



Search forums

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

[< Previous \(Censorship and Morality\)](#)
[\(American Exceptionalism\) Next >](#)


Censorship and Morality

by Joe Escobar - Friday, April 12, 2013, 5:06 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](#)


upset and offended

by Tyler Kennedy - Sunday, April 14, 2013, 2:20 PM

What I find compelling is that people were so offended and upset over the final scene in the play the not only was closed, but it went as far as having criminal charges filed against the actress who played the lead role. I find it kind of crazy that the final scene, where she's being carried up the stairs without protest caused so much of an uproar, and luckily for the actress the jury was sympathetic and she was found not guilty.

Concerning the mann act I don't think the law was necessary then, and certainly not necessary today either. The person driving the car across state lines shouldn't be charged if the person riding with him/her happens to be a prostitute that makes him/her guilty by association which is just a way of punishing two people for one crime.

And finally the humiliation does in fact shows that the morality is quite the same as it was back at the turn of the century. Only back then there may have been a trial if we

use sapho as an example. Today however if he didn't resign it would have affected his political career. People wouldn't look at what he's done as a politician, but rather what he did when he was off the clock.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: upset and offended

by Michael Shaw - Tuesday, April 16, 2013, 12:17 AM

Of course people get offended, and they get offended by the littlest things that in retrospect seem pointless. For instance, "The Kiss" caused all manner of uproar in crowds around the nation because at the time that was something not everyone had been exposed to. Nowadays, people kiss on TV and movies all the time because its now so common place in our changed society.

Back in 2007, when the video game "Mass Effect" first released, FOX and other news networks were in an uproar because the player could have sexual relations with different crew members. Was it justified? Of course not, this is FOX. Had the reporters actually reviewed the game by going in and playing through it, they would have realized that it was nothing more than what you can find on HBO later at night and that the little "M" on the front of the box indicates that it is in no way made for children or younger teens.

So what it really boils down to is the level of tolerance our nation has at what point in time the "offensive material" might exist.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Getting the facts

by Kaylee Garman - Saturday, April 20, 2013, 3:38 PM

As a society, we seem to be all about 'shoot now and ask questions later'. Often times when people feel offended they get carried away by their emotions and don't analyze the facts. People tend to become very riled up at things they really know nothing about. I could easily see parents becoming upset over FOX's "Mass Effect" story. If something is on the news or the internet then it just has to be right. Right?

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



How Are We To Know Who's Morals Are Right?

by Jacob Wines - Friday, April 19, 2013, 2:50 PM

If you hear that something is going to offend you going in, you simply don't go. You don't impede someone else from seeing something that they would enjoy

simply because you think it is wrong. Unless it is impede someone's basic rights, there is no use for censorship anywhere. If it offends you, don't see it, listen to it, read it or whatever else. We face censorship today all the time. Christian groups wanting to shut down certain musicians because they believe their music to be "anti-christ" music. We have yet to progress as a country in terms of letting people do what they want, live how they want, and be who they want. Let your beliefs define you. Don't shove your beliefs down someone elses throats.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Pushy progressives

by Kaylee Garman - Friday, April 19, 2013, 11:17 PM

You are so right! The idea of people staying out of things that aren't their business and that they find offensive seems like it should be reasonable. The problem was that many of those that were offended happened to be progressives. The progressives thought it was their duty to clean up society and make America a better place. Like the progressives, many people believe that the way they do things is right so they feel the need to give their two cents to everything instead of keeping their beliefs to themselves.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: How Are We To Know Who's Morals Are Right?

by Jesse Nichols - Saturday, April 20, 2013, 11:49 AM

Jacob,

I Completely agree with the points that you have brought up here. What good is censorship if it cannot possibly encompass the beliefs and values of everyone, not just the select few it does now? To me this seems like its a giant wast of time, money, and effort. If something offends you, then avoid it, it's really that simple. Just because a select few do not like something, it does not give them the right to ruin it for everyone else who enjoys it.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



offence in anything

by JessicaZoe Wallace - Sunday, April 14, 2013, 3:22 PM

This just shows that any sexual act even a small as going up stairs with a man with no protest, people can find offense in anything.

lets face it censorship, has always and still is alive and well. its not going away

however, theres always morals behind every decision, whether people are trying to have a play shut down or get upset with seeing a film that involves a kiss or provocative dressing.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



The Moral of the Story...

by Leah Livesay - Monday, April 15, 2013, 12:16 AM

As I watched the Sapho video, I could not believe what was going on! Talk about time differences. Seeing how seriously a small play like Sapho was taken in a sexual way, and then comparing that to things today, it's like a smack in the face! It's rare nowadays to even watch a movie without there being nudity and sexual references, much more provocative than Sapho. This is the way our culture is now though, it's completely normal to see sexual references by women all over the place. In this video the lead actress was arrested for how she acted in the play, I was shocked! I'm very glad that she was not found guilty and was able to continue the play. I suppose it just goes to show how different things are compared to many years ago.

I think that the Mann Act was set in place for a good reason, however I'm not sure how effective it would have been. Human trafficking and prostitution is something that should be stopped, if possible, so the attempts that have been made I think were justified for the most part. Unfortunately though, it seems that when people are being stopped from doing something, it just gives them reason to push harder to do it anyways. I think this is one fault with the Mann Act, people will find ways of doing what they please, getting what they want. At times when someone tries to control or "regulate" peoples behaviors, it makes them want to act out even more, and things can spiral out of control quite quickly.

Although in some parts of our culture things have changed drastically, there are still parts that are very much alike. For example, the Spitzer scandal, it doesn't seem to matter who you are or how "big" you are, if something like this happens, people want to know about it. Not only do people frown upon sex scandals but they can and will change your life, and how people think about and see you. When you are supposed to be someone that people look up to as a leader, and you are caught in something like this, you lose that respect you may once have had, you lose those people that once supported you, you lose your title and gain a new one. So in some ways, things are still alike and people still carry some of the same values and beliefs.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Over censored

by Matt Blackshear - Tuesday, April 16, 2013, 12:41 AM

The commotion caused by this play was blown way out of proportion. Criminal charges for a role in a play where you go to bed with a man? Could you imagine the kind of charges we would have today? A way the progressives could have censored this play would have been in a review. Put it in the papers that there is a scene of moral wronging , or something along those lines. Like our movie ratings today. My mother finds alot of the movies I like offensive so she just doesn't watch them. I think putting a criminal charge against her was unnecessary.

The Mann Act I feel was necessary then and is still necessary today. Prostitution is a bad thing so why not set laws to try and stop it. I believe there are good people in the world just as there are alot of bad people. People will do bad things and someone has to try and stop them. However if a government gets to controlling people will revolt. For example gay marriage. People are not exactly revolt but there are protests. Who's to say two people can't be with eachother. I feel like that is more of a personal life decision where the government doesn't need to be involved in.

When your in a position to lead people will look up to you. People will expect more out of you. That is what goes on with people in office and get caught in sex scandals. Noone ever cares about the local sex scandals or cheating of common day people you see everyday. People like Eliot Spitzer are held to a higher standard. They have many eyes on them, many of whom expect them to be role models and to do the right morale thing. The moral standing is no different today than it was years ago.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Times have changed

by Laura Wood - Tuesday, April 16, 2013, 8:24 AM

I find the fact that men were found to be sexual creatures and not women to be crazy. Obviously women have to be sexual creatures as well, considering they are the ones who give birth to a mans child. Its sad that because she wasnt punished in the play that she had to get punished in real life, because if it was still like that in todays times, tv, plays and etc would be a lot different.

I dont believe that the law was necessary then and no it is not necessary now, the only way I think it would be necessary is if they are going involuntarily because that would be considered kidnapping. Other than that, it is not our governments duty to tell someone who they can and cant drive with across state lines.

When in a position of authority or power, people obviously nobody wants to see or hear about the way that they get sexual pleasure. We like to act blind to it, like they shouldnt have a sexual life outside of their job.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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

Re: Times have changed  



by Leah Livesay - Thursday, April 18, 2013, 8:24 AM

Laura-

The video on Sapho surprised me very much as well, the entire thing! I think that of course it was crazy back then for people to think that it was "wrong" for women to engage in sexual relations, or situations. Does that even make any sense? Men are supposed to be sexual, women aren't, then who are the men having sexual relations with? How are children being born? It's pretty clear that men and women engage in sexual situations, and that's completely normal. These days there are not many things that do not have some kind of women portraying sexual references! It really blows my mind how many things have changed over the years!

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Times have changed  

by Jesse Nichols - Thursday, April 18, 2013, 1:21 PM

Laura,

I strongly agree with your position on the Sapho play. Its amazing to me that she was put on trial for something that was not even an actual crime. Yes being seen taken to bed might have been seen as offensive to the people of the time but its nothing to press criminal charges over. I also find it strange that men are considered sexual creatures while women are not. How are these men satisfying their sexual desires then if women are not participating in sexual acts? In order for reproduction, women must engage in sex, which in turn makes them a sexual being in some way or another.

As for mixing sex with politics, it's not so much that we think they shouldnt have a sex life outside of their work, but that they should have a respectable relationship that is kept behind closed doors. With great power comes great responsibility, and we as the American people should expect nothing but the best from our leaders because they are held to a higher standard than the rest of us. People who are in a position of power like Eliot Spitzer are expected to be role models, not participants of sex scandals.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Judging By Today's Standards  

by Jesse Nichols - Tuesday, April 16, 2013, 12:34 PM

After watching the Sapho video, it was shocking to see how different our societies values are today compared to what they were in the early 1900's. In a scene at the

end of a play a woman was carried up to bed by a man, while today we see absolutely nothing wrong with this, in the early 1900's this act was viewed as scandalous and inappropriate, and because she was not punished in the play Olga had to be punished in real life. It's crazy to me that she was actually tried on criminal charges for committing what was not even a real crime. Sex is so prevalent in our society today that its hard to fathom a time where it was so harshly criticized and looked down upon.

Considering the Mann act, I think the law was neccessary then, and still is today because the ugly truth is that human trafficking is a terrible act that has long been out of hand and we need to do anything within our power to stop it. Early on I believe the Mann act was written with good intent but its rules were too vague which led to unnecessary interactions with law enforcement but the amendment that have been made to it within the last 30 years have helped to clear up some of the gray area.

In regards to Eliot Spitzer, I believe he shouldn't have even had the option to resign from office, he should have been fired. Some may argue that his resignation is a sign that the morality of U.S. hadnt changed much since the turn of the 20th century but this is far from true. Our society is open to and accepting of sex, just not when it involves a political office. A person who is in charge of leading the people should be far to busy with politics to be involved in a sex scandal, so obviously somebody wasn't doing their job correctly.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Judging By Today's Standards

by Leah Livesay - Tuesday, April 16, 2013, 3:47 PM

Jesse-

I definitely agree with your responses, and I'm glad to hear that you feel the same as I do for the most part! The entire Sapho situation is just mind boggling! Like I said in one of my posts, you can't go anywhere or watch anything without seeing pictures/videos, etc. of women making sexual references in one way or another. Yet in Sapho, nothing even happened, she was not nude or actually doing anything, and look where it got her!

Concerning the Mann Act, I too feel that it was necessary then and is still necessary today. Sex trafficking is not exactly something that people should be doing, or allowing. Just like with other important laws set in place, there needed to be something set to try to keep this from going on, although it did not and has not stopped it completely. Reduction of situations like sex trafficking and prostitution has to start somewhere!

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Not really surprised

by Kaylee Garman - Tuesday, April 16, 2013, 9:40 PM

What I actually found most compelling wasn't how outraged people were, but who they went after. I would think that the crowds would rather go after the writer or perhaps director of the play instead of the actress. After all she was just following her lines; the play wasn't her brain child. I don't find the outrage of this scandalous play to be that surprising. For other history classes I've been in, we've had to read about how modest the women had to be with their clothes and bodies. Not to mention how older shows like "I Love Lucy" don't even show the mom and dad in the same beds, because that would be too risqué.

I think that the Mann Act was more necessary then as opposed to now. Now people tend to do what they want and are less fearful of the law and the spiritual consequences than people were back then. Even though the Mann Act isn't 100 % full proof I think that it does do some good in reining in certain people. I wouldn't say that it's really necessary though. When the government steps in to try to control things some people actually give in. For the most part though, government interference just makes people sneakier.

For people with higher power and fame that are involved in scandalous events, the United States response isn't very different from back then. If some random man or woman did the same thing, no one would care. The United States' morality has definitely changed, but some things do remain the same.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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

[< Previous \(Censorship and Morality\)](#)

[\(American Exceptionalism\) Next >](#)

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Logout)

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

