

**Rights & rights**by [Joe Escobar](#) - Tuesday, 19 May 2009, 12:57 PM

Rights, rights, rights. Every human being today believes they are entitled to an ever growing list of "rights". Historically, the Declaration of Independence of 1776 states that "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness." The Constitution contains the Bill of Rights, ratified in 1788. After the 1954 Brown v. Board of Education decision, the idea of "separate but equal" was challenged and defeated by using the 14th Amendment to the Constitution, ratified in 1868. African Americans received the "right" to an equal education. Equality has also become a modern day rallying cry, along with human rights. Read, listen, and watch these documents on rights and discuss, prioritize, and scrutinize them.

Read the materials in order, numbered 1 through 10. They are found in the HTD Materials link.

[Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Rights & rights**by [Roxanne MacDonald](#) - Tuesday, 19 May 2009, 08:35 PM

Hi everyone, this post is in response to HTD numbers 1 and 2 of the ten posted.

A social contract is the political mechanism by which people become equal by law and by right, according to Jean-Jacques Rousseau in The Social Contract. "Under a bad government, this equality is only an appearance and an illusion; it serves only to keep the poor in their wretchedness and sustain the rich in their usurpation. In truth, laws are useful to those with possessions and harmful to those who have nothing; from which it follows that the social state is advantageous to man only when all possess something and none has too much." (p. 25 The Social Contract) The right of any individual to life, liberty and property always runs straight and true until it is arbitrarily bisected by the wide thoroughfare of exceptions. In a good government, though, we believe rights are inalienable/permanent but the right to life does not mean that you will remain un-murdered nor does the right to freedom prohibit you from being imprisoned. The rights of ownership "...is always subordinate to the right of the community over everything..." (p. 24 The Social Contract) As Americans, we were born into a social contract over which we had no input yet we call ourselves free. The laws that uphold the rights for some people infringe on the freedom of others. Rights, by their very nature, require obligations for their fulfillment. "Man was born free, and he is everywhere in chains." (p. 2 The Social Contract) The concept of rights is a key stabilizing force in Western civil societies but, as Diogenes of Sinope "The Dog" believed, all of man's interactions are mere convention.

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

Rate...

**Re: Rights & rights**by [Robin Patterson](#) - Wednesday, 20 May 2009, 03:46 PM

I truly believe that SOME rights are needed to be provided in order to have a functioning world. Like many other things this simple statement has been twisted and turned into a tool that is used by EVERYONE to get their point across. I thought the song about the rights of vegetables was hilarious because I couldn't stop thinking about how many times a vegetarian has tried to put their beliefs on my for being a meat eater. Talking about how it is wrong to kill an animal and eat it..blah blah blah. Rights are definitely something we should be happy we have, but not abuse them to try and gain certain things. During this "war on terror" there was a certain thing called the patriot act that was passed which deliberately lets the government impose on your right to privacy. The government could literally tap your phone just for the hell of it. Even if your cell phone is off, if the battery is still in it and has juice it can be used as a microphone to listen in your conversations with a friend a loved one or just whoever. So it is deemed ok for this to be going on, but we should be worried about the rights of plants? Come on....reading things like this just really pisses me off. As far as animal rights go, ya some animals should have some rights, but cows and pigs...come on really? I can tell you the psychology of cows and pigs right now it goes like this (eat, crap, drink pee and repeat). Do I care if they are "treated humanely before exploited or eaten...no. Why should I all i care about is whether or not there is some A1 on the table for my steak or if there is some scrambled eggs on my plate to go with my bacon. This whole rights game that has been played for such a long time needs to calm down because really its just a bunch of bull mustered up from a simple need.

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

Rate...



Re: Rights & rights

by [Nicholas Simeone](#) - Friday, 22 May 2009, 02:42 PM

Ha Ha, that is my view too, animals do have rights, their is a Fish and Game wildlife department that controls animals that are going extinct, or having issues. As far as cows and pigs, I love my bacon and steak, sorry if they have to be cramped up for a little bit before going to slaughter but at the end of the day, they are in high demand.

I loved the Animal rights question and answer. Because if there wasn't hunters and farmers wildlife would be crazy. I would love to see some of these activists get eaten by cougars on their stroll through the woods. Then maybe they would rethink their policy on every animal having the same rights as our societal views. As all deer, elk, cow, pig has become extinct by severe over predation by this time.

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

Rate...



Re: Rights & rights

by [Kerry Gleasman](#) - Saturday, 30 May 2009, 12:10 PM

I agree! Without a doubt animals do have rights. I love meat, but can't really buy it in stores. I was raised on a farm and i always knew where my meat came from, so i am a little weird in that way. I took an ethics class last term and studied animal rights which made me sad. I found out things that i didn't know and didn't want to know! I think it is ok to use animals for testing and to slaughter them for food, but how we go about these things could use some changes. Thats all! Animals have rights but they are not able to communicate with us protect those rights.

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

Rate...



Re: Rights & rights

by [Robin Patterson](#) - Saturday, 30 May 2009, 01:36 PM

Ya I agree that they should have SOME rights like basic needs such as living conditions. My whole point was though that people try and stretch that out to something much greater, like in comparison to the rights of humans. In my mind it's the food chain.

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

Rate...



Re: Rights & rights

by [Stephenie Fraga](#) - Friday, 22 May 2009, 06:39 AM

I believe that some of the rights that we have are completely nescessary. We do deserve life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. However I think nowadays people take that a little overboard. Especially with people who have more money or fame. Today it seems like people think they are number one always and have the right to do anything they want no matter how many people's toes they step on. I have the right to do this this and this however you don't. That seems to be the thoughts of many people and alot of times younger people. I see it so often in teenagers who think they can do, get, and say anything they want. Well, sorry this just is not the case. We do have a lot of great rights but our rights do not take priority over other peoples rights. I firmly beleive that we need to consider ourselves as less that other people and do what we can to make our friends, family, and other people in our life priority over ourselves.

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

Rate...



Re: Rights & rights

by [Roxanne MacDonald](#) - Friday, 22 May 2009, 07:31 AM

Hi everyone, here are some thoughts on the Declaration of Human Rights

"This Declaration is based upon the spiritual fact that man must have freedom in which to develop his full stature and through common effort to raise the level of human dignity."

This statement from Eleanore Roosevelt introduces a larger question into the discussion of freedom and rights. Political theory revolves around two main ideas of freedom: positive freedom and negative freedom. In America, we are more accustomed to the views of negative freedom--remove the governmental/regulatory obstacles to an individual's pursuits/desires as long as those pursuits don't infringe into the sphere of another person's freedom and rights. In other words, stay out of my business and let me live my own life in my own way. That is agreeable to most people. Negative

freedom is the basis for the "rugged individualism" held in such esteem in America - the idea of pulling oneself up by one's own bootstraps.

The other side of the freedom coin is positive freedom and this school of thought is what Eleanore Roosevelt touches upon in the excerpt.

"...man must have freedom in which to develop his full stature..."

With that comment in mind, answer these questions: is a starving man free to reach his "full stature"? In society today, is an uneducated man who works a minimum wage job free to develop his "full stature"? Or think about this situation: a man owns a large field on the outskirts of a village. It has been in his family for generations. The village experiences a few bad agricultural years and enters into a state of famine. The owner of the field on the village's border has water and his land is still fertile but for personal and economic reasons he elects to leave the field fallow. Is this his "right" as property owner? What are the rights of the people in the village? If you tend to agree that the property owner can do as he wants with his own land, you generally fall within the school of Negative Freedom; if you think the village can seize the property and plant it to grow food for the local population OR that the property owner has an obligation to his neighbors that overrides his personal decisions and his own personal economic interests, you fall within the Positive Freedom philosophy. The positive freedom perspective means that society should provide as many advantages as possible to each of its members in order that each "...develop(s) to his full stature..." and adds his skills to the greater good of society. In other words, give each person as many advantages as possible so that when the person reaches his "full stature" he can give back to society. Positive freedom is a much more communal approach while negative freedom focused on the individual.

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

Rate... 



Re: Rights & rights

by [Nicholas Simeone](#) - Friday, 22 May 2009, 02:29 PM

The article on the blind and their rights was extremely intriguing to me, because I have a brother that is deaf. I find that being deaf and blind are definitely debilitating but they are able to function and don't "look" handicapped and therefore are treated differently than someone in a wheel chair. Which this article clearly illustrates.

If I was blind though, I probably wouldn't carry cash in this country (in other countries the cash is different sizes). It would make more sense to have a debit card. I sometimes question the sensibility of things such as this article states its such an issue, change the entire country's currency to appease the minority, or just force the vendors that don't have a debit card POS system to have one.

The fact that blind people can't distinguish between their cash in America makes sense carry a card. It works every time, and you always get exact change.

As far as the other rights are concerned. I always laugh at the fact we feel we have so many rights. But there is always a clause....."without due process of law"

Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, this line is hysterical because its so subjective. Poor people live, they have liberty, they are allowed to beg, and they have the right to pursue being happy, but are they happy? Would you be happy if you were poor? I know I wouldn't but I guess you make the best of the situation you are in.

I remember when I joined the Army, we supposedly upheld all these rights, but sacrificed so many when we joined the Army. For example, you cannot be a satanist and join the military, if you are gay, you have to stay in the closet, and there are a lot of taboo's in sexual relations. (missionary only, no oral sex) All of these are punishable and you can be discharged for them. I always felt the only freedom I had was the ability to smoke cigarettes. In some places you can't even do that now.

Property rights, you can own a home, and you can sell a home. But if the government needs to put a railroad through your home, tough, they are taking it. I like the false sense of security of property rights vs. places like China. Preparing for the Olympic games they just said you are out and began leveling everything, at least we have "due process"

But lets not kid ourselves, we don't truly have all these rights.

I believe we have rights as long as they are convenient for the government.

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

Rate... 



Re: Rights & rights

by [Bryn Riley](#) - Sunday, 24 May 2009, 11:45 AM

Rights; what a rabbit hole this concept is! Let's begin with a few of my favorite quotes from these assigned materials.
1)" Religiously driven people do things that don't calculate in a nice academic faculty surrounding"-Newt Gingrich.
What a statement! Good try Gingrich but I believe you meant to say "fanatics" in place of "religiously driven people".

2)"The government might as well argue that there's no need to make buildings accessible to wheelchairs because handicapped people can crawl on all fours or ask passers-by for help, the court said"- Court, Paper money discriminates against the blind.

A fine display of logical thought. This pleases me so, that there are court authorities who put this in to plain terms for the Treasury department. The article states it plain and simple, the change would hurt no one and benefit many, not only those using the sightless friendly bills but those who would might attain employment from the change.

3)"The signers of the Declaration of Independence deemed it a "self evident truth" that all men are "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights". Critics, however, could argue that use of the word "Creator" signifies that these rights are based on theological principles, and might question which theological principles those are, or why those theological principles should be accepted by people who do not adhere to the religion from which they are derived"-Inalienable Rights. All I have to say is this , where is the suggestion by the "critics" of a better plan? This is what I love about critics, they are just that, critical, but not smart enough to formulate a better plan. Who cares if inalienable rights are derived from Christianity? Especially when this particular aspect is only preaching something that benefits everyone. We could do away with "inalienable rights" and everything derived and associated with them, but then where would we be?

I guess my question is where do we draw the line? The materials ventured in to animal rights and what I hope was a joke (the video) about vegetable rights. I think that the Plant Rights article put it perfectly. "Switzerland's enshrining of "plant dignity" is a symptom of a cultural disease that has infected Western civilization, causing us to lose the ability to think critically and distinguish serious from frivolous ethical concerns. It also reflects the triumph of a radical anthropomorphism that views elements of the natural world as morally equivalent to people". HAHA! Beautifully stated. I feel so deeply connected to the people of Switzerland in that we both belong to communities that are so completely obsessed with making sure no one's/thing's "feelings" get hurt.

I see stated in previous replies that the debate of whether or not we even have these rights has been mentioned. As it is, I have not really been affected in my daily pursuit of a better life so any infringement on our rights as a result of the war has not really ruffled my feathers. I would like to think that even if I do experience some sort of invasion or restriction of rights in the future that if it was for the assurance of safety for me or my fellow Americans/global ally that I would comply willingly.

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

Rate... 



Re: Rights & rights

by [Robin Patterson](#) - Monday, 25 May 2009, 02:53 PM

Oh ya. A debit card would be optimal for a blind person. I haven't been to many stores that don't accept debit cards these days. I would say that more than half of people today use card over cash anyway. I agree with you that to change the entire nations paper currency to accommodate blind people would be a waste of time. Not to discriminate, but like you pointed out there are alternatives!

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

Rate... 



Re: Rights & rights

by [Nicholas Simeone](#) - Friday, 29 May 2009, 09:04 PM

Not only would it be a waste of time, just extremely expensive. Think of all the vending machines that would need to be altered. The cost in that alone is enough to make me cringe.

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

Rate... 



Re: Rights & rights

by [Robin Patterson](#) - Saturday, 30 May 2009, 01:39 PM

Ya, vending machines, ATM's and money counters at the bank. It would be a bigger hassle than most people realize!

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

Rate... 



Re: Rights & rights

by [Stephenie Fraga](#) - Saturday, 30 May 2009, 09:56 AM

There is a blind man that I am a personal shopper for and when we go to check out it's hard when he has cash, A) because he doesn't know which bill is which and B) he could get stiffed with change because he can't see it or someone could easily steal his cash without his knowing.

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

Rate... 



Re: Rights & rights

by [Kerry Gleasman](#) - Saturday, 30 May 2009, 12:04 PM

I think that the government said some unintelligent rude things about handicapped people, but i don't think is is needed to change the money. Use debit cards and if you really want to use money, we have people like you that are willing to help!

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

Rate...



Re: Rights & rights

by [Brandon Mc Nutt](#) - Sunday, 24 May 2009, 05:07 PM

I think that the question of rights is very sticky wicket. I do think that people do have certain inalienable rights, life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. It doesn't matter to me weather they are "natural right" or "just cause we said so" rights I feel that these are givens. As far as legal rights go that varies from place to place and really generation to generation. Some of which are fair and some that aren't. Many time legal rights tend to be "flavor of the month" orriented and change with the mood of society. I think that there are some animal rights as well, like the right not to be made extinct by us. As far as plant rights I thought the music video was a crack up. There has to be a line and many times I think people go way across it in the name of "rights". When really these people that cross the line are really looking for priveledges.

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

Rate...



Re: Rights & rights

by [Brandon Mc Nutt](#) - Sunday, 24 May 2009, 05:13 PM

I thought the video of Newt Geengrich was very interesting. At first I wasn't sure what his motives were, it was hard to tell without knowing the full context of the press conference. It looked like it might be just more partisanship, but he made a very true comment at the end, about people not caring about being stripped of civil rights in times of severe crisis. It seems to happen every time this country faces that type of adversity. I suspect he is right to warn people who are preaching about rights at the moment that they better be a little wary, and pay attention. I'm not for most of the tactics with regards to rights we've seemed to exercise lately, but if there is a catostrophic attack we'll all be on lock down.

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

Rate...



Re: Rights & rights

by [Roxanne MacDonald](#) - Sunday, 24 May 2009, 09:59 PM

Everyone defines "rights" in a personal way. It is a personal choice based on the time period in which one lives, one's culture and one's personal perspective toward life. It is easy to laugh at plant rights or disregard animal rights when one doesn't recognize that a non-human "life" has any value. What makes our life any more valuable than the life of a bear, a whale or a pine tree? As omnivores, humans can eat both plants and animals. Rights all too often are power-based. In the wild, a hungry grizzly has power over an unarmed human and is not concerned about the human's "right to life". However, when hungry and holding a gun the human is not concerned with Bambi's "right to life" and will enjoy the meat with his/her garlic bread and salad. We are humans and live in a "human centered" world. Just because we have not broken animal languages does not mean that they don't have a culture themselves. Elephants, dolphins, whales and some primates, just to name a few, have extensive vocabularies and social organization that we are just beginning to study. Even magpies have a complex social structure.

There are people who will find it offensive to kill/eat an animal of any kind, and those who find it offensive to kill/eat a vegetable of any kind. The Jain religion espouses these principles. (<http://www.religioustolerance.org/jainism.htm>)

There are also people as clearly evidenced by previous postings who enjoy eating meat and who find no problem in doing so. The Atkins diet is primarily a meat based diet. I personally was raised a vegetarian and in the last few years have started eating meat and am thoroughly enjoying it. Bring on the steak! If I could run faster there would be fewer cattle in the Eugene area. I am not personally bashing meat or plant eaters; most of us are one or the other. What I do want to say is that this entire HTD is one of personal choice. It is not about what is right or wrong. What I do think is at the heart of this discussion is how each person **defines what life is** and the **rights we each think that life has**. Humans are imperfect animals living under imperfect laws in an imperfect society. It is not going to be possible to please everyone.

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

Rate...



Re: Rights & rights

by [Brandon Mc Nutt](#) - Monday, 25 May 2009, 04:40 PM

I absolutely agree that people's rights are defined by the time period they live in. I also believe that many of these rights are in direct contrast with not just human nature but nature itself. Your example of the bear is a perfect one. There is no right to life in nature just survival of the fittest. Many animals' intelligence gives them their edge. Rights are a human social construct, it is part of what separates man from animal. Take being a vegetarian, that is a personal choice and it is your right to do so. Nature doesn't have these constructs.

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

Rate... 



Re: Rights & rights

by [Heath Dilley](#) - Monday, 25 May 2009, 09:48 PM

I have to say, I very much enjoy the Caveman rights thought up by Geico. With so many different activists going for so many different rights (Gay rights, Polygamy rights, Animal rights and so on) it's good to see somebody come into the fray with a little joke at the whole charade.

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

Rate... 



Re: Rights & rights

by [Brandon Mc Nutt](#) - Wednesday, 27 May 2009, 09:42 AM

The caveman rights thing was hilarious, it shows the absolute absurdity of all of these different groups making all these claims of right. But it is a sad indictment of the country and world as well. Different groups of people should not have to go to drastic lengths to get the basic human rights that other groups enjoy. They should not have to justify getting those basic human rights, they should just have them.

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

Rate... 



Re: Rights & rights

by [Megan Lanphear](#) - Wednesday, 27 May 2009, 11:38 AM

I thought it was funny too! Like it's so easy a caveman can do it and it shows how smart they are. Ha. anyway it's true. They should just give them the basic rights instead of having them try to earn them or what not. I agree with you.

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

Rate... 



Re: Rights & rights

by [Stephenie Fraga](#) - Saturday, 30 May 2009, 10:35 AM

I agree that the caveman rights commercials are trying to show the absurdity of all the different groups trying to get rights that they don't have. I don't think that just because someone starts a group, club, or fad that they get special rights. It seems as though they are not satisfied with their basic human rights and have to get more and more. It shows who we are as a country and a society where we are not satisfied with anything that we have and we are always looking for more.

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

Rate... 



Re: Rights & rights

by [Kobin Patterson](#) - Saturday, 30 May 2009, 01:42 PM

Ya the caveman bits are pretty funny and there is some truth to them, but you have to remember it's just an advertising ploy. The truth in it is what makes it funny but really I think the vegetable song did the best job at poking fun at the whole rights topic.

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

Rate... 



Re: Rights & rights

by [Stephenie Fraga](#) - Tuesday, 26 May 2009, 06:36 AM

I very much enjoyed that video with the carrot and the "vegetable rights". I thought it was hilarious and it shows that sometimes people do go a little overboard on rights.

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

Rate...



Re: Rights & rights

by [Joshua Tokich](#) - Friday, 29 May 2009, 02:39 PM

I agree, certainly people do go overboard. The video put that issue into a funny light. I think that because "rights" are a human conception, they really only pertain to humans. Plants being the bottom of our food chain are a necessary product for our society so are animals for that matter. We all have to eat!!

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

Rate...



Re: Rights & rights

by [Elliott Rose](#) - Tuesday, 26 May 2009, 04:14 PM

I agree that plants and animals do have rights. You could say any living thing should have rights. The only reason why we have rights is because we have voice to say our opinion. Any individual had different rights due to age or even gender.

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

Rate...



Re: Rights & rights

by [Joshua Tokich](#) - Tuesday, 26 May 2009, 04:42 PM

On the topic of animal rights and the article about them. The article said that the animal rights movement believes that all animals should be free from harm, abuse, and exploitation. Well my first question for them would be then does an animal have a right to be free from harm from another animal; and if so would people have the moral obligation to rescue or save an animal from being eaten by another animal? In this way I see the animal rights issue as a paradox. Maybe it should be the animal rights as it pertains to humans movement. Furthermore I do believe animals should be given a humane life and not treated poorly so I would tend to side with the animal welfare groups mentioned in the article; but humans are connected irreversibly to domesticated animals. We have manipulated the genetics of different species of animals to rely on human intervention and in some cases without humans the species would die off. So I believe that animals should be treated kindly but I do not believe that we should domesticate any more animals; we have a responsibility to take care of the species we have though. As an avid meat eater I believe that it is my right to be able to kill an animal to eat it, because it is in my genetics and I have evolved to get the most nutrition from meat vs dietary supplements in the store.

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

Rate...



Re: Rights & rights

by [Joshua Tokich](#) - Tuesday, 26 May 2009, 05:07 PM

Eleanor Roosevelt's speech made a very good case and point. I related with the facts in which she recounted that all of the delegates did not agree and would not agree even given many years. Understanding this helped me to see that some people even very intelligent people may feel differently about human rights than do I. What we as a majority today see as open racism and bigotry from the state and the church in the past, was nothing more than the way things worked back then. In the text about inalienable rights I believe the statement; "We hold these truths to be self-evident" is simply a "more elegant version of 'Because we said so'" hits the nail on the head. We believe we should have rights because we want them not because "god" gave them to us, and as long as it affects us personally we will do something about it. My thought is then what about the people who are still being affected in other parts of the world, for example the political genocide of the Tibetan people by the Chinese. Why does America spend its energy and money on an ongoing war for oil. We should be focusing our energy on the different humanitarian causes plaguing our world. We all are people, it's the only thing we all have in common; and that is why we believe in human rights. That's what America stands for right? freedom, lol

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

Rate...



Re: Rights & rights

by [Megan Lanphear](#) - Wednesday, 27 May 2009, 11:21 AM

Rights, everyone has them. I guess even animals are starting to get rights to. The only thing is that animals help support the people in the world and they don't know anything. I don't understand how they have rights? Aren't they there to feed us? Not all animals but the ones that count like pigs and cows. They give us pork and bacon and beef but if people start giving these animals rights we won't get to enjoy those types of food anymore. So what they have to live cramped up in their lifestyle and they don't know any different. But there's the perspective I'm sure some people think is what if we were kept like animals waiting to die? How would we feel? I don't think that relates to us. Animals are a little different than humans. Are all animals created equal?

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

Rate...



Re: Rights & rights

by [Roxanne MacDonald](#) - Wednesday, 27 May 2009, 10:07 PM

Hi Megan,

Hmmm, a provocative post at the very least. Your closing question was "are all animals created equal?" No, all animal species are not created equal with each other. Neither are humans created equal with each other. Some people are more intelligent, more athletic, more creative, or physically more appealing than others. Equality is not something you are born with. Equality is a man-made concept and it is granted under law and manifested through rights. Your statement that cows and pigs are useful to us and subsequently should not have rights because of that seems to be irrational. Most animals, at one time or another, have been or are being eaten and used by people. That "usefulness" should be a determining factor on who or what is granted rights opens up a Pandora's box. This argument could have been used by slaveholders to ensure that slaves did not get any rights because they were "useful" in the fields. I am curious, though, why you are willing to grant rights to horses, dogs, cats, monkeys, snakes, bugs, frogs and many other creatures that are eaten around the world yet refuse rights to cows and pigs and deem them the ones that count. Also, I am even more curious as to how you arrived at your opinion. I personally feel that an animal such as a pig or cow is quite aware of their environment and has a preference for laying under a shade tree by a cool stream on a hot day versus a dirty, cramped feed lot with no shade or cool water. I am not inferring that they should not be eaten but why are they not entitled to comfort prior to the arrival at the abattoir and ultimately on my sandwich? Is this something you were taught or is this an idea you developed on your own? I am not personally attacking your thoughts but trying to understand your line of reasoning as stated in your post.

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

Rate...



Re: Rights & rights

by [Megan Lanphear](#) - Thursday, 28 May 2009, 06:28 AM

Hey Roxanne,

To be honest I kinda just threw something out there. I like animals all animals even cows and pigs and it would be great if they had a big pasture to live in and shade to lay under i was just thinking of the fact that they are always crammed up anyway you know? I totally understand your thinking and it makes me re-evaluate my thoughts. I guess animals don't have a voice to make a opinions for themselves and so its hard to think that they have feelings too. They probably would like to live wherever and do whatever but they are made to become food products, but it still doesn't mean that they should live in crammed spaces without clean water.

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

Rate...



Re: Rights & rights

by [Roxanne MacDonald](#) - Thursday, 28 May 2009, 07:56 AM

Hi Megan, Thank you for responding and clarifying what you were thinking. I hope you have a great day. 😊

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

Rate...



Re: Rights & rights

by [Megan Lanphear](#) - Thursday, 28 May 2009, 08:54 AM

Hey Roxanne, Your welcome. I really hoped it helped. You have a great day too! Its so sunny!

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

Rate...



Re: Rights & rights

by [Stephenie Fraga](#) - Saturday, 30 May 2009, 10:01 AM

I do believe that animals are intitled to cetain rights, but they are not human. We were created and given domain over the earth so I believe that means we have free rain to eat animals if needed. I do not think they should be treated the way they are when they are sloughtered. That part is very horrendous, however I still do not see any issue with using them as a food source.

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

Rate... 



Re: Rights & rights

by [Rebecca Millican](#) - Friday, 29 May 2009, 10:08 AM

Humans have rights, ok, animals have rights, ok, but flowers and vegetables? Soon where not going to eat anything, and we'll all just fade away. The video on vegetable rights was hilarious I always wondered if people would ever talk about that, just because it doesn't scream doesn't mean it doesn't feel, right? and personally I like to have flowers in my living room, I go to the store, I buy them, and I put them in my vase, is that considered wrong, I suppose to the swiss it would be.

I always that the human rights was a funny thing, we all have blood that runs through our viens, we all have feelings, so why is it that because a skin color was different because our cultural differences we discriminate against people I never understood it every one still has the right to be a free individual, it should not matter if there is a war going on, people of mid eastern descent is no different that some one that is "white", we all are integrating.

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

Rate... 



Re: Rights & rights

by [Hari Khalsa](#) - Friday, 29 May 2009, 07:22 PM

I am sort of surprised to learn that African -Americans were granted the right to vote before women---*white women*. Does this have any relationship as to why we, as the American public, voted an Afro-American *man* to the presidency rather than a *white woman*? But in reality, because of grandfathering voters rights and other racial oppression---Afro-Americans were not truly given their **Equal right to vote** until the civil rights movement of the 1960's, this means that although women were given voting rights after male Afro Americans---according to law---women were actually the 1st to be given this voting right federally--in every state. Black people of the early 20th century in the deep south were not allowed to vote by means of **State's rights** and other racial loopholes even though this was an obvious violation of **Federal law** which legally extended the right to vote to all Black males in **every state in the union**. The reason for the federal governments ignorance of this obvious violation of federal law is curious to me. The term Historically heirarchical **EQUAL RIGHTS** priorities were given to whom equal rights applied to, this a term that doesn't historically mean anything for anyone actually having real **Equal rights** because if a society selectively gives rights to only a select part of the population, than this is definitively NOT **EQUAL**. **This would be giving the respective society preferential rights**. And giving rights to only the *preferred populus* is absolutely not giving the society **EQUAL RIGHTS**. TO TRULY GIVE EQUAL RIGHTS TO A SOCIETIES POPULATION means to truly extend these rights to everyone regardless of gender, race, creed, beliefs, sexual orientation and any other distinguishing factors.

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

Rate... 



Re: Rights & rights

by [Nicholas Simeone](#) - Friday, 29 May 2009, 08:59 PM

I don't think it has any relationship at all with who is in presidency. Voting rights and choosing a leader are two totally different things. I do not see a correlation.

I think you just summed up discrimination. Which still happens today, something fun to do is go to court, on just about any day, and sit through it until the judge deliberates on all the cases. You will see lots of different cases, and some exactly alike, and not all punishments are created equal either.

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

Rate... 



Re: Rights & rights

by [Kerry Gleasman](#) - Saturday, 30 May 2009, 12:00 PM

When I read the article on plant rights, I laughed! Ok, plants are living, yes, but to go this far and actually try and make laws for plants. The fact that there are tons of humans starving in this world today and we are worried about the rights of plants. Please! I can't tell you how many times i have "beheaded" a dandilion! This article was just silly to me. I could understand people being upset if we were abusing plants and killing species...

I enjoyed reading the article about money and blind people. It blew my mind that the government was worried about the \$\$ they were going to have to spend to change the money and vending machines. When they were talking about people in wheel chairs and that fact that they can crawl or ask for assistance made me mad! It is weird to believe that we have just recently made laws against discrimination of all kinds. My uncle is deaf and i have heard stories that he was sent away as a kid to go to school. People with any disabilities were not able to attend public school. I just can't believe it took this long to grant certain rights to people with dissabilities!

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

Rate... 



Re: Rights & rights

by [Rebecca Millican](#) - Saturday, 30 May 2009, 05:22 PM

rights are a funny topic, especially know a days, in california the took to court was the same sex marriage idea, I only wish that people would open their minds up a little bit. I understand that people are afraid of change and that its not a traditional concept, but shouldn't everyone be able to marry who they want?

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

Rate... 

[Send in my latest ratings](#)

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

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

HST 203 (Escobar META 41740 41741)