

[Forums](#) / [General Discussion](#)[Help](#)

## Will we be able to have a non-partisen discussion?

 You are subscribed. [Unsubscribe](#) No tags yet. [+ Add Tag](#)Sort replies by: [Oldest first](#) [Newest first](#) [Most popular](#)[Anonymous](#) · 2 months ago 

I'm hoping we can engage in discussions without pointing out the flaws of the "other" political party. That's what I took this course for, to get away from finger pointing and blame, and learn more about what the Constitution says and not just what Republicans, Democrats or Libertarians think it says.

Who's with me?

 **42**  · [flag](#)[Dara L. Grieger](#) · 2 months ago 

While it's not possible to entirely divorce ourselves from our own political views, I know it IS possible to have respectful discussions with people from all viewpoints. I share your hope that the discussions on this board will be civil and respectful. I, for one, plan to conduct myself in this manner.

 **13**  · [flag](#)[James P Morgan Sr](#) · a month ago 

After reading the different forum comments for the last 7 days, I personally have decided to not read any comments from the "ANONYMOUS" postings. Iff you do not believe in your postings and are not willing to add your nme to what you write, why shuld i read it? .

 **3**  · [flag](#)[Anonymous](#) · a month ago 

not believe in your postings

under the Sauk Alinsky model, Rules for Radicals, Alinsky was a Marxist or socialist... whatever term you prefer... what you do when a person says something you dont like is, to demonize the person and take the attention away from the issue. Thus Ken Starr was out of

control rather to suppress the fact Clinton used the DOJ to deny Paula Jones her legal rights.

↑ -3 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

Exactly!

I am a different Anonymous but when arguing with liberals, anonymity helps to keep the discussion within the topic at hand vs the demonization of opponents. As I said, the trend here seems to be that all "Anonymous" are of a conservative political persuasion, while the majority (though not all) of those "showing off" their names are liberals.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

That's interesting. Where I spend most of my time online it is the opposite, conservatives insult liberals. "Showing off" to me means ownership, not bragging, but I also understand not wanting your name out there if you are in a position where any opinion online is seen as negative.

What I'd like to see, aside from no sweeping partisan insults, is at least a first name and last initial so we know who we are talking to. It is really frustrating to not know if you are addressing the same person.

BTW - This entire thread is exactly what I'd hoped to avoid.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

It is clear that this is a class populated mostly by liberals with a liberal professor, so anonymity is key to have an intelligent discussion on matters that the professor and his followers are going to take an ideological angle, like calling the Obamacare penalty a tax (the prof wrote a Q&A for Yale asking for that in the aftermath of the Obamacare oral hearing and before the final decision was public; he was part of the overall "bully Roberts to change his mind" effort that gave us Obamacare). You cannot have an honest discussion with such people unless they have no way to attack you personally. They are forced to deal with the merits of the arguments.

↑ -2 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

This is the Q&A that I was referring to <http://www.law.yale.edu/news/15229.htm> . The prof was

part of the overall effort to bully Roberts into changing his mind. So, we need the anonymity pal, if we are to challenge him and his followers effectively on the merits.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · a month ago 🔒

**You cannot have an honest discussion with such people unless they have no way to attack you personally. They are forced to deal with the merits of the arguments.**

Well, I'm liberal and I think I've been pretty reasonable so far. So far I've seen liberals being predominantly insulted, not conservatives.

You cannot even give a fake name so we can get some kind of idea whether we are talking to the same person? It is very difficult to talk to someone when you don't know who you are talking to.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · a month ago 🔒

Let's put it this way. Several surveys confirm that conservatives know the liberal point of view (even when they disagree with it) better than the other way around, just an example <http://hotair.com/archives/2012/04/13/confirmed-conservatives-understand-liberal-positions-better-th...> . There are many others.

As to why this is the case, we only have speculation. I think that there is some merit to the idea that because the overwhelming majority of the media, except for Fox News , the WSJ and a few other outlets, lean left, liberals take for granted that what they hear there is "unbiased". Conservatives, on the other hand, hear that and what conservative outlets say. The difference between the editorial lines of ABC News, NBC News, CBS News, PBS, NPR and MSNBC is one of degree not of fundamental differences. So a liberal who doesn't watch media with a different angle might come to the conclusion that "the liberal point of view" is an "objective point of view".

Those of us with a different angle who, in addition, live in areas where liberals outnumber conservatives, are forced to constantly challenge our own assumptions, so we are better at understanding the opponent point of view.

Precisely because we understand the liberal point of view better, giving out our names here would be professional suicide :D.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Steven Stone · a month ago 🔒

I don't have a problem with the professor being blatantly liberal partisan as long as the lectures are taught in a non partisan way. So far they have not and I find them very interesting.

↑ 3 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

You've just spewed a lot of hokum. I would contend that all passive media bring nothing to the debate except labels. Surely you can do better for your conservative views than appeal to Faux News. I'd be embarrassed if I relied on what YOU say are liberal networks for my views. FOX, CNN, CNBC ABC NBC et al are infotainment. in fact, almost all communication outlets in this country are now in the hands of multi-national corporations who went slumming in news business. Whatever label you care to apply to them. I smell the sort of paranoia that leads a man to become a 2nd amendment nut (defined as someone who will appeal to this right to defend himself against his government, but keeps his yap shut when sending soldiers off to die in imbecilic, useless wars - or who has no problem with the whole security apparatus the last Republican president unleashed upon the people (Department of Homeland Security)) In the end I'm left scratching me head wondering if it is not just really about 'boys with their toys'.

↑ -4 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

2nd amendment nut? you must have missed it when people called me a 1st amendment nuts and wanted to limit free speech as opposed to just seceding from the discussion. and when we will get to the rest of the amendments I will have to plead guilt as well for embracing them. The idea that they were needed at all was rejected by some saying no one in their right mind would ever try to claim the government would limit this or that right.

Of course now with modern liberalism the Bill of Rights is one our last defenses for freedom.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

Hello Anon,

The insults that follow your "I smell the sort of paranoia that leads a man..." is the reason I remain anonymous :D. You know nothing about me. Only after expressing a few well reasoned thoughts you feel entitled to label me with a great deal of preposterous epithets.

So let's keep the conversation on topic to be sure, but if there was any doubt as to why those with my line of thought need to remain anonymous, you did a pretty damn good job at dissipating them!

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

So who was it who stated -> ""I smell the sort of paranoia that leads a man..." certainly not first by me.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Steven Stone · [a month ago](#) 🔒

People should start naming themselves Anonymous 1, Anonymous 2, etc. so at least we know who or what we are responding to.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag



Jennifer cuddy · [a month ago](#) 🔒

I thought it was inappropriate to post a discussion asking, " Any Ron Paul fans out there?"

↑ -2 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

Do you favor abolishing the 1st Amendment?

↑ 0 ↓ · flag



Jennifer cuddy · [a month ago](#) 🔒

Obviously, no. Do tell me, do you think hate speech should be allowed in the workforce for the sake of free speech, or would you find racist slurs against co workers inappropriate and counterproductive?

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

hate speech seems to be speech the politically correct don't care for.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

my favorite Seattle Seahawk is Richard. People, termed his mocking of Eric Crabtree to be hate speech. I thought it was just good fun and he was trying to psych out the Broncos and it worked.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag



Jennifer cuddy · a month ago

Is that a yes or no?

↑ -1 ↓ · flag



Jennifer cuddy · a month ago

Btw...How on Earth is not stating your name freeing you from being harassed? Quite the opposite, I think. Using "anonymous" gives you free reign to abuse people in the forums. It takes guts to stand by your words in an honest manner. Only cowards hide their identities in public debate. If you are right and have evidence to support your defense, you wouldn't hide.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · a month ago

there must be a reason for the convention ... most likely resulting from the followers of Saul Alinsky.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag



Jennifer cuddy · a month ago

Well, that "convention" won't help you here, nor will it if you aim to run for public office in our Democracy. People have to VOTE for you, and in order to do so, they must know who you are.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · a month ago

I am one of the Anonymous. I have no intention whatsoever of running for office. Not everybody is that egomaniac. I am concerned though that government can get out of control, as it is currently with the NSA/FISA Court.

↑ -2 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · a month ago

I have a question for Anon #?, who posted this 2 days ago:

"Precisely because we understand the liberal point of view better, giving out our names here would be professional suicide."

I don't quite understand what you mean. Are you saying you would experience discrimination

in your professional life due to expressing conservative views in this forum? And, how does that relate the idea that conservatives understand the liberal pov better than the reverse? Thanks.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag



Vara Sue Tamminga · a month ago 🔗

I do not think we should minimize this blatant racism by suggesting that insulting terms of dehumanization are merely politically incorrect. When the N word is used to refer to black people or a swastika painted on a Jewish person's house or a cross burned on the lawn of a Black church these are considered, properly so, as hate crimes and can be prosecuted because they not only insult and demean someone like a racist or sexist joke, but they also threaten harm and violence. We are waking up to the long history of religious persecution practiced in this country, eroding our constitution and basic human freedoms. The covert system which insults and threatens and carries out physical and emotional violence is very real but it is cleverly hidden as suspicious illnesses which may be gotten at any restaurant through poisons, or as suspicious accidents or sabotage of vehicles or terms or symbols every bit as threatening and frightening as swastikas. If we are to preserve human rights we must confront those who practice ethnic cleansing right in front of our noses in hospitals and in the media. And we must prosecute churches and media channels or organizations who endlessly promote this vicious, ancient practice. It is as old as slavery, it is NOT merely politically incorrect unless you want to call slavery politically incorrect. But slaves had an advantage over the victims of concentration camps, slaves were considered valuable property, whereas Jews were systematically exterminated only 70 years ago, in my parents' lifetimes.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · a month ago 🔗

Ok, let's start with my favorite SeaHawk, Richard Sherman. He said using the word thug was a substitute for the N word. Let's say almost all people playing the "knockout game" are of his race. What should we call them now that thug = the N word. Should Blacks be prohibited from using the "N" word too? You never hear about the "knock out" game in the media except for the Drudge Report and Fox News (Faux News as the fascist left calls it).

Oliver Stone can finance lousy a lousy uninteresting history based on a Marxist world view and it gets on TV. Matt Damon gets to praise Marxist Howard Zinn and it gets into theaters. Elia Kazan, (On the Waterfront - an allegory of Hollywood being taken over by Stalinists) gets a lifetime achievement award because of Karl Malden and guys like Spielberg and Ed Harris and Nick Nolte glower with hate on their faces and don't applaud. So access to speech is controlled virtually 100% by the left. Colleges - profs are almost 100% hard left and K12 education not far behind. We have 4 justices on SCOTUS ready to strip away our freedom and sometimes a Roberts will stab us in the back and call something a tax and not a tax at the same time.

I don't want to give mine up what free speech I have left to you.

I thought Sherman had a perfect right to say what he said about Eric Crabtree and the 49ers.

From him getting all that attention I looked up his history and then learned he graduated very near or the top of his class in Compton and also graduated from Stanford with very high grades. Only thing that disappointed me in him was he later apologized for his speech. He should have the right to say whatever he wants short of limits on slander and libel and fire in a crowded theater etc- that is what the 1st Amendment is all about. The more people he irritated including the Broncos the funnier it was to me. Let Richard speak. I love the guy.

Two Blacks were out in front of Walmart the day after Sherman popped off. One was asking for money for the homeless and other was asking money for stopping gangs. I told them I loved gangs. Shocked they asked my how I could support gangs. I told them that Richard Sherman was my favorite SeaHawk and he sure sounds like a gangbanger and I loved the guy. They quickly got my point and one, the older guy, said that his dad told him that if you can do it you aren't bragging. Then I left without giving a donation and both said "God Bless You" ... meaning I affirmed them as individuals and we can love each other and also have freedom of speech.

How about let's put Bill Maher in prison for all the nasty things he says. I got a package from Charter (silver) that included HBO. So I was sending him my money. So I quickly cancelled my silver package even as I wanted some of the other choices in the package. That is how I deal with Bill. And people had the perfect right to boycott the Duck folks too. Oc course when I told Cracker Barrel I would no longer visit their places and 100s of thousands of others did too they turned on a dime.

Scarlett Johansen is being attacked by the Hollywood left for speaking for Soda Stream ... I am going to go out and buy one hoping the drink tastes good. I will help the employ of 500 Palestinians and she is soooo hot!

And Joe Namath is under attack from the PETA crowd for wearing his wonderful fur coat. Feminists do hate speech against men all the time.

And look what the fascist left calls Sarah Palin. Look how 75% of America thinks Sarah said she could see Russia from her home when Tina Fey said it on SNL. Since the left controls almost all speech and the media no wonder that they want to assault free speech and oppose Citizens United.

See ... attack on freedom comes mainly from the left and i haven't owned a slave for as long as I lived. From Indiana. We haven' owned slaves for as long as I know our

↑ -1 ↓ · flag



Jennifer cuddy · a month ago



In response to Anon (1?)

To recap, you are afraid to state your name in this free online course because you believe you will be personally targeted by the NSA for debating fellow students on Constitutional Law AND you think politicians are egomaniacs? Is that correct?

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

Jennifer, no, I am not giving my name because I live in a place where liberals are the majority and have a tendency to make the life of those they disagree with difficult. I am a "closeted conservative" if you will. People know that I am conservative but they don't know the depth of my stances on many issues, like the second amendment, my belief that Europe sucks and it is a doomed continent, etc. In my circles, Western Europe is the ultimate paradise. It begs the question of what the heck are they doing here instead of massively migrating to Europe. They have 20+ different versions of socialism to choose from. For some reason, they prefer to stay here, bash the US and continue to sell Western Europe as if it was some kind of Nirvana. It's been a long time that I stopped trying to understand the liberal mind. It's too irrational for my taste.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag



Jennifer cuddy · [a month ago](#) 🔒

I think it is irrational to make such sweeping stereotypical allegations that liberals are irrational just because they disagree with you. I'm not liberal per say, as I tend to be moderately conservative. I have seen many libertarians proclaim outlandishly racist and misogynist views. This is the problem with extremist views. Neither are consistently rational.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag



Jennifer cuddy · [a month ago](#) 🔒

Btw...are there people in your community who are taking this class who have harassed you for your beliefs?

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

It is not a sweeping stereotypical allegation, it is a fact. Because of my work, I am surrounded of highly educated people who got their degrees from places like Yale (I got mine from one such institution too). There are several studies that show that faculty members, and the highly educated in general, tilt to the left. I have seen them picking on conservatives and I have to say, thanks but no thanks. I don't have the stomach to face angry liberals upset by whatever I have said or I will say here.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag



Jennifer cuddy · a month ago 🔗

Stating your views here under anonymous or not simply makes no difference at all as to how others who are inclined to debate what you have to say. After all, you do not know me personally, and have only my thoughts to either agree or disagree with. In fact, many people here have stated that they will simply skip over anonymous posts. I do not think that helps your learning experience.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · a month ago 🔗

>And, how does that relate the idea that conservatives understand the liberal pov better than the reverse?

The media is controlled by the left as is the education system. To get a grade you have to regurgitate Marxism propaganda back to the professor. Large foundations formed by classic barons of industry like Ford, Carnegie and GM now all have boards controlled by operatives who are far left of the country. Hollywood s hard left. So yes, the rest of us now more about liberals than liberals know about Americans.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · a month ago 🔗

One thing about liberals, they have no idea they are liberal and believe in their heart of hearts that they are grounded in reality.

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · a month ago 🔗

JENNIFER:

How were you insulted? If people point out that liberals want the last word on everything how is that an insult rather than reality?

>Well, I'm liberal and I think I've been pretty reasonable so far. So far I've seen liberals being predominantly insulted, not conservatives.

Could you tell us how we can discuss what liberals do without you feeling personally insulted?

>You cannot even give a fake name so we can get some kind of idea whether we are talking to the same person?

Should I take that as an insult? Look speech codes on colleges where different groups get to be insulted and thus they can shut down free speech of others. The people claiming the right not to be insulted are all liberal. I don't see speech codes inscribed in the US Constitution.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [a month ago](#) 🔒

Roberts had his finger in the wind on Obamacare checking which way the wind is blowing. I don't think our prof has seen that the excuse for all liberal actions taken using the commerce clause got repealed at the same time Obamacare was ruled legal. But with Roberts the law really doesn't matter so if the going gets tough you can count on him to be bullied again.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

---

[+ Comment](#)

[Ray Strong](#) · [2 months ago](#) 🔒

I am with you

↑ 2 ↓ · flag

---

[+ Comment](#)

[Jason Grabner](#) · [2 months ago](#) 🔒

I agree. Let's make this about the law and not the political bias.

↑ 7 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · [2 months ago](#) 🔒

So there was all sorts of political wrangling at the start of the country and a great Civil War but now we all must just get along? Appears to be a very strong need to censorship is being expressed here. I prefer a lot of ideas including ones I don't like to challenge my thinking ... but that is just me.

Of course the other side is to blame. And don't leave out Marx and Jefferson and Hamilton, they share in the blame too.

Was that a civil post and ok with everyone for me to think these thoughts?

↑ -2 ↓ · flag

[Anonymous](#) · [2 months ago](#) 🔒

Challenging thinking is exactly why we are here.

There is no censorship from me. Feel free to say whatever you want. The forum admin may have something to say about it but I won't.

What I'd like to get out of this is an escape from the partisan bickering that seems to drive any political discourse. I see this as a challenge to myself to let go of who I voted for and examine the Constitution as a historical document. You are free to join me in this project. If you aren't interested, that's fine too.

It will be interesting to see how discussions evolve over time. I'm looking forward to it!

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago 🔒

If you want to avoid ideas you don't like then don't read something you don't agree with. Of course all comments should be within the rules. What you seem to be asserting is the right to not be uncomfortable by something you happen to read. What if I want that idea excluded from having to read what you just wrote?

↑ -1 ↓ · flag

Chris Waters · 2 months ago 🔒

To Anonymous

"If you want to avoid ideas you don't like then don't read something you don't agree with." From a practical standpoint, that is impossible. If you don't read a statement, you will never know whether or not you agree or disagree with the author's statement(s) or presentation of fact(s).

"What you seem to be asserting is the right to not be uncomfortable by something you happen to read." I would like to understand how you drew that conclusion based on Jennifer S.'s statement. My take is, she doesn't want to hear rank and file BS talk and just have a thoughtful discussion. Nothing she stated implies "the right not to be uncomfortable..."

Lets not kid ourselves here, we can all agree that in our current political climate, if a party leader says get inline behind this idea and/or opposition to this idea, the party's junior members, lobbyist and the rest of the rank and file will support their leader without consideration of the merits/implications of said idea.

However, I take it Jennifer would just like to discuss the merits, legalities and concepts behind such ideas while trying to eliminate or reduce bias/judgment of that idea by associated party affiliation. Jennifer, please correct me if I am wrong.

↑ 4 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

I'm not sure where you are getting this from. I'm not telling anyone how to talk, only looking for people who would be interested in having a conversation that isn't driven by who they voted for. Is that possible? I don't know but it will be fun to find out.

Do you have a hard time discussing a topic without insulting people, trolling or barreling over other people's opinions? If the answer is yes, I don't care to participate in a conversation with you.

I'm not uncomfortable with anything. I participate in an online forum where we have very strong partisan opinions thrown around and people write posts simply to inflame. I'm hoping to find a people who aren't interested in starting a flame war.

There is a lot of irrational talk in the media among people who consume it. One reason why I'm taking this is to get to the root of where our laws come from. That to me is very interesting.

You are free to start any thread you want, in any tone you want to start it in, and criticize any politician you feel deserves it. You are also free to not read threads I start if you aren't interested in what I have to say.

(Am I even talking to the same person through this?)

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Anonymous · 2 months ago

Spot on, Chris.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

---

[+ Comment](#)

Elizabeth DeMeis · 2 months ago

I hope that we can have good discussions without blaming the "other side" for everything that went wrong ever. I do think that some bias is always going to come through. The point is to be mature and respectful. No one wants to deal with name calling.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

---

[+ Comment](#)

Scarlett Hilton · 2 months ago

I for one don't expect to agree with everyone, that just isn't always possible. But that shouldn't mean we can't have calm and respectful discussions. After all, those discussions are one way to learn new facts and gain better understandings.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

---

[+ Comment](#)

Chris Waters · 2 months ago

I agree with all parties above, you cannot remove personal bias from public discourse when it comes to politics no matter your leaning. However, I like to argue for the sake of thought provoking conversation. So don't shoot the messenger when he says something unconventional. Hope this discussion board becomes fun and enlightening at the same time.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

---

[+ Comment](#)

Wilma Jeanne Merello · 2 months ago

I am in complete agreement with everyone so far. There is no reason not to have a civilized discussion - regardless of our personal political views. Differing opinions can often be very thought provoking, as long as nobody takes anything as a personal insult. With so many students in the class, there is no way we can hope for total agreement on any one view - so let's all just try to remember to use our good manners when we post. That way, we can all learn something new, and have a good time in the process.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

---

[+ Comment](#)

Sylvia Theall · 2 months ago

I agree with all of you. But perhaps before we get too caught up on different political viewpoints, we should concentrate more on the factual information provided by the Professor.

↑ 2 ↓ · flag

---

[+ Comment](#)



Jasmine Lim · 2 months ago

Hi all,

Well I suppose when we are all too passionate about something that's when we start to get defensive

(and personal) perhaps even unknowingly! So long as we can agree to disagree and take a step back to consider the viewpoints of others (no matter how different it may be), I'm pretty confident we would be able to have a productive (and respectful) discussion!

Cheers!

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

---

[+ Comment](#)

[Anonymous](#) · 2 months ago

I hope we can stay away from "But Obama is worse than Bush" or "Bush is worse than Obama" and instead focus on what the Constitutional issues are around some of the actions by contemporary Congress. I'm looking forward to respectful, mature discussion.

This is going to be a lot of fun!

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

[Anonymous](#) · 2 months ago

Amen-Jennifer--hope discussions will be thoughtful, respectful of others viewpoints and stay away from "agree with my ideas or your stupid" comments. I agree--this is going to be fun!

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[Chris Waters](#) · 2 months ago

President Clinton is the greatest of all time, period. There is no fact(s) that can dispute this sound logical reasoning, followed by President Obama. With all jokes asides, lets start the discussion with how one feels about the fifth amendment and eminent domain. This should be a good party starter!

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

---

[+ Comment](#)

[JoAnn Young](#) · 2 months ago

I absolutely agree that we need to have civil discussions. I don't expect everyone to agree with my just like I probably won't agree with everything from you. I do believe that civil discussion is something that is sadly lacking today in this country regardless of what side of any issue that is being discussed.

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

---

[+ Comment](#)

Sylvia Theall · 2 months ago

I received three rather critical responses to my comment that I hoped we would be able to stay on track to the course content rather than stooping to political wrangling. In other Coursera courses I have taken, I have found that these discussion forums almost often are filled with individuals are more interested in expressing their views rather than learning the course material. Perhaps these individuals in this course can wait to express their views in the peer graded papers we are supposed to write later. I am amused that there are already so many critical remarks when we have just completed reading the Preamble. Peace people!

↑ 1 ↓ · flag

Edward L Dunlay · 2 months ago

Great course by one of the authorities in the field but 30 minutes of my life perusing comments here, which I am never going to get back, convinces me (again) that forums in these courses are actually detrimental to learning.

↑ 3 ↓ · flag

Sylvia Theall · 2 months ago

I agree, Edward. A few of the forum comments are actually thought provoking leading one to consider another point of view on the subject. But as you say, as in other Coursera courses I've taken--most are simply a waste of time and detrimental to considering the subject matter.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

Michael Riccio Signature Track · 2 months ago

Sylvia, probably discussing differing political opinions/positionns the peer assessments would be the worse possible place to discuss our views since we can be easily punished (by our peers) through the scoring system, and they can do so anonymously. I also hope we can have intelligent and thought provoking conversations and know that what ,and how ,we post will realistically be somewhat slanted by our political views, no matter how hard we try. Mutual respect is the key. I am still confused however, why some people post as "anonymous". I don't think any one signed the Declaration of Independence as "anonymous".

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)



Esteban Ortiz Durán Signature Track · 2 months ago

I'm with you. We can discuss the american constitution with different perspectives, but I think this course its principal by a pure law approach, and in this way should be. And either, we must respect all points of view.



↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Cynthia Blanco · 2 months ago

I agree with Jennifer. Her statement does not imply censorship - that's an exaggeration of what she's really trying to say. When we discuss issues like gun ownership, gay marriage, healthcare reform, etc., all we seem to be doing lately is talking *at* each other. Therefore, we never really analyze the issue at hand with any real depth. Once the partisan bickering commences, each side is just formulating a response rather than actually listening. It's very unproductive.

Hopefully we can avoid that here!

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)



James P Morgan Sr · 2 months ago

After reading the above comments, it seems that almost everyone agrees that the discussions should not get personal and must avoid negative remarks about the comments that others express. If you don't agree with them, explain why logically, not emotionally. Remember we are all supposed to be educated and rational people taking this course for our education, not political ideology. I hope your comments educate me and make me think.

↑ 2 ↓ · flag

Michael Riccio

Signature Track

· 2 months ago

very true james

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Cole Edward Hillier · 2 months ago

I think that a lot of people taking this course probably do have strong political leanings that will rear themselves during discussions. I think this is natural. It seems silly to think that there wouldn't be political debate in a Constitutional Law class. I personally love a good, well-reasoned debate. However, I think the truth is what everyone should be interested in getting at, and so every opinion expressed should be backed with relevant facts.

↑ 2 ↓ · flag

---

[+ Comment](#)

Janique Jones · 2 months ago

this course has bombarded me with vast amount of information that is very educational. It teaches you about the history of the Senate and House Of Representatives and gives you brief information about the Preamble.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

---

[+ Comment](#)

M B "Bud" Fields Jr DMA · 2 months ago

I can come at this course from many angles. One of the more important of those, however, is for me to set aside 40 years of political life. I wish to encounter this course only as "*citizen*". It may be seen as a nationalist viewpoint. If so, so be it. One of the greatest of all great damages done to the US democracy of late has been either the inability, or the unwillingness of her citizens to simply talk with dignity, respect and honor to one another.

It is for this reason that I affirm the position of the OP, and hope that I can remember, or at least relearn how it all got started, and why. The mood and reality prior to the beginnings of the American Revolution, the environment of the discourse surrounding the founding documents, and what it is that makes our American Constitution still a living document are of great interest to me. These may only be my goals, but at least they are mine. Good luck to everyone on the journey.

And, having participated in online learning for a while now, reasonable discourse is always possible--IF the participants require it by their own words. If we could begin with just that agreement, I think we will all go far in this course. Claiming your own words with your name would lend credence and dignity to the conversation, as well; this remains an individual choice.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

---

[+ Comment](#)

Janique Jones · 2 months ago

its good to gain knowledge and understanding about this whole political issue so we can know exactly how to speak about politics and not blame our very own people

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

---

[+ Comment](#)

↓ scroll down for more ↓

Will we be able to have a non-partisen discus...

<https://class.coursera.org/conlaw-001/forum/...>