issue, the people of a state should decide on the matter. Some people are so evil, they deserve to die for their actions. It is also a deterrent.

**wkj2**

*Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:26 AM New!*

I disagree. I am a traditionalist and am a firm believer in 'an eye for an eye.' Although a life in prison would be bad and yes they would have to think about what they did...but I don't ever see any remorse in most of the serial killers. Because they are sick and don't feel bad about what they did. Why should the criminal be able to see their family, have overnight visits with their spouse, and (although it isn't luxurious) be provided with food, cable tv, internet, and simple day to day life when their victim is the one that is not able to do any of that?

**heinj**

*Posted Yesterday, 12:55 AM New!*

I am undecided on this issue. While I don't agree with killing those who have killed others, but I understand that the prison system is overloaded and there aren't a lot of options right now.
Jonathan Spatacean’s Thesis #1

jspace

Posted Jan 10, 2007 1:30 AM New!
The Intelligent Design Theory along with the Evolution Theory should be taught at public schools.

keegan82

Posted Jan 10, 2007 1:52 PM New!
I am not too sure what the Intelligent Design Theory is, but I strongly disagree with the Evolution Theory. I was born and raised Catholic and I believe that if you refute the existence of God, you take away many peoples reason for living. If you have no dream of a better life after death, what is there to live for?

mkdipo

I disagree. When I was taught the evolution theory in school, I took it as just that--a theory--and I wasn't offended. If intelligent design were to be taught, then which version? Even within Christianity, there are many differing opinions of how the Creation took place. If I want to learn about the philosophies of God (and I do), I go to church. If I want to learn about the current philosophies of Man, I go to school.

banannie

Posted Jan 10, 2007 3:58 PM New!
I don’t know much about intelligent design, but from what I’ve seen it sounds like a disguised version of creationalism. I think that touches a little too close on the separation of church and state.

hkp

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:55 PM New!
Evolution is taught because of the evidence we have
discovered from our exploration of the history of our world. Having not been raised catholic, or being raised in a different religion, teaching Intelligent Design seems to both refute the most probable explanation of our world and also to place one religions view of the creation over others in importance.

hassd

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:45 PM New!
I disagree. I dont think that either should be taught. Banannie mentioned separation of church and state with regards to intelligent design. I think that if you believe in evolution then that is part of your religion and therefore should not be taught in schools.

brianna2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:11 PM New!
I agree. I feel that the Evolution theory is not a good basis of solid education. there should be many things taught, including things about God. I know i was raised in a Catholic house and school from grade 1-12. I never really learned about evolution, but would have be open to hearing about it.

sktc

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:29 PM New!
I disagree, because it would just make things too complicated for students. Should they believe that both is responsible or is it one or the other. Public schools already have problems trying to teach them english and math.

heinj

Posted Jan 11, 2007 11:51 PM New!
i disagree as well, i think it would be easier to argue teaching evolution in school because it has scientific evidence, but intelligent design is more an issue of faith, not fact.
I agree we live in a diverse culture, a huge melting pot, and in our country the basis for freedom of speech and religion is a must.

I don't think it should necessarily be taught, rather it should be mentioned. Since it would be taught in a scientific atmosphere I don’t feel the belief of intelligent design would make sense to be taught in a science class. It is a religious belief and unless the students are in a religion class the scientific way of evolution should be expressed. However, there shouldn't be ignorance to Scientific Design.

Thesis: The punishment for auto theft in the state of Washington should be a minimum of one year in prison.

(Under current law, a person who only commits auto theft would have to be caught seven times before getting a state prison sentence. Source: The Seattle Times)
I agree, I personally love cars (even though I don't have a nice one) but if my car was stolen, I would hope the person who stole it paid the price for their crime. I don't know if a year is too much, but there definately needs to be a more severe sentencing scale for auto theft.

Disagree. This punishment sounds pretty harsh, and as long as no one was hurt in the process, maybe 4-8months at a max.

I agree that there should be a a more strict punishment but a year is too long. Maybe it should be a really high fine and a little bit of time in jail.

I agree, auto-theft level is ridiculous there needs to be a deterrent.

I definitely agree! Why is the currant punishment so weak? It obviously isn't working as deterrent for car theft.

I agree. I can recall several instances where cars were stolen and stripped. Oftentimes insurance will not cover true cost of the car. If owners are having to pay when car theives arent caught, then when they finally are caught, they should have to serve atleast as long
as you suggested to keep them from doing it again.

**davehunt**

*Posted Yesterday, 12:49 AM New!*

I agree, i would be pissed if my car was stolen and the criminal was back on the streets to repeat the offense immediately. With the knowledge that he could commit the same crime 6 more times is ridiculous.

**YOUR NAME:**

**YOUR REPLY:**

---

**Danny Hass' thesis #1**

**hassd**

*Posted Jan 9, 2007 6:30 PM New!*

The city of Seattle should fund a new stadium for the Seattle Supersonics.

**jspace**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 1:34 AM New!*

Disagree, I want Brandon Roy and Martell Webster playing up in Seattle, which would likely happen if the Supersonics leave. (Paul Allen will fund a new stadium and move the Blazers up to Seattle).

**keegan82**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 1:48 PM New!*

As you'll read, this was my choice of topic as well, although I argue against funding a new stadium. The old management failed to make any strides in recent
years to obtain premiere talent and continue to
give/trade away our big contributors (ie. Desmond
Mason and Nate McMillan). I also disagree with the
previous 3 first round draft choices, who drafts an
unproven center three years in a row? Frankly, the
management and the city have given up on the
Sonics, the only reason I continue to watch is because
of Ray Allen. I also agree that if we were to allow the
Sonics to leave, there is a very good chance we might
be able to see B-Roy playing again in Seattle!

mkdipo

Posted Jan 10, 2007 3:22 PM New!
I disagree. If the ownership of the Sonics can pay
millions upon millions for players, they can buy their
own arena. If they think a professional basketball
team can generate revenue in the middle of nowhere
(Oklahoma), they are certainly welcome to try.

banannie

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:00 PM New!
I think if they want/need a new stadium so bad there
are other methods of funding.

hkp

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:37 PM New!
I think the sonics have a better chance of a
championship run this season than of seeing the kind
of support both emotionally and financially needed to
build a new stadium here in seattle. I think the
general public feels little compassion for their current
situation. What about the viaduct? Traffic and
Education???

almighty

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:34 PM New!
I disagree. The Sonics have access to numerous
sources of funds, which could easily allow them to
build a stadium by themselves. It is clear that they do
have the means to buy players at amounts that would
easily be able to allow them to build a stadium. Why
then, should the city spend its taxpayer's money on
something that would be in the interest of a private party? There are other areas that need funding, such as education and healthcare. Why do the Sonics deserve the funds more than anyone else?

brianna2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 10:06 PM New!
I think that there are better ways to spend our city's money. Since we already have a stadium what will that use go to? Why build a new one, and maybe push for the women's basketball to be the main source of basketball entertainment in Seattle.

sktc

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:39 PM New!
I disagree, even though the stadium isn't the biggest and nicest, there are other ways of providing funds for it than the City.

wkj2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:14 AM New!
I disagree. There have already been a new football stadium and baseball field built in the last 10 years and it is unnecessary for taxes to soak up the costs for another pro sport's arena. There are much more important things the money could be spent on. Perhaps, I don't know enough about this topic ;)

heinj

Posted Yesterday, 12:32 AM New!
I disagree, I think they are many more practical and crucial things that Seattle should be funding right now.

davehunt

Posted Yesterday, 12:43 AM New!
I disagree. I think there is a huge disparity between the cost of the new stadium compared to the amount of revenue it would drive in looking at the fan
numbers for this year. Also our money could be spent well elsewhere.

**YOUR NAME:**

**YOUR REPLY:**

---

**Annie Drury's Thesis statement #1**

**banannie**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 3:45 PM New!*

Drug convictions should not effect a student's ability to get financial aid.

**jspace**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 5:02 PM New!*

Agree, a mistake a student did in the past should not haunt them in the future.

**hassd**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:03 PM New!*

I did not know that drug convictions effect a student's ability to get financial aid. I guess I feel that one drug conviction should be allowed, because people do make mistakes. But, if you have more than one drug conviction then you should not be eligible for financial aid. I feel this way because if you got money to spend on illegal drugs, then you have money to spend on college.

**brianna2**

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:38 PM New!*

I don't really have a very strong opinion on the subject. But I do know that I feel strongly about
giving second changes, and that people can change and that we cannot judge them too harshly on the choices of their past. Financial Aid shouldn't have anything to do with a past conviction of drugs.

keegan82

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:50 PM New!

I don't agree, I feel this is extreme punishment for some drug convictions that can be as small as having a small bag of weed. The punishment for drug convictions is already really severe, adding another punishment to that is a little too much in my opinion.

sktc

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:58 PM New!

I agree, because I think that's too extreme.

heinj

Posted Yesterday, 12:14 AM New!

I agree. I think financial aid only be only be based on financial needs.

davehunt

Posted Yesterday, 12:21 AM New!

I agree, everyone makes mistakes. The punishment does not fit the crime though. How does a drug conviction have anything to do with financial aid? Unless a felony also follows. I think you should clarify your thesis a bit
Brianna Crompe’s Thesis #1

brianna2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 1:49 PM New!
Sexual Offenders should be punished more harshly than they currently are

keegan82

Posted Jan 10, 2007 2:05 PM New!
I agree with this position. First off, a sexual offense is a much bigger crime than justice holds it to be. The offender is intentionally violating the civil liberties of the victim and potentially causing permanent psychological damage to them as well. These kinds of crimes go unnoticed so often because the victims are so emotionally scarred from the incident they dare not to bring it up ever again. For these reasons along with numerous others, sexual offenders need to be punished much more severely, possibly death for serious sexual offenses when forces and deadly weapons are involved.

mkdipo

Posted Jan 10, 2007 3:14 PM New!
I’m not sure how much sexual offenders are punished right now, but I do believe that they deserve a very harsh punishment for trying to take away something invaluable from mankind—virtue.

banannie

Posted Jan 10, 2007 3:55 PM New!
I very much agree. We were told how many sexual offenders live on 18th st. in a speech about rape and it blew my mind! It was somewhere between 10 and 20 and that’s just on my street!

jspace

Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:24 PM New!
I agree, sex offenders are dangerous to society and their tendency to repeat the same crime is quite large. We need harsher punishments.
hkp

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:45 PM New!*
Definitely agreed, we have people spending the rest of their lives in prison for smoking dope and yet we have known sexual offenders living in our neighborhoods, many of whom will re-offend...

hassd

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:47 PM New!*
I do not know how they are punished now, but I feel the punishment should be very severe.

almighty

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:50 PM New!*
I'll be a devil's advocate here.

Sexual offenders should not be punished more harshly than they are because the current punishments are adequate. They allow for people that committed crimes such as statutory rapes (even without their knowledge) to greater chances to get back to life. Also, it is very hard to determine how harsh a penalty should be. You say its not harsh enough because people still re-offend - then what about murderers or thieves that also re-commit their crimes? Should the penalties for those crimes also be more harsh? How do you determine which is harsh enough which is not? Eye for an eye? Is that really going to work?

Sexual offenders re-commit their crimes largely not because the punishment is not harsh enough, but because it is an illness of mind. It is a sickness that, if bad enough, then regardless of the punishment, it will lead to a repeated crime. Is making the penalties more harsh really going to work? Doubtful.

wkj2

*Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:50 PM New!*
I definitely agree, sex offenders are often sentenced to only a few years in prison. Beyond that, they are allowed to get out early with good behavior and "rehabilitation," with simply parole. Most sex offenders that are out of prison do commit repeat offenses,
therefore their sentences should be more harsh.

heinj
Posted Jan 11, 2007 11:59 PM New!
I agree. Not only should they be in prison longer, but I don't think they should be able to live in such close proximity to schools!

davehunt
Posted Yesterday, 12:04 AM New!
I agree especially since it is considered the worst crime in our society today according to a survey done in Joe Weis's Sociology of deviance class for the past 3 years by students

YOUR NAME:  YOUR REPLY:

Annie Drury's Thesis #2

banannie
Posted Jan 10, 2007 3:47 PM New!
The US should adopt a universal healthcare system.

jspace
Posted Jan 10, 2007 4:56 PM New!
A universal healthcare system does have its benefits, however I have to disagree with the thesis because the drawbacks are more significant. A universal healthcare system means that doctors get paid less...thus reducing the quality of doctors because they will go where they make more money. This is why so many Canadians come down to the US to have their surgeries. I would much rather have our healthcare than that of Canada.
hassd

Posted Jan 10, 2007 6:05 PM New!

I will be honest, this is an issue that I do not know a lot about. I know there are plenty of reasons for both sides of this issue. From the little that I do know, I think that the U.S. should not adopt a universal healthcare system because I think it will get abused too much by people who do not really need healthcare, costing the U.S. too much money.

brianna2

Posted Jan 10, 2007 7:40 PM New!

This makes a lot of sense. With everyone in the same boat, then there wouldn't really be a lot of need for people without jobs to worry about healthcare issues. I think that this statement is a great idea.

keegan82

Posted Jan 10, 2007 8:44 PM New!

I don't know alot about this subject, but I know that a universal health care system would require much higher taxes and I am definately opposed to that.

sktc

Posted Jan 10, 2007 11:59 PM New!

I agree, but it should extend to a certain point like to American citizens.

wkj2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:08 AM New!

I don't necessarily entirely agree. There needs to be some qualifications and restrictions. For example, for struggling or working families, etc that really can't afford health care. I don't think our tax dollars should go up to pay health care for people that are mooching off of the system.

almighty

Posted Jan 11, 2007 6:51 PM New!
A universal healthcare is a very expensive project. The costs would probably far outweigh the benefits. We should stick with what it is now. Look at Canada, not a very good example.

davehunt

I agree and disagree... i think that the US should adopt some sort of policy like the one you propsed in the near future, but the idea isn't really feasible because of the cost. Maybe you should narrow your topic choice on gov spending for the current health care system in place. Medi Care, HMO's etc

Joy Hein's thesis #1

heinj

The UW should stop animal testing for medical research.

keegan82

I disagree, certain animals are overpopulating our world and using them to find cures for human diseases is a better way to control them than to simply slaughter them.

hassd

Posted Jan 11, 2007 12:01 PM New!
I disagree. I think humans' lives are more important than animals' lives. Animal testing can be valuable to finding the cure for diseases which results in the saving of many of humans' lives.

brianna2

Posted Jan 11, 2007 3:28 PM New!
Agree. there are much better ways to test a theory or product. Innocent animals is not the way to go.