



Search forums

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

< Previous (Demonizing the Enemy)



Using and Abusing History

by Joe Escobar - Friday, May 17, 2013, 9:30 PM

This forum thread is for Using and Abusing History 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.

BE SURE to use an informative subject line for your post.

Sum of ratings: -

Edit | Delete | Reply



Propaganda double-take

by Barry Sommer - Saturday, May 18, 2013, 11:29 AM

The use of historical images to make a statement on current events is common, we need to ask whether it should be done. Not that I advocate censorship, yet I do wonder sometimes why a particular image was used and for what purpose.

The one that struck me the hardest is the cross. A symbol thousands of years old that elicits emotion across all levels, the cross is the worlds most powerful symbol for 2/3 of the global population. Representing the crusades, the death and rebirth of Jesus, cities and towns across America use it as part of their symbol and it has been set ablaze numerous times by white racists to terrorize. I find the picture not so much insulting to the cross but to the military and those who died while struggling to uphold its ethics and morals. To use the cross to recruit for replacements by implying that you will need to die to allow the next replacement to serve strikes me as crass.

The next one that really got me was the comparison between the victory on Mt. Surabachi on Iwo Jima and the victory (ostensibly) over global warming. I do appreciate the symbolism of raising a tree to make the point, but the point itself is

silly. I think it is folly to believe mankind has the power to either exclusively improve or destroy the natural world. It is a nice visual but tells the wrong story.

Lastly, Princess Leah playing Rosie the Riveter made me laugh. Harmless promotion for a science fiction franchise using a known and loved character. I admit the hair buns combined with the historical pose is done very well, it's slightly silly but proof that (marketing) propaganda can work without insulting or demeaning the audience.

As a blogger myself I agree with the first set of posters. The first amendment is at play here and we should all stand for, and support fully the right to speak freely. I would put that one on my wall.

I have many personal favorites, here is one of my top 10;



How many innuendos can you come up with?

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Pictures P S

by Francisco Gomez - Sunday, May 19, 2013, 5:35 PM

One of the pictures I found personally impacting is the rationing picture. I remember seeing latter pictutre(anti-libreal message) on internet borads years back. The knoweage I gained about that rationing picture though this class has further gave me reason why I still dislike that picture. It disrespected the history of the rationing picture and also gave a negtive message. I felt it was like threat towards libreals and

disrespected them.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Disrespect

by Matt Blackshear - Monday, May 20, 2013, 11:22 AM

One of these photos I just cant stand is the photo with anti-flag. I use to listen to this band years ago but after I joined the military I couldn't stand them anymore. They are a left wing band who are against imperialsim and war (odviously by the photo). If anti-flag was around the time of the teens and the twenties, they would have been deported out of here right with Emma Goldman.

Fun fact: After the September 11th attack many stores pulled Anit-flag's records from the stores bescause it was labelled as "anti-American" (Wikipedia).

Im sure anyone from WW2 would be very enraged by the desecration of the Iwo Jima flag raising. I know I am.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Disrespect

by Barry Sommer - Monday, May 20, 2013, 7:43 PM

I had never heard of anti-flag until this forum, and now seeing your reply as someone who was in the military I understand why you switched allegiances. I looked at their website and they seem the stereotypical anarchist/radical socialist, just like we have here in town. I think you are right in that they would have been deported w/Emma Goldman, this type of free speech would not have been tolerated back then. Even today they are ostracized by some, you yourself decided not to listen anymore, and I am sure there are others who feel the same way. I would not listen, the short clip I heard reminds me of a band called GWAR, and they definitively would have been burned at the stake by the angry torch and pitchfork wielding mob. I agree that the use of the Iwo Jima flag raising is a touchy subject, but can it really be seen as desecration? Milton Berle said the greatest compliment you can pay is to steal someones material, so maybe any representation using the image of the flag raising is a tribute to the original? I have an emotional reaction when I see that image, and respond accordingly. That will always be a part of it, but should we disallow the use because it offends or insults? What are we, followers of Islam where any slight is an excuse to burn and pillage?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Disrespect

by Matt Blackshear - Monday, May 20, 2013, 8:42 PM

I don't think that we should disallow them to use the image how they want. That would be taking away their rights to free speech. I still do however see it as desecration. If you google the definition of desecrate it says, "Treat (a sacred place or thing) with violent disrespect; violate." When flying a flag upsidedown it is a sign of distress. When you look at the original picture you don't think distress at all. You think of victory, and grounds won fighting. Two very different things on opposite ends of a spectrum. If Anti-flag was paying tribute to the original it was worst tribute I have seen.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1 

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Disrespect

by Barry Sommer - Tuesday, May 21, 2013, 4:14 PM

I agree 100%. I may despise what you present but I will defend your right to display it. I once gave a lecture on the Holocaust, and as a Jew wondered how it would be received. Since I raised what I considered valid questions about certain "mechanics" of some of the camps I was attacked as a racist (imagine the irony!) anti-Israeli and a historical revisionist. I have also stood by the free speech rights of an avowed Nazi, even as I knew that if he had his way I would be dead.

Yes we may be insulted or feel demeaned by what we see, but until it rises to the level of advocating violence we MUST protect our right to speak freely....that is until your fist reaches the end of my nose.

Propaganda is protected speech as you rightly point out, and we have a responsibility to uphold it with "our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor".

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1 

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete |
Reply



something i know

by JessicaZoe Wallace - Monday, May 20, 2013, 1:27 PM

This is just kinda funny after all. it reminds of all the days playing as a fat Italian plumber known as Mario so when i was looking and i came across this i had to use this.

granted the use of spreading Communism greatly disturbs me, because in the game he is trying to save princess peach who always seems to get captured by someone.

and of course this is not a positive message at all super Mario is supposed to be a happy game, nothing about spreading communistic ideas and thinking.

**THIS
IS
THE
ENEMY!**



**BE READY!
JOIN NOW!**

FIND YOUR LOCAL RECRUITING OFFICE!

The Enemy



Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: something i know

by Barry Sommer - Monday, May 20, 2013, 7:56 PM

The funniest thing on the poster is the admonition to "find your local recruiting office" as if they are hidden in some secret place. Never having played Mario Brothers I can only wonder about Princess Peach and her relationship to the mustachioed one. I do like the communist/socialist look to it, and doesn't Mario look like Stalin?

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: something i know

by JessicaZoe Wallace - Wednesday, May 22, 2013, 5:12 PM

yeah when i saw this i was inspired in this form

Sum of ratings: (1)

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



Propaganda Posters

by Drew Peters - Tuesday, May 21, 2013, 6:32 AM

Of these photos the one i cant stand the most is the poster with the cross in the ground and stating "vacancies available". In the original picture it was portraying that there could be communist spies around and everyone should watch what they say because they never knew who was listening. The message was straight to the point and very clear to take caution when talking about the war. But in the newer poster I saw nothing like that, it seems to me that the government is losing more soldiers than they are recruiting and needs to fill spots quickly while forgetting about our dead and what they meant to our country as well.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Propaganda Posters

by Brittani Cotton - Tuesday, May 21, 2013, 12:30 PM

I found this one on-line, and it just made me laugh. To think that something like Rosie the Riveter, one of the most influential posters from the WW2 era has been turned into an ad for the Hunger Games or Star Wars.

But, the most disrespectful poster I found was the one with the cross. The original one was done very well, and it was a way to tell people to be careful about what they say and who they say it to. But, the new one pretty much slams the men and women who have given their lives. It basically says that when someone dies, we immediately need to fill that void.



Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Propaganda Posters

by Leah Livesay - Tuesday, May 21, 2013, 5:29 PM

Drew-

I also found these posters the most concerning. I definitely saw no connection or resemblance between the two messages. The message that is used in the second poster kind of bothers me, as it has nothing to do with the confidentiality of the war, and the loss of lives if that confidentiality is not kept. I too felt that the second poster was basically just throwing out the soldiers who lost their lives and quickly looking for new ones. Totally different messages and meanings, same picture, not well portrayed.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Who's Liberty? (Blogger's Liberty!)

by Jennifer Smith - Tuesday, May 21, 2013, 12:38 PM

Looking at all of these posters and their "creative remakes", I feel as though I could go on for hours and hours about all of them, but the two that really stopped me were the blogging/women working one and the 'real freedoms'/rations one. Since some one already went in to the rations poster and it's remake, I'll focus on the working women during the war one.

WWII dealt heavily with the idea of patriotism and the idea that you, yes *you*, *all of you* needed to be doing something for your country regardless of what that something was. So long as you were contributing in some manner you were a proper American citizen, and anyone who wasn't were often side-eyed for being 'unpatriotic'. Granted it was a gross generalization and the truth of this matter varied from person to person, but there was a constant bombardment on the homefront once we were involved in the war of posters telling us that if we wanted our freedoms to be protected and we wanted victory over seas you'd best be doing *something* for it. This poster in particular is directed at women that were recruited to work in offices and take up spots that had been vacated by men going to war.

Now, twelve years after the events of 9/11, patriotism balances on a precarious line, and while we technically still involved in a war (though not nearly on the level as WWII or even some of the wars following it) our freedom has extended beyond life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It's also become the pursuit of being able to say whatever the hell we want online. This poster's remake is no longer directed at just women, but bloggers - those who write articles exclusively online either via a web news source or on their own personal blogs - and telling them that liberty is waiting on these people to get to typing.

But I see a problem with this, having spent so much time online in forums, browsing blogs and talking to other people. While having this freedom and this wide-reaching ability to say something, post it, and have people not just in your country but all over the real world is pretty spectacular, amazing and likely something people back in WWII couldn't even dream of, it's one of those "freedoms" people tend to take a mile when they really should be given an inch. Most bloggers aren't this bad; most are courteous, polite, and follow the basic rules of web etiquette. Most just want to state

their opinion and be done with it. Others still just want to share ideas with the world. But there's that select few that ruin it for everyone by behaving like pretentious jerks when so often they don't even know what they're talking about, or are so set in their own opinion that they won't ever be swayed and will browbeat anyone who refuses to see things their way.

I'm certainly not against speaking your mind, and I'm not going to sit here and stomp my foot and say that these sorts of things should be taken away from us just because a few people are going to ruin it for the rest of us. I just feel that when it comes down to going so far as using old propaganda for new, and telling people that their blogging will bring liberty, I have to question... liberty for who? Who are they targeting? Those who are willing to share, discuss, and debate thoughts and ideas civilly or those who would trample on the rights and ideals of the rest of us simply because they don't agree and won't agree? Because it seems to be the ones who won't agree aren't going to be fighting for the same liberties the rest of us are. And what happens to those who are trying to blog for one liberty and the others come around to stomp on it? What happens when you need to be protected on the web from attackers that aren't physical in nature?

Which brings me to my next point...

I said all this with just a look at the two posters, deciding to put my thoughts down before looking in to it a little bit more. It seems to be that the site it links to (Electronic Frontier Foundation) IS a site regarding Blogger's Rights. It made me happy to see this, because it is an important issue that often gets overlooked in our technologically advancing world. The site carries a Legal Guide for Bloggers, and lists off many important facts regarding blogging, rights, safety and anonymity. Thinking that all these posters potentially had something negative in connotation in the remakes, I was pleased to find out this one wasn't just some scare tactic or negative outlook.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Who's Liberty? (Blogger's Liberty!)

by Alex McNeil - Saturday, May 25, 2013, 2:46 PM

The first amendment needs to be abused--it's the only way that it'll stay strong. You're right, bloggers do occasional 'go a mile when an inch would do,' but those people--the obnoxious, over-the-top dissidents--are the ones who prove that the right to free speech is valuable. The extremist bloggers are those who stir up revolution in politically-corrupt nations. They provide a good service to society. I don't think that it's right to ask them to lower their voice.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Re: Free Speech in Blogging

by Brittney Nestle - Saturday, May 25, 2013, 5:54 PM



Well said Alex, I completely agree with you!

I have a small anecdote: recently I was in London on a tour, we came to a place called "Hyde Park Corner," where the tour guide assured our group proudly that the British had "absolutely free speech" there; they could stand and rant about anything they wanted, EXCEPT they couldn't "say anything bad about the queen." I had to bite my tongue from pointing out the obvious: that's not free speech. In fact, what good *is* protection of free speech when we can't bad mouth our leaders? I always thought that was why we had protection. Can we threaten our president? Heck no. It's normal for threats on lives to be taken seriously. Can we stand on any corner and rant about what a "stupid-head" our president is? Absolutely. And people do.

So the point:

Propaganda though it is; it speaks the truth: "Liberty waits on [bloggers] fingers," because it's not necessarily what we say, but the fact that we have the right to say it.

I'd also like to point out that what's considered obnoxious can be extremely relative, and even if some of these bloggers are truly rude and over-the-top, I think the minute we start censoring is the minute we lose our liberty.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Different Meanings

by Leah Livesay - Tuesday, May 21, 2013, 5:18 PM

I think that the posters that I found most interesting were the ones with the cross in the ground with the soldiers gear hung from it. In one, the message is "a careless word....another cross" while the other says "Join the Army, Vacancies Available". The messages portrayed by each of these posters are completely irrelevant to one another. I'm not sure how I feel about the change of the message here, but I think that the second poster should not have used the same picture for their message. "A careless word....another cross" was referring to spies. This message was trying to get the people to realize that there were enemy spies looking for information. It was saying that people needed to watch what they said concerning the war, and if they didn't, lives would be lost. In the second poster the message was no where close to the first. "Join the Army, Vacancies Available", is not suggesting anything about spies or using caution while addressing situations that were going on. This message is simply trying to get people to join in on the war, become a part of the Army. I really don't see the connection between the message of joining the army with the cross and soldiers gear. I feel like the second poster is basically saying "soldiers died, there's room for more", which is kind of harsh if you ask me. I feel that this was not a

good way to portray their message, considering the first poster had such a different meaning.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Inappropriate Uses P S

by Brittney Nestle - Saturday, May 25, 2013, 11:44 AM

So like several others who've posted, the piece of propaganda that struck me the most was the cross with the army helmet bearing the words: "vacancies available." The message is very obviously anti-war and I see that point, but during WWI/WWII this was meant as an incentive to protect America's troops and the country itself. Whether or not one agrees with war I think this is an inappropriate use of history; the new version makes light of how serious the World Wars (and war in general) were and also of the people dying for our country.

I think this also is a piece of propaganda switched over from pro-war to anti-war...





This is the same picture with a twist and one of the most misused pieces of propaganda; I see this one everywhere: pinterest, twitter, facebook, tumblr etc ...it's obviously completely out of context.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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

[< Previous \(Demonizing the Enemy\)](#)

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

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

