

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 (Military Industrial Co...)

(Rights, Rights, and Mo...) 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



Defining Rights

by Roy Fernandez - Monday, May 26, 2014, 6:32 PM

First and foremost, I believe that it is important for people to understand what defines a right, as well as that there are different types of rights. As the Wikipedia article on rights explained, there are differences between rights, duties, and privileges. While a right is a moral or legal entitlement to do or keep from doing something, a duty is something a person is expected or required to do, and a privilege is something that is earned or given, but that can be taken away as well. I think the article did well in explaining these differences right off the bat, because people tend to clash when these three concepts are misinterpreted and confused with each other. A common example of this is when someone gets a privilege taken away for breaking the rules (i.e. driver's license), then proceed to argue that their rights are being violated when it really wasn't a right in the first place. When explained this way, defining rights is pretty straightforward. However, it becomes more complicated and in depth when different types of rights must be defined. Referring back to the Wikipedia article, rights can be sorted into two different categories: natural and legal.

Natural, being that all human beings are born equal and entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And legal, rights set by the society we are a part of and upheld by fair policy. Both are equally important to understand and acknowledge. It is up to us to protect both and ensure that there are equal rights for ALL people.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Cartoons not Telling the Whole Story



by James Price - Tuesday, May 27, 2014, 1:21 AM

Neither cartoon fully represents the complexity of the issue of rights surrounding immigration. I thought cartoon 1 misrepresented the whole issue by comparing two different things. In the first four frames the man going somewhere and showing i.d. in order to receive a service, but in the last frame he is being stopped and required to show i.d. This cartoon also doesn't address the ability for people to use that law to openly discriminate against an entire group of people.

Cartoon 2 does a good job of showing the difference between natural rights and civil rights (as discussed in the Wikipedia article) but like cartoon 1, it doesn't address the whole issue. If, with the family, the artist were to draw a child with a shirt that read "citizen," then the issue would become much more complex. While the Wikipedia article shows that rights are easy to define on paper, defining them in a real setting is much more complicated... a thought that both artists didn't bother to address.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Cartoons not Telling the Whole Story



by Karla Miller - Saturday, May 31, 2014, 10:23 PM

I don't think the cartoons are wrong. The police officer may have pulled him over because of a broken tail light. It does not say it was racial profiling. Besides that, I think a person should be a legal citizen of the U.S. to get a driver's license. Or at least have a green card. That proves that you didn't sneak across the border. I liked the second cartoon, because of the truth in it. If you are not a citizen, then why would you expect the same treatment. When a person is a citizen, legally, then you shouldn't be in any trouble.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Human Nature



by Jaalen Johnson - Tuesday, May 27, 2014, 8:00 AM

I think the most important thing first and foremost is the fact that humans alone have greed. The definition for greed is excessive or rapacious desire. it is human nature to want more of whatever it is they want more. The problem I personally don't believe is people don't want more "rights" but they see a glimpse of freedom and latch on to the idea that, rights will get them closer and closer to freedom.

The second thing that I believe Roy Fernandez touched on very well is people have to realize the difference between what is a natural right and just a privilege. People today are mistaking something they have a privilege today as what they want to be a right tomorrow. One of the biggest mistakes in American's today is the false sense of entitlement. if we would just realize that everything isn't going to be given to us that list of growing rights would be stalled at the list it is now but certainly wont ever shrink.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Who has rights?



by Paige Nibley - Tuesday, May 27, 2014, 10:38 AM

The Declaration of Independence of 1776 stated the following, "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." I believe that the previous statement and its meaning is what established the legacy of the United States and ultimately allowed us to become a world power. However, more than once in our short history these rights have been challenged and groups of people, among them U.S. citizens, have been stripped of their supposed "unalienable rights". An event that stood out in my mind while reading the information provided about rights was the internment of Japanese-Americans during the second World War. Japanese-American citizens were taken from their homes with little to no time to recover belongings and were even, at times, separated from their families. Families that were American citizens were not only forced into internment camps but were stripped of everything from their clothing to their homes. These people and, more importantly, citizens, many of them born in the U.S., were absolutely stripped of the rights guaranteed to them only 150 years earlier in the Declaration of Independence. Guaranteeing rights for citizens as a nation is a slippery slope because the human race encounters change, challenge, and mistakes. As long as rights are granted by one human being to another, they cannot be truly guaranteed.

Rights are not easy to define and they are even harder to grant. It seems that granting rights is the highest power given over one human being to another. While we are granted what we call "unalienable rights", there is huge controversy and confusion surrounding what this means and to who these rights apply. If the definition of unalienable rights held true, it seems that there should be no restriction on immigration. However, without guidelines and restrictions on who a nation allows into the country there would be caos. The question that complicates this subject for me is: should unalienable rights be granted to all human beings or just citizens of the nation under which they are guaranteed? What about the times in the past when citizens have been stripped of the rights they were guaranteed by the founders of our nation? How can we truly call certain rights unalienable if they do not apply to everyone? I'm not sure a nation can guarantee rights to non-citizens and maintain balance and control as a world power. Rights cannot be universal because they cannot be universally understood, making them meaningless. Where the line should be drawn I am unsure.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Rights/ Education

by Joseph Foley - Thursday, May 29, 2014, 6:15 PM

Paige,

You bring up some great points. Japanese Internment Camps in the U.S. are a strong example of U.S citizens losing many of their rights over night. When I think of the issue of rights in the U.S., I always go back to Reconstruction. The North was implementing some extremely progressive concepts post-civil war, namely equal rights regardless of race. Many of these concepts embraced equality, and it appeared the equal rights battle had leap-frogged into the future. Yet, contrary to many believing that societies are always making forward progress, we took giant steps backwards. A deal was made, and the North stopped their support of Reconstruction in the South, and Jim Crow Laws and sharecropping nightmares became the norm. As we have covered this term, nearly a century later, African Americans were still fighting during The Civil Rights Movement, for rights that had been supposedly granted after the Civil War.

American history is an extreme mix of positive and negative (like many societies). The U.S. had, and has become a "promised land" in certain senses, for peoples all across the globe. Yet, the deep rooted sense of American nativism has produced hateful racial or religious persecution with nearly all groups, ranging from African American's, Native Americans, Catholics, Germans, Islamic, Irish, Catholics, Jewish, Chinese, Japanese, and of course women (only mentioned a small handful of examples). I'm never surprised when I see examples ranging from equal rights progress, to hate crimes. We have struggled with the definition of rights, federal or state control, and equality since our birth as a country. The struggles are real, but in comparison to other areas of the globe, I feel pretty lucky to be in a position to eat whenever I want, worry about where to fish this weekend, and to experience higher education.

I thought the short video on this forum brought up some some good points. Having rights is obviously a reciprocal relationship. I have certain rights, but I must also not interfere with others rights, and I maintain these rights in the U.S. by paying taxes and not committing crimes, just to name a couple. I think American's have become much more entitled in regard to what they feel they deserve, and much less educated on what their rights actually are. Many of us lack perspective (spectrum tools), in regard to how many opportunities we have in comparison to other areas of the world. America became an example to the rest of the world in regard to woman's rights, where many countries still lag drastically far behind, even in areas that we would consider basic human rights today. American educational standards and test scores continue to slip, and history is disappearing from many curriculum's. With most of our citizens not formerly educated on their rights, they don't even understand their supposed constitutional rights. You can't claim what you are not aware of.

Immigration is a hot-button issue that will probably always be a hot-button issue,

especially in our ultra-politically-correct climate. Historically, immigrants in the U.S. have fought against hate and adversity, and eventually carved out their piece of the pie. Then new immigrants come, and everyone focuses their hate on the "new different." My Irish-Catholic ancestors have done exactly that, they experienced persecution, and they have persecuted, all in America. I'm grateful for the opportunities I have, and I believe that higher educational standards will aid our understanding and access to our rights, and also what are referred to as "immigration issues."

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



A price tag, whether you like it or not...



by Daniel Hovet - Tuesday, May 27, 2014, 10:45 AM

I think everyone on this forum would agree that there are such things as fundamental human rights. But the eternal problem is, as they are intangible, it is completely up to people to make them so. Each person must fight for their rights, as they will not fight for themselves. The whole purpose of government is to safeguard those rights, providing an engine to empower them, through providing law and order, etc.

The laws of physics are where the buck stops. If a person can take your things from you because they are stronger, or make you shop somewhere else because of your race because they have the store, they will. Rights, civil and human, exist, But they ARE NOT free- every person must shoulder the price those rights come with, and that is protecting them, enforcing them for those who cannot, and providing remedy for those whose rights have been violated. The police who die going after criminals, the civil servants who work thankless 12 hour days year in and year out, activists who were killed on the march, the families of killed in action veterans, and so on- these are examples of the price at it's extreme.

So, one reason often forgotten that people have that causes such a debate about just what our rights exactly mean, or which ones we exactly have, is that at the end of the day, the decision will affect us all. Either there will be something else we have to stand up for and protect as a right in this world, or something we will lose, and no longer have protected for us, depending on the issue (is it a right or not?).

So to some Americans, the naturalization process or right not to be ID-ed for random illegal immigrants May seem like an absurd new burden to carry, or a great injustice that everyone needs to step up for. One way or another, there is a price...

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Give me, give me, give me



by Elizabeth Atkerson - Tuesday, May 27, 2014, 11:27 AM

While reading these articles and listening to the short video clip the concept that stuck with me the most is the idea of reciprocity that is inherent in rights. If we have the right to life then someone else's right to murder us is removed. It makes sense. I just had never

thought about it In this way. If you gain a right you also gain a responsibility.

Recently in our local news there has been much debate over the, "right to sleep." It has always sounded silly to me. The right to sleep signs have always made me ponder. Is everything we do naturally a right? And if so does the government have the ability to regulate it? Can you imagine if we made this simple ability or natural phenomenon a right? Can you imagine someone attempting to end laziness and mandating no more than 7 hour sleep night?

The wiki article addresses this distinction between things we do naturally and rights with this concept of responsibility and reciprocity. If sleep is a right, what is my responsibility in that sleep to my community? Do we have an inherent responsibility to not wake people up? Or do we have an inherent responsibility to vacate areas to provide a place for sleep? What is my responsibility?

It seems to me that people demand more and more rights without thinking about their responsibility in the equation. This material hammers it home that when you have a right you also gain a responsibility. Freedom is not free. We have heard that for decades. I would argue that rights are not either.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Give me, give me, give me

by Alex Quadrini - Thursday, May 29, 2014, 9:58 PM

I had very similar feelings regarding Eugene's issue with the homeless community demanding spaces for legal sleep and security from the persecution of law enforcement. I always had this internal struggle to understand how these homeless community members really thought their political battle for this apparent right to sleep would overrule what the city council members and EPD would do to enforce this protest. Yes sleep is a human right and always will be but within certain restrictions. One can't just go and sleep wherever they want to within other forms of private property, that is not a right granted to everyone but the people who specifically own these lands, spaces or properties. But returning to your idea of sleep not being human right, what a concept. We take things like this for granted due to their nature as a physical and conscious necessity to survive, but what if its spectrum was stamped with such limitations and could be prosecuted against if violated. I believe that this is the perspective of such community members in Eugene involved with this city wide protest. Natural rights can be countersued due to the perspective of the person carrying out the actions of this right. Even in sex, it's naturally applicable to every person and is a right we all are granted to share and express an emotional and physical capacity for a desired partner. But age is where the legal boundaries and rights are put under the microscope. Adults have age gaps in relationships all the time but with young adults and teenagers stigmas and uncomfortableness can erupt when age becomes confrontational. At this peak of young adults sexual exploration and hormonal development one could be 17 and another 19, this is considered illegal in most states, but again is a state by state matter that is dealt with differently regarding its region. just another example of when a natural right that has always been and is perpetuated by passion and emotion can become a legal allocation.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Rights, Rights, and More Rights

by Alex Quadrini - Tuesday, May 27, 2014, 11:51 AM

The human and societal construct of rights is a concept that is set to withhold boundaries and set a legitimate system of retaining civil and fair means of structure in our country. In a complete and total "Free World" rights wouldn't even need to be declared due to the explicit freeness that comes with it but due to such nature of a free world human beings most likely would not all cooperate or function on the basis of such a system. Humans naturally have subconscious means to be greedy, violent, unfair, and all around not follow the rules of what people say we act upon. Due to this if rights and rules were not set in place chaos would most likely set way to our country rather quick. Now the difference between these rights all can displaced by what side of the border you come from. Natural rights are granted to all human beings at birth and should always be. Humans have the right to eat, sleep, breath, reproduce, love, live and ultimately be content and happy. But within certain boundaries you rights that allow you to obtain such values in life are limited based upon your placement in the world. Thats what i've never agreed within this world of nations and politics and imaginary lines we call borders. Societal rights are only bestowed upon and granted on the basis you qualify and follow the rules, if not then you get the boot. Why cant we live in a world where such placement of rules and regulations is put upon the persons own view and perspective and not put into such a rigid box of speculation and fierce authority.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: We define entitlement

by Alexandra Hazen - Friday, May 30, 2014, 1:21 PM

As Americans, we are supposed to possess certain rights. The Constitution gives us freedom; however, in most cases it is not exercised. Take for instance, the private school system. In order to attend a private school you must sign your rights away. You are not entitled to freedom of speech, the term "free dress" is a contradiction. You can wear your clothes as long as it does not have this and this and this. Another example, is the recently discussed, Kent State rally. The school prohibited the rally however the Constitution gives us the right to assemble. So although we have rights that should be guaranteed, they are not, which makes the issue on rights a "slippery slope" and also problematic. In turn we have defined the word entitlement. We feel it is our prerogative to have what some people in countries are still fighting for. And what we do with our basic rights does not always benefit the country. But the bottom line is that someone will always be in control of what we can and cannot do.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: We define entitlement

by James Price - Friday, May 30, 2014, 11:35 PM

I liked your Kent State reference and think it also shows the problem with defining what rights are. While the students had the right to assemble, the administrators of the college also had the authority to deny them access to the campus. I'm not sure the students' rights were ever really violated because they weren't told they couldn't protest, they were just told they couldn't use the campus.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



our human rights



by Britney Painter - Friday, May 30, 2014, 5:02 PM

I had never paid much attention to my human rights til I got into college and didn't understand what everyone was talking about. How we have to fight for this, fight for that, I always thought that everyone just respected each other and their rights. I think people these days like to push and see how far we can push before someone says that it isn't our right. In the wiki I liked how it explained our rights, duties and privileges and it really opened my eyes to explore it more. Now a days, I feel that people expect to be handed everything and not have to work for anything, where just because we have these rights, means we don't have to do anything.

Unless you truly care, I think that a lot of people don't know their rights and whenever someone finds out, they take advantage of it. I think it's incredibly important to be aware of what your rights are and know the difference between rights, duties and privileges.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Rights/ Change



by Joseph Foley - Saturday, May 31, 2014, 1:33 PM

As I have mentioned in several forums, I hope to eventually teach history. I have a passion for the subject, but I also understand that my current level of understanding has its limits. I have personal opinions backed by a small amount of independent and scholastic research. I tend to lean on historians I have learned to appreciate, for a better understanding of what I'm studying. I really enjoy reading Eric Foner's work, a longtime professor at Columbia University.

There is an article titled *Freedom Writer*, which summarizes some of his broad reaching work (found @<http://www.college.columbia.edu/cct/winter12/features5>). The article closes with something that I found applicable to our discussion on rights, "The right to dissent, to criticize, to agitate for freedom, goes to the core of what Foner loves about America... "The patriot is the person who is never satisfied with his country," he says. "That's why I teach the history of American radicalism. Because these are the people I think we ought to admire in American history, the people who are trying to make this a better society. There are so many aspects of this country that are admirable. But it should be more. It should be better." I find that this thought aligns with my current view of American History, and even rights. Our country obviously has

room for a great deal of improvement, but there are also so many positive aspects of our past and present. As we have learned, America is an anti-radical society, but over a long enough time period, we have seen some fairly radical changes.

We continue to question and study our rights as they evolve (or change or vanish), and we have witnessed individuals and groups work within the confines of our system to better our country. We witnessed it during the Civil-Rights period, Reconstruction (and of course the reversal), the Labor Movement, women's rights, and now the LBGT community and new immigration questions. We are far from perfect, and there will always be complaints, but denying that there has been positive progress would be incorrect. My largest concern in regard to our rights, is that our citizens have lost touch with what our rights are, and how they can benefit us. The opportunity to challenge, or push the envelope of what is possible (rights, movements, etc.), is what makes America attractive, but without a firm grasp on our history it would not be possible (more more people seem to be unfamiliar with our constitution).

We have learned how progressive movements can cause conservative backlash (Nixon election is a great example), and vice versa (conservative= liberal backlash), but the beauty of it is the allowance to pick a side, and have an opinion. To me, the Eugene culture seems to be a collection of conservative backlash. An eclectic mix of hippie, now yuppie converts, raised in the 60's and 70's. I don't typically fall into any particular category, but I appreciate the difference of opinions. They range from conservatives, to conspiracy theorists. Our rights have their limits (especially during war time), there is lot's of room for improvement, but change is possible (as we have learned). If you despise what America represents, unlike in some countries, you have the ability to move to another country if you choose.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



A Touch of Gray

by Laura Newman - Saturday, May 31, 2014, 2:57 PM

Rights are extremely difficult to describe. Law and the Constitution in itself are a collection of vague documents that are meant to be interpreted as time goes on; a main objective for lawyers and the Supreme Court to decipher and rule upon.

General rights, such as the right for life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness are ones that seem to be a given. Freedom of speech and the "right" to bear arms however lead us more into a gray area. There has been much dispute over these two, although it seems they are

clearly outlined in the Bill of Rights. Upon further investigation, the right to bear arms describes it more in a militia type situation, an occurrence in which to overthrow the government if such a time came.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Second_Amendment_to_the_United_States_Constitution

Freedom of speech we've learned in class can have limits, especially in a time of war or if what someone says publicly can be interpreted as anti-American, communist or socialist ideas, leading to jail time or consequences.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Freedom_of_Speech

I think many times Americans confuse what is their right as a citizen with privilege of being an American citizen. It is not your right to refuse a police officer proof of vehicle registration or identification. Although it is unlawful for police to search and seize your vehicle. Right? Well in most cases, unless there is suspicion, or you are in a place in which Stop and Frisk is a tactic in policing. See, more gray.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



You do have the right to..  

by Sherri Patterson - Saturday, May 31, 2014, 5:59 PM

The one thing I notice everybody in my inner circle, and in the media and just here and there talk about is there rights getting trampled on. Or them losing rights. Well the one thing that I know for certain is that you do have is the right to vote. If you do not like what is going on then you need to pay close attention to what is going on in the government not only federally but within your state. You need to know who is running for what offices and what they will do for "your rights. You need to get involved and have a voice. If you just sit there and merely sit by and hope that everybody else votes the right way and that things will get fixed then you are merely being a pacifist. And things do not get fixed that way and you are basically giving your rights away.



Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: You do have the right to..  

by Alex Quadrini - Saturday, May 31, 2014, 9:23 PM

I think the right to vote is a very powerful weapon in our american citizens arsenal but to what extent are these valued rights being manipulated and swayed to vote in a certain manner and to only vote fro what legislature is being presented by the

government itself, of course with certain goals and agendas. Is it really free right when your voting for one politicians preferred ballot. Yes theres hundreds of great measures to vote on and which are presented by the people and for the people but money has a huge role to play in the major elements of most elections. Some would say money is the deciding variable in any political election especially the presidential. To what extent are our votes just an extent to US citizens being used as pawns for a much larger game of chess within our entire political and government structure. For me most politicians are untruthful and deceived by veils of greed and some corruption, this has been proven over and over agin through history, for me it seems most elections is picking the lesser of two evils to have a firm grasp in our nations government. When real people of the communities are leading this country and not the wealthy beaucrats who most often have been born into power. The people of this country don't seem to truly understand, organize or specifically run this country like it was intended the very clutches of church and state that the founding fathers ran from has in a new sense been reestablished with our capitalistic imperialistic like government that is named one of the biggest world powers across the globe.





DISCLAIMER: "Vote or Die!" should not be considered as a literal statement. Voting will not prevent death. Voting will not cause nor prevent any life-threatening disease. This campaign should not be considered as a threat directed against any person or persons, including non-voters and Republican voters. You will not get a free T-Shirt if you vote. Voting will not make you rich, rich, and sexy. Voting will not get you laid.

This is a fake political message. "Vote or Die" is not affiliated with any political party, past or future.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



What rights are?

by Hao Nguyen - Saturday, May 31, 2014, 10:45 PM

Civil right, is simply known as one of the most essential features sticking with an individual in their lifetime, contains the freedom of speech, freedom of living as a human and equal treatment. In history, there are some obvious cases such as Sacco and Vanzetti. Because they were foreigners, the court convicted them as murders, in fact, they weren't. Or in black people's case, they didn't obtain the right to be treated as equal as other ethnics because the difference in their skin color. As the instant development in society, people demand for more "right", privilege from the higher power side or the government. According to the definition in the text, the right which people obtain from the government as well as the society "Societal rights or civil rights are bestowed to its citizenry by society and are a set of obligations that are purported as a social contract. Societal rights are a privilege of membership and the benefits are limited to its members though may be extended to temporary guests". They collect some and, at the same time, lose some. As a citizen, he/she has to pay tax in order for the government to run and support the community, for instance.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Rights are Subject to Change

by James Price - Saturday, May 31, 2014, 11:15 PM

As societies evolve and respond to issues they face, their concept of rights and what rights people have also evolve. The Wikipedia article states that "the idea of legal rights holds that rights are human constructs, created by society, enforced by governments and subject to change." This can be seen historically by looking at the *Miranda v. Arizona* case, which "established the 'Miranda Warning'" (Textbook p.1010). Legal rights also have a tendency to be taken away as well. During World War 1, the Espionage, Sabotage, and Sedition Acts "constituted the most drastic restrictions of free speech..." (Textbook p.785). Our societal rights are constantly subject to change.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Logout)

 Moodle Docs for this page

