In an era when all the frontiers of civilization’s expansion seem to have vanished, when the settling and industrialization of all the Earth’s land and resources seem to have reached a limit, we, as innate pioneers, look towards space as our next domain of conquest. Despite a hostile, hostile environment, beginning to the Space Age, in the midst of global tension and a threat of total catalysm, mankind has since returned to space as a medium of peace and progress. But space is not free, space is not safe, and space is not easy. With millions of dollars of the Federal budget tied up with NASA and related institutions, with unprecedented dangers plaguing every launch, every point, and landing, and with public interest and support dwindling, should the United States, or any space-capable country in that matter, continue to invest in exploring this frontier in the coming century?

The question is not “what are the benefits of exploring space.” History, science, literature, and imagination have all shown what “out-of-this-world” feats we can accomplish and how beneficial they are. The first space-born object, the Sputnik, paved way for a massive integrated network of communication which plays a critical role in society five and a-half decades later. Telephones, television, the Internet, and cellphones all depend on satellites in orbit. Science satellites capable of detecting weather patterns, cosmic rays, and all terrestrial changes contribute to our awareness and understanding of our surroundings. Information from these satellites tell us how to dress for tomorrow’s weather, where a

The benefits do exist, and they are ubiquitous.
hurricane will hit next, and how much time we have until a
Near-Earth Object strikes Earth and destroys all life, if God forbid
that ever happens. Every-day appliances have their origins in space,
from microwaves to miners, from super-comfortable mattresses to super-
durable clothing. Our the future, space promises many exciting things:
new colonies on Mars, new medicinal discoveries in weightlessness, new
drugs, elements, and dimensions, and a haven for mankind in case
Earth's resource are really depleted. In addition, space creates a
pop-culture for us, exciting movies, sci-fi literature, and our
imagination to explore it. Proponents of space point of these benefits.

But whether these benefits exist or not is not the question. The
real dilemma, issue, controversy is this: at what cost, to what means,
with what sacrifice, do we need to pay in order to obtain these benefits?
This precisely, is the argument of the opponents. Certainly, millions of
dollars devoted to space instead of solving our problems down here on
Earth—poverty, disease, unemployment — could make space unattractive.
Serious risks are involved, and the recent Columbia disaster
magnify these risks. Some fear that by exploiting space we
are creating the same military tensions that grew up the frontiers
in the past place. Eric Severud, in his editorial "Dark Moon",
points out some of the psychological costs of going to space. He points out
that children will be dreaming of missile, rocket fuel, and missile news
instead of dreams, hopes, and winners; businesses will now gaze at the
moon with passion instead of lovers, and generals and scientists will
own space, not our imaginations.

Currently, the United States government is acting on a small

NASA budget as a compromise of sorts; space enthusiasts want more, realists want less. A formula for compromise is non-existent, and to create one would be foolhardy. Forty lines are drawn. Opinion is carved in stone. What is the solution?

In the uncertainties of the future, look at the certainties of the past. Surely, a similar debate ensued before Columbus left for the Americas, or Marco Polo for China, or American families for the frozen frontier. But if we, from hindsight, see how our civilization has changed as a result, we can say, with some confidence, that moving to space will progress mankind in the right direction. That is not to say that it will be morally and ideologically perfect, but we must bear those consequences. When a door has been opened, we take it.
In today's world of information technology, we find that many of the IT jobs are being outsourced to other countries, like China and India. This poses a large problem for the United States, in the long run, although the new flow of jobs has been nothing but conducive to the growth of the economy in present times; therefore a solution must soon be found to remedy one of the outward flows of jobs.

If you were to talk to the CEO of a large company about what they thought of the IT industry, they would probably tell you that that profits are up. When jobs are outsourced to third world countries like China and India, companies are able to find employees who are willing to do a lot of work for a meager sum of money. Therefore, the world production output dramatically means, and the companies do not spend as much money. Not only that, but companies receive the added bonus of not having to pay taxes on any money earned outside of the US. All of this profit has led to the immediate effect of brightening up the economy at stark markets.

Many of the IT workers, however, would probably differ on their opinion of the outsourcing of IT jobs. With 90% of the jobs being sent off to third world nations, America is faced with the enormous problem of a deficit of jobs. Thus, an increasing number of IT workers are left unemployed. In America, we depend on the people's buying power to keep the economy flourishing. With so many people buying, the demand for the goods of the people will be decreased enormously, perhaps resulting in...
the collapse of the economy.

In order to keep the IT outsourcing problem in check, we must take steps to stop the alarming flow of jobs out of the US. Of course, like most other problems, the root of the problem lies in educating more of America's children to show the same level of expertise in the IT field as do the children who are trained to do that in places like China and India. This will help to keep some of the jobs in the US because companies will perhaps take more of the well-educated and experienced American to fill jobs. However, it is not a permanent solution.

While better education could maybe help to alleviate some of the pressure caused by outsourcing, the real solution lies simply in that companies must realize that, ultimately, America's hierarchy of basic needs should be met, not just by the consumption of America's factories, and therefore, the outsourcing must be maintained at a level to insure security and prosperity for future generations of Americans.
It seems that in today's world, everywhere you turn people are arguing over one issue or another. The very nature of America is that we are allowed to disagree and argue over everything. From a current controversial issue we are facing in America is how much the FCC should be allowed to censor the TV we watch. After incidents this past year, the FCC has tightened regulations which leave Americans to question how much is too much control to give the FCC.

As with every issue, there is two sides. First, there are several reasons to support the tightening of regulations. Surely, everyone recalls the issue that began this controversy of the 2004 Superbowl Half-Time show. Janet Jackson exposed her breast to millions of viewers. This started an enormous controversy and made the FCC pay closer attention to what went out on the airwaves. Many support this. They appreciate the govt making TV more suitable for families with children. In a society where kids are becoming desensitized, why air as it is, why air more violence and bad language to further the process? Often times, the same effect can be portrayed to the audience who excessive violence or profanity. Also, what gives artists & performers the right to behave objectionably on TV? Parents should feel comfortable letting their children watch TV. Is the daytime. The reason having to explain the government, they feel should be allowed to have a say in what goes on TV.

However, many people fear that this is only the first step towards the FCC being allowed to
dictate exactly what Americans are allowed to watch. While children make up a portion of viewers, are most television viewers adults? Shouldn't adults be allowed to decide for themselves what is appropriate and isn't appropriate for them to watch? Also, perhaps parents who worry about what their children are watching should be parents and teach what their kids watch. If the parents become involved with the decisions of TV for their kids, does the govt really need to be involved? The FCC becoming stricter creates the feeling of Big Brother watching our private lives. People should be allowed to decide for themselves what to watch. If they don't like something, there's always an "off" button.

Most controversies, like this one, boil down to matters of opinion. There is no clear right or wrong in this case—so no solution can ever be found that will appease both sides. However, there's a chance a compromise can be reached. Perhaps a good solution would be to regulate a "family time" in the early evening, where only non-offensive shows can be aired. This way, shows that are not appropriate for kids can be viewed later, when most children are sleeping. Another solution could be to install chips that will block out programs above a certain rating. Whatever "solution" is found to this problem, one thing is certain: if either side ever hopes to get anything done, both must be willing to compromise.
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