

mod 5 disc 1

classmate 1

The issue that I'm going to write about is the well-being of children who are raised by same sex couples. This affects me personally because my future children will be from a same sex couple. My partner and I have already decided that we would start the process of having children once we are married next year. We want to both adopt a child and we want to try to have one biologically. I know that our children will do just as well as children who are raised by different sex parents. I have a lot of friends that have different family, some are same sex parents; both male and female, I have a few opposite sex parents, and I also have female friends that are single parents. In my experience it has been the same sex parents who are both involved consistently with their children's life's and school activity's then my other groups of friends. However honestly my opinion is that a child's well-being is not dependent of their parents' sexual preferences. But instead depends on how well the parent teaches the child how to be a positive human being to themselves and others, to support and love their children.

My position is that there isn't a disadvantage for the well-being of children who are raised in a same sex household vs an opposite sex household. The organization that would be disagreeing with me would be the Family Research Council. They believe that children that are in same sex families is bad for the children.

One of their arguments is that the children need the opposite sex parent. They say that girls without a father will be more likely to have a teen pregnancy than girls who have two opposite sex parents. And children who have two dads miss out on the emotional security that mothers give. (Council)

Second argument is that same sex children are more likely to be a victim of gender and sexual disorders. They believe that the children are more likely to grow up and be homosexual because they were exposed to it. (Council)

Third argument is that kids feel abandoned by the donor when same sex couples decided to use in vitro fertilization. (Council)

Fourth argument is that same sex couples can't parent that way a heterosexual couple can. That there are not enough studies that can prove otherwise. (Council)

I'm still working on the fifth argument.

Classmate 2

The topic I will be writing about is gender dysphoria. This topic affects me because my child is transgender and every single day, I fear that my child will not be fully understood as to why she is different from other kids she interacts with.

What instances leading up to why she made the "decision" to be a female versus a male, or if I, as her parent had some type of influence, or because she was born feeling the opposite gender of what she was born as is due to a psychiatric illness. I will be refuting all and any person or organization that feels that being transgender is a choice, fad, abomination, or form of mental illness. Many different people from different religions, politicians, or the general public that are just not educated enough to understand the history of gender dysphoria and how one lives when transgender.

Some examples of peoples position on this particular topic as quoted. "The theory suggests that youngsters are being misled into claiming a trans identity before they truly understand what that means. They are supposedly influenced by the internet, social media and peers" (Alexandre Baril). However, I disagree with this statement. There is a stigma that a boy is born a boy and a girl is born a girl, but the fact and the matter is, gender dysphoria is a feeling of being trapped inside a body whose gender one simply does not identify with or an intense dislike for one's sexual anatomy. My position on this topic is a touchy one. Although my child is old enough to speak for herself, it is still my job as her mom to educate and make people aware that gender dysphoria is a serious topic and is always misrepresented.

Some things about gender dysphoria that should be considered. Transgender people have brains that are different from males and females. Their brains are unique. "In 2013, showed that even before treatment the brain structures of the trans people were more similar in some respects to the brains of their experienced gender than those of their natal gender (Francine Russo)." I want to make sure that people understand better, and know that it is perfectly acceptable to ask questions if you don't know. I think the real issue with this topic is, people aren't educated enough on the subject and they should.

Five main arguments

- 1. Gender dysphoria is not a choice. Gender dysphoria is a male/female that has a strong belief that they were born the wrong sex. Therefore they live their life as what others feel they should as opposed to who they identify as.**
- 2. Gender Dysphoria is not only about a person's mental capacity. Yes, mental health can be a factor upon the aftermath being bullied, disowned, or not simply being understood.**
- 3. Gender Dysphoria is not understood by many, because most have an automatic assumption that someone who is born with GD is weird or seeking attention. I want to prove that science proves different.**
- 4. That the suicide rate continues to spike because of this topic.**
- 5. I also want to argue that gender dysphoria, in a sense, does require some type of counseling, but does not always mean they have a mental illness. Some people feel a certain way and don't necessarily understand it fully themselves. It's important that we have specialists on this topic to talk to people who want to better understand why they feel the way they do.**

Mod 5 disc 2

Classmate 1

The first source I'm going to use is from the Family Research Council the article is titled Ten Arguments From Social Science Against Same Sex Marriage. The Family Research Council is a Christian organization who says that they fight for religious freedom through-out the United States. This organization is known for disagreeing with L.G.B.T.Q. rights among other things. The President is Tony Perkins, is a conservative who served as a member of the legislature in the state of Louisiana for eight years.

My second source is a journal article I found written by Wendy D. Manning, Marshal Neal Fettro and Esther Lamidi titled Child Well-Being in Same-Sex parent families: Review of Research Prepared for American Sociological Associations Amicus Brief. This article explains the many different studies have been done and the result is that there is no major difference between children who come from same sex families verse opposite sex families.

These two sources are very different from each other, my first source is against same sex couples having children or raising children. They believe that the child suffers when being raised in same sex homes. Instead this organization promotes heterosexual marriage and opposite sex families. They seemed to have more conservative mentality and work with congress to help with opposing L.G.B.T.Q. rights from passing. Whereas my second source is a academic article that explains children do not suffer because of them being in a same sex home.

Classmate 2

The first source I'm going to use is from the Family Research Council the article is titled Ten Arguments From Social Science Against Same Sex Marriage. The Family Research Council is a Christian organization who says that they fight for religious freedom through-out the United States. This organization is known for disagreeing with L.G.B.T.Q. rights among other things. The President is Tony Perkins, is a conservative who served as a member of the legislature in the state of Louisiana for eight years.

My second source is a journal article I found written by Wendy D. Manning, Marshal Neal Fettro and Esther Lamidi titled Child Well-Being in Same-Sex parent families: Review of Research Prepared for American Sociological Associations Amicus Brief. This article explains the many different studies have been done and

the result is that there is no major difference between children who come from same sex families verse opposite sex families.

These two sources are very different from each other, my first source is against same sex couples having children or raising children. They believe that the child suffers when being raised in same sex homes. Instead this organization promotes heterosexual marriage and opposite sex families. They seemed to have more conservative mentality and work with congress to help with opposing L.G.B.T.Q. rights from passing. Whereas my second source is a academic article that explains children do not suffer because of them being in a same sex home.

Mod 5 Discussion 3

Classmate 1

ery rough draft; need to develop a few ideas in more detail. If anyone is interested in learning more about a certain topic, let me know and I'll be sure to elaborate in my final draft:

A plant based (vegetarian/vegan) diet has proven to be appropriate and beneficial for every stage of life. Following a plant based diet can reduce diseases, minimize a person's environmental impact, and overall improve quality of life. There are several arguments against this lifestyle, some of which are outlined in the article entitled, "Vegetarianism is an Unhealthy Dietary Choice" by Micah Issitt and Rosalyn Carson-Dewitt. The main points of contention are tradition, nutritional deficiencies, economics of meat production, ecological damage, and the existence of environmentally friendly/morally acceptable meat. I intend to disprove all of these points in this essay.

First, there is the matter of tradition. Issitt and Carson-Dewitt argue that since humans have throughout history consumed meat, that meat eating is "meat-eating is natural for humans and always has been." The argument can be made that there have been several institutions "traditional" to humankind; one of which is slavery. Most people would agree the institution of slavery is morally wrong, and just because it had been a tradition at one point does not mean it is acceptable to continue based solely on that fact.

As far as nutritional deficiencies go, the authors claim that vegetarians and vegans are deficient in some nutrients such as protein, iron, and B12. The fact of the matter is that it is just as easy for a person that eats meat to eat an unhealthy, imbalanced diet, and for them to be susceptible to deficiencies regardless of the fact if they are consuming meat or not. Meat is not the only source of protein and iron. In fact, many plant foods are high in protein such as tofu, lentils, beans, hempseed, quinoa, and nuts; not to mention most foods

contain at least a small amount of protein in addition to these foods. As far as B12, animals get their B12 from the soil in which they graze from. In fact, in factory farms, many farmers supplement their animals with B12, so meat eaters are in fact receiving a supplemented form of the vitamin. As a vegan, it is easy to get B12 from fortified sources such as nutritional yeast, and fortified nut milks/ cereals without taking a multivitamin. In fact, almost 40% of the population is deficient in B12, and that does not correlate with the amount of the population that follows a vegetarian/vegan diet. Lastly, studies have shown that heart disease, cancer, and many other ailments are prevented or reduced by consuming a plant based diet.

Issitt and Carson-Dewitt state that, the "meat industry is one of the world's largest employers, providing jobs for millions of workers" in making their argument for meat consumption. While this may be true, it does not take into account that if the world were to switch over to a plant based diet, there would be just as many jobs producing vegetarian/vegan products as well as farming fruits/vegetables. In fact, this year has seen a huge increase in the demand for more vegan products, causing some of the largest producers of these products to increase their production by opening new plants and therefore providing more jobs. Working in the meat industry is also hazardous to humans, exposing them to dangerous equipment and hazardous chemicals, increasing the risk for injury and illness that largely goes unreported for fear of workers losing their jobs.

When speaking about ecological damage, Issatt and Carson-Dewitt state that, "agriculture damages the environment when vast tracts of habitat are cleared and replaced by a monoculture of a single or very few species" when discussing the alternative of farming fruits/vegetables over meat. The fact of the matter is, much of the farm land available is used to grow crops to feed food animals, on top of the land that is cleared to house and grow these animals. A large amount of land that is cleared in the Amazon rainforest is used for factory farming. By eliminating food animals, not only is the land used to house these animals available for growing crops, but the land already in use to feed these animals can be utilized to feed humans. There is also a huge environmental impact when it comes to raising, transporting, and slaughtering animals for meat. Not only do animals produce a huge amount of waste that often contaminates our waters (such as in this year's instance of Hurricane Florence whose floods drowned many factory farmed animals and released all the reserves of their waste into the water source), utilizing large trucks to transport animals to slaughter (and then the empty trucks driving back) creates a large amount of greenhouse gas emissions. It has been said that eliminating meat consumption would do more for the environment than driving a hybrid vehicle.

Finally, Issatt and Carson-Dewitt state that, "sustainable animal farming can be an environmentally friendly form of food production" while also mentioning that there are good questions raised around the "ethics and morals of raising animals for food and materials". The first part of that statement can be drawn back to the

ecological impact of meat production, and that if we are continuing to use animal products at the scale we are now, there is no way to reduce that impact enough for it to have the same effect as eliminating animal products from one's life. The authors do not address the moral dilemma besides mentioning that it exists, so I would like to address that now. Consider that we know animals feel pain, love, and many other emotions in the same way that humans experience them. Pigs for example, are more intelligent than dogs and three year old humans. Yet, we do not eat dogs in America. What would be the difference, then, when eating a dog or a pig? Neither animal willingly walks up to their death, and saying that we gave that animal a quality life before their death is hardly justification for slaughtering those animals. Many of the animals that are eaten are barely a few years old when they die; just a fraction of their natural lifespan. If one would not consume a dog or cat, what makes a cow or pig any different?

In conclusion, eating a plant based diet is beneficial to humans on the level of health, environmental concern, and ethics. If more people were to make the switch, our population would see a drastic decrease in the number of chronic diseases present in our society, as well as benefitting the earth through creating less emissions.

Classmate 2

The legal drinking age should be extended to 25

The legal drinking age is currently twenty one years of age. Your brain isn't fully developed until you are twenty five years old. What I ask then, is why is the legal drinking age twenty one if our brains aren't even fully developed until twenty five? It seems like we are purposefully putting young adults at risk. Though some agree that the legal drinking age should be changed to twenty five, some believe that it doesn't matter what the drinking age is because kids will be kids, but what about the effects it has on these young maturing bodies? If young adults are still developing through the age of twenty five, then it could certainly be possible for alcohol and drugs to have a more profound effect on them than it does on older adults. There should be a more informed conversation about the legal drinking age being changed to twenty five. This is when the body is at its highest maturity and potentiality. Some think that it will have no effect if changed, but if the legal drinking age is changed to twenty five, I think, as well as many others, that it will benefit young adults and reduce the amount of deaths between 16-24 year olds on alcohol usage.

On the opposing side, it is believed that raising the legal drinking age doesn't reduce the amount of young adult deaths, but rather just postpones those fatalities. "Raising the drinking age to 21 may, then, reduce fatalities among those 18 to 20 years old. But as these same people reach 21 - the new drinking age - they become the risky, inexperienced drinkers and display the higher fatality rates. The 21-year-old drinking age clearly shifts the age distribution of highway

fatalities, in effect postponing some fatalities from 18 and 19 to 21 and 22." Now, I can see what the writer is saying, but I don't think it is postponing death, but rather saving lives. By raising the legal drinking age, it gives young adults more time to mature and make wiser choices. "According to the University of Minnesota who reviewed over 57 studies, found that older drinking ages were associated with lower crash rates. States saw a 59% decline in drinking in 1985 compared to a 40% drinking rate in 1991 between people's aged 18-20 years old. Those aged 21-25 years also saw a decline when states adopted the minimum drinking age of 21, from 70% in 1985 to 56% in 1991. With stats this good, we can continue to reduce these numbers and not postpone fatality, but rather save lives, and further maturity in young adults.

There is no doubt that once reaching the legal age to drink, people are going to drink. There is no secret that even people under the legal age drinking limit are drinking, but what is the age to start drinking? The legal drinking age is currently 21 in the US, but this age is still a young age, and these young adults haven't reached their full maturity yet. Alcohol consumption by young adults results in numerous harms including deaths, injuries, commission of crime, risky behaviors, and reduced workforce productivity." 40 percent of 16 to 17-year-olds admit they drink to get drunk. With 18-24 year olds, this ignoble pursuit jumps to 63 per cent." These statistics are pretty high and it shows just how much young people are drinking. With stats these high we need to be protecting our young ones and raising the drinking age limit just might be something to do because it can lower not only the amount of young adults and teens drinking, but reduce fatalities and give young brains more time to mature." The impact of alcohol on a developing brain is far more acute than on a mature one, as is the risk of addiction. The earlier people start drinking, the more likely it is that they will be hazardous boozers later in life."

My father started drinking when he was fifteen years old. It was his choice at first, but then time after time of drinking the booze he became addicted to it. Though the legal drinking age was 21, he started earlier, most likely influenced by his friends and peers. He wasn't mature, he was still going through puberty, but he started so young and his body soon would be needing it constantly. He became addicted and continued to drink alcohol until this past year. His body had enough. Trying to stop, his body went into shock. He had many seizures, appendicitis, and his health was going down hill. Now sober for six months, he is doing great, but he is fighting everyday still. His body still craves it, but he keeps pushing and in result he is learning to live his life away from toxins, living his best life.

Now, I wrote about that because it was a struggle for my father, and it's a continuous struggle for the people out there who are drinking. It does have an impact on your body at what age a person drinks. People are drinking at too early of an age, but some very well disagree. "Raising the legal age would be stupid. And anyone who did actually choose to abide by the law - not drinking until the

age of 21 - would inevitably get completely inebriated on their 21st birthday, failing to understand the effect that drink has on their body. It's surely better to learn about what your system can take at a younger age in a safer environment - we're capable of learning about ourselves in that way." Though some do abide the law, most young adults and teenagers don't abide the law and most are influenced by their peers. Most drinking does not happen in a safe environment, as so this person thinks, but instead most drinking takes place at parties or in social groups where kids are in that position to take a drink.

Controversy continues to grow with the subject of the legal drinking age and whether it should be raised or not. The opposing side believes it is "illogical" and doesn't actually reduce death among young adults, though the other side argues that the legal drinking age should be extended because it gives young people the chance to be fully matured and statistically is shown to reduce the amount of deaths. Which ever side one is on, we need to think about the effects of alcohol and especially the effects it has on young adults. If teens can't have alcohol, then why should 21 year olds? They as well are not matured yet, the age needs to be changed, and not to prevent their fun, but to protect them.