



Search forums

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

[< Previous \(American Exceptionalism\)](#)
[\(Conservatism and Censo...\) Next >](#)


Censorship and Morality

by Joe Escobar - Friday, April 12, 2013, 5:08 PM

This forum thread is for Censorship and Morality posts and replies.

After studying the required materials, address the individual questions in SEPARATE 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

Since there are multiple questions, BE SURE to use an informative subject line for your post. Don't simply leave it RE: Censorship and Morality

Sum of ratings: -

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


I CAN believe it

by Chazz Milner - Monday, April 15, 2013, 12:47 AM

I do not find the story of the actress who played in *Sapho*, who was arrested for playing a provocatively implied part, stunning. There was no ground for women to stand on in any realm of life in the 1900s. They had no real rights to money, land, even their own children would be granted as the fathers' if a divorce ever occurred. The most compelling parts to the story was the quickness of action that was taken in arresting the actress. There was obviously enough law enforcement to see to the necessities of protecting and serving the public's safety against actresses, but not the black community from lynching. This does not differ much from today's procedure in law. The Eugene Jail still has room to jail minor offenders if fines are not paid up but must release the rapists and robbers to the streets for lack of room. The other point that was almost comical was that the publicized arrest led to a rise in the acceptance of the new found right of a women's own body. Which also relates today to publicity that can affect the cause oppositely.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Times have changed

by Gregory Vandelune - Monday, April 15, 2013, 9:56 AM

I found the most interesting aspect of the Sapho video was that public opinion and ultimately the verdict of court case reflected a view that the people were interested in that type of presentation. The fact that attendance of the show increased after it was described as immoral is a reflection about the public conscience at the time. The question of the necessity of the Mann Act is debatable. I believe that it was passed with admirable intentions. The text presents an obvious liberal bias, "...exaggerated the dimensions of the problem and led to some questionable legislation such as the Mann Act (1910), ..." and down plays the seriousness of enforced prostitution. (p. 709) The issue of the law being used for intended purposes is beside the point. The idea of Gov Spitzer's resignation or Sen. Weiner, raises interesting questions about American morality. I do not believe that it shows a continuation of turn of the 20th century morality because we can just look at Presidents Kennedy and Clinton, whom were known to be adulterers and the American people were fine with that. President Clinton even smugly lied under oath, yet he was not convicted. There are similarities but the differences are too great in my mind.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Times have changed

by Megan Russell - Monday, April 15, 2013, 7:39 PM

President Clinton was impeached for his actions, just so you know. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Impeachment_of_Bill_Clinton

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Times have changed

by Gregory Vandelune - Monday, April 15, 2013, 9:38 PM

I am aware of that, hence the use of the word *convicted*, but thanks for looking out.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



How do you define morality?

by Megan Russell - Monday, April 15, 2013, 7:58 PM

In both cases, Sapho and rock and roll, morality was at question. "Representatives of

groups such as the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice, the Society for the Study of Life, and the New York Mother's Club, protested that the plays language and costumes were immoral." [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sappho_(play)] In Sappho, a woman has love affairs with a man she was not married to, which at the time was considered immoral. The Sappho indecency trial was a gateway to the United States transitioning from Victorian morality to present day thinking. I would like to think that in more modern times, individuals would be more open and tolerant of other people's views and ideas, however that would be too easy. As I watched the PMRC video I observed once again a group trying to come down on another because lyrics to a song, or assumed meanings of songs were immoral. Twisted Sister was a great advocate to show self-image doesn't define one's morality. He was attacked in court by conservatives who were afraid of the change and message he could bring to the youth with his lyrics, and assumed they could fix the problem by putting a label on the front album's considered "immoral."

The content in Sappho and 80's heavy metal made a certain group of people uncomfortable, which lead to calling each of these immoral. How can we determine what is and isn't immoral? I believe both of these examples demonstrate conservatism because in both situations a group of people were afraid of what the impact on society would be. They were afraid of change, quite tolerant of inequality (Sappho's star was a woman, metal stars dressed and looked differently than most Americans), and tried to instill a fear of both into the minds of American citizen's.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Is Censorship Effective for Human Morality?

by Kristina Meza - Monday, April 15, 2013, 9:31 PM

The integral question is whether censorship is effective in protecting human morality. Censorship is defined as the control of the government or other authority over the mass media. Could stringent control of so called crime-inciting films protect morality? The main thought in most societies is that some types of films, namely those depicting violence and sex, have an effect on the human mind. Some people believe that such films act as a catalyst to promote violent and sex-related crime. Censorship is important to protect the morals of society However, the implementation of censorship may not always be successful. Since censorship is the government ruling on what people are allowed to watch on the screen, it cannot be successful unless there are strict and stringent checks on stores dealing illegally with pornography. Censorship restricts the flow of pornography in public, but in the end, it is up to the public to decide for themselves what to do. Censorship is only effective if the public wants it to be.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Re: Is Censorship Effective for Human Morality?  



by Karlee Andrew - Saturday, April 20, 2013, 1:49 PM

I definitely like where you headed with the question if censorship is effective for human morality. I agree with you that yes, censorship is important to protect our society but also censorship can only do so much. Towards the end of your statement is what really caught my eye "In the end, it is up to the public to decide for themselves what to do. Censorship is only effective if the public wants it to be", which is entirely true.

What I am looking for is the barest acknowledgment that, well, yes, there are some larger problems having to do with the Net's corrosive effects upon society, and, no, we do not get any closer to solving these merely by voting against censorship at every opportunity. We can only release the trap by pulling both jaws apart, and that means turning off the rose tint on our computer screens and reconsidering the most fundamental terms of our embrace with technology. Maybe if we weren't so technologically engulfed, our children and peers wouldn't have as much access to society's corrosive behavior.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



What does censorship really do?

by Keeler McJunkin - Monday, April 15, 2013, 10:03 PM

I believe that a big question here is whether censorship really affects the way we perceive an idea or mentality. When we are talking about things like violence and sex in a movie per say, then it may. The reason and belief behind censorship I believe is that a young mind seeing these things can cause issues towards growing mentally. We also get into a whole new thing when bringing in the human morality factor. With the point being whether censorship is good for human morality? The key is how we define human morality. How do we define human morality?

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Censorship and Morality

by William Jones - Tuesday, April 16, 2013, 9:37 AM

It is definitely hard to believe that something like this could happen considering that today we live in a society saturated with sex and violence. The two concepts have become cultural norms and are practically unavoidable. Sex fuels all media including advertisements, film and television shows. We are constantly flooded with images of sex whether we recognize it or not. I find it incredible that Olga Nethersole was arrested and brought to court for portraying a character on stage. Her role would not be considered promiscuous at all according to today's standards. Many felt threatened by the role because of its sexually expressive nature. Critics served to

suppress not only material of this kind, but also to constrain women's sexual expression. As the video stated, women weren't supposed to receive pleasure from sexual behavior. The topic itself was taboo and was avoided all together rather than confronted. People wanted to retain women's innocence and purity rather than allow them to express these natural feeling. The concept of censorship, at times, appears to be a good idea on paper, but not when put into practice. It raises the question of a "slippery slope." Where does the censorship end? If people censor something because it is deemed "inappropriate" or "offensive" then where does one draw the line? Something that is offensive to me may not be offensive to another. These reactions differ from culture to culture and person to person which could suggest that there is no way to please everybody. The fact that attendance increased after the trial shows the counterproductive nature of the actions taken by advocates of censorship. Controversy sells whether it is 1900 or 2013.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Censorship and Morality

by Karlee Andrew - Saturday, April 20, 2013, 2:57 PM

YES , i agree with you that clearly cultural norms have changed compared from now to the 1900's. Sometimes i wonder how we possibly went from Sapho, where a woman was arrested for being sexy, to only a couple decades later and the entire media is full of sexual explicitity? but than again like you mentioned, clearly society advocates this sort of media since the attendance increased after Olga got released from being arrested.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Progressive M.O.

by Jonathan Edwards - Friday, April 19, 2013, 12:03 AM

Censorship is a strange manipulation. For all the freedom we presumably had way back in the heyday of our country, we still abided strictly to creeds that frowned on many actions. This restricted the span of the individual's free choice, and was mostly kept in check by Protestant cultural pressures in America, instead of government mitigation.

Like with the Sapho case, (the performing arts always seem to be what pushes the cultural boundaries...) there really wasn't a legally convicting argument to be made, even if some in the American culture found it appalling and dangerous that a woman be portrayed with several lovers, and actually find sex pleasurable. They tried to use legality to thwart the controversy but didn't really have the legal grounds to do so.

They believed that stopping this show would be to the benefit of the USA as a whole. However, the way they went about trying to stop it (using legal authority) is a

very pessimistic progressive solution to the issue. You think something is bad? Try to outlaw it!

This speaks to me: Progressives haven't really changed their M.O. Conservatives of today have even started picking up on it too. The former may have different convictions now, but they still possess that same sort of idealized exceptionalism that says, "Hey, I know what's best for us, so I'm changing the rules." That mindset brought us the Sapho case, Oregon shortening the length of a woman's work day, the ousting of child labor through mandatory schooling, and Prohibition (though that fell on its face).

What's the danger in using the government to mediate what can and can't be perceived as culturally appropriate in a country? Well, certainly it's a limitation of individual freedom. What if someone simply doesn't see things that way? What if they want to watch a controversial play about a loose woman? Is that a crime? Well, had that court case gone the other way, it would have set precedent toward the government saying, "Yes, it literally is a crime."

A second danger: a law may be built off of the soul conviction of, "We know what's best for you." Prohibition, and limiting cup sizes in NY being a prime example. I'm baffled by this. New York has literally gone down the route regulating people into healthiness. Are you serious? If they want to be unhealthy and fat, why try to stop them? If they're fat happy people, more power to them! Regulating stuff like this is just another step down a mindset that a government can "fix" its people.

While I find McDonald's to be an abomination straight from the pit of hell, (just kidding, I work there! I DON'T EAT THE FOOD THOUGH) would it be wise for the government to force them to keep everything on their menu under 400 calories and low carb just because eating too much of that crap per meal gets you fat? It's the same basic principle as the cup sizes, just taken to another level, and as we saw with the 16th Amendment, the government will take whatever steps it deems necessary if you give it the grounds to do so. It's a censorship of nutrition. I wouldn't be surprised if some day, there's a whole black market for McDoubles...

(I use hyperbole to make my points, because that's just my M.O.)

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



women being independent... so we arrest her

by Karlee Andrew - Thursday, April 18, 2013, 11:58 PM

After watching the video on Sapho, i am not suprised in the actions law inforcement took so quickly to arrest Olga. I looked up Sapho on wikipedia to see if i could obtain some more information about this incident. Here is what i found interesting; Olga was not only an actress but she was as well the manager. Dating back to the 20th century, Americcas attitudes towards gender roles would defintley raise some conflict here. Women were not supposed to have that much authority, or get that much publicity. It was always about men and what they did. Women were only

portrayed as wives or mothers in images from the 20th century. But here Olga was seen as independent and sexy. Having Olga display herself against these social norms, is the reason I believe law enforcement took quick action. The men felt insulted, women were not supposed to have so much power, they were not supposed to get attention nor be a manager of a play. I applaud Olga for being bold!

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



The Mann Act

by Haley Shaw - Friday, April 19, 2013, 11:30 PM

I found the audio link about the Mann Act very interesting. What really caught my attention was the fact that we had to have a law for "taking of women across state lines for the means of prostitution or any immoral act". Jack Johnson, an African American boxer was the first man charged under the man act. The idea of it being racial driven does not shock me for the time. I believe that his charges were based mostly on the fact that his mistress was white. Charlie Chaplin was also another famous man charged but acquitted. But was never seen the same after the charges were dropped. It did shock me to find that it wasn't until the mid 1980's for the law to be changed. And only to change the wording to say "any sexual act". From this information I don't think the law was necessary then or really now. It was just another way to control women and to scar someone's reputation. It seems that every time the government wants to regulate the behavior of American citizens they just take it "underground" i.e. the black market. In this case moving a women accused of prostitution or any immoral act from state to state.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



The Need to Censor

by Alex McNeil - Saturday, April 20, 2013, 8:34 PM

Taking steps to classify and outlaw content deemed "immoral" is a noble and ignoble. On one hand, I agree that some content truly is inappropriate--maybe not for all people, but for minors, certainly. I think there's a real need to censor things when their content is potentially harmful to a young audience. But censorship can also be dangerous. We have a tendency of censoring things that make us uncomfortable, but so often the pieces of art that make us most uncomfortable are the most valuable pieces of art. Sometimes it's the uncomfortable stuff that pushes the envelope artistically and culturally. Censoring that threatens forward progress.

In regards to the research, I want to know how liberal the researchers are. I'm nervous about accepting such a clear definition (and condemnation) of conservatism. Does anyone know who the researches are/their political stances?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: The Need to Censor

by Keeler McJunkin - Saturday, April 20, 2013, 10:00 PM

You made some really good points. Censorship is a tough issue because there are two very strong sides to the argument. Both with good and bad alike. Some things need to be censored, with no question. Especially for minors. But when too many things start getting censored is when the trouble arises. I really like what you said about missing out on some fantastic pieces of art, literature, film etc. The bottom line is there needs to be some give and take by both sides. Like letting some things be shown or said for learning purposes.

Sum of ratings: (1)

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

[< Previous \(American Exceptionalism\)](#)

[\(Conservatism and Censo...\) Next >](#)

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

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

