

# HST 203: U.S. History Sp18 (Escobar Meta 41002 43590)

[Home](#) / [My courses](#) / [HST 203 Sp18 \(Escobar Meta 41002 43590\)](#) / [Week 9](#) / [Forum 4](#)  
/ [Rights, Rights, Rights](#)



## Forum 4 Rights, Rights, Rights

[Subscribe](#)[The Military-Industrial Complex](#) ►

### Rights, Rights, Rights

by [Joe Escobar](#) - Friday, May 25, 2018, 7:11 AM

This thread is for discussions on the Rights, Rights, Rights topic.

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, something that describes which one of the questions you are addressing. Do NOT simply leave it RE: Rights, Rights, Rights

Sum of ratings: -

[Permalink](#) | [Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Eisenhower upholding the right for integrated schools



by [Sydney Plaza](#) - Friday, May 25, 2018, 5:28 PM

A good example of a right is the incident where D. Eisenhower (who was not at all a prominent figure or encourager of the Civil Rights Movement) until the Brown Vs. Board case which won in favor to desegregating schools. It was not until it became a legal federal law that he acted upon protecting the right for integrated schools when the Arkansas governor fought against it. ( In class notes) A right exists as a right because like Dr. Williams states, " A right exists simultaneously among people. A right does not confer an obligation onto other people." (0:32 of video on Dr. Williams) To me a right is something that if it exists it must exist for all people. In the case of Eisenhower stepping in and putting militant activity to protect the federal law of desegregation was not a motive that came from Eisenhower being pro-civil rights. Instead it was a necessary action to enforce the law and those rebelling against it.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#)

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



### **Re: Rights of Immigrants and Illegals**

by [Daniel Zavala](#) - Sunday, May 27, 2018, 2:46 PM

The question of what rights illegal immigrants have has always been a divisive one. As a second generation citizen, I have had many people question my opinions on the matter (even though I have no more authority on the situation than anyone else seeing as how everyone in my family is a citizen themselves). In truth, I do not agree with the sentiment that illegal immigrants should have the same rights as citizens. The most common misconception when debating illegal immigrant rights is the extent of the 14th Amendments effects. As stated within the amendment itself, the rights granted by the constitution apply to citizens, there is no mention of these rights also belonging to any non-citizen and certainly not to illegal immigrants.

Another common issue concerning the discussion of rights is that people simply do not understand what rights Americans actually have. As Walter Williams (Walter E Williams video) explained, rights are rules that dictate what a person is allowed to do, not a law that gives people things. For example, citizens have a right to bear arms, that does not mean that every person must be given a gun if they do not have one.

Sum of ratings: [3 \(1\)](#)

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



### **Re: Rights of Immigrants and Illegals**

by [Tanner Wiese](#) - Friday, June 1, 2018, 12:45 PM

This is a very interesting take. And, I think your viewpoint is even more interesting considering you are a second generation citizen. And, for the most part I agree with

most everything you said. However, should someone who contributes to society, pays taxes, and simply just moved his family over here for a better life not be granted certain rights? It is a very tricky subject. But, I just think there are a lot of good illegals who deserve rights. And, I understand that in the constitution it obviously doesn't say illegals should have the rights of citizens. But, not all illegals are bad, and, many of them can help improve this country.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

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



### Re: Rights of Immigrants and Illegals

by [Daniel Zavala](#) - Friday, June 1, 2018, 3:36 PM

I also agree with you. If most of the people here illegally are not trying to cause problems. But one major issue is that only half to seventy five percent of illegal immigrants pay taxes, and those that do pay less than the average citizen does ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic\\_impact\\_of\\_illegal\\_immigrants\\_in\\_the\\_Unit](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economic_impact_of_illegal_immigrants_in_the_Unit)

As unfortunate as it may be to admit, illegal immigrants are a problem. Most of them are not bad people, but by being here they are causing problems for citizens, both natural born and legalized. That being said, it is certainly arguable that it should be easier to attain citizenship than it currently is. This would allow for immigrants to stay while also removing the downsides of them being here.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

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



### My thoughts on the Walter Williams video

by [Tanner Wiese](#) - Sunday, May 27, 2018, 3:56 PM

Yes, I thought professor Williams clarified the difference very clearly. He stated that a right “is something that exists simultaneously among people, a right does not confer any obligation on another” (30 seconds, Walter Williams Video). He used examples like, free speech, and the right to travel. Which are all right because they do not put any obligation on another person. And, he goes on further to show examples of what people mistakenly call “rights”. And, he uses examples like health care, food, and even housing (1:30, Walter Williams Video). Because, in order for everyone to have them it would be putting an obligation on other people. Which makes complete sense to me. Because, if someone is to receive housing as a “right”, then an obligation was put on someone else to give them free housing. And, he uses another example, implying that if we used that way of thinking, then the “right to travel” would mean someone would be purchasing the ticket for someone to fly (2:15). But, the right to travel actually means people have the right to purchase a ticket with money they have earned.

Although, housing and food are important things for people to have. They are not rights. Overall, I agreed with most everything he said. And, what it took from the video is, a right must not put an obligation on anybody else.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



### Walter Williams Rights Explanation

by [Jacob Spriggs](#) - Sunday, May 27, 2018, 4:43 PM

Listening to Professor Walter Williams did help clarify my understanding of what rights are in our country.. I liked what he said about what some people call rights are actually wishes. If Medicare was a right, every U.S. citizen in any situation would have medicare and no one would have to pay for it.

Sum of ratings: 0 (1)

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



### Re: Rights, Rights, Rights: Something which we possess?

by [Sadie Baker](#) - Sunday, May 27, 2018, 4:59 PM

From what I gathered from the forum materials, a right is something which "exists simultaneously among people", (Walter E. Williams video, 0:40), "does not confer an obligation upon another", ( W.E.W. video, 1:06), and serve as "rules of interactions "between people, thus placing "constraints upon the actions of individuals or groups" (Rights, Rights, Rights topic page, pt 1, pgph 2). Even if a right does not obligate people to act a certain way or do particular things, it does hold them accountable to not do certain things. But should someone choose not to respect a mutually agreed upon, universally established right, do I, or does anyone, really possess it? Even if a right is something which everyone has or should have, someone with the power could choose not to let me have it.

If I think of a right as a possession, for instance, like a car, it could be stolen from me, but it would still technically belong to me, not the person who took it, because my name is on the car's title and I paid for it. A right is more abstract and intangible than an actual physical possession like a car, but I believe it is something which each individual can claim ownership of.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



### Rights on Rights

by [Reed Battaglia](#) - Sunday, May 27, 2018, 7:52 PM

When talking about citizen's rights in America, it is always a slippery slope because of crossing human rights. Being a citizen of the United States, you are born to certain rights called human rights. I agree with the fact that if you are a citizen you are born to certain rights. I think that we have the right to do anything we please and say anything we please as long as it is constitutional. Noncitizens do have rights in America, but they are different than our human rights that citizens are born to. In my view, Walter Williams did a great job of clarifying the difference between citizen's rights and other things that we mistake for human rights. I agree with being born as a citizen of the United States and being given human rights. Some of our rights consist of freedom of thought, speech, expression, and many other rights. Every human deserves the right to think freely and express themselves as their own person in America. It is a place where every human being is born free and equal and I believe that it should remain that way.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Rights on Rights**by [Tanner Wiese](#) - Thursday, May 31, 2018, 11:27 AM

I agree, it is a very slippery slope. I understand how truly blessed I am that I was born with these rights. And, a very tricky subject for me is, what rights should people who are not legally citizens have? I can understand both sides of the argument in this scenario. I understand people who believe that we are all people, and, deserve the same rights. But, I can class understand the people who say "illegal aliens" should not have any rights. Because, they are living here illegally. But, my viewpoint lies somewhere in the middle. My dad always told me that he didn't care if people living here illegally were given rights, as long as they were paying some taxes or contributing to society. And, thats what I still believe in. So, if someone is illegally living here simply to provide a better living for his family, I believe they should have rights. But, there are plenty of illegals who aren't doing that, and, I don't think they should deserve the rights of an American citizen. However, that does not mean I think we should just treat them terribly. All people deserve rights, and deserve to be treated like people. But, I think someone should only receive the rights of an American citizen if they pay taxes, or contribute to society in someway.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

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

**Re: Rights, Rights, Rights / Right On!**by [Kevin Gable](#) - Sunday, May 27, 2018, 8:30 PM

Professor Walter Williams explains the difference between a right and a wish pretty well. It is interesting to me how often the two get confused. Take the 1950's segregation of public schools in the south. The Supreme Court had to step in and protect the rights of African Americans from the wishes of the southern white supremacists. "In 1954, Chief Justice Warren wrote a unanimous opinion (in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka) declaring that states could not segregate their public schools on the basis of race without violating the constitutional rights of African American students to equal protection of the law." (pg 939) The Board of Education of Topeka got it's wishes of a segregated school system confused with the constitutional rights of the African American students. The mistaken right of segregation forced the obligation of the African American students to forego their right to equal protection under the law and except unequal educational opportunities by being barred from state and federally funded schools. Then again, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 gave the federal government the legal means needed to protect the rights, of mainly, African American voters. "This measure gave the Justice Department broad authority to monitor electoral procedures in jurisdictions with a history of discriminating against African American Voters." (pg 956) Parts of the south were using what was called "sham 'literacy tests'" to prevent as many African Americans from voting as possible. Maybe they really did believe they had the right to test a voters literacy. I think most likely they confused their wish for segregation as a right to control the political and legal structure of the south in favor of white supremacy. Either way it those tests clearly violated people's right to vote in the elections of public officials.

(<https://www.uscis.gov/citizenship/learners/citizenship-rights-and-responsibilities>)

Sum of ratings:3 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Rights, Rights, Rights / Who has Rights Right now?**by [Kevin Gable](#) - Sunday, May 27, 2018, 8:32 PM

The constitution has within it the 10 original amendments called the bill of rights. This amendment guaranteed specific rights to American citizens. We all know the 1st one, Freedom of speech, press, and religion. But does anyone remember the tenth? I didn't. I looked it up in our textbook and it was interesting. The textbook explained, "The Tenth Amendment stated that powers not assigned to the national government by the constitution remained with the states and citizenry, through the intentional omission of the word 'expressly' left room for argument." (pg 240) This opening for argument seems to present the federal government with an avenue of exerting its regulation over the states when it deems necessary. That has the potential to be a good thing when you consider how it allowed the federal government to pass the Voting Rights Act of

you consider how it allowed the federal government to pass the Voting Rights Act of 1965 empowering the Justice Department to monitor state elections. What do you think are negative outcomes of this verbage?

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



**Re: Rights, Rights, Rights / A US Citizen**

by [Kevin Gable](#) - Sunday, May 27, 2018, 8:33 PM

As a United States Citizen, these rights apply to you unless otherwise decided through due process of law. Amendment V of the bill of rights guarantees this. (<https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/bill-of-rights-transcript>) This also means under the due process of law the state or federal government can suspend or revoke your civil rights. As seen in the slides of rights and responsibilities, it is our responsibility to exercise these rights, through responsible civil participation. I know that even I fall short of the second listed responsibility. I am not always informed on issues affecting my community. My concern is the third listed responsibility; participate in the democratic process. The US voter turnout during the last election was lower than a democratic nation would hope for. About 42% of the registered voters did not participate in the democratic process. Those listed responsibilities are the cornerstone of action that ensures the survival of our Civil Rights.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



**Most are rights, some are not... yet**

by [Emily Hemmerle](#) - Sunday, May 27, 2018, 9:03 PM

When it comes to rights I think of marriage, freedom of speech, and being a natural born citizen. When it comes to healthcare we currently do not have a system that accommodates everyone therefore to have healthcare in the United States it is not a right but treated as a privilege. However, the country originally had a belief that rights were only applicable to rich white men. Slowly overtime women and other ethnicities have gained similar rights to rich white men. The comics about illegals not automatically getting rights is right because they did not go through the proper procedures and protocols to become citizens. These people are desperate though which is depressing but rules are rules. Since the civil rights movement of the 1950s black people have worked their butts off to be treated as equal. Black people to this day are still discriminated against and white people think they're the supreme race.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



### Rights are not a duty or a privilege #1

by [Katrina Kreklau](#) - Sunday, May 27, 2018, 9:40 PM

I believe that rights serve as a basic form of rules in which everyone is supposed to live by. However, as our nation has aged and grown many have forgotten or not been taught what our rights as citizens of the united states are. I am staying this because our rights are not duties or privileges. If they were then we might as well be paying medical bills for people who can't pay for there last surgery or for their medication., Health care isn't a right but a duty each family has. Like this, it is a person's duty to pay the bills on time and pick up the groceries. If health care was to become a human right than that would mean everyone would be paying everyone else's medical bills through Taxes, meaning an increase in what comes out of your monthly or weekly paycheck.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#)

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



### Re: Rights are not a duty or a privilege #1

by [Emily Hemmerle](#) - Friday, June 1, 2018, 4:56 PM

I'd rather have some taxes taken out for universal healthcare because our current system is trash. Medicare is a scam and as a human id rather have free healthcare paid by taxes than paying an arm and a leg for a medication. I work in a Pharmacy and I see the heartbreak everyday. What big pharma and insurance companies are doing is profiting off the sick and it's time we have socialized medicine.

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#)

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



### Re: Rights, Rights, Rights

by [Landon Stevens](#) - Sunday, May 27, 2018, 10:55 PM

I once heard it said, "don't use the 'right to free speech' as an excuse to be a jackass". I personally couldn't agree more, and yet so often I witness it. Arguments could be tossed back and forth however, claiming that free speech is free speech, while the other side claims that people have a right to not hear offensive or threatening words. It isn't hard to find loopholes and exceptions in the constitution, in terms of real life scenarios. And while rights aren't like privileges where they have to be earned, they shouldn't be abused. I once heard one of my high school teachers say, "Just do what's right. Deep down, everyone knows what's right". I don't know that I believe this fully, but preaching to myself, I can definitely say there are times when I could have treated someone how I would have wanted to be treated and chose a saltier rout. Just do what's right. The simplest, most difficult advice I've ever heard. The cartoon animation of the citizen obliging to everyone asking for his ID except the police officer reminds me of a bit of a sad reality and one that is somewhat hidden in the artists meaning.

the other of a bad reality, and one that is somewhat modern in its artist's meaning.

That is, simply, that cops are becoming more and more hated as time progresses, as another innocent man or woman is gunned down by cop who happens to be completely unfit for his job. Good cops and bad cops? Absolutely. Clumping all cops into the negative category? You bet. It's not exactly fair, but few things in life are.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

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



### **Rights are not inherited they're earned through hard work**

by [Maxam Robison](#) - Sunday, May 27, 2018, 11:03 PM

There is a YouTube video I found that involves the topic of rights. It's pretty self-explanatory to the point I want to make. That point is everyone has rights, but sometimes people treat that right as if it only applies to them or they misuse that right and overstep their bounds into someone else's rights.

(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bG6omxJJrw4>)

There was also a statement on Facebook that goes very much with what I'm trying to say:

"I will not apologize for being straight.

I will not apologize for being Christian.

I will not apologize for being white.

I will not apologize for supporting gun rights.

I don't personally attack anyone else's beliefs. I don't discriminate. I don't make hurtful comments. But I am sick and tired of being made to look like a bad person because of the above."

what this is saying is "I'm not taking your rights away so don't attack me for being who I am."

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



### **Rights, Rights, Rights: School Integration**

by [Sadie Baker](#) - Tuesday, May 29, 2018, 1:30 PM

The Brown V. Board decision to integrate schools was an important milestone in the civil rights movement which brought into question peoples' differing opinions of what (their) rights were. The grounds for the ruling was that "states could not segregate their public schools on the basis of race without violating the constitutional right of African American students to equal protection of the law" (Liberty, Equality, Power p. 939). According to Walter E. Williams' definition of a right, this ruling holds up well. To receive the same treatment as everyone else, in this case attending the same school, would be something which would exist simultaneously between all people, and would not obligate people to act in a specific way, except not to prevent the children from

obligate people to act in a specific way, except not to prevent the children from attending certain schools. There were protesters of the ruling who believed it was their right not to associate with African Americans, and not to send their children to the same schools. When compared to Walter E. Williams' definition, this cannot be defined as a valid right, but rather as a wish, because it would require certain behaviors from African Americans, and it would not be held simultaneously between every American person. School integration was absolutely crucial to the advancement of civil rights because it upheld the true basic and constitutional rights of American people.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

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



### What Does it Mean to Have Rights?

by [Peyton Tooze](#) - Tuesday, May 29, 2018, 4:04 PM

When it comes to Professor Walter Williams, I believe he did a good job describing the difference between a "right" and a "hope." Everyone has a right to something like free speech and nobody can interfere with that and it doesn't interfere with others lives, but when people say that healthcare is a right they are incorrect. You may hope that everyone has healthcare even if they can't pay for it but it would take money out of someone else's pocket for everyone to have healthcare. Something like healthcare is important to have for various reasons but if you make it a right it would impose an obligation on other people. People have various rights but they are limited to things that do not impose a duty on someone else. As a citizen of the United States, my rights are simply those that are protected by law that nobody can interfere with, but if I were not a citizen, my rights are limited. I wouldn't have the right to vote, run for office, be federally employed, or have a fair trial by jury. It doesn't seem morally right to restrict other humans from obtaining the same rights as citizens but it seems that the United States isn't a country of rights but a country of laws. Even if you are a United States citizen but you violate the law, the court has the power to take away your rights and put you in a prison. In prison there is no right to vote or travel or anything for that matter. As long as you are a law-abiding citizen, you will have the rights given to you by the constitution.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



### Is the Right to an Education Reasonable?

by [Rachel Gragg](#) - Thursday, May 31, 2018, 5:03 PM

When I google searched the definition of a “right,” I found the definition: a moral or legal entitlement to have or obtain something or to act in a certain way. Walter Williams challenged that people from the left would define a right as something imposing an obligation on someone else, using the example of , “right to free speech would mean someone else has to buy you a microphone.” I’m not sure if that’s what democrats believe, I obviously can’t speak for all liberals, but it seems as though it is putting words in their mouth. When I think about the Civil Rights Movement and how the rights of African Americans were being harmed so greatly when they were just trying to exercise their rights, education seems to fall into the category. I believe that people have a right to education and wouldn’t that cause an obligation to others? I believe every person, no matter the race, has the right to the same education and same opportunities, but that would insist an obligation on a school principal to keep their school desegregated. In Little Rock, Arkansas, as our textbook authors tell us, “Orval Faubus, the state’s segregationist governor, promised to prevent black students from entering the school building and deployed his state’s National Guard to block them... Eisenhower [then] took command of the Arkansas National Guard and augmented it with members of the U.S. Army.” (*Liberty, Equality, Power* Pg 943). Would that mean that the right to education is burdening someone else?

I am aware that USCIS does not list the “Right to Education” as a right, but how is that fair? Also the right to have “freedom to pursue ‘life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness’” is pretty vague. Couldn’t it be argued that the right to an education could be considered pursuing happiness? If an education, in this day and age, is what is basically required in order to get a good job that therefore gives you money that therefore gives you food and a home and the ability to take care of your family, wouldn’t that be pursuing life and happiness? So then, therefore shouldn’t education be considered a right? Also, education through the Compulsory Education Law, is required through many years of secondary school (findlaw.com) so how could you not give all children the same education if they are required to go? How could it not be considered a right? But it still imposes an obligation because in order for students to go to school, there has to be teachers and a building and classrooms, but I still believe it should be considered a right. What do you think? Is the right to an equal education amongst races a reasonable thing to believe? Or is it not a right because of the obligation it imposes on others?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



### Re: Is the Right to an Education Reasonable?

by [Sadie Baker](#) - Thursday, May 31, 2018, 5:44 PM

I think that if we are simply talking about the right to pursue an education, then yes, it is a reasonable right. However, if you mean that the government or someone should provide or pay for education, then perhaps it can't be considered a reasonable right according to the definition that we were given.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

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



### 1st Amendment

by [Sydney Plaza](#) - Thursday, May 31, 2018, 5:26 PM

I wanted to talk about the First Amendment and how there is flexibility and loopholes within it. For starters, the First Amendment promises 5 rights: Freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom to assemble peacefully, and freedom to petition the Government for a redress of grievances (ACLU) However, historically there have been incidents such as the shooting at Kent University in Ohio during the Vietnam war. The protest was not legally protected under the first amendment because it took place at a public university which has the power to determine what is allowed. ( In-Class notes) Although the protest was peaceful, there were shots fired and students killed. I think that the belief that Americans have full protection to go against their government even in a peaceful matter is incorrect. It is not protected by law because of where the demonstration took place. However, in the nation's history we can see this in a multitude of instances such as during the riots of the great depression, the red scare and the prohibition of any socialist gatherings (in class notes) (which should legally be protected under the first amendment.) However, these were not protected incidents. They were punishable.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

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



### What is a "right"?

by [Kyle Shrope](#) - Thursday, May 31, 2018, 9:46 PM

In America we all know are given rights. Our rights are stated in our countries constitution and apply to all legal citizens inside the united states. But even in America's history rights have been taken away from certain groups of people. One big right that was denied for many years was the right to vote. It wasn't until the women's suffrage act of 1920 when women were granted the right to vote. And not until 1954 when black people were given the right to vote. Listening to Professor Williams short talk just brought me more confusion to what is a "right". As seen throughout history it seems that the government can determine what is a right and what isn't. The one topic Professor Williams discusses is healthcare, he claims that healthcare isn't a right but a privilege. But if the government passes a law that grants universal healthcare to all

citizens wouldn't that now make healthcare a right? They were able to grant women and African Americans the right to vote by passing legislation and laws that say they can. So wouldn't them passing a law about universal healthcare be what we know as a right? It seems to me that whatever country one lives in determines their people's rights.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1) 1

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



**Re: Rights, Rights, Rights / Undocumented Minors, Education, and the 14th Amendment**

by [Kevin Gable](#) - Thursday, May 31, 2018, 11:17 PM

Do illegal immigrants have rights in the US? As it would turn out, yes they do. Not all of them though. If you are under 18 years of age and your parents came to the US illegally then you have the right to the equal protection of the law under the 14th Amendment. This means it is illegal to discriminate against an undocumented child. Example; an undocumented minor has the right to attend public schools k-12 regardless of immigration status. In 1982 the US Supreme Court heard the case *Plyler vs Doe*. The case involved a decision made by the state of Texas to deny enrollment to an undocumented child in public schools and to block any federal funding for their education. A class action suit was filed and heard in the Texas district court. The Texas court ruled in favor of the children. Upon appeal the Supreme Court heard the case. In a landmark 5-4 decision the Supreme Court upheld the ruling stating, "education has a fundamental role in maintaining the fabric of our society" and "provides the basic tools by which individuals might lead economically productive lives to the benefit of us all." Further, while persuasive arguments support the view that a state may withhold benefits from people whose presence within the country is a result of unlawful conduct, the children of such illegal entrants "can affect neither their parents' conduct nor their own status," and "legislation directing the onus of a parent's misconduct against his children does not comport with fundamental conceptions of justice." You can read the concurring and dissenting statements here <http://www.uscourts.gov/educational-resources/educational-activities/access-education-rule-law>

I think the heart of the issue is once again money. However, that does not make it an invalid argument. I could imagine we all would agree that every child NEEDS an education. Not receiving an education does create an incredible hardship on an adult. But who's going to pay for it? Remember what President Coolidge said taxes represented a portion of a citizen's time being forced to work in service to the federal government. Forced is the key word here. Morally I think we all want to do the right thing, the thing that makes us sleep better at night, the thing that will make it easier to look at ourselves in the mirror in the morning. But where in the constitution, history, or

any speech made by a president say that the ideologies and implementation of freedom was going to be easy. Why should it be?

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

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



### Do you know your rights?

by [David Nguyen](#) - Friday, June 1, 2018, 1:18 AM

I know there are quite a few people out there who do not know all the rights that they have. Often, they let others take advantage of them and violate their rights. This usually happens with immigrants. For example, I am an immigrant myself who came to the U.S at a young age and became a U.S citizen. When I became a U.S citizen, I really didn't know what the difference was, except that I can travel around the world a little easier now. Then one day, my high school had these seminars where some adult people teaches us things in their specialty. After walking around to see which one is fun, I then saw the one that was pretty interested. It was a seminar that ran by a lawyer, and she taught us what to do if we get pulled over by the police officer. After the seminar, I felt like I have learned a lot of rights. I came from a country where the government is pretty corrupted. A country where most of the time when the police pulled you over, you can bribe them with money and they'll let you go, or else you have to answer and do everything the police tell you to do whether you agree or not. But, it's very different here in America. I have rights that can protect me from the police. For example, I can refuse the police to reach me, I don't have to talk to the police, I don't have to show them my ID if I am not being detained, I have the right to remain silence and request for an attorney, etc. Before that seminar, I didn't know anything about all these rights. This is just one example out of many, and I think I am not the only one. I feel like, not just immigrants, but every body should learn about the rights that this country has granted them because it may protect them one day.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



### Do we really posses these "rights"?

by [Kyle Shrope](#) - Friday, June 1, 2018, 3:54 PM

I think that no one actually posses these rights. Specifically in the united states we have the constitution that gives us rights, but it seems that the government can do what they want. The 1st amendment in the constitution grants all citizens freedom of speech. But as seen in history the government has been able to silence people who have spoken out against them. The government was able to silence the critics of World War 1 and were able to silence people who supported communism. Even though freedom of speech is in the constitution the government was still able to shut people

up. It seems to me that whatever government you live in determines its citizens rights. In the United States we were granted rights by our founding fathers that only apply to citizens of America. Because of these rights we were given, people in oppressed dangerous countries want to move to America. They want the same opportunities that the citizens of the united states were granted.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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

[The Military-Industrial Complex](#) ►

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

You are logged in as [Joe Escobar](#) ([Log out](#))

[HST 203 Sp18 \(Escobar Meta 41002 43590\)](#)