

1. The major thesis to the “yes” side of the anabolic steroid argument is that the use of anabolic steroids has serious health consequences. The use of these illegal performance enhancing drugs is popular amongst young athletes and should be tested for.
2. The major thesis of the “no” side is that anabolic steroid use is that the health dangers of using the drugs have been over exaggerated and there has not been adequate enough research done on the effects of their use to label them bad or good.
3. Glen Cook gives two facts concerning the use of steroids; only thirteen percent of High Schools in the U.S. have drug testing policies and between 1994 and 2002 the number of teenagers who admitted using steroids doubled.
4. Ken Caminiti was the first professional baseball player to admit to using anabolic steroids during his career. In 1990 Congress passed The Anabolic Steroids Control Act.
5. The reasons the author gives for Taylor Hooton taking his life are a matter of opinion. The author writes that coaches ignore the problem of steroid use among student athletes.
6. The author writes that the bans on steroid use in sports are based on moral concerns rather than the actual effects of the drugs. Aggression caused by increased testosterone shown in animals doesn’t apply to human beings.
7. It is a fallacy to write that Taylor Hooton took his life as a result of steroid use. It is just not possible to reasonably assume that there is no other reason or possible explanation for the teen’s death. The author presents this as fact, which is based on assumption and misleading support of his argument.

8. The author argues that the question about steroid use should be aimed at what kind of performance is gained by using them rather than if the players are using them. This is a fallacy because the argument does more to cover up the real issue rather than address it. If the steroids are illegal for whatever reason than there is no reason to gauge the performance gain. The comparison would be nearly impossible to measure, something the author probably realizes.

9. Personally I feel that to encourage or even permit the use of steroids in competitive sports would be unethical. The argument that supports the use of steroids is a convincing one to read, given the evidence he presents concerning the negative health effects. The argument against steroid use lacked some evidence to support the thesis. I was not wholly convinced of the negative effects of steroids, but both authors did admit that there are some negative side effects. I don't agree with the idea of allowing teenagers to use drugs or to think that it is acceptable. I guess that the message is already there to some degree. Taking a drug such as Viagra for erectile dysfunction might be considered the same as using steroids that improve self esteem and performance.

10. Actually the argument for the use of steroids was more convincing empirically, although it is against my better judgment to agree with the idea. The article against didn't really convince me that the use of steroids was dangerous and seemed more emotion evoking than empirical. Cook writes about the teenager who took his life and uses that as evidence to support the negative health effects of steroids.

11. A possible reason for Cook's bias in the article could be that he feels that drug use is morally wrong and unethical. He may have a number of reasons for feeling that way. It could be his upbringing, religious beliefs or personal experience that influenced his opinion. I think that he is probably an educator or a politician, since he boasts about the steps being taken in

education and policy. That would also influence his opinion, either to please constituents or pat himself on the back.