

HST 203: U.S. History Sp18 (Escobar Meta 41002 43590)

[Home](#) / [My courses](#) / [HST 203 Sp18 \(Escobar Meta 41002 43590\)](#) / [Week 3](#) / [Forum 1](#)
/ [Censorship & Morality](#)



Forum 1 Censorship & Morality

[Subscribe](#)[◀ American Exceptionalism](#)[Censorship & Morality ▶](#)

Censorship & Morality

by [Joe Escobar](#) - Thursday, April 12, 2018, 9:05 AM

This thread is for discussions on the Censorship & Morality topic.

To make your POSTS, click the reply link in this, MY post. To reply to another student's post, be sure to click the reply link within in THEIR post.

IMPORTANT - SUBJECT LINES

BE SURE to use an informative subject line for your post, something that describes which one of the questions you are addressing. Do NOT simply leave it RE: Censorship & Morality

Sum of ratings: -

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



Re: Censorship & Morality: Sapho, 1900s vs Today



by [Sadie Baker](#) - Thursday, April 12, 2018, 2:55 PM

As the paragraph preceding the forum questions states, there sometimes seem to be inconsistencies between a political group's place on the spectrum and their actual behavior. This actually makes for some similarities, even consistencies, in the actions of liberals and conservatives. Both groups endeavor to uphold (aka enforce through legislation) what they believe is right morally and/or ethically. The biggest difference I see between the two groups is not their behavior, but simply the ideals which they believe in. If conservatives are the "morality police", the liberals are at least the "ethics police". Certainly both groups are the "ideals police". I would argue that both groups are equally successful in enforcing their ideals, as well as guilty of injustice and invasion of some other groups' rights as a result thereof.

Having made this assertion, I believe it is both supported by the example of Sapho and other cases of censorship in the 1900's, as well as insightful into the issue. Both parties were and are apt to attack or censor anything that is wrong according to their ideals, and often to unnecessary extremes. We saw conservatives over-policing immoral messages in the Sapho case, but there are examples of progressives doing this with legislation in the same era. For example, the progressives pushed for the ideal of a political voice for the general public, and made this possible with important legislation that changed the voting system. However, there was censorship of those who wouldn't support progressive ideals with their votes with the shield of voter registration laws. (pg. 695 in the textbook). In our current era, there is more idealism than ever, and both conservatives and liberals attempt to silence others (often each other) in the fight for what is right. There is plenty of demand for censorship, with people constantly calling out anything which is said or done by another that doesn't align with their ideals. There is a strong theme of ridding the government of all moral and ethical misconduct. And especially interestingly, there seem to be a lot of people who advocate to silence any person who silences another (logic, right?).

I find it compelling that in the Sapho episode, conservatives felt so threatened by the message being spread by a mere stage play that they felt the need to silence it and punish the ones broadcasting something that didn't align with their ideals. More compelling is the insight which can be drawn from Sapho and any other other instance of censorship both in the 20th century and our current times, which is that no political party is ever fully right, and to involve government in idealistic affairs is always to a degree both futile and damaging to society.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

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



When Rule of Law becomes Tribal Law

by [William Perdomo](#) - Friday, April 13, 2018, 12:26 PM

When perusing Joe's available options for questions for this topic, one in particular stood out: "What are the unintended consequences when experts pass legislation attempting to help or protect a specific group of people?" Immediately a quote from Frderic Bastiat, a 19th century economic philosopher, who was a prominent member of the French Liberal school, comes to mind. This quote out of his monumental treatise, *The Law*, I think is prescient now as it certainly was then: "When plunder becomes a way of life for a group of men in a society, over the course of time they create for themselves a legal system that authorizes it and a moral code that glorifies it."

There is a popular misconception that when something is considered public such as the government, i.e., because it is constituted through democratic means, that it must be good; likewise, if something is private it is always ambivalent, suspect, and must prove itself through, what we call now in modern parlance, virtue signaling to the public at large to prove they aren't just a collection of thieving "bad guys." The government, however, gets a pass from this scrutiny and is always considered to have its collective heart in the right place despite the horrors it may inflict on its population both overt and subtle. The reason for this oversight, I think, is that we have been taught to think collectively and to place ourselves into groups based on phenotypic attributes (race, gender, ethnicity) and aggrieved status (Native Americans, Blacks, Latinos, Muslims, LGBTQ ++, etc.). Because of this, we don't see individuals, or citizens with their own bundle of legal rights, as such; but rather a set of boxes that can easily, and neatly, place them within the context of one of the tribes mentioned above. The grave danger of this is that tribes are just that: self-contained cultures; echo chambers that have their own law and moral codes that they wish to impose on their neighbors who may not see the world the same way nor orient themselves around the same beliefs. So, what ends up happening in a democratic system is that one or more tribes turns to the state (the government) to create laws and entitlements that benefit themselves at the expense of others. Basically, a group seizes control of the courts, the houses of congress, the presidency, and begins to write laws that allow them to seize other people's property and liberty under the guise of morality because, as I've stated, the government is always good since it was democratically elected.

This notion about the absolute sovereignty of the people via democracy goes right back to Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *Social Contract*, the seed of the modern world-wide Left, where he wrote in the 18th century: "The social pact, far from destroying natural equality, substitutes, on the contrary, a moral and lawful equality for whatever physical inequality that nature may have imposed on mankind; so that however unequal in strength and intelligence, men become equal by covenant and by right." The language is subtle but what Rousseau is advocating for is for government, blessed by the sovereign (the people) to equalize the differences between members of society. Well, how do you do that without chopping the legs off someone else in order to make them

the same height, so to speak? The only way is to limit the growth of some so that others can achieve the same height. Now extrapolate this from an individual to a collective level and you have groups, such as the ones that exist in this country that I have already mentioned, who all have a collective grievance, and who all have been taught to think of themselves by their tribal label rather than as American citizens: all in it together. Immediately you have differences where one sees the other as suspect and possessing privileges that one does not have for whatever reason that must be, short of civil war, be recalibrated by the only means at their disposal: the coercive power of the state. Hence, they direct themselves to gain control of the state to use it in order to punish their enemies and impose their will on the people.

The state itself cannot teach one to be moral or ethical; it does not have the ability to create art and music; nor does it have the ability to, in itself, push science forward to the stars or under the seas. It has one purpose: to govern. And to govern it must use force which means putting a gun to your head on April 17th because Uncle Sam isn't exactly asking you to work three days out of your week for free so that He can use it to bribe someone else to vote to increase his own power at your expense.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#)

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



Mann Act Relevance

by [Jason Yeager](#) - Saturday, April 14, 2018, 5:29 PM

As noted on the Wikipedia page about the Mann Act, the intent of the legislation "was to address prostitution, immorality, and human trafficking....." (Wikipedia) I think that the human trafficking aspect was, and continues to be, the most important part of the act. Forced enslavement of other humans is inherently abhorrent and despicable, regardless of the time period, and should always be criminalized.

Unfortunately, as we see in the case of Jack Johnson, an unintended consequence of this act is that it has not always been applied evenly or fairly. In Johnson's time, many believed that bi-racial unions were immoral. As such, Johnson was arrested and convicted--by an all-white jury--under a twisted interpretation of the act in order to address the perceived immorality of his relationship with a white woman. (Wikipedia)

While I think that at its core, the Mann Act in relation to human trafficking is incredibly important, other attempts by the government to regulate the moral compasses of citizens have not gone so well. The Eighteenth Amendment is a prime example. Humans are driven by desire, and if they want something, they are going to get it. If the government say they can't have it, they are going to want it even more. This is readily apparent in the fallout that happened after passage of the amendment. It was a good-intentioned attempt to curb lawlessness and other scourges on society brought

good intentioned attempt to curb lawlessness and other scourges on society brought on by alcohol consumption, but as noted in our textbook, "It soon became apparent, however, that Prohibition was doing as much to encourage lawbreaking as abstinence." (pg. 794, *Liberty, Equality, Power*)

This speaks volumes about human nature, and is the exact reason that I don't say something to my kids like "Don't play with fire," because I know their desire to taste the forbidden fruit will overcome my admonishments, and they will burn our house to the ground!

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

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



Sappho

by [Kevin Gable](#) - Monday, April 16, 2018, 1:58 PM

What I found most compelling about Sappho and the reaction to it at the time is that the reaction seemed to be more about controlling women's behavior than just about defending the perceived moral good. "Sappho hinted that women too were sexual creatures and any hint that women could experience pleasure in sex was scandalous and dangerous." (1:24 into the video) The idea that a woman would consensually in an illicit sexual activity was infuriating. Since the character wasn't punished the actress had to be. She was arrested for violating public decency and heavily fined (1:07 into the video). Connections to issues today; I found it puzzling that when last year the Senate was to relook at healthcare in this country it convened a panel of exclusively 13 men to decide the particulars a bill that would have changed the ACA and had a significant effect for women. There were available female Senators Mitch McConnell (Rep. Ken.) could have selected to work on this but instead chose exclusively men. Why do you think this specific choice was made?

(original submission Saturday, April 14, 2018, 11:55 PM)

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



"American Morality"

by [Kevin Gable](#) - Monday, April 16, 2018, 2:00 PM

Harvey Weinstein himself in the news a not too long ago for allegations of sexual assault and harassment. As a result his career was pretty much devastated. And we would not, in my opinion, be wrong in feeling that is justified. I can think of Anthony Weiner and his famous Twitter debacle that led to his resignation. But no one arrested him for it. Actress Olga Nethersole was arrested, fined, and tried for staring in a play as a character who engaged in immoral sexual behavior (or so it was

thought of at the time and she was found not guilty 2:52 into the video). So I think certainly our idea of what is moral and what is not has changed over the years. The one thing I think has stayed the same however is, what is our accepted cultural definition of morality and who defines it? The first answer I can not pretend to say I am qualified to answer for every American but I can answer the second one; us. We the citizens get to argue what we believe is moral and just. It's not just the government who decides what issues America faces as a government but "We the people" decide what issues we face as a nation. And maybe this long history of free speech is among the most "moral" and "exceptional" thing about us.

(original submission Saturday, April 14, 2018, 11:56 PM)

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

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



The Mann Act

by [Kevin Gable](#) - Monday, April 16, 2018, 1:59 PM

I would like to think that every law is conceived out of necessity. The Mann Act of 1910 was viewed then as being very crucial to stopping forced prostitution and debaucherous behavior. I think everyone can agree now that forced prostitution is worthy of fighting against. But laws must be created and enforced by humans. And that is the difficult part. To get gain support there were rumors circulated about vast networks of prostitution rings ran by immigrants. This was done in response to vast amounts of women flocking to cities because inventions like the typewriter made it possible for them to support themselves for the first time. (:27 in to audio). Somehow this translated into a danger of societal moral decline. In 1986 it was amended to better protect minors and replaced words like "debauchery and any other immoral purpose" with "any sexual activity for which any person can be charged with a crime." (1:58 into the audio) In this new format it is very needed today. It helps to prevent the law from being misused by people with private or perhaps discriminatory agendas. Jack Johnson was arrested and convicted in 1913 under the original version of this law for having relations with a white prostitute. He was convicted of committing a "crime" 3 years before the law even existed. (Jack Johnson additional reading) This made it seem very racially motivated. Anytime the government tries to dictate or control citizens behavior someone will have their ideals of freedom infringed upon. This is almost unavoidable. This is why we as citizens get together to argue "the greater good" so often. The progressives of the early 1900's managed to get a law passed restricting children from working. This was a great idea as you and I see it now through our lens of understanding but to the immigrant families that found themselves without income this was in fact a hardship.

(original submission Saturday, April 14, 2018, 11:56 PM)

Sum of ratings:3 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Censorship & Morality Part 2 Political Spectrum**by [Kevin Gable](#) - Sunday, April 15, 2018, 12:36 PM

It has become increasingly difficult to pinpoint exactly where I find myself on this spectrum. Over the last two weeks of lecture and the last two chapters of reading I have seen this spectrum get a little blurry. For instance, We heard in the first week of class lectures about how we can think of the spectrum of conservative as resistant to change and on the other side as Liberal embracing change. Roosevelt was a republican conservative. He believed in his moral and racial superiority. (textbook page 734) But at the same time he was building America's military, especially it's navy, at a never before seen rate. He was pushing America's influence in the east and growing America's territories. (textbook section marked "Theodore Roosevelt, Geopolitician" pages 734-740). That's change at an unimaginable rate for the time. That seems very far left and Liberal to me. So at times it seems to be hard to place Roosevelt in the spectrum unilaterally and permanently. As for figuring out the accuracy that isn't so easy either in my opinion. Sure it seems intuitive to think that the desire to keep things the same is because it's "safer". "The researchers said that conservative ideologies, like virtually all belief systems, develop in part because they satisfy some psychological needs, but that 'does not mean that conservatism is pathological or that conservative beliefs are necessarily false, irrational, or unprincipled.'" (direct from the article) But I can't help but notice that there is no other factors mentioned. Does this mean there are no other factors or does this maybe show a bias in the whole premise of the study? I do think that they should have studied both spectrums side by side.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Censorship & Morality Part 2 Censorship and the PMRC**by [Kevin Gable](#) - Sunday, April 15, 2018, 12:36 PM

The similarities between the battle between the PMRC and heavy metal had the very same outcome as the moral battle of the progressives and the actress in the play Sapho. Both turned out to be the best thing that could have happened for them. There success was greatly increased as a result of the attempt at repression. "The PMRC was the best thing that ever happened to heavy metal". (Bret Michaels 7:29 into the video) They both seem to be cases of conservatism in action by the desire to hold onto traditional views of morality. However, challenging the notion of free speech as being susceptible to censorship and repression seems a bit on the "extreme change" side of things from what the founders intended. I am starting to see the lines between these

two sides less and less concrete. Honestly the motive seems pessimistic if the justification is preventing the moral decay of America. As if heavy metal will ruin the American people through moral corruption. And I see a very prevalent atmosphere today for a similar more dangerous argument. The freedom of the press. Right now we are watching what could be the precursor to more arguments about what the legal and moral obligations of the American press should be. And this is not even a new argument honestly as we heard about the "Yellow Journalism" of 1900. (Textbook pages 721 and 722) Though I must say that I believe that government repression or censorship of the press would be disastrous for the American people.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Comparing Sapho in Today's Society

by [Justin Douglass](#) - Sunday, April 15, 2018, 2:21 PM

Sapho is a timeless historical event that's still relevant today. One of the most compelling things about this event is what exactly Olga did on stage that brought her to court. According to the video provided, Olga's character consented and was eager to have a sexual encounter with a man. (Video, 0:37-1:14) The intriguing part of this entire story is how we, as a society, view sex now compared to Olga's time. It may seem ridiculous now that a woman was put on trial for playing a character that consented to sex with someone that wasn't her lover, whereas in 2018, there's plenty of videos of both men and women doing sexual acts on different platforms, and (for the most part), no one is getting in trouble. However, there is a correlation with Sapho and the state of morality in 2018.

Back in 2014, the U.K. government banned certain types of pornography from being made and distributed by English citizens. Without going into graphic detail, some of the things banned included "savage" acts that could "potentially harm someone, if not done correctly." What they were trying to achieve was for folks not to repeat acts they see in these videos and photographs, so they don't harm themselves; this ties in rather beautifully to the story of Sapho. In both cases, it shows some sort of government trying to "protect" their citizens from lewd and immoral acts, judged by them. This brings up an important question: is there an objective line that should never be crossed? Who gets to decide what the line is? Indeed, I agree that there are some acts that are just too disgusting to show and that we as people should ban them, but what my line is may be different from the person who made the post above or below me. It's been over a century and this conversation is still being had; this shows how important and crucial the story of Sapho is.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

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



Re: Comparing Sapho in Today's Society

by [Michael Workover](#) - Friday, April 20, 2018, 3:12 PM

You're absolutely correct about there being a correlation between then and today's society. It's a lot different but similar at the same time. If you look into the United States' views on sexually explicit content, we look pretty open now compared to 1900 when Olga Nethersole was put on trial for what you could find today at almost any High School Theater group play. Although when you take a look at other countries beyond the US like mentioned above, there's still a correlation between the 1900's and Now. Another example other than the UK would be Japan. "By Japanese law, any lawfully produced pornography must censor the genitals of actors and actresses" (Pornography in Japan, Wikipedia) which you would not find this intense in the US where as people today are making a living off of being overly explicit.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

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



The Mann Act

by [Michael Workover](#) - Sunday, April 15, 2018, 9:55 PM

I definitely believe the Mann Act was needed at the time it was implemented mainly because the amount of human trafficking that was going on across state lines at the time the Act was put into place in 1910. I also believe it is necessary today because of the amount of human trafficking we still have this very day. Although when the government makes laws not everyone agrees with them so the jobs are still done under the table which could lead to more aggressive forms of human trafficking such as kidnapping rather than being sold and transported regularly. Today I would say the Mann Act serves well for some but not for others. *"In practice, its ambiguous language about 'immorality' has resulted in its being used to criminalize even consensual sexual behavior between adults."* (Wikipedia Entry on Mann Act) and I bring this up because there are actually people today who would like to make their living through prostitution which the Mann Act is against.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

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



Re: The Mann Act

by [Kevin Gable](#) - Monday, April 16, 2018, 10:19 PM

In 1910 new inventions like the typewriter made it easier for women to support themselves resulting in women flocking to cities for work. It was even suggested that lots of the human trafficking was actually rumors circulated. (27 into the audio

that lots of the human trafficking was actually farmers circulated. (27 into the audio report). Now even if the law only prevented one case of human trafficking then I would say it did its job. I just happen to find that part interesting. I wonder how many times facts have either been misrepresented or omitted with the intent of doing the greater good? In 1985 The Mann Act was amended better protecting minors and changing the original language, "debauchery and any other immoral purpose" with "any sexual activity for which any person can be charged with a crime." (1:58 into the audio) To me this seems reasonable and clear, although I am not a lawyer and privy to every case. But I do agree with you, especially under the later amendment that this can be a useful law provided it is not used in the way it was used against Jack Johnson in 1913. He was convicted under this law due to relations with a white prostitute. Heres the kicker, he was charged, tried, and convicted of committing a "crime" before the law was even written! (additional reading on Jack Johnson)

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**Re: The Mann Act**by [Tanner Wiese](#) - Thursday, April 19, 2018, 2:24 PM

We talk about similar things in our posts. And, I agree that it was implemented at the right time for the right reasons. And, I think that we still have more human trafficking than people realize today. So, the Mann Act is still important even today. And, I understand that people want to make a living doing that. But, I think the main purpose is to prevent human trafficking across state borders, and, people from controlling vast numbers of women. Because, human trafficking became a big issue back then, and, immigrants in many cases were controlling large numbers of woman. So, the Mann Act was implemented to prevent that, not prevent woman from making money.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

0

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**Re: The Mann Act**by [Kevin Gable](#) - Thursday, April 19, 2018, 5:43 PM

Human trafficking is still very much a problem today. And with the changing of the language of the law in 1985 it still is very useful. Did you read the extra reading about Jack Johnson? This law was used to convict him after he had relations with a white woman. What I didn't know was the State tried to convict him twice. Once was for relations with a woman who refused to testify against him so the case fell apart. However, during attempt number 2 they found a "victim" willing to testify and they convicted him and sentenced him to 1 year and

victim willing to testify and they convicted him and sentenced him to 1 year and 1 day in jail for an "offense committed" 3 years before the law was ever written.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Public humiliation

by [Casandra Fountain](#) - Sunday, April 15, 2018, 11:07 PM

Part I

Believe it or not I had to search for recent scandals, I don't engage in celebrity news or magazines so please correct me if I'm wrong on this. The first news trend that came up was about the Harvey Weinstein allegations. I'm not quite sure if popular opinion of him has plummeted, I'd like to believe so if 85 women have come forward with reports of criminal behavior. (usatoday.com) Let's say my belief is right, this does show that morality of the US is similar to early 20th century morality to a certain extent. In this case, I don't believe Weinstein has been charged with anything, but I feel the actuality of him going to prison is slim to none. Many people of this high of popularity get a slap on the wrist and it doesn't truly affect us as the public if they serve time or not whereas in the early 1900s people were more engaged. When something like this happened laws were placed, movements were started. What do you think, do things today change when scandals like this come up?

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Public humiliation

by [Kevin Gable](#) - Monday, April 16, 2018, 10:37 PM

I think it depends on whether or not you are willing to take a stand and change them. It's not easy either. The price is heavy sometimes but sometimes the need is much greater than the price. I'll give you a personal example. 5 years ago I found out my daughter was being sexually harassed in school by a group of boys. No matter how many reports and grievances I filed nothing happened and it got worse. Then I found out that my daughter was not being singled out and that it was school wide and even many other schools in the district had the same problem going on for almost 10 years as I could find. So I got a lawyer and filed a federal law suit. (google Kevin Gable vs KISD) Long story short the retaliation we suffered for being whistle blowers is that I lost my career, my home, and that was the easy stuff. But on the other end of the not only did the school settle once 1 suit became 3, the state of Texas investigated and cleaned house, and my kids and I started over here in Oregon last Sept. The state of Texas even passed a new law last year stating that no educational system receiving funds from the state is allowed to enter into non-disclosure agreements if the damages are more than \$10,000. Not because I was

discloser agreements if the damages are more than \$10,000. Not because I was some hero or even mentioned, more like I was a drop in the bucket as to the lawsuits they most likely found. I can tell you this because we were not allowed to even consider such arrangement by the state. In the end it's not a perfect change or solution but maybe it will help empower other parents to come forward now that some new transparency is coming to light. However, that will be their responsibility to fight.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2

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



Re: Public humiliation

by [Mirissa Hicks](#) - Wednesday, April 18, 2018, 6:45 PM

I completely agree with you when you make the point of highly popular people get slapped on the wrist for sex scandals now a day. If you look at what's going on in the white house today there are multiple women including porn stars say that our president had affairs with them. But it seems like people aren't caring and the only person is taking the heat from the whole situation is the lawyer who may or may not have paid Stormy Daniels (Trump alleged mistress) off. If you look at Elliot Spitzer, whose disapproval rate dropped according to the chart posted in the forum during his sex scandal with proustite's and which lead him to leave office why are we overlooking our president compared to a governor?

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

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



Re: Public humiliation

by [Tanner Wiese](#) - Thursday, April 19, 2018, 2:32 PM

I agree with you 100 percent. I think that famous people or celebrities get away with too much. And, in the Harvey Weinstein situation, he should be in jail for along time. But, he is somehow 85 woman coming forward about his criminal behavior didn't result in anything. Although, he wasn't doing Human Trafficking across borders. He still did some outrageous stuff that should have him in jail for a long time. And, in the Mann Act video they state that Charlie Chapman got caught breaking this law, but, was still acquitted (1:35, Mann Act Video). Although the video said his image was never the same. It shouldn't matter how famous you are, if you break this law you should be put in jail.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

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



Re: Censorship & Morality



by [Shana Martin](#) - Sunday, April 15, 2018, 11:50 PM

Finally, consider the public humiliation of any politician or celebrity in recent years, caught in a sex scandal which caused his or her approval ratings to plummet. Do these events signal that the morality of the United States today is not very different than it was at the turn of the 20th Century?

In response to this question, my answer is yes. These events do signal that the morality of the U.S. today is not different than in the 20th century. Sex scandals, and people speaking up about being sexually harassed have become a more frequent occurrence in these days rather than in the 20th century. That doesn't mean that it never happened back then. It was way more censored in those days, so we didn't hear about it as much.

The Harvey Weinstein incident that took place a few months ago was something that sparked more and more women to come to the public and talk about sexual harassment (time.com "*Here Are All the Public Figures Who've Been Accused of Sexual Misconduct After Harvey Weinstein*", 3rd paragraph).

It is not, by any means, easy to talk about personal sexual harassment to anyone. Although, I do think it is "easier" to talk about it today than it was in the 1900s. My reasoning for that is because sexuality, in general is more tolerated and accepted in many different scenarios than back then. So playing with the line, and crossing that line is bound to happen more frequently today. Like I said, that does not mean that it didn't happen as much back then, that just means it is publicized more so these days because sexuality is more popular.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Censorship & Morality "Sappho in today's society"

by [Bryce Milke](#) - Sunday, April 15, 2018, 11:50 PM

" she hinted that women are sexual Creatures too" (01:35) Sappho video. This is pretty similar nowadays where when women are treated as sexual creatures the connection that they are indecent and that men are the only ones allowed to be openly sexual creatures still carries on to this day not to the extreme of being arrested and fined. But still a double standard has not been broken

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Re: Censorship & Morality: Berkely Conservatism Article

by [Sadie Baker](#) - Monday, April 16, 2018, 10:12 PM

Should people on both sides of the spectrum should get to judge the accuracy of the Berkely article's claims regarding conservatism? I think that one's political affiliation will most likely affect their interpretation of the report, but anyone can choose how biased or objective they will be. I think this bias becomes more instructive and important not when deciding if the article is true, but when translating the results. The article is on a surface level pretty accurate. Even as one who considers myself relatively conservative on most matters, I feel that these traits can be attributed to conservatives, and I accept the negative connotations of them. However, I do not think that this article should be taken as a conclusive description, definition, or explanation of conservatism.

The traits outlined were found by the researchers to be more consistently and strongly associated with conservatives than liberals. But I think they could easily describe a multitude of individuals, conservative, liberal, or anything else. Just as with any widely found characteristic, it is not inaccurate to apply them to a certain group. But it is fallacious to assume that these generalizations are definitive of and/or exclusive to the group.

A particular trait mentioned several times in the article was the "intolerance of ambiguity". The researchers referenced in the article say, "This intolerance of ambiguity can lead people to cling to the familiar, to arrive at premature conclusions, and to impose simplistic cliches and stereotypes". The article may appear not to have a bias, but it would be wise to consider what motives led those conducting the studies, and whether the interpretation of data was entirely objective. If the liberal audience isn't careful, they may find themselves making a very uncharacteristic, conservative, "premature, simplistic, stereotypical" conclusion about conservatives based on the article's findings.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

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



The outcomes of The Mann Act

by [Mirissa Hicks](#) - Wednesday, April 18, 2018, 5:27 PM

I feel like the Mann Act was necessary back then because of the troubles our society is facing today. The Mann Act was put in place which stated, "its original form made it a felony to engage in interstate or foreign commerce transport of "any woman or girl for the purpose of prostitution or debauchery, or for any other immoral purpose" "(Wikipedia article on The Mann Act.) which was a good idea in the early 1900 to potentiality avoid issues we are having today with prostitution and even sex trafficking since its "intent was to address prostitution, immorality, and human trafficking,

particularly where trafficking was for the purposes of prostitution”(Wikipedia article on The Mann Act.) Clearly that didn't fully solve problems since people still partake even though it's against the law. When government puts laws to effective it compares to like a mother telling their child what to do, they don't listen, sneak around to bend the rules, or still do it anyways. People don't like hearing that they aren't allowed to do something. I have noticed recently which some laws being passed its turns into a bigger issue because people feel like the government cheats them out of what they believe is theirs or their given right. It amazes me how this law had been passed in 1910 but now we are in 2018 and going back to what we talked about in class with craigslist shutting down its dating section due to article H.R 1865 which is trying to put legal responsibility to websites that people can abuse and use for sex trafficking and prostitution. Clearly with The Mann Act being passed times had changed technology advanced and people found new ways around The Mann Act that wasn't covered. But how do stop this vicious cycle that we as humans don't want to listen to congress because we view them as our parents almost?

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Women's Sexuality Shamed Then and Today

by [Rachel Gragg](#) - Wednesday, April 18, 2018, 5:34 PM

The issues of sexual immorality and women having the rights to be sexual beings alongside men are something still definitely very prevalent today. Especially when considering all of the feminist movements going on today, many of them have to do with allowing women to be sexual beings and to not be punished for it because most times, men are not. In 1900, women were not given many rights at all. They still couldn't vote and they were thought of as delicate beings and less suited for the activities of men. Even the suffragists used this as one of the platforms for their campaign to give women the right to vote. Our textbook authors addressed this when they said, "Women were different than men, possessing a moral sense and a nurturing quality that men lacked" (*Liberty, Equality Power* pg 697). This was thought to give people reason to trust women and allow them to vote. Women were thought of as nothing but mothers and moral beings and therefore were not allowed to be sexual or to express their sexuality. That is why, in the play, Sapho, when the main character was expressing her sexuality, the actress was ridiculed for it. The girl who played the character of Sapho was arrested and put on trial just for playing a character that expressed her sexuality. I find all of this very compelling.

This is still a highly debated issue today as women who express their sexuality are often deemed as "sluts" or other derogatory terms. Women are shamed for embracing their sexuality whereas men are celebrated for it. When men talk about sex it's just

“locker room talk,” but when women do it is often frowned upon. This is being fought against currently and women and men are fighting for women to be allowed the same rights as men, but it is definitely still an issue prevalent today.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

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



Re: Women's Sexuality Shamed Then and Today

by [Mirissa Hicks](#) - Wednesday, April 18, 2018, 7:52 PM

You made excellent points it seems like we still face issues that we did in the early 1900s with women empowerment. Our book talks about “Women, they stressed, were different than men, possessing a moral sense and a nurturing quality that men lacked” (*Equality Power* pg 697). I feel like women are still seen for their nurturing quality and I find that’s where a double standard starts to come into play between men and women today. We have come a long way from the early 1900’s but it still seems we aren’t quite there on full equality. I know for myself I once had a job that was majority male than female, and it seemed like all the females there where looked as weak and somewhat lazy which wasn’t the case, but it seems like stereotypes haven’t fully changed in everyone’s mind. I also had experienced at this job that the men would stand around and talk about women in demeaning ways and get high fived for their sexual actions with them but if any of the females that worked there did the same people would look at her as being a “slut”. We maybe not on Sapho level in the US where she was arrested just by being carried away by a man who wasn’t her lover but today I think women still have a lot of obstacles to face on being 100% equal to the male gender.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Re: Women's Sexuality Shamed Then and Today

by [Casandra Fountain](#) - Thursday, April 19, 2018, 10:11 PM

You sparked a thought for me about recent articles I’ve seen or read. One was about the ongoing issue of breastfeeding in public for women. Though it is the law for women to breastfeed in public, they are still discriminated against and shunned by glaring eyes. Our society has made women’s bodies out to be sexual toys and nothing more. On Womenshealth.gov, there is tips for how to handle criticism while breastfeeding in public. In my opinion this should not even be a thing. Everybody should see this act as feeding an infant who is hungry and need the nutrients from the mother to survive. Not as a woman’s boob is out and let’s stare (yes, some women will cover up also).

Another tissue I remember seeing on social media (an article was done about it on shareably.com) was about a middle school aged girl was sent home for violating the dress code. What was the girl wearing you may ask? Jeans, nude under shirt (that covered her cleavage) and a white sweater. So why was she sent home? Because the sweater sometimes showed her collarbone. This young girl went to bat against the Portland Public School Board and won and in turn the school redid the dress code. But policymakers are missing the point, girls in middle and high school should not be sexualized by staff members. They are minors, and they are at school to learn. The issues with dress codes are just a symptom of a wider issue of how society views women and their intentions. Today, women and girls are made to think that their bodies are inherently and primarily sexual. It starts in learning institutions while they're young and continues throughout their schooling into adulthood. Instead we should be wanting girls to be valued for their kindness, their intelligence, and their prowess in sports or the arts. Not the message most schools are currently sending our girls.

I believe both these current issues relate back to Sapho. We deemed women's bodies back then just as we do now, in prerogative ways. Yes, actress Olga Nethersole was displaying "immoral sexual behavior", but would have it been the same reaction from the public if a man was in the lead role performing this behavior?

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Re: Censorship & Morality: PMRC and Sapho parallels and outcomes

by [Sadie Baker](#) - Wednesday, April 18, 2018, 10:44 PM

An immediate similarity between Sapho and the PMRC is that in both cases, the people who wanted the changes were not personally affected by the things they were so concerned about. I think it is rather ridiculous that a bunch of moms felt the need to control what musicians were doing so that they could subsequently control what their kids were doing. In a way, Sapho was even more ridiculous and extreme than PMRC, but both are humorous episodes. They are both examples of conservatism, and as the conservative spokesperson in the PMRC video at 0:26 said, "it is our moral obligation", that is a characteristic motivation or excuse for conservatives' actions. I think in both cases, the attempts at censoring resulted in great ridicule and defeat for the morality police, as well as more support and publicity for the parties receiving opposition. It is interesting to think that had the concerns never been addressed, life would have probably gone on the same as ever and society probably wouldn't have been any worse off for the questionable messages being perpetrated by those entertainers.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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


Re: Censorship & Morality: PMRC and Sapho parallels and outcomes

 by [Tanner Wiese](#) - Friday, April 20, 2018, 12:05 PM

I love everything you said here. I immediately thought it was weird that the people who wanted changes were not actually affected by those concerns. And, it is clearly ridiculous that people tried to control these musicians, to prevent them from being a bad influence on children. And, I agree that both are examples of conservatism. I consider myself a conservative, but, I do have views from both sides. And, this one I did not agree with. I do not believe it was their moral obligation. I understand the worries of bad influences on children, but, you cannot try and control musicians for you kids benefit. And, I also believe kids will find a bad influence one way or another. So, even if these musicians weren't creating a bad influence, kids would still find one.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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

Re: Censorship & Morality: PMRC and Sapho parallels and outcomes

 by [Casandra Fountain](#) - Friday, April 20, 2018, 4:47 PM

To add to that, Dee Snider made a excellent point in the court hearing stating these people are purchasing heavy metal albums with their money, on their own time, playing it in their home, in their room (4:20, Heavy Metal v. PMRC video). I also fall under being a conservative in my beliefs but I am not head strong enough to raise fits about music lyrics and change an entire genre. If I care about what my kids were listening to I would monitor them the best I could and being involved in what they were listening to. I believe back in the 1980s to be conservative was different than today's view. It was more black and white as compared to today's standards where there is a lot more gray areas.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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

Part 1: My thoughts on the Mann Act

 by [Tanner Wiese](#) - Thursday, April 19, 2018, 11:52 AM

Part 1

The Mann Act video states that woman were being forced into prostitution, and shuttled around the country by vast networks controlled by immigrants (Mann Act Video, 45 Seconds). Which clearly seems like a significant issue, that people would try and prevent Therefore, the Mann Act, also known as the White Slave Traffic act was implemented in 1910, and was intended to prevent forced prostitution and [Debauchery](#)

([Mann Act Video, 15 seconds](#)). The act made it a crime to transport woman across state line for prostitution or any immoral purpose. Which I think is clearly a good law. They took the necessary steps to try and prevent this issue. So, yes I believe the mann act was necessary back then. And, it became pretty clear that this Act was the right choice, when they named people like Jack Johnson, Charlie Chaplan, and Chuck Barry who were caught breaking this law. And, the government realized that this is still a legit issue. But, congress substantially amended the law, so the terms debauchery and any other immoral purpose, was replaced with any sexual activity for which any person can be charged with a criminal offense (Mann Act Video, 2 minutes). And, yes I believe this is still this is still necessary today. Especially since, they are still catching people like Eliot Spitzer in 2008.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Conservatism Very Prevalent in Both Examples

by [Rachel Gragg](#) - Thursday, April 19, 2018, 6:01 PM

Conservatism is defined as “ a commitment to traditional values and ideas with opposition to change or innovation” (Google). I definitely think there are examples of conservatism in both Sapho and the PMRC. The issues with the Sapho play really exemplify conservatism. As said before, conservatives didn’t like change at in this time period, women were not seen as sexual beings or that they even had the same rights as men. According to our textbook, people like Jane Addams and other Clubwomen were “troubled by the emerging sexual revolution, which she worried would lead many more poor women into prostitution” (Liberty, Equality, Power, Pg 690). Conservative people were afraid of women getting to change and have the rights to be sexual beings just like men and to not be shamed for it.

In the video about the PMRC one of the artists said that “throughout history, heavy metal battles conservatism” (video). People were afraid of their children getting these ideas of rebellion and were afraid of things changing from how they were. Children weren’t meant to rebel during the time period of the PMRC, they were mostly meant to be “seen, but not heard” and that was the way things had always been. However, heavy metal and Rock N’ Roll music brought about this idea of rebellion and letting kids get out their anger through song and music and that wasn’t okay to conservatives because it was a change and by definition, conservatives do not like change. Both of these examples really show the conservatism of this time period. What are other ways these exemplified conservatism?

Sum of ratings:2 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Failed reforms**by [Casandra Fountain](#) - Friday, April 20, 2018, 4:11 PM

There are many examples of similarities between Sapho and the PMRC. One being how the establishment won on the court side of things but were the true losers of the debates. Which leads to another similarity of how each event ended. Both Sapho and the Heavy Metal bands profited from sales and gained popularity with the result of each of their court cases. Nikki Sixx of Motley Crue says the explicit warning label was wonderful and would want people to buy the album (6:55, Heavy Metal v. the PMRC video). With Olga Nethersole's found not guilty, the play reopened and the only thing the sensors group accomplished was expanding the audience to volumes they could have never expected (2:55, Sapho video). Both endings resulted in unintended consequences for the opposing sides, I believe. The crusaders against the explicit contents of each case only made people want it more and indulge in it more than ever.

I found it funny how Dee Snider of Twisted Sister comments on the PMRC how they were a bunch of senator's wives with a political agenda with too much time on her hands (2:40, Heavy Metal v. the PMRC video). Does this remind you of a previous group with too much time on their hands? The middle class women of early 20th century reformers. Both groups were middle-upper class, and were not part of the group in which they were trying to reform.

Sum of ratings:3 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: A conservative time in a progressive era**by [Emily Hemmerle](#) - Friday, April 20, 2018, 10:46 PM

It was no surprise that in 1900 there were concerns about sexual vulgarities of those times. What was very revolutionary of the time was the Mann Act that prohibited human trafficking between state lines. Jack Johnson "violated" this law because his girlfriend of the time was an alleged prostitute and were traveling over state lines. I feel that the Mann Act if implemented correctly would be beneficial today because human trafficking is so prominent. Our morality has slowly changed over the last 100 years but when it comes to a sex scandal the approval ratings will drop because we still have morals about adultery.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

◀ [American Exceptionalism](#)

[Censorship & Morality](#) ▶

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

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

[HST 203 Sp18 \(Escobar Meta 41002 43590\)](#)