

HST 203: History of the United States Sp14 (Escobar Meta 41237 41238)

Home ► My courses ► Spring 2014 ► HST 203 Sp14 (Escobar Meta 41237 41238) ► May 26 - June 1 ►

Forum 4 ► Rights, Rights, and More Rights

Search forums

Forum 4

Display replies in nested form Move this discussion to ...

< Previous (Environmentalism as Re...)

(Military Industrial Co...) Next >



Rights, Rights, and More Rights

by Joe Escobar - Thursday, May 22, 2014, 8:44 AM

This forum thread is for the Rights, Rights, and More Rights discussion.

After studying the required materials, address the questions in your posts.

To make your POSTS, click the reply link in this, MY post.

To reply to another student's post, be sure to click the reply link within in THEIR post.

IMPORTANT - SUBJECT LINES

BE SURE to use an informative subject line for your post. Do NOT simply leave it RE: Rights, Rights, and More Rights

Sum of ratings: -

Edit | Delete | Reply



Between Having and Enforcing Rights

by Robert Johnson - Monday, May 26, 2014, 8:36 PM

I can agree with the listed definitions of rights, and I believe the importance of those rights. Unalienable rights, for example the pursuit of life, liberty and happiness is a moral entitlement I would agree.

I believe other rights such as civil rights, are in place and can be exercised, in order to achieve, and enjoy these unalienable rights, for individual's who realize and understand them.

We have learned in class that having rights is not the same as those rights being enforced. Through our history book, some examples include the civil rights movement and even the reconstruction period after the civil war.

As to the question, do any human beings actually have the rights, as explained in our material? to me this is a big question, one that I'm going to be thinking about.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Rights by whos standards?

by Alexis Adair - Monday, May 26, 2014, 10:36 PM

I agree with the concept of rights. Rights are our entitlement as Wikipedia had said, whether it is legal or moral. The societal rights I think would be considered a "slippery slope." For example the civil rights act was passed which as stated in the chapter "The act also prohibited racial discrimination in all public accommodations connected to interstate commerce, such as motels and restaurants." However this was an act granting people, who were already citizens to begin with, their rights. Which in the Wikipedia definition states that already citizens are granted with such rights as long as they are "complying with the law."

I think this follows into Illegal immigration rights. When looking at the second cartoon I admittedly laughed. What made it funny to me was that I feel that it has truth to it. The illegal immigrants are demanding that they not be treated as second-class citizens, demanding that they too be given the rights that actual citizens have. Which made me think of a cartoon that was shown in class, where there were illegal immigrants crawling under the little border fence and going from booth to booth being given rights to things such as education and health care.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



People who live in Fence Houses should not throw? got nuthN

by Kenneth Green - Tuesday, May 27, 2014, 8:41 PM

Important to remember not all "illegals" crawled under a fence we built to keep them on their side of the Pacos, (after our Government decided they wanted Mexico's land btw.) (There are over a million Asian illegals, and hundreds of thousands European illegals who never crawled under a fence.) And the Arizona Law is not just about asking for a Driver's License but actually empowering Law Enforcement to stop perfectly legal citizens and ask for their "papers." Especially if they have dark skin. That's a scary precedent in any society.

The issue is about Push/Pull. They wouldn't be here if they weren't working and contributing not only their families back home, but in vast majority of cases to our own society. But once they are here, there is no path to citizenship.

It's just way too easy for FoxNews to ramp this up without any understanding of the dynamics whatsoever and encourage viewers to grab a shotgun and head for the border! And build a dadgum bigger fence!

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Fences don't discriminate nor do laws

by Jesse Flannery - Wednesday, May 28, 2014, 9:33 PM

"Illegals" regardless of their original nationality are still illegal aliens. I myself find it hard to argue for someone who technically broke the law to get here in the first place. Regardless of how you paint the picture illegal immigration is against the law. You can argue that yes they are contributing to society, but the bottom line is the initial breaking of the law. I'm not saying I want to keep any race out of the country, but I am a firm believer in if you work hard, and keep a goal in mind you will get there. Coming here legally is feasible. I don't know how hard it is to become a citizen. I myself have never had to deal with anything like that. I do know that people do it. Is it fair for a legal citizen to share rights with illegal citizens? I don't think that seems right.

Based on this chart from Wikipedia I sort of understand why we may focus our energy mainly on Mexican immigrants not to say any illegal immigrant deserves different treatment. They are all equally illegal.

Country of origin	Raw number	Percent of total	Percent change 2000 to 2
Mexico	6,650,000	62%	+42%
El Salvador	530,000	5%	+25%
Guatemala	480,000	4%	+65%
Honduras	320,000	3%	+95%
Philippines	270,000	2%	+33%
India	200,000	2%	+64%
Korea	200,000	2%	+14%
Ecuador	170,000	2%	+55%
Brazil	150,000	1%	+49%
China	120,000	1%	-37%
Other	1,650,000	15%	-17%

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Oh, I think that they do!!!



by Bart Golden - Friday, May 30, 2014, 11:28 PM

I have to disagree with your statement **laws don't discriminate**, I think this whole term we have been looking and situation after situation were laws were in place but not enforced, or on the other hand rights were taken away unconstitutionally, from voting writes too free speech. In my opinion if your going to make policy of the laws the laws the law well then it should count for all laws not just the ones that certain groups with more power favor. Basically I'm saying that laws do discriminate horribly and I personally think that is a far bigger problem than illegals crossing our borders .

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Fences don't discriminate nor do laws



by Kenneth Green - Saturday, May 31, 2014, 11:15 PM

Jesse I could have used your help in my Technical Writing class this term! That is an excellent table. I understand the Conservative perspective on this issue, but again it comes down to the push/pull of economics and how our own Government (as we've read in the last few chapters) actually helped create the problem of illegal immigration, often by proping up awful dictators. Why was Communism so bad in Central America if it created a (not higher) but maybe better system for poorer countries?

Having lived in Phoenix, it just pisses me off that one of my dark skinned friends could be stopped on a street corner and asked for his/her "papers." I get the Rush Limbaugh listener, he's listening to AM radio as he works his arss off, and feels like people are trying to take away his own standard of living to feed the world. I pulled green chain at the old Davidson Industries in Mapleton, it's hard to sing kumbaya when your staring at fresh cut old growth heading your way. (Then get your paycheck and discover you are feeding the world.) I get it.

But I prefer NPR, and there was a recent report about how apple growers in Washington state can't find enough lighter skinned folks who complain how illegals are "taking our jobs," to bring in a harvest. Why not take the emotion out of the issue, just admit the system is broken and fix it? Where was the rule of law when, as we just read, Reagan was breaking it to defeat the Sandinistas? Law is a funny thing, we often obey the ones we like and break the ones we hate. All of us.

I have no problem with a Mexican crossing the border illegally to pick apples in Washington so he can send a few pennies home. Just sayin'.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



No need for a moat



by Alexis Adair - Thursday, May 29, 2014, 10:43 PM

I by no means meant to isolate "all immigrants" to just Hispanics. I had only referred to the cartoon that we had seen. Which at that was just a basic idea, cause though there are illegals coming from everywhere we share that border with Mexico which is why it is pinpointed in most every case. When it comes down to Arizona it is kind of reassuring to see that there is that step to action when it comes to illegals. Although, to request that of someone because they are dark skinned is against their own rights. When it comes to "Rights" and "Illegals" the ground gets shaken up because in trying to enforce it people will feel that their rights are being taken away. Maybe me being a white female, never having to prove my citizenship, just don't understand on that level, but the law is the law and to me it does not seem right to give someone who is illegal the same rights

as someone who is.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: No need for a moat

by Amanda Daniels - Friday, May 30, 2014, 6:39 PM

I would just like to say that not ALL illegal immigrants committed an illegal act in order to get here. There are approximately 1.75 million of immigrants that have been brought to this country by their parents when they were small children and obviously unable to make their own decisions about where to live and these people are being denied citizenship and in some cases deported back to these countries where they have never been except for as a small child, often times they no longer even have family members there to help them once they are brought back to that country. I don't see how anyone can deny them the same rights we all have but they do everyday and I personally know people who are directly affected by this. This issue goes a lot further than just some illegals slipping under a fence to get here.

It's a tough call because obviously you can't just let everyone in but at the same time they are so desperate to get here they are willing to give up anything to do it. It really sucks, it seems like the solution would be to try and structure other countries the same as the United States, but without completely taking over governments or violently forcing what we considered civilized or our way of life upon the people there. It seems like the logical thing to do as a country, but it just isn't that simple. It's sad that we have to actually write it down how people should treat one another it seems as though people should just know its wrong to enslave others or that its wrong to tourcher or kill someone, or to oppress a whole country of people but I guess they don't that's why they had to write it down in the first place.

I think there is a degree of responsibility that comes along with having rights and the biggest one being to learn what they are, exercise them and never give them up to anyone. Many men have given their lives fighting for the rights we have today and it is crazy to see people so foolishly willing to give up their rights often times out of fear or just plain and simple ignorance . There is far more security in learning what your rights are and learning to use

them in your favor, rather than simply giving them up to someone else and depend on them to be honest and keep you safe.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



upholding rights

by Emily Kiernan - Monday, May 26, 2014, 11:00 PM

I agree with the definition of rights that was listed in the Wikipedia reading. As we have talked about in class previously there is a vast difference between simply having rights and enforcing those rights. Like the video clip mentions people often forget that along with our rights comes the necessity for governance and "implementing policy".

Ultimately rights are a social norm fabricated to uphold morals and ethical standards that are intended to make our society a better place. However, I don't think that the idea and concept of rights is one that is straight forward and easy to define.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Illusion of Rights

by Matthew Wunderlin - Tuesday, May 27, 2014, 12:00 PM

For the most part I tend to agree that as a citizen of the United States I do have rights. Although it's hard to determine whether or not we actually do, because I think that rights tend to vary from person to person so it ends up becoming one of those undefinable terms. Sure, we have freedom of speech in the United States, just look at the Westboro Baptist Church and all of the hate they spew, but they are protected under the first amendment. Then look at the one man who made the video on his hatred towards the Muslim religion and posted it on youtube and gets arrested for causing a riot which ultimately led to our ambassador of Libya. Except the catch there is that the video was blocked in every other country other than the United States, and there were no riots. So the fact that we are suppose to have rights but the government dictates what those rights actually are is suspect. Mostly because the government doesn't do anything consistently with little or no bias.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Human Rights > Citizen Rights

by Jennifer Rose - Tuesday, May 27, 2014, 12:02 PM

I strongly believe that human rights are extremely important. I believe that all humans are entitled to what they need to survive: food, shelter, medical care, and safety. ALL humans, whether or not they happen to have a piece of paper that says they're affiliated with a certain country. People who don't have that piece of paper may not be citizens of the US of A but that doesn't mean they aren't human beings, just like you and me, who deserve to be treated with respect. They, as humans are also entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of

happiness, to borrow a certain phrase.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Beam Me Up, Scotty

by Kenneth Green - Tuesday, May 27, 2014, 8:15 PM

This is a very interesting and controversial subject, dating back to Samaria, Greece and Rome. It was the Twelve Tablets that codified legal rights and responsibilities (Law) leading into Western Civilization, but once Rome fell the meaning of "rights" have ebbed and flowed from the Feudal System, to the Magna Charta, to the outset of Liberalism (Locke, Paine and Rousseau,) to the Declaration of Independence, to the 14th Amendment, to the 19th Amendment, to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, to Row V. Wade, to the Citizens United Decision. The one constant seems to be that once Legal or Civil Rights are granted whether it be a Corporation's right to spend unlimited amounts of money to elect a candidate, or an LGBT couple's right to get married: they are damned hard to take away. By this paradigm it would appear that Natural Rights are ever expanding and it is the legal system that continually finds the "enlightenment" to recognize these rights.

And why not? We all just live a short span on a planet in a solar system, in a galaxy in a universe. Natural Rights should be expanded to include food, water, and a "legal" place to go to the bathroom. (The expansion of human rights discussed in the video.) It was John Stuart Mill (1806-1873) who championed the "do no harm" principle, and this Forum is too limited to debate Philosophy. But the idea of expanding human rights can be so egregious to some in Society because they feel their Legal Rights expand beyond the "do no harm" principle into downright entitlement of Earth's resources. We always speak of entitlement these days in terms of the "poor" or social welfare. But we only live on one Planet and the rights of Property only include the current occupants, not the former. So I believe the expansion of "rights" has to do with an enlightenment brought about by Science, broader social interaction, and a greater study of human history.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Do we actually have rights?

by Michael Brown - Thursday, May 29, 2014, 10:50 PM

During class, we watched the video where National Guardsmen started unloading on peaceful protesters of the war in Vietnam. I think the protesters should be entitled to their opinion on the war, whether right or wrong. A similar event occurred at Berkeley in 2011, but no one was killed. Clearly, our rights are not clear as they are written. This is what I can expect from our government. Wow, and to think that some poor soldiers died many years ago for our freedom. We are not free. I do think there are many legitimate police officers out there, but it only takes a few to give them all a bad name. Check out the video from our fine police officers that are supposed to protect citizens.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=B_f06VQOkI4

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Do we actually have rights?

by Dakarai Hightower - Saturday, May 31, 2014, 11:47 PM

Yes thats true we may have the constitution and the bill of rights, but is it really effective when our own government feels they are above the documents that made this country? Our own government that tries to find loop holes in the documents that guarantee Americans our rights. Like the separate but equal law. All Americans are born equal, and what classifies someone as an American is to born in the US. But they still treated african americans like they were foreigners, not even foreigners more like they were less than foreigners. And although the federal government did what they could to fix this, the local governments(more so in the south) were still treating these Americans pretty much to the equivalent of that of shit.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Right to Stand Up and Fight

by Robert Johnson - Friday, May 30, 2014, 3:55 PM

To me the single most important question here about our rights is, do we, or have we ever really had any?

To me without question, all human kind are entitled to, and born with the unalienable rights as defined in the forum material. These most essential human rights, at least in America, are and have been supported on paper at least.

The 14th Amendment, for example in our material, clearly states the rights of citizens. So to me, this is to question the actual reality of our constitution.

It may not be perfect, or always smooth, but we have things like The Constitution, or Bill of Rights, in which many have already fought for, that are signed into law, in order that all may live with true equality.

In this country, if a person's rights are being abridged, that paper, although it doesn't enforce itself, it at least provides a legal foundation for one to stand on, and in one way or another fight to enforce those rights.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Right to Stand Up and Fight

by Amanda Daniels - Friday, May 30, 2014, 11:55 PM

I would like to point out that in other countries things like medical care are not given to us simply because we are Americans if fact if you get sick in another country you better have your credit card because your insurance is unless there, so we don't have

to provide medical care to all these immigrants we should be offering whatever there own country is offering or something along those lines, like their country should have to pay us and reimburse our doctors for their medical care if provided by American doctors

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Freedom plus Democracy equals Rights



by Robert Johnson - Saturday, May 31, 2014, 4:28 PM

Since at least back in 1620, people have come here to America for a life of freedom. Take the Mayflower for example, p. 65. Even back then, separatist's seeking freedom of religion, to be able to freely worship differently than the church of England required, seems like a right to me.

Since that time back then, besides money, freedom and rights have been big attractant's to America, for people around the world coming here, trying to live the dream, peacefully all together in one country. So we then have a democracy

I think the best way for a free democracy to work equally for all, is for all to have equal rights. Even if we have to protect our rights, or fight for them first, we do have rights, and a system of law to enforce those rights if need be.

One example of the court protecting personal rights, a controversial abortion case. A supreme court over ruled the state, and defended women's " right to privacy ", in **Roe v. Wade** (1973) p.1011.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



No right if there is no practice of rights.



by Linh Tran - Saturday, May 31, 2014, 7:13 PM

In response to the question of whether or not throughout history, people did actually possess "rights," one of the aspects that I find myself quite relate to this problem is religion (after reading so much about environmentalism as religion in the other forum topic). Back in the founding period of the country, the first ever amendment established in the national governing document – the Constitution is the right to freedom of religion. Having the law of the land that early in history, we would expect people to acknowledge their right as well as others' right, particularly religious rights. But the problem seems to occur when people seek their own right but not others'. There are many examples that can prove my point. One of the most related to this class might be American nativism with the branch of anti-Catholic. With the view of nativism in mind, Americans had spread hatred and prejudice among many groups of people. We sure can remember the case of Sacco and Vanzetti who got executed because of the hatred from nativism mindsets. The first amendment was set in 1790s but not until 1960s – almost 200 years later, the United States has the first Catholic president, still he faced lots of struggles for being Catholic himself. Think again about freedom of religion? Is there such as thing? The point I am trying to make is that if there is a right established but the majority, including people who govern the country, don't practice it - practice for themselves, and more importantly, practice the right for other people – there is

no right to this right.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Right... I heard of that once.

by Dakarai Hightower - Saturday, May 31, 2014, 11:13 PM

I believe that my rights are enforced but to a certain degree. In class, we watched a video about the Kent state massacre. In the video the government didnt allow the students of kent state their right to assemble. The studdents were just organizing a peaceful protest and were gathering in the courtyard area of the school, where they were not informed that they were not allowed to protest. Its the actions like this by my government that concern me in regarding our rights. They say that we have all of our rights and then the government can just go and decide when we can and cant do something. It makes me question the knowledge of how much power they have.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Society and Culture influence rights

by Kevin Wright - Saturday, May 31, 2014, 11:45 PM

I think the way you define a right is dependent upon the society and culture in which people live. The rights people have in the United States are not all the same as those in other countries. The UK has a bill of rights similar to ours in some ways but it is more closely tied to the Monarchy and the crown.

I would agree with the wiki article and how they define human rights. I think it makes sense that everyone in civilization has certain rights or privileges simply because they are people living on this planet. Being apart of the Human race has it's benefits and disadvantages. Yes, humans have rights in which we are inherently born with and at the same time these rights can be taken away from you by someone, group, or government. The judicial branch of the US government is one way to uphold our rights as US citizens so that they aren't easily taken away by the laws we pass. However, our rights can still be taken away. Religion has its own influence on the rights we possess today as well as scientific thoughts and ideas. I guess anything in our culture and society can influence the way we perceive our rights as humans. Though the core rights, defined pure and un-influenced, are going to be the same anywhere you are born, the only difference is whether or not you have someone standing up for your rights and allowing you to practice those rights un-inhibited.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

< Previous (Environmentalism as Re...)

(Military Industrial Co...) Next >

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Logout)

