



Search forums

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

[< Previous \(Conservatism and Censo...\)](#)
[\(Censorship and Morality\) Next >](#)


Censorship and Morality

by Joe Escobar - Friday, April 12, 2013, 5:07 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](#)


Of men and morals

by Barry Sommer - Sunday, April 14, 2013, 1:24 PM

Interestingly enough, the video title "Saphos" implies a not so subtle sexual context, if you add a second "p" you get the common spelling, and by the mid 19th century the word sapphos was applied to women who loved women; lesbians. This came from the Island of Lesbos, where Sapphos lived most of her life, and wrote poetry some consider to be homoerotic. It makes sense that the public, and those charged with enforcing morality codes would take great offense to the story, and the fact that the character (like the actress) made no bones that she liked sex went against all the conduct and morals of women of the day. As a woman you were supposed to do your "wifely duties" and that was that. The lead actress, Olga Nethersole was quite the sexual pioneer for her day. If you think the term "free love" came from the hippies in the 60s, and that the sexual revolution began somewhere in San Francisco in 1966, you would be about 120 years off. Olga Nethersole was the first to coin that phrase back in the 1850s, so her performance of a woman wanting the company of a man for her own pleasure was in keeping with Nethersoles character in real life. With

women now seeking out the pleasures of the flesh, men were willing to exploit the situation.

Olga Nethersole was arrested, prosecuted, found guilty and then released. Her time in jail did not silence her supporters or her critics, the notoriety only made the illicit more attractive, and the show was even more packed than before. Some in the audience said the show was “instructive” and a policeman who saw the performance commented that after 6 times, he did not see anything offensive! I would wager that those who saw the show as instructive were mostly women, and that policeman would just as easily sit through a “Little Egypt” dance and make the proclamation, with just as straight a face that it was only “art.” The guardians of public morality and their war on vice proved that nothing sold more tickets than talking about sex, a point not lost on how advertising would sell products in a few years.

The advent of the automobile and the ability to travel farther than 15 miles a day (the standard travel distance for horse and buggy) created a perfect opportunity for the passing of the Mann Act. Not that the auto was the only reason, but it was much easier to flee with your lover to a far away place, maybe across the state line to his (or her) farm or house. The authorities could not control their people if they could leave the area, so it makes sense to try and restrict movement. Not that keeping people close to home would stop the carnal desires, it just made them more creative...like doing it in the back seat. As with all morality laws, the intention may be good but it is virtually impossible to legislate behavior. Look at any example of laws designed to restrict some kind of behavior (adultery, fornication, drinking, smoking, over-indulging...) and you will find that the people have found some way around the laws, and the behavior; since it is now against the law it becomes more of an attraction due to curiosity. Government interference with how we live our private lives always grates on the populace, begging the question; who decides what is moral and what isn't?

The folly of man knows no bounds, either ethically or politically. The one that comes to mind is Senator Larry Craig (R-ID) who was caught in a bathroom sex scandal in Minnesota in 2006. He had been the target of an investigation back in 1982 on allegations of cocaine use and having sex with male congressional pages, nothing was found and he was not prosecuted. He also tried, in 1989 to lead an effort to punish Rep. Barney Frank for his involvement in a gay prostitution scandal. Hypocrisy, thy name is shame and denial. Granted, gay sex scandals are fairly recent product of 20th century culture, but the behavior, denial, tears and scripter contrition have not changed since man first became aware of his own capacity to seek pleasure and lie about it.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Of men and morals



by Robert Sappington - Monday, April 15, 2013, 10:33 PM

"Interestingly enough, the video title “Saphos” loved women;

lesbians."

Wow I didn't exactly know the full story on the background. Thanks for the info.

"The advent of the automobile ...passing of the Mann Act."

You know I never thought about how transportation could affect it. Its interesting to think that being able to travel farther might influence it. I was thinking it was tied to how people of this profession followed cowboy towns or the railroad. But yea, totally the automotive could add to it, especially in the 20th century.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



A lot to consider

by Mercedes Shutt - Monday, April 15, 2013, 9:53 PM

To be honest I am not sure how I feel about the Saphos and the way it was handled. I feel like the issue would have been handled the same way if something of that sort happened now. People like sex and at the same time they look down on it. I am not sure if this has anything to do with this, but I think it is crazy how a movie can be R rated because they show nudity and it can have a lower rating for watching people murder people... This is just so hard to understand. I believe sexuality is hard to understand but very interesting. I find it funny how more people went to the show after it was a larger scandal.. things have not changed in my mind. Please help me understand this better and if anyone has more information on this issue please share.

I believe the Mann Act was necessary when it had to do with prostitution and illegal sexual acts. I think that if it was not formed years later society would believe it is morally accepted. I do not think that sex should ever be legal to sell, I do think that maybe it will slow the rates of STDs but I think it will lower the self worth of women. I can not imagine what it would be like to think that it is "okay" for someone to go have sex with someone for money.. If prostitution does become legal, which i hope it never does, it will grow tremendously.

I believe people that have morals well never look up to someone that pays for sex. now, then, or ever.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: A lot to consider

by Veronica Wilkens - Monday, April 15, 2013, 10:24 PM

I agree in the belief that "Saphos" would have been regarded in a very similar fashion today as it was then. Despite growing up in the late 90's, early 2000's era of music videos with way too many bikinis, I still feel that we as a society are ridiculously hung up on sexuality. In an internationally connected world with commercials from other countries being posted on Youtube (often showing naked men and women or even, my personal favorite, people in Brazil urinating in the shower to help save water), it becomes quite obvious that the United States seems a category of its own.

With regard to the Mann Act, I agree that its protections against prostitution are necessary, but that perhaps a more refined law would suit us better (such as if the new wordings it uses now had been used from the beginning). However, I feel that this was, unfortunately, the way it had to be. Corruption is often times spread too far for truly humanitarian laws to be passed, and casting a wide net such as the original form of the law did is, in my opinion, what helped get that law put through.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



People have no morals? I doubt it!



by Ruby Kalamas - Saturday, April 20, 2013, 12:40 PM

Mercedez,

I believe that to find the reasons why we treat some 'immoral acts' worse than others, we must look at the overall sense of morality of our society in America. If you think about it, back when Sapho was made, a play showing extreme violence might have received just as much uproar as Sapho did for its sexual connotation. After Escobar showed us the variety of propaganda last week in class, it made me realize that even some blood on a knife or sword would have stirred the "ethical Pot".

After realizing that, I was able to think that perhaps a truly gory play would have been worse than Sapho, especially since Sappho gained popularity after its publicity (That actually sounds familiar to today's stars, doesn't it?).

As far as the Mann Act goes, I don't think that it was really put into play for the seemingly 'good' reasons that many people believe. We're looking at it from our standards today, when prostitution is an ugly scene to Americans, and sex trafficking is a horrific industry throughout the world. Back then, the Mann Act was used almost solely to discriminate against Black Americans! The first person it was ever used against was Jack Johnson (the black boxer who had many white lovers). The Mann Act at the time was just another example of the Reformists flexing their muscles. See source 1 for more info.

Onto your thoughts on prostitution-

This brings me back to my first point, of needing to take a look at the

overall ethics of our society, and our society back then. Reformers were radical, and they didn't like the idea of white women selling their bodies to men for immoral (ungodly) acts. Even if those women had no better prospects to earn money at the time. Was this the view of our entire society at the time? I highly doubt it. Considering that America was chock full of immigrants that had come from their own societies with perhaps different ethical views, it's hard for me to think that everyone at the time thought that prostitution was a bad thing; especially the women who were prostitutes and the men who paid for their services. I would guess that many wives and reformers were against prostitution, and probably also a lot of Christians.

To relate to current day, prostitution is certainly more frowned upon than it used to be. Good luck finding a legal brother in Oregon! The people (and there's a lot of them!) that feel this way are not considered radicals any longer. Although to say prostitution is entirely illegal here wouldn't be telling the whole truth. Take, for example Nevada (See Source 2). Nevada is the only state left that has legal brothel prostitution; although from what I've heard (and seen in movies, if that counts at all) it's fairly rampant on the streets as well.

Source 2 ties this all together. Just prior to the Mann Act, the BOI (now the FBI), interviewed 1106 prostitutes, and only 6 of them said they were victims of 'white slavery'. To me, that seems like the other 1,100 prostitutes were at least somewhat content in their line of work. Relatively happy, as Escobar might put it.

Perhaps at the time, the 1,100 women that were interviewed had used prostitution to elevate themselves in some way. Maybe they left an abusive husband, and were able to support themselves. Maybe they like having sex all the time and the job was a perfect fit. Or maybe they just liked being able to work a job where they would actually get paid more than a man would at the same job. At that time, women didn't make anything compared to their male counterparts (maybe in the case of a Black American, they would fare better due to our history of racism).

So I don't agree with you that prostitution necessarily begets a low self-worth in those women. It could for some, but for others, maybe it actually makes them feel better about themselves, or helps them take control over their own lives? I've had the modern version of this conversation a few times with folks in regards to strippers, and I tend to feel the same way, although I have in the past felt that it was a demeaning job.

Finally, to say that someone with morals would never respect a person that pays for sex I think is a very narrow point of view. The morality of one person cannot and will never extend to an entire nation. And what of other nations and cultures that have different moral codes and views? I think that morality is a very personal thing, and to live in a group, whether it is a family or a country, we must learn to find common ground on the issue, but we must also have respect

for the nuances and differences in the moral codes of others. To say that a person that pays for sex has will not be looked well upon by moral people is false. They just have a different version of morals than you do.

(Source 1) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mann_Act

(Source) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prostitution_in_the_United_States

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Society of Sexuality

by Joshua Reay - Monday, April 15, 2013, 10:03 PM

The society that we live in even now is based upon sex. Whether we want to believe it or not it is. Sexual innuendos in every single television commercial there is even if all they are selling is a hamburger. It is out of control. It is crazy to consider that they went after the actress based solely on the fact that in the play the character she was playing wasn't prosecuted. That in my mind is outrageous. She was playing a character, it wasn't her doing the acts herself.

For the question of whether or not the Mann Act is is a necessary law or not is crazy. Yes it is necessary for us to have a law saying that transporting women for prostitutional reasons is necessary. It was necessary back then and I believe it is even more necessary now. It gives us more ways to prosecute offenders of sex trafficking and put them behind bars for longer periods of time, where they belong

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Censorship and Morality

by Robert Sappington - Monday, April 15, 2013, 10:27 PM

What do you find most compelling about the entire episode?

The thing I find the most compelling is that something like this was wasn't enacted sooner. With the way the New England States were, I'm surprised there were no other laws on the books already.(that I know of) It's common knowledge that there was a lot of prostitution in the west, but since the west "ended" in 1890s, it makes sense (according to history) that people want to "civilize" the rest of the country. Jumping ahead a hundred yes, the thing that seems weird to me is that it takes almost a century for Congress to update the laws to today's "standards," of what's morally wrong.

Concerning the Mann Act, was this law necessary then?

I don't think it was, but I believe people wanted to "end" prostitution and decided to make an example out of some people. It just happens though, that the girl who played Sapho, was proven innocent. Or that the law was misused to prosecute

people, who didn't commit the crime. (Jack Johnson and his wife)

Is it necessary today?

Yes. Human traffic still goes on today. In fact, it's becoming so bad that laws are being revamped to on who and how to charge people. USA today had a few recent stories about it. Google has even implemented a text line to report violations. I think the law is more necessary today than it was in the past.

(Source: <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2013/03/31/human-trafficking-laws-legal/2036077/>

<http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2013/04/09/network-aims-to-combat-human-trafficking-globally/2067497/>)

What can happen when the government attempts to regulate the behavior of its citizens?

People rebel. History has shown us that the more someone tries to restrict liberty (right or wrong) in some way, shape, or form, people rebel and do exactly what was supposed to be restricted. A past example that was restricted, and then rescinded, was alcohol (prohibition of the 20s). Or more currently, the ban on pot.

Finally, consider the public humiliation of Eliot Spitzer (or any other politician in recent years), caught in a sex scandal which caused his approval ratings to plummet. Doesn't this governor's early resignation in disgrace signal that the morality of the United States today is not very different than it was at the turn of the 20th Century?

Yes and no. Yes because people are still embarrassed or their image is damaged, so they leave. This ruins their party's reputation and their own. There is actually a huge list of people too. (see below 1) Although, I think it depends when it happened, if the info has spread, how its spread and what happened. This is where I will also say NO, because it depends who you are, what you did and most importantly when.

I have two examples, one from the past and one from the present. My past example is Andrew Jackson. His scandal was living with a married woman, and marrying her before she was divorced. He still won reelection though. (Lets ignore the fact the slander against her ended up killing her) And my prime example of now is: Arnold Schwarzenegger. He had scandals prior to coming to office as a movie star and it didn't affect him running for office. In fact he settled a lawsuit while in office with Anna Richards (2). He also had a scandal while in office with his maid having a kid, though he covered up until after he left (2). And should I mention Bill Clinton?

So this is why I said yes and no. It completely depends on the who, what, where, why and when.

(1)

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arnold_Schwarzenegger#Allegations_of_sexual_misconduct

(2)

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

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



The Mann Act- intended for black men only?

by Ruby Kalamas - Monday, April 15, 2013, 11:11 PM

Robert.

I like your post. I was not terribly surprised that the morality police made the headlines with the Sapho play. I mean, even if radical moralists were a minority, they still were heard. The Wikipedia article about the Sapho play even mentions Yellow Journalism (Which ties into our class nicely)(1). There were rumors of the press handing out tickets to the show. My guess would be to write about the reactions from the exiting crowd. The attention the 'scandalous' play got in the media may have brought on the arrest of Olga and her associates, but it seemed to help her more than anything. Olga's trial, according to the video clip in the forum materials, did nothing to hamper the play's success. In fact, it made it more popular.

The Mann Act being used didn't surprise me either; especially since it was used to get in the way of an African American who was doing better in his sport than his white competition was. He also had three wives in his time and multiple lovers- all white women. This wasn't popular at the time by any stretch, and they used the Mann Act twice to attempt to prosecute him for it. (It worked the second time). According to Wikipedia, this happened before the Mann Act had even passed (2).

This led me to grimace when even thinking about the Mann Act. It seems like it could easily just be a tool for racism. During the time it was enacted, I'm sure that was its use. Although today I could see it being properly used to try and combat actual human trafficking. The whole topic of the Mann Act left a sour taste in my mouth.

1- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sapho_%28play%29

2- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jack_Johnson_%28boxer%29

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Re: The Mann Act- intended for black men only?  



by Robert Sappington - Tuesday, April 16, 2013, 12:09 PM

To tell you the truth, I never considered yellow journalism, but yeah it appears to also hyped the events up. Its funny though, how in the long run the whole scandal ended up making the play more popular. I wonder if this was the underlying goal in the first place? or if it really did just happen to play out this way?

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



changing morals  

by Lesley Pilz - Monday, April 15, 2013, 11:55 PM

What do you find most compelling about this episode?

What I found most compelling was the fact that while the play was about the main character's flings with men, the most controversial scene was just her and a man walking up a flight of stairs towards (an implied) bedroom¹. This was during a time in America when just showing a kiss between unmarried people was considered immoral². I found it interesting that the book and other play that this play was adapted from had a man as the main character³ but that they purposely changed it to a female to make it send much more blatant message to those who watched it. There was no outrage or trial for the original play. While I understand the social morals of this time period, did they not watch any of shakespear's plays⁴? Why I wonder did they not get upset at the in-your-face sexuality in some of those, or did they just ban them during this time?

1,2,3 link

4 link

Mann Act= Was it necessary then? Is it necessary now? What can happen when the government seeks to regulate the behaviors of its citizens?

In rearguards to its necessity then I think that other laws (such as those outlawing prostitution) where enough and did not need another law with wording that was so open-ended. Later the law was changed so the wording makes it apply to either prostitution or unconsensual activities⁵. I'm not certain we need this law in addition to others we already have in place for these very reasons even today, other then maybe to lengthen jail time or raise fines in more extreme cases.

An example of when the government previously tried to curtail the personal behavior of its citizens was during the prohibition. Historically we can see that prohibition not only didn't work but raised violent crime in the form of mafia run speak-easies. Trying

to regulate something that is a highly popular activity and has been legal for a vast majority of time or has strong cultural ties just isn't going to work in the long run. Making it illegal won't stop the majority of those people from engaging in the activity. It also runs the risk of infringing on constitutional or personal rights and freedoms.

5 link

Does the disgrace from scandals suggest that morals of today are not that different from the turn of the 20th century?

My point of view on this matter, based on discussions I have had with others during such scandals, is that people today are mostly disappointed in the decisions made by the individual less then the sexuality of the act itself. It brings into question whether or not the individual can make proper or wise decisions for the people they are representing if they can not make these decisions for themselves. Therefor it is more the job they have that makes it a scandal not the act.

For example during the Bill Clinton scandal my parents (who are republican and consider themselves conservatives) couldn't care less that the president cheated on his wife. They considered that his personal business, but the fact that he did it in the Oval Office and then lied under oath to the American people was what upset them. at the time this seemed to be the majority of the views I was told. However as this is all personal opinions it is merely conjecture.

I do feel if this happened at a later time in history the outrage would be more centered on the crime or act itself and not on the aftermath.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Censorship of Sapho

by Hayley Demanett - Tuesday, April 16, 2013, 9:02 AM

I was pretty surprised by what happened regarding the movie Sapho. It made me realize how much people's views on morality have changed. I couldn't believe that the actress from the movie got punished for starring in the movie. From the video it sounds like there wan't anything explicit shown and that it was all implied. Comparing it to some of the movies we have now it seems extremely mild. What I also found interesting was how the actress in the movie got punished but no one who went to see the movie did. If people were so against that movie, it makes me wonder why they kept showing it. It also talked about how the police chief went and saw the movie six different times. Obviously he didn't seem to have a problem with it. It is interesting to me how much things regarding movies have changed.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Censorship of Sapho

by Thomas Comings - Saturday, April 20, 2013, 8:53 PM

I think that the reason the show kept playing is because people often less moral than they care to admit. That's easy to see with Prohibition, everyone wanted to come across and being anti-alcohol and "moral" for the times, but what came out after the law was passed that that everyone still wanted to drink. Americans, in this last hundred years, has gotten more comfortable admitting what they are ok with and what they even enjoy.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Censorship and Morality, Today and Yesterday

by Brenda Contreras - Wednesday, April 17, 2013, 8:06 PM

What I found most compelling about Sapho was, obviously, that the actress was punished for the role she played. When famous women of today play a role, whether it's in a music video, photo shoot, movie, or commercial, they tend to be criticized and labeled. "*Did she go too far?*" Is the most common headline I hear or read when a woman expresses some form of sexuality? Many people were shocked when *Time Magazine's* cover was a breastfeeding mom; she was criticized for doing something that is natural. If Olga Nethersole was to perform in that same play today, people wouldn't overreact the way they did in the early 1900's.

I think that the Mann Act law was directed toward African American men, in this case, Jack Johnson. There is still human trafficking today, women from different cultures and children as well, are being trafficked around the states and even the world. When the government attempts to regulate the behavior of its citizens, they tend to lash out. Maybe this is why we tend to not listen to our parents when they attempt to control our behaviors. Getting to a rebellious age is kind of a rite of passage; it's almost expected of you.

When it comes to politicians, the people and the media eat it all up. I believe that everyone secretly enjoys scandals, even if they disagree with whatever happened. With what we are exposed to everyday, it wouldn't surprise me if when the next couple of generations are old enough to be in office, the sex scandals will still be scandalous, but it might not attract the same kind of attention it does today. In the textbook it says "The movement for sexual and gender equality aroused considerable anxiety. Parents worried about the promiscuity of their children." When I read this, I thought about how there is still a fight for sexual and gender equality, and how parents tend to worry about their children's promiscuity as they age. What about the adult's promiscuity, who is going to worry about that? When the politicians, celebrities, presidents, or athletes are involved in a sex scandal, hatred toward them usually follows, usually resulting in the end of their career.

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

Sum of ratings:3 (1)



Re: Censorship and Morality, Today and Yesterday

by Robert Sappington - Thursday, April 18, 2013, 12:38 PM

You bring up a few interesting points I would like to expand on.

" If Olga Nethersole was to perform in that same play today, people wouldn't overreact the way they did in the early 1900's."

I think it depends on who people are and where they live. I think that there will be certain people in certain parts of the country that say its too much. I really dout you will see a play like this in say, rural North Dakota or Montana. I'm not talking about the population but culture. But once you move to the bigger cities, it seems to be more "accepting," and bigger cities seem to have a looser sense of morality and censorship.

Also, if you didn't know, cable companies and other cooperation's tailor their material to regions, or interests. Example: History channel has a east and west. If you have satellite you might have both, but cable companies you tend to have 1. And if you never knew, they tend to have different shows based interests of the region.

"When it comes to politicians, the people and the media eat it all up."

I wonder that if America's sense of morality and censorship changes over the next few decades, if the media will even care? Like if people become so accepting of every way of life (far fetch I know) then would anyone care about these "scandals"? I mean if it doesn't affect the oath of office of a politician, why should we care?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Censorship and Morality, Today and Yesterday

by Brenda Contreras - Thursday, April 18, 2013, 8:42 PM

I'm sure that if most of the world became comfortable with what is considered inappropriate behavior, there will always be that town, or group of people, who will be against it. I've lived here my whole life and noticed when I go to cities, people aren't judged as much as they would be in towns.

That's very interesting about the programs they put on television. I didn't know that they did that, and I would be really interested in what it is that they watch. Culture has always been an interesting subject for me, and now that I think about it, I'm not really surprised that cable companies and

the other corporations do that.

Maybe the sense of morality is changing in the U.S. but it will always change, and it has been changing. It reminds me of when Joe was talking about how the people who supported the prohibition ended up having their own secret stash of alcohol. Sometimes, people just don't practice what they preach. I've noticed that the younger generation sometimes seems to have no respect for people of authority. And when I mean authority, I don't mean just cops, but adults, parents, teachers, etc. Or maybe this is how it's always been, but I think that the extent of the situation changes throughout each generation.

I believe that the media will continue to care about the scandals, especially if the person in question is someone who is well respected and someone people can look up to. It's like when your parents or guardians talk about you to other people, they either tell them the good things or the bad things you have done. You do something wrong once, and you never hear the end of it, and they think that it's something you're likely to repeat.

Why should we care? I don't really know. I've heard people complain about how much money politicians probably spend to attempt to keep their scandals a secret. Some may think that if they can't commit to their relationship, how can we expect them to commit to our towns, states, nations, own needs?

Sum of ratings:2 (1) Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Censorship and Morality, Today and Yesterday

by Mercedes Shutt - Saturday, April 20, 2013, 11:41 AM

Robert Sappington:

Yeah but the performance really didnt show anything. so your saying that if this play was shown people might say its too much. I think the opposite because you cant even watch tv without seeing someone half nude or pretending to be sexual eating a hamburger. I do agree with you about the bigger cities, but I think that if this play was brought back without being a history play, people really wouldnt think much about it and I bet children would be able to see it as well... I dont know I guess I just think this generation is falling apart.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Censorship and Morality, Today and Yesterday

by Robert Sappington - Saturday, April 20, 2013, 7:33 PM

".. so your saying that if this play was shown people might say its too much"

When I lived in North Dakota there were a few different groups, I believe mennonites, that thought showing ANYTHING was too much. These people do not own TV's, or at least the ones I met.

"people really wouldnt think much about it and I bet children would be able to see it"

Again, there are always people who care and would say its too much.

"I dont know I guess I just think this generation is falling apart."

This statement is interesting because when I was talking to my Grandma the other night we talked about this. She said when she was a kid her Grandpa told her how he thought her moms generation was falling apart. Then my Grandma told me how her mom thought her generation was falling apart. But guess what? Then my Grandma thought my moms (60s era) generation was falling apart. And now it seems people think the new generation is falling apart. My point is that its funny, how each generation thinks theirs is falling apart.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Censorship and Morality, Today and Yesterday



by Mercedez Shutt - Saturday, April 20, 2013, 11:41 AM

Brenda Contreras:

I really like your third paragraph. "What about the adult's promiscuity, who is going to worry about that?" I guess the law... but they had it pretty easy with keeping their children away from sex, now you really cant even let your children watch commercials. The saphos episode is like a burger king commercial now a days. The start to when people realized "sex sells"

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Regulating Morality



by Thomas Comings - Saturday, April 20, 2013, 8:46 PM

To me it makes sense that the "progressives" were part of a force that advocated for what now seem like more conservative values. In their eyes, they were helping guide America in a more morally perfect direction. While I see their point, I think it goes against strong American ideals to try to legislate and regulate morality -- especially

when those morals are strongly founded in religion.

I find the Sapho incident to be expected of those times, given America's puritanical background. I find it interesting that the actress was European as that seems in-line with the idea that Europeans are more loose morally and more lax on social freedoms.

Morally, things have definitely shifted in this country to allow for a more liberal view of things like sexuality and violence in entertainment and in the public eye. However, situations like public sex scandals show that fundamentally we still have similar sensibilities as we had 100 years ago -- the Spitzer situation proves that.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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

[< Previous \(Conservatism and Censo...\)](#)

[\(Censorship and Morality\) Next >](#)

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

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

