

HST 203: U.S. History Sp19 (Escobar)

[Home](#) / [My courses](#) / [HST 203 Sp19 \(Escobar Meta 44706 47037\)](#) / [Week 3](#) / [Forum 1](#) / [Censorship & Morality](#)

?

Search forums

Forum 1

Censorship & Morality

 [Subscribe](#)

[◀ American Exceptionalism](#)[American Exceptionalism ▶](#)

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

Move

Pin



Censorship & Morality
by [Joe Escobar](#) - Friday, April 12, 2019, 9:40 PM

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, which clearly describes the source and questions you are addressing. Do NOT simply leave it RE: Censorship & Morality

Sum of ratings: [_](#)[Permalink](#) | [Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Censorship & Morality the change we see now versus then
by [Matthew Berry](#) - Sunday, April 14, 2019, 3:18 PM

The morality of the United States today is FAR different than that of the early 20th Century. The overall morals of man have deteriorated in an unprecedented way, you need to look no further than the music played on the radio, to the commercials on the tv, and the uninhibited access to pornography on the internet. Yes this could be construed as a result of new technological advancements, but if you look at the things that were available at the time you would've never seen scantily clad women dressed in lingerie printed in ads in the magazines of the time. Just the simple example of Olga Nethersole shows the difference in the view of morality (see Video – Sapho and Olga Nethersole). Even though she was eventually acquitted for her charges, she faced harsh treatment from the liberals of the time (see Video & Notes on in class discussions- liberals leaning towards more conservative spectrum). Just the idea of women having sex for pleasure was enough to blow people's minds of the time. In stark contrast, today we see the only ones that are held to a higher standard of "morality" are celebrities, politicians, and those who conduct themselves as servants to the public; for example, police, sheriffs, judges, and those who serve in the military are all held to a higher standard than the average citizen. The moral decay over the last century has led to close to a 50% divorce rate (see divorce statistics for USA 2018) in comparison to the divorce rate of .9% in the early 1900's (see PBS divorce statistics – The First Measured Century – Ch. 4 Family). There are many more examples and statistics that can be shown to prove the difference between the morality of the 20th Century and the morality of the 21st Century. Even though we would like to see ourselves as a beacon of light in the morality issue to the world, I think history shows us that our values have changed to an immoral, almost radical stance than that of the previous century.

Sum of ratings: [3 \(1\)](#)

3

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



Re: Censorship & Morality the change we see now versus then

by [David Galbreath](#) - Wednesday, April 17, 2019, 10:05 PM

I disagree, with a few points.

First, to say morals have 'decayed' or 'deteriorated' is to overstated in my opinion. yes I agree on the access to things like pornography and other less moral content on the internet is a step back, but as you said that could be chalked up to the advancement of technologies. However, I feel most of the morals you presented - such as divorce, or publicized sex appeal - could be explained with the morals of Christianity. as per the reading, we know that the majority of the country was protestant or Catholic. I'm not saying you believe this, but there are many that would say that gay marriage would be immoral. In my book, we are being more morally correct in letting anyone get married.

Secondly, I feel there is an argument to be made that we are becoming more moral. The advancement of freedoms for all people of different races, like the creation of the NAACP was a moral choice. was it morally correct to lock workers in the top three floors of the Triangle Shirtwaist factory of 1911? Heck no, our society agreed it was and we grew from tragedy.

while I agree that sexually explicit content is growing and can be deemed immoral, I find that there are many facets of morality we have improved upon.

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

1

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



Re: Censorship & Morality the change we see now versus then

by [Matthew Berry](#) - Saturday, April 20, 2019, 4:33 PM

I'm sorry that you disagree on my view that there has been a huge change in the overall censorship & morality of our country between the 20thand 21stCentury. I would have to argue that the historical data as well as social norms shows otherwise, i.e. Sapho; just the simple theatrical performance and the general consensus at the time seemed to prove it shocking enough that she was jailed and put on trial (see Sapho Video, or Wikipedia, or textbook). In comparison to today when you can go to the theater and see videos such as Fifty Shades of Grey or Magic Mike and these actors can produce these films without fear of censorship or receive legal consequences, or even harsh judgment from the public. Rather they are being given awards for their performances. So, I would say things such as Censorship & Morality have changed extremely dramatically over the last 100 plus years. The facts I presented are based on the differences between then and now it is simply that things that were "immoral" at that time are considered to be more generally or "morally" accepted now. If morality is the differentiation of intentions, decisions and actions between those that are distinguished as proper and those that are improper (see Wikipedia "Morality"). Than I would have to state again that the "actions" that were distinguished as proper or moral in the 1900's are on the complete opposite end of the moral spectrum of what we are seeing now.

I don't understand when you stated that *"most of the morals you presented - such as divorce, or publicized sex appeal - could be explained with the morals of Christianity"*. The fact is Christian morals are based on the bible, Gods laws not the laws of man. The teachings of mainstream Christianity as well as Catholicism in the early 20thCentury absolutely without a doubt held people to a higher standard. Also, according to the teachings of Christianity and Catholicism, homosexuality is absolutely immoral, I challenge anyone to provide a historical account were acts of homosexuality was considered moral in the eyes of the Christian or Catholic churches. That is prior to deviations of the religions in the last decade that have made allowances for those whom are homosexual. So, if you are basing the argument off of the religious views of morality, yet saying *"we are being more morally correct in letting anyone get married"* I would still argue that based on religious morality we can see that the decay in our country is extreme compared to the early 20thCentury.

Morality, political correctness, and legalization of new laws have made many morally correct decisions when it comes to passing laws on employment, or on issues such as the FDA (see class lecture notes) and censorship. But you can't compare things like religious morals to morality, it's completely different views of what many understand to be the same thing. The definition of morality as found in Merriam-Webster is defined as *a doctrine or system of moral conduct or conformity to ideals of right human conduct.* - Based on mans views of human conduct. The difference in the 21stCentury is not that religious morals have changed

(with few exceptions of religions that are now allowing gay marriage etc.); but rather the view of human conduct or acceptance of these acts is more acceptable or moral (as in the definition of how we see things as being proper or improper) now than in the early 20thCentury.

Sum of ratings:[3](#) [\(1\)](#)

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



Re: Censorship & Morality
by [Jessie Shafer](#) - Sunday, April 14, 2019, 5:37 PM

At 1:10 in the Sapho clip, he said, "Because Sapho wasn't punished, Olga had to be punished in real life." They punished a woman for a play. For something that she didn't actually do. That was unethical. Why couldn't they just ban the play, rather than punish an actress for doing her job?

Sum of ratings:[0](#) [\(1\)](#)

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



Re: Censorship & Morality
by [Kate Adkisson](#) - Wednesday, April 17, 2019, 8:34 PM

In my opinion, I would think that trying to get the play banned would be a longer and more difficult process as opposed to just arresting the people who were a part of it. Trying to ban the play could also add some infamy or notoriety to it, making it more attractive to people who hadn't seen it, making them want to see it more. Your post brought some thoughts to my mind, such as why did they feel the need to punish Olga and not the director or producer of the play? Why punish the actress who is just following direction from others? While looking at the Wikipedia page for Sapho, I found out that a playwright named Clyde Fitch adapted Sapho at the request of Olga, and she "produced, directed, and starred" (Sapho Wikipedia) in the play. Not only was she the face of the play, Olga seems to be the entire reason this adaptation happened in the first place, which could also be a reason why she needed to be held accountable for the immorality of the play.

An interesting blurb from the Wikipedia page just for fun was that the story was told "from the point of view of the female lead character rather than the male character as was done with the original novel and play" (Wikipedia). I wonder what would've happened if the play had stuck to the original point of view.

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

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



Re: Censorship & Morality
by [Nicolette D Erazo](#) - Saturday, April 20, 2019, 9:34 AM

In the video, the historian states that Olga's trial had only drawn more attention to the play. "The show reopened, and the censors that had got it closed down succeeded only in expanding the audience far beyond what it would have been without the arrest." (Sapho Video 3:30) So if the New York Society For The Suppression Of Vice had the intent of trying to ban the play, the amount of attention that the production would draw in, I believe, would be the same because the reasons for shutting it down were the same: open sexuality of a woman. In your post, you stated," Trying to ban a play could also add some infamy or notoriety to it, making it more attractive to people who hadn't seen it, making them want to see it more." I think that this idea of it being attractive was already in action because of the appeal of why Olga got arrested.

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

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



Is the Mann act necessary?
by [Brayden Lane](#) - Sunday, April 14, 2019, 7:13 PM

As with many laws and acts such as the Mann act, it can be shown to and seen in the public eye as a public justice but can be used by the government to control. Such as the Sapho case, the government wanted to prosecute Olga but a jury of her peers found her not guilty. The Mann act itself is not a necessity both then and now, what is a necessity that the Mann act missed on both then and now is human trafficking. Unintended consequences that are passed by legislation in an act such as this is hurting/ damaging peoples public appearance and also the act not being used for good. As spoken in the npr podcast it was said that it seems as if in the case of Jack Johnson it wasn't about the act but more of an attack on an African American who was with a white women.

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

Sum of ratings:

1(1)

1



Was the Mann Act Necessary?

by [Zachary Oswald](#) - Sunday, April 14, 2019, 8:53 PM

The Mann Act was an unnecessary law in 1910. Slavery was already illegal under the 13th Amendment, rape was also an established crime. The Mann Act expanded criminal slave trafficking to include attempts to "persuade, induce, entice, or coerce" any woman to travel for "debauchery, or any other immoral practice, with or without her consent" (Text of 1910 Mann Act).

The law criminalized what middle-class protestants viewed as immoral behavior regardless of victimization. Jack Johnson's 1912 prosecution demonstrates this. The supposed intent of the law to target forced prostitution rings is incongruent with the application of the law against a black man traveling with his white girlfriend (wikipedia article on Jack Johnson).

The fact that Johnson's arrest occured only two years after the passage of the law and his later conviction under the law lends credence to the idea that his arrest wasn't a missaplication of the law, but its intended effect. This also fits the pattern of early 20th-century progressive using legal means to enforce their own cultural norms, such as in their targeting drinking cultures among european immigrants (pg 689, textbook). The progressives' attempts to use government to regulate moral behavior nessecitated a specific moral perspective, which happened to be their own. After all, reformers benefit themselves (11 April lecture).

Sum of ratings:

3(1)

3

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



How Censorship Use Changes Over Time

by [Maddie Neale](#) - Sunday, April 14, 2019, 9:29 PM

Censorship, as we can easily tell by watching the short clip about Sapho, is seen necessary in different situations and it depends largely on what time period you are in. Different standards set the need for censorship. In a time like the early 1900s even a public kiss was considered indecent, while these days we have movies like 50 Shades of Grey that make the "indecent" acts in Sapho pale in comparison. There are few things that warrant censorship in modern day America, and they are very different from what warranted censorship in the early 1900s. For example, using the "N-word" In the 1900s was seen as normal and just what the African Americans were largely called. Therefore any reason for censorship would make no sense to the people of that time period. However now-a-days many books such as Huckleberry Finn have been completely censored, changing the word in question to "slave" ([PBS. Article](#)) . In the clip about Olga Nethersole it talks about how her play, Sapho, made many people uncomfortable with the idea that women could experience any of the same pleasures that men did (around 1:30), which most likely is what contributed to the outrage that followed the play in the press and in the public.

Sum of ratings:

2(1)

2

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



Re: How Censorship Use Changes Over Time

by [Nicolette D Erazo](#) - Saturday, April 20, 2019, 10:31 AM

You make some very good points abut how our ideas of censorship have evolved between time periods and how nowadays our views of what came before us can sometimes be just as baffling. However, it is interesting that there was such outrage among the public and moral police, that a show with women's open sexuality also had a sense of appeal to others, drawing in a great deal of attention. Could the idea of wanting to have a more open view of these things been inspired by Sapho, helping us to evolve to where we are today regarding censorship?

Sum of ratings:

1(1)

1

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



Re: Censorship & Morality

by [Sidney Axtell](#) - Sunday, April 14, 2019, 10:35 PM

censorship and morality

Sum of ratings:

0(1)

0

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



Sapho and Morality

by [Kate Adkisson](#) - Monday, April 15, 2019, 10:47 AM

If one looks through a 21st-century cultural lense at the play Sapho, the most “scandalous” part of the play seems pretty mild, if at all controversial. In the play, the part that caused the most uproar was, according to the video, “at the end of the piece, Sapho was carried up stairs, clearly to a bedroom. Sapho did not protest, she went willingly to have an illicit, sexual relationship with a man, and she wasn’t punished for it” (Sapho video, 0:45 minute mark). To me, and I assume others, in today’s standards this would seem pretty modest. But in the beginning of the 20th century, morality standards were far more conservative, which is what made this play so improper. The people who held these morality standards were the progressives, who “fought against prostitution, gambling, drinking, and other forms of vice” (textbook p.562). Looking up the definition of vice on google, it is described as “immoral or wicked behavior”, as well as “criminal activities including prostitution, pornography, or drugs”. The progressives would want to censor this play, or punish the actress Olga, because they felt a duty to fight against what they may have viewed as pornography.

What I found most compelling about this clip was that part of the scandal was the exposing of women as sexual creatures. “Any hint that women could experience pleasure in sex was scandalous, was dangerous,” (Sapho video, 1:30 minute mark). This is humorous to me, but also saddening, to think that our ancestors were deprived of this pleasure, and may have been considered dangerous if they explored their sexuality. Today of course, women in the west are for the most part sexually liberated and can explore and experience their sexuality freely without being afraid of punishment. There are movements within the left to decriminalize and normalize sex work, as well as do away with the stigmas revolving around sex work. Whether you agree with this movement or not, it’s amazing what 100 years can do to a culture.

Sum of ratings:[3 \(1\)](#)

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



Re: Sapho and Morality

by [Cristian Alamo](#) - Monday, April 15, 2019, 7:01 PM

America up until 1960's were heavily against sexual themes in any form of entertainment. In I love Lucy, Lucy and Ricardo would sleep in separate beds so it didn't imply they had sex. Which is weird compared to our standards.

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

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



Re: Sapho and Morality

by [Zachary Oswald](#) - Friday, April 19, 2019, 12:00 AM

The thing that I found most interesting about the Sappho case was that many progressives were against it, along with their entire attitude of cleaning up society. I suspect that this is because the progressives held explicitly religious elements, such as Billy Sunday and other young protestants (textbook pg 687). Christian groups and evangelicals, in particular, hadn't become so closely aligned with the right wing at this point. The religious character of many progressives also helps explain the 18th Amendment.

Another point to consider is that Sappho was on Broadway in 1900, around the same time that Feminism was experiencing a rebirth. Greenwich Village, not too far away from the playhouse, was a center of the feminist movement (textbook pg 677). I suspect that these two things are related. Instead of viewing Olga's arrest as a symptom of a highly repressive society, it may be more accurate to view the arrest as pushback by sexually conservative elements in a changing society.

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

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



Re: Censorship & Morality

by [David Galbreath](#) - Monday, April 15, 2019, 1:08 PM

I take censorship personal. there is something about it that makes me feel that others are trying to think for those they are censoring. Also, being apart of Lane's news team at the Torch I fear that Censorship will dictate what I can and can't write. It's not true freedom. if you censor someones speech would you not be censoring their mind? In my mind it's cruel and wrong. I know this name is a trigger for some, but somebody I like to bring up on this topic is

Jordan Peterson. Peterson has many opinions and I don't agree with all of them, but his first claim was that eventually political correctness will be lawfully enforced. In a tweet he wrote "Freedom of speech is the freedom to engage in the processes that we use to formulate the problems that we have in our society, to generate solutions to them and reach a consensus. It's actually a mechanism, it's not just another value." In many other countries, such as Spain, many people are being imprisoned because they speak out against their government. I feel this censorship could evolve into a similar issue, but instead of the government only protecting them selves from slander or libel it will be social groups.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



An outdated law
by [Cristian Alamo](#) - Monday, April 15, 2019, 5:42 PM

The Mann Act of 1912 was a progressive victory in the war against prostitution progressives launched in the era. However, now in current day it seems like an outdated law that has virtually no use of having in place. Number one it can be considered a racist law outright. For example: Jack Johnson was arrested due to being in relationship with a white woman who was allegedly a prostitute and was indicted with an all-white jury looking over the case (wikipedia). The nature of how the mann act was advertised back in the era can be argued as racist as well . Pamphlets handed out on the streets portraying white woman as hopeless and as "white slaves" to drive home the fact of hopelessness even more. The pamphlets also liked to talk about these "invisible powers" that kidnap and exploit women (wikipedia). These "invisible powers" many times were depicted as people of color or immigrants. Number two: this law targeted lower income families of the time, middle class progressives were so dead set at the time to end the prostitution problem, they didn't see the harm of outlawing prostitution. Morally to progressives it was wrong but to lower income families it provided as source of revenue so they can maintain their lives (in class lecture thursday). Legislature even if it has the right intentions can end up harming groups intentionally or unintentionally.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

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



Re: Censorship & Morality
by [Aidan McNarie](#) - Monday, April 15, 2019, 9:31 PM

The battle between conservative and liberal voices in the media will always be there. The Spectrum shifts. Trying to pin either political movement as a source of censorship or a center of morality is bogus. The progressives of the turn of the century are fundamentally different from modern liberals. Their moralist virtues became more mainstream and conservative after the political shift of the early 1900s and are now considered more aligned with that side of the spectrum.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



What can happen when the government attempts to regulate the behavior of its citizens?
by [Aaron Richards](#) - Monday, April 15, 2019, 10:50 PM

To start off, think about how we felt when our parents forced us to act certain ways based upon their ideals. How did that make us feel? Where we happy to comply or resentful? Now a government regulating the behavior of its citizens is a larger form of that system. When individuals are forced to make a choice based upon another's ideals they will often find ways around the rules in place or act against them openly. An example for going around the rules was the boom of bootlegging and speak easies during the time of prohibition. The public continued to drink and produce alchohol in secret. Another example are the events leading to the formation of this country. When great Britain continued to force taxes on the colonies it led to violence and war. Forcing people to change doesn't work unless under threat of great punishment such as jail time for federal offenses.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

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



Re: What can happen when the government attempts to regulate the behavior of its citizens?
by [Maddie Neale](#) - Tuesday, April 16, 2019, 5:28 PM

I agree completely that when a government tries to regulate its citizens with an iron fist there are bound to be repercussions, whether from the people or just how the country functions as a result of it. Although it's also not a good idea for a government to just say "Regulate yourself!" There is obviously a sweet spot right in the middle of the two that would make a relatively well-functioning government. I think your post makes a good argument about how when there are laws or amendments passed like the prohibition, many people find ways around it

through loopholes and even through blatantly illegal means. This could also be translated into the argument about restricting gun rights. It could be argued that if gun rights were restricted or even completely taken away, maybe the good people would follow the laws. But who's to say that the people who make gun rights even an argument in the first place wouldn't go to illegal means to procure guns. Maybe that's totally wrong though, I guess we won't know unless something passes restricting gun rights. But looking at people in history is a good way to determine how people in the future will act.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: What can happen when the government attempts to regulate the behavior of its citizens?
by [Aaron Richards](#) - Saturday, April 20, 2019, 10:05 PM

No I agree we shouldn't just have a system that says "regulate yourselves" because that leaves an opening for anarchy. I was mainly referencing laws that focus more around morality than rights. A large number of laws that have been enacted on the basis of morality have been hugely ineffective in preventing the undesirable behavior. Prohibition, anti drug laws, plastic bag laws as mentioned in class, age requirements for drugs, alcohol, and sex. These laws aren't effective because as Joe mentioned in class the government stops enforcing them. Once there is no punishment to a law no one will abide the law. Another main issue is how does the government maintain and monitor the obedience without intruding into our personal lives? These laws of morality don't regulate risks to other but risk to yourself which requires almost full surveillance, which is entirely creepy.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: What can happen when the government attempts to regulate the behavior of its citizens?
by [Kaleah Holmes](#) - Friday, April 19, 2019, 5:34 PM

I agree with your post. Attempting to oppress the people made them act out even more. Arresting Olga for acting in the scene where she went into a bedroom with a man made people want to see the play even more (Sapho and Olga video). People who would not have gone to see it went to see the scandalous play everybody was talking about. Humans are naturally curious and we do not like being told no, and so we resent being told what we can not see. Because of this the Censors practically pushed everybody into the theater to see that play. There are many examples of this such as when liquor was banned what do people do? Make speak easies. Drinking age is twenty one, how do teenagers handle that? Purchase fake ID's to get into clubs, and buy alcohol. Great Britain taxes us? Throw their tea in the water! The public likes to defy because we want to explore and find out for ourselves what is bad or good for us. We don't want to be controlled.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: The Mann act has its flaws
by [Zoe Brunson](#) - Monday, April 15, 2019, 11:10 PM

The Mann act prevented women and young girls to become involved in sex trafficking. At the time I do think it was necessary to have a law that protects women from encountering in sex against their will and I do think it's still necessary today. But to go as far as to arrest Nethersole because of a part in a play was unnecessary.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



The use of the Mann Act
by [Matthew Berry](#) - Wednesday, April 17, 2019, 1:11 PM

I think you are absolutely correct that the Mann Act was necessary in the early 20th Century as well as now in the 21st Century. Just look into the recent convictions in where the Mann Act was used to prosecute. Obviously The Mann Act has been amended by Congress in 1978 and again in 1986 (see Wikipedia – The Mann Act) to include more defined definitions to the term “transportation” as well as other language used in the original act. It added protection against commercial sexual exploitation of minors, and various aspects of child pornography and making the law gender neutral. Congress also replaced some of the more ambiguous verbiage to be more specific. For example, instead of language such as “debauchery” or “any other immoral purpose”, they used more specific verbiage such as “any sexual activity for which any person can be charged with the criminal offense”. Because of the Mann Act and the amendments to the Mann Act it has allowed law enforcement to engage against those who were and are in the practice of child pornography, child abuse,

kidnapping and much more. Just one example of the use of the Mann Act was in the case of a kidnapping and sexual assault of a minor, was the conviction of Brian David Mitchell in the well-known and publicized case of Elizabeth Smart. As well as the conviction of Jack Schaap a Pastor in Indiana who pleaded guilty for transporting a 16-year-old across state line to have sex with. Even though there were some “unintended consequences” i.e. Jack Johnson, Olga Nethersole and the censorship that was placed on things that clearly fell under the 1stAmendment in the early part of the 20thCentury. I think for the time it was a progressive move for the Protestant’s towards curbing the immorality that they saw was plaguing the nation at the time. Again as brought out in class, it would be nice to assume people are going to do good, but the reality is far from that.

Sum of ratings:[3 \(1\)](#)

3

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



Re: The Mann act has its flaws
by [Nicolette D Erazo](#) - Saturday, April 20, 2019, 10:14 AM

I agree that the Mann Act is a necessary part in protecting women by making 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" (Mann Act Wikipedia). In the case of Jack Johnson, there seems to be some grey areas revolving around his prison sentence due to his relationship with Lucille Cameron and the fact that "the incidents used to convict him took place before passage of the Mann Act" (Jack Johnson Wikipedia). To go along with the question of what happens when the government attempts to regulate the behaviors of its citizens, there is always room for grey and unclear aspects when enforcing behavior, such as Jack Johnson's actions occurring before the effect of the Mann Act and the concept of resistance of the accused. His jury was made up of all white jury members, which has another layer of grey because at that point you aren't just dealing with the law anymore, during that time period. Other factors go into each individual situation.

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

2

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



Sapho Incident
by [Robert Whitney](#) - Monday, April 15, 2019, 11:25 PM

When looking at events, reactions, and actions in history, one must put themselves in that time. When looking at the Sapho scandal from the perspective of someone in today's America, it seems like absolute nonsense that that would even be an issue. With R rated, and even PG-13 films being widely available to most people in America, us citizens have a vast array of potentially "obscene" entertainment, especially when compared to that of 1900. Censorship in 1900 seemed to me that the government, and many citizens, wanted to be moral police. They wanted to make sure that neither themselves nor any others were put at risk of seeing things they deemed as inappropriate. The fact that the actress in Sapho was even at risk of a fine and jail time for a performance is baffling to me. To me, that seems like a perfectly legal and reasonable use of someone's first Amendment freedoms and I assume most people would protest that either. I suppose that shows people in America's dulling to things such as sex, relationships, drugs, violence, etc.

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

1

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



Re: Sapho Incident
by [Brayden Lane](#) - Wednesday, April 17, 2019, 12:28 AM

I like and very much agree with the comparison between todays time and that of 1900. That being said was it maybe seen as "obscene" from the viewpoints of Americans born in the mid 1800's? similar to nowadays you see People born in the mid 1900's who see music, or movies and view them as obscene, and maybe during the play it was a generational thing. However the fact of it being a first amendment right being freedom of speech allows it to seem unconstitutional that they wanted to end the play and even go as far as putting Olga in prison for creating it. Times do change and that can also be seen as a result of progressivism, in a small sense people wanted times to change and the play to stay on Broadway while others disapproved of it. I'm curious to what you think of my feedback and if you agree or disagree with the fact people wanting it off Broadway may have been a generational thing.

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

1

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



Re: Sapho Incident
by [Robert Whitney](#) - Thursday, April 18, 2019, 7:47 PM

I would agree with you that it could have been a generational opinion towards the Sapho play. I've seen with my grandparents and people from the baby boomer generation act differently towards things than my parents generation and even my own generation. The viewpoints of every generation I have been around seem to be different, and less open and progressive than the generations after them. I think that could have been the case back in the early 1900's, but, I think it was also a reflection of the views of older Christians. I think that it is interesting that in the time of progressivism society opened up to new things and allowed things like the Sapho play to continue, but yet could'nt stand to give equal rights to black people or stand to let Chinese people into their country. It was certainly an interesting time.

Sum of ratings:1(1)

1

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



Censors & Metal

by [Zar Oelke](#) - Tuesday, April 16, 2019, 9:53 AM

For the article, "Researchers help define what makes a political conservative" I do believe that the article is accurate in certain ways but also wrong in other ways. In the beginning of the article, they mention that researchers read through "...50 years of research literature about the psychology of conservatism" and what they had found was that Conservatives had certain traits that dealt with closure and fear. Which rings true when they wrote, "The terror management feature of conservatism can be seen in post-Sept. 11th" I do believe that as a country, many conservatives do see immigrants or foreigners as a possible threat. I do also agree with this article attempting to be fair and unbiased by mentioning that conservatives, "...does not mean that conservatism is pathological or that conservative beliefs are necessarily false" Which I'm glad that this article tries to stay unbiased.

As for what I disagreed with, they bring up that conservatives are more likely not to embrace different sexualities as opposed to liberal views that embrace all sexual orientations. When this article came out it was in 2003, the war in IRAQ was raging and America was conservative. I believe that right now that view has changed and that there are more conservatives that are open to different sexual orientations. The article mentions, "They also stressed that their findings are not judgemental" which I disagree with. Even going as far as saying, "...there is a host of information available about conservatism, but not about liberalism" I believe that this article is left leaning and the notion that there isn't a plethora of information on liberalism is a bit ridiculous to me. If this article was more neutral, people could identify better with it.

Sum of ratings:3(1)

3

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



Re: Censors & Metal

by [Zachary Oswald](#) - Tuesday, April 16, 2019, 11:22 PM

I generally agree with your points, though I have a few bones to pick. While I agree that conservatives are more open to different sexual orientations than in 2003, they are less open to them than liberals. The average opinion of the country has changed, but there is still a difference. The newest frontier of LGBT rights, where the differences in opinion are still stark, is transgender rights. The conservative opposition to transgender rights or validity of their existence illustrates an intolerance of ambiguity. Ben Shapiro is a great example of this, his arguments against the existence of transgender people are based on a binary and inflexible understanding of gender with no room for ambiguity.

I agree that the researchers could have conducted a similar study of liberalism and leftism. Personally, I found the article's comments on left-leaning ideologues discrediting. It's hard for me to view someone like Stalin, who violently dragged Russia into industrialization and radically altered Russian life, as conservative.

Sum of ratings:2(1)

2

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



Re: Censors & Metal

by [Zar Oelke](#) - Wednesday, April 17, 2019, 9:41 AM

I can definitely see what your saying, you are right in that the way conservative's do see sexual orientations as different or stark. The feel of the article is left-leaning, which there isn't anything wrong with that, however I wish that there was more information on Liberalism in order for the article to be more nuanced and balanced.

They even acknowledge how other's could view the article as "Liberal" by writing, "Glaser acknowledged that the team's exclusive assessment of the psychological motivations of political conservatism might be viewed as a partisan exercise" This article does give a partisan feel from my point of view. Throughout, they mention what makes a person conservative and for the most part it's in a negative light. Which I can see why especially with where the country was at in 2003. The only disparaging quote in the article that has to do with the Liberal party is, "...liberal traits may be liabilities, and being intolerant of ambiguity, high on the need for closure or low in cognitive complexity might be associated with generally valued characteristics as personal commitment and wavering loyalty".

I do believe that this article is strong, there are just certain points in the article that make me think.

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

2

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



Re: Censors & Metal

by [Cristian Alamo](#) - Wednesday, April 17, 2019, 3:36 PM

The GOP relies heavily on the evangelical and deeply religious votes to be able to compete against democrats. While yes, many conservatives are against gay marriage the evangelical vote is very important for the Republican running for any office to secure and many might say they are against gay marriage but their personal views are different. Since we are talking about the early 2000s an example of this would be Dick Cheney. Dick Cheney's daughter was gay and the Bush administration needed the evangelical vote and was against gay marriage. Cheney stood by his daughter and supported her. I definitely think that conservatism has evolved to accept more sexual orientations. I think it depends on ones religious beliefs more than ones party on acceptance of sexual orientation.

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

1

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



Re: Your Censorship & Morality Post

by [Matthew Berry](#) - Wednesday, April 17, 2019, 9:01 PM

I think you may have missed the understanding of this Forum- "Censorship & Morality". The first two sentences of your post honestly are way off topic. The Forum topic is on "Censorship & Morality" not the comparison of "Religion & Politics". We are supposed to base our Forum on the historical information of the Progressive Era of the early 20thCentury, that we are studying in class and in our text books, compared to the early 21stCentury, while obviously using additional research to make our arguments historically correct. While you are correct about "Religion" being a big part of Political Party lines, even going as far as to guide policy and to help push certain laws. You are also correct when you stated information regarding Vice President Cheney's daughter Mary Cheney being a lesbian. Although you should fact check the Bush-Cheney Presidential campaign of 2000 (see Wikipedia 2000 Presidential Campaign) because even though they were silent about Mary's personal life, it was public knowledge that she was gay and some even saw her presence on the campaign trail as "Bolstering" the Republican ticket with a "compassionate conservative" image (see Wikipedia Mary Cheney- Presidential Campaign). So in short I would implore you to take another look at Forum guidelines/outlines and maybe try to tie in the then and now concept a little bit better for this Forum. This is just some friendly advice feel free to take it or leave it. I myself am new to the entire Forum thing, I had to reach out for advice myself regarding my first post on "American Exceptionalism". The way I see it is the only way we are going to fully grasp the information we are expected to learn, as well as to earn full credits for the Forums that we post, is by challenging one another's work and pushing each other to do better.

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

2

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



Re: Your Censorship & Morality Post

by [Kate Adkisson](#) - Wednesday, April 17, 2019, 10:01 PM

If I'm reading your comment right, I think you misunderstood Cristian's reply for an original post. I believe Cristian is replying to Zar's original post regarding what makes a person politically conservative, rather than starting a new discussion topic on evangelicals.

I also think it's okay to stray away from the main topic sometimes in these forums, as long as the discussions are along the lines of what we're discussing, are supported by facts, and remain positive. I took one of Joe's online history classes in the past and I think I remember that getting a little off topic in

forums was okay. Maybe not for this class, but just my two cents.

Sum of ratings:1(1)

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



Re: Your Censorship & Morality Post

by [Zar Oelke](#) - Thursday, April 18, 2019, 8:58 PM

You are completely right Kate, I apologize for opening such a huge can of worms. I just found the article interesting on where I believe it fell politically and how different paragraphs touched upon Liberals and Conservatives.

Sum of ratings:0(1)

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



Re: Your Censorship & Morality Post

by [Matthew Berry](#) - Thursday, April 18, 2019, 10:10 PM

Looking back, I didn't see that Christian had posted above, and was under the impression that it was his initial post. But I now see that this post was a reply to Zar's comment. Sorry for the mix up, just didn't want him to not get the points available for the Forum.

Sum of ratings:0(1)

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



Re: Your Censorship & Morality Post

by [Cristian Alamo](#) - Friday, April 19, 2019, 1:11 PM

Yeah you're right my bad. I get off topic pretty easily I'll try and keep it more on topic. What I wanted to say was that as time goes on beliefs change and I think it has changed drastically since Sapho was considered a big deal. I would say that since the anti-war anti culture movement in the 60s and 70s that we as a country have been becoming more and more accepting of all people from all sexual orientations.

Sum of ratings:0(1)

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



Morality and How it Adapts and Changes

by [Maddie Neale](#) - Thursday, April 18, 2019, 5:29 PM

I agree that morals have not deteriorated per se, but our standards as a nation have changed and adapted to the advancement of technology and society. This is not directly correlated with a decrease in a good moral compass by any means and one could even argue that it could be a result of our nation growing and advancing. Obviously the higher access to pornography would not be a positive advancement necessarily but we have become more open-minded of things like the LGTBQ community and although some may say we have much more to work on in that area it still is considered an advancement of our societies open-mindedness as a whole.

It can be clearly seen that no nation will retain all of its former morals and beliefs over time, and we cannot expect America now to have the same reservations and morals as it will 200 years in the future.

Sum of ratings:1(1)

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



Wanting Morality, Regardless If It Was A Character Portrayed

by [Nicolette D Erazo](#) - Thursday, April 18, 2019, 11:30 PM

In the video, Sapho, who willingly went to a bedroom with a man, was not punished. As stated in the video, "Because Sapho, the character, was not punished, Olga, the actress, had to be punished." Olga was arrested for violating public decency and the fact that this occurred during this time indicates that censorship and the idea of sexuality being discrete was of high importance and the formation of censor committees, who tried to keep seductive images and peep shows at bay, were part of the idea that this was wrong to have these concepts out in the public. Olga was simply an actress portraying a character, however it did not matter to those who felt her ending scene of the play to be offensive, regardless of how the majority of the audience felt of her portrayal. The goal of the censor committees was to uphold a strong morality for the public regardless of who or what the source was.

Sum of ratings:1(1)

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



Rock and roll, and Sapho
by [Brayden Lane](#) - Thursday, April 18, 2019, 11:59 PM

There are a lot of similarities than more differences to me in the case of Sapho and PMRC. For starters they both have explicit scenes and words that were seen as wrong and should not be said or heard. They are both seen as defiant in nature and not moral by one side and not so much by the other. They also both had similar unintended consequences in which because Olga the creator of Sapho was taken to court, quickly found not guilty ended up more people going and buying to see the show and making it more popular. In the case of Pmrc, adults and more specifically mothers had a problem with rock and roll and made it so on the labels of albums there is a sticker that says explicit language. The consequence of that being more albums were sold. Similar as well on posters for Sapho and albums for rock and roll there was explicit pictures of sexuality which can be a reason they were both popular. According to the video of sapho "New Yorkers were now seeing things in public places never seen before". Which created sensations all over the city, similar to Rock and roll there were things being said and shown not seen or heard before which made it a sensation. At the bottom of both of these is Americans wanting less change and in both cases they were pessimistic reformers trying to make changes for better according to themselves. In the cases of both the progression position of trying to protect people and children backfired and subsequently made it more popular.

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

2

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



The Protestant Influence on Progressivism
by [Owen McCoy](#) - Friday, April 19, 2019, 12:15 AM

"Progressivism emerged first and most strongly among young, mainly Protestant, middle-class Americans who felt alienated from their society." (textbook p. 687) As we've seen in class, while many progressive reforms could be described as more liberal in nature, some Protestant values drew progressives in a conservative direction. (class lecture notes) The 18th Amendment (prohibition) is an example of this, and the Mann Act also reflects the desire to conform morality, by coercion if necessary.

In Olga Nethersole's case, the Mann Act was pitted against the 1st Amendment right to freedom of expression. As was seen in the video, Nethersole was acquitted and the 1st Amendment won out. It is an interesting example of how the Bill of Rights was created to protect Americans from government regulation. Nevertheless, we have seen the federal government historically take much more power than it was enumerated in the Constitution, even sometimes going so far as to violate the Bill of Rights. In Chapter 23, we saw the effects of the Committee on Public Information, "the first official propaganda agency in U.S. history." (class lecture notes) Furthermore, "in the Espionage, Sabotage, and Sedition Acts passed in 1917 and 1918, Congress gave the administration sweeping powers to silence and imprison dissenters." (textbook p. 762) In these extreme cases, one can see why the Bill of Rights was put in place.

Sum of ratings:[3 \(1\)](#)

3

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



Lowering Censors
by [Kaleah Holmes](#) - Friday, April 19, 2019, 11:55 AM

Censorship in the 1900's is completely different than today's. I knew that women had to dress modestly to be accepted in society and that sex was not really talked about or taught in schools. I did not realize they would go so far as to arrest an actress who in a scene went willingly into a bedroom with a man (01:15 into Sapho and Olga Nethersole video). This seems over the top to me. I feel like if they truly could not stand that scene then they should arrest the director or even the writer of the play. Olga was only doing her job so the arrest was unfair. I find the fact that after Olga was found not guilty the show got an even bigger audience than they would have if Olga had never been arrested. I liked that the majority of people wanted to stick it to the man (the Censors who got Olga arrested). People in that day really wanted to see some scandal I guess. There is a connection to this today. In many shows, movies, and even commercials there is sex and nudity. There is even sexual innuendos in children's movies such as Aladdin and The Road to El Dorado. I think there is too much of that out there but the censorship level seems to lower all the time. I do not think we should arrest people who act in the sex scenes but I think it would be better if we raised the censor bar a bit and made movies more modest.

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

1

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



Re: Lowering Censors
by [Maddie Neale](#) - Saturday, April 20, 2019, 9:20 PM

Raising the censorship bar does seem like a good idea in theory but to even raise it a little bit would be a tough task considering how much of an influence media has today. A few well circulated posts would be enough to shut any sort of budding reform.

I also agree that the fact that today there are more "hidden" sexual innuendos in children's movies than in T.V shows like "I Love Lucy" 70 years ago, (Which I do concede was a family show) clearly indicates the change in society and its beliefs.

Sum of ratings:[0](#) (1)

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



PMRC/HEAVY METAL!
by [Zar Oelke](#) - Saturday, April 20, 2019, 5:07 PM

I believe that there are many similarities with Sapho and Heavy Metal outrage in the 1980's. Both Heavy Metal and Sapho went against the grain of society and utilized art to express emotions and beliefs that were different than what had ever been seen before. Both having some form of controversy around them. A similarity with both of these subjects is that it outraged the public and it had to be, "stopped" because it was considered obscene and morally outraging. Both art forms went to trial as well, Olga went to trial because they aimed to arrest her for how controversial she was. While Heavy Metal singers went to court to protect and defend their art form from being censored and diminished. As well as, when her show re-opened it drew large crowds. With Heavy Metal, because it had a Parental Advisory sticker, it was seen as more hardcore and more offensive which drew people to spend money on albums thinking, "How offensive could this be? My parents are telling me not to listen to this!" selling many copies. Both art forms drew larger audiences because of the controversy.

A big difference between both of these topics is that Olga was arrested and charged with; "...violating public decency" while Heavy Metal artists had their art form censored, no individual was arrested for the songs they created. With Heavy Metal, politics were brought up when Twister Sister's lead singer "Dee Snider" discussed how conservatives at the time wanted to crack down on people's rights and the rebelliousness of, "Heavy Metal". While the Sapho section doesn't discuss political sides. Only that there was a moral outcry.

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

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



Re: Censorship today
by [Sidney Axtell](#) - Saturday, April 20, 2019, 8:02 PM

Censorship in today's society has changed immensely. Being a women in that day of age, you often were expected to be passive, and proper. Take Sapho for an example. It first went on broadway in the 1900's. Prostitution remained a major topic of social concern during this time period. Olga Nethersole, portrayed a character that was past society's standards being too "sexual" and "indecent"; she was later arrested for her actions. (Sapho and Olga Nethersole). I find this outrageous. I personally believe that there were other ways to handle the situation. This definitely wouldn't be the case for today's views. The connection in today's society, the "sexual process" has improved tremendously. We often see sex as a normal thing. While there are millions of movies today that involve women and men being sexual, the actors aren't judged for portraying a character that is overly sexual, (that's why they call it acting). Society's views have allowed sex to be a comfortable topic, not a punishable one.

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

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



Re: mann act
by [Sidney Axtell](#) - Saturday, April 20, 2019, 8:51 PM

The Mann act primary stated intent was to address prostitution and prevent women from being sex trafficked. The law was misused often and usually enforced improperly when first passed. But it was necessary to have in order to protect women. Though we still have the act today, It isn't brought into effect often. It is important to have because it limits the involvement of the potential sexual exploitation of minors. Jack Johnson, a heavyweight boxing champion, was charged + convicted of a Mann Act violation in 1912, for taking his mistress across state lines. When you look back at his trial, you start to notice that being of that time period, Johnson had the odds stacked against him since he was african american. During this time "white slavery" was the public panic. (Wikipedia).

Sum of ratings:

1 (1)

1

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



Censorship: Today vs. Then

by [Anthony Nguyen](#) - Saturday, April 20, 2019, 9:43 PM

From watching and listening to the video I can conclude that the censorship was very common in 1900. In the case of Sapho people were outraged by a play that contained sexual ideas. In today’s world if an actress was arrested and charged with “violating public decency” (video 1:18) for preforming a play, that itself would be considered scandalous. Olga was arrested because I believe during her time women were supposed to act and be seen as more “proper” or “lady like” where as today it isn’t expected. Obviously it was wrong for Olga to be arrested by today’s standard, however during her time her play was socially unacceptable. With relevant issues today, censorship doesn’t seem to be as common as it once was because people can say and do as they please. To me this is a positive development because it allows for people to be expressive and honest. As far as “morality police” on social media everyone holds everyone accountable for things they say. Media makes it much easier to speak out against someone who has said something that others perceive as “morally wrong” and if most people view it as wrong they are quick to jump in and tell them exactly why they think so. In my opinion this is can be positive because it holds people accountable for their words and actions but at the same time one controversial statement could be held against someone forever.

Sum of ratings:

2 (1)

2

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



Considering Sapho

by [Aaron Richards](#) - Saturday, April 20, 2019, 10:36 PM

Sapho was a prelude to a large amount of censorship in film. In the 1930s the PCA (Production Code Administration) was made to regulate the morality of films because they were ruled as a from of commerce and were not yet protected under free speech. Until the PCA enforced their rules films became largely racy until 1934 when the code was enforced. The code was upheld until the 1960s when more and more filmmakers began to ignore it. The code led to a lot more clever use of dialogue and imagery to convey hidden meanings.

Sum of ratings:

1 (1)

1

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

[◀ American Exceptionalism](#)

[American Exceptionalism ▶](#)

[◀ Chapter 23 Quiz](#)

Jump to...

[CLICK HERE for Forum 1 Materials & Questions ▶](#)

Moodle Docs for this page

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Log out)

HST 203 Sp19 (Escobar Meta 44706 47037)

Get the mobile app