

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](#) ►

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](#)



Re: Censorship & Morality

by [Patryce Miller](#) - Saturday, April 13, 2019, 9:48 AM

I think that it is interesting that more people came to see the play after the release of Olga Nethersole (3:09 from the Sapho and release court case). This happens all the time when the government tries to censorship something but happen less with movies and more with government or politically an example is an article about how the U.S. is censoring new record that came out March 31, 2018.

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



Re: Censorship & Morality

by [Patryce Miller](#) - Wednesday, April 17, 2019, 10:43 PM

The sex scandal for celebrity (like actors) are some times fake that the magazines' people have something to write and sell. The reaction to this news is still the same. whether it is one like Eliot Spitzer or a fake one for money. An example is Eliot Spitzer and him leaving office (audio NPR story on the Mann Act). We expect our leaders to lead in an example that is both in the legal and moral right. So when someone that is a leader (like people in congress or the president) does illegal and immoral things. It will be made a big deal and be people will talk about from a negative view.

part 2:

I am more Liberal the conservative politicly. Even then I will have to disagree with the accuracy of researchers. I disagree with all the points they made in the article. I discern if it is accurate or not because not every conservative have

- Fear and aggression
- Dogmatism and intolerance of ambiguity
- Uncertainty avoidance
- Need for cognitive closure
- Terror management

as a psychological factor in being politically conservative (UC Berkeley Study). They might have one, two or three maybe none but not all.

Sum of ratings:1(1) 1

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



Re: Censorship & Morality
by [Patryce Miller](#) - Saturday, April 20, 2019, 3:37 PM

part 2:

There is a similarity between Sapho and PMRC censorship. People try to censorship them thinking they were "Inappropriate" to be seen or listen to. The only difference is the PMRC censorship made the Rockers put labels on certain songs/albums and arrested no one because of what the music is about (video clip on the PMRC and Heavy Metal lyric censorship). The sapho censorship did (video clip sapho). They are also an example of conservatism. Sapho and the PMRC censorship is the example of the traditional American value at that time for some of the people. The people pushing for these censorships are pessimistic reformers. I say that because they don't think highly of what they are censoring. An example of this is sapho thrown in jail for playing a character in a play and the PMRC wanting to place a warning label on the music product "inappropriate" for young children(1:15 sapho video and 4:14 PMRC video). In both case because the attention they were given they got even more popular with their intended audience.

Sum of ratings:1(1) 1

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



The Religious Foundation of the Progressive Movement
by [Amanda Francis](#) - Sunday, April 14, 2019, 1:44 PM

As we learned in Chapter 21 of our textbooks, "progressivism emerged first and most strongly among young, mainly Protestant, middle class Americans". These progressives felt that politics had become corrupt, and it was their responsibility to "right wrongs" and to "uplift the human spirit" (p. 687). A lot of good came from this progressive movement like Jane Addams's the creation of the "Hull House" in Chicago which helped mostly poor, working class, immigrant families and inspired other women throughout the nation. "Hundreds of thousands of women belonged to local women's clubs that sought to improve schools, build libraries and playgrounds, expand educational and vocational opportunities for girls, and secure fire and sanitation codes for tenement houses" (p. 690). Considering the religious foundation of the progressive movement, it's no wonder that issues arose around women's sexuality.

Taking all of that into consideration, I can understand why Sapho would have been controversial and unpopular by progressives. Our textbook even goes on to mention that Jane Addams "was troubled by the emerging sexual revolution, which she worried would lead many more poor women into prostitution" (p. 690). What I can't understand is why the actress, Olga Nethersole, was put on trial for her performance. Disliking the content of a play is one thing but arresting someone for their participation is ridiculous. The historian in the video mentions that the significant point of the play is when Sapho "willingly" goes to bed with the man, and "she wasn't punished for it." So, since Sapho wasn't punished in the play, Olga had to be punished in real life (Sapho Video 1:00). Again, disliking a play for conflicting with your moral, religious beliefs is one thing, but arresting someone for the content of the play is extreme and unconstitutional.

Sum of ratings:3(1) 3

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



Re: The Religious Foundation of the Progressive Movement
by [Anna McNutt](#) - Friday, April 19, 2019, 4:09 PM

I completely agree that Olga's arrest was horribly wrong. I also understand that the times were different than what we know now. For example, a photo that was thought to be "obscene" in 1900 was shown to us, college students. (Sapho video 1:53) The New York Society for the Suppression of Vice not only forbid photos like this one, but also poems and songs. (Sapho video 2:04) This caught my attention because I image that so many songs today would be considered unacceptable back then. I'm sure that a huge percentage of rap would be banned.

Times have changed, but by how much? Those songs that have curse words are censored on most of the radio. When you go to see a movie, you may have to prove your age and you may not be able to attend. The line has gotten farther and farther away from 1900, giving us more grace and less rules, but there is still a line that can

be crossed.

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

2

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



Censorship & morality, the deceptive language of a good thing.

by [Adam Moore](#) - Sunday, April 14, 2019, 2:27 PM

What kind of upright citizen would not want morality to determine our laws? Most people strive to live in a moral way, but what are there morals? Who determines the compass of morality? I would hazard a guess that the real-world definition of the word morality would differ from person to person or group of people to group of people. Think about the vast differences in religions, immigrates or nationalized citizens, etc. These are just a simple list of the differences in people whom may have different view-points on morality. The early 20th century United States middle-class individual wanted to “help” those less fortunate by-passing laws that would force them to follow their moral code of conduct and these laws created more problems. Prohibition is an excellent example of fitting one’s own personal or group-think morality into the laws of a nation.

White protestant middle class women were the driving force behind the prohibition. On the surface prohibition made moral sense as drinking and domestic violence often go hand in hand, as do a slew of other issues: financial hardship, alcoholism, and overly poor decision making. Refer to page 690 of our textbook for a more exhaustive list of these evils correlated to drinking of alcohol. What these early reformers failed to see was the benefit of bars and saloons for many in the immigrant population. Page 690 of our textbook speaks on these benefits it says:

” On Chicago’s South Side, for example, saloons provided food, meeting space for fraternal organizations, and camaraderie to men longing to speak in their native tongue. Saloonkeepers sometimes functioned as informal bankers, cashing checks and making small loans.”

As you can see reformers sometimes missed the mark when it came to “help” those less fortunate then themselves by apply only their views of morality.

Censorship is a tool of force one’s morality on the population on a whole. Like a wolf in sheep’s clothing, censorship on the surface has a lot of great things going for it; but underneath it can devour a culture and silence history. Although, I believe censorship is important for childhood development, like keeping children from violence or pornography I believe there’s a pendulum effect that could happen if there was no censorship allowed. I for one do not want my young daughter seeing inappropriate or lewd things on TV or movies. In opposition to censorship we have a rating on all kinds of entertainment, allow the viewer the choice to decide what to consume. Where do we draw the long on censorship though? Do we stop talking about history because it is offensive, raw or emotional? Many would say that censorship is a violation of the 1st amendment and the basic rights of humans to freely share ideas and concepts. (this image is in [week 2 lecture images](#))

Forum | connection



From the Video

Reformers

Middle class women
Fewer household duties/chores
“Time on their hands”

Forums require “proof”
Connections to textbook, video,
lecture, etc.

Dee Snider from the band Twisted Sister went before congress to openly speak against censorship. He felt that censoring songs was a violation of his artistic interpretation and his first amendment rights.

If we look at morality and censorship only at the words, they are we may be fooled in giving away some of our rights. However, if we decide to look a little closer at these two issues, we notice that it is a majority trying to force their opinions on the minority.

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

3

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

 Why so much censorship? Part 1
by [Baylee Crowson](#) - Monday, April 15, 2019, 3:22 PM

Part 1: I think the censorship was very strict in the sense of sexuality. It wasn't socially acceptable in public and in films, which is just about the opposite of today's movies and/or music. Sexuality has become a popular thing to discuss and have in films or put into advertisements, it would knock the socks off the people from the 1990's if they saw some of the movies today. I think the most interesting part was how she got charged with public indecency over the play, and it only took 15 minutes for the jury to find her "not guilty". It makes you wonder who the stickler was that gave her that charge when the charge went no where. I think sexuality is not censored anywhere near as much as it was in the 1900's. (Sapho video from Forum 1 materials)

As I understand it, the act was primarily made to prevent prostitution and human trafficking of women. I think that they thought the Mann Act was their best solution at the time, so I don't think it was bad of them to do at the time, seeing as how immoral it was for sexuality to be expressed by women. I don't think it's really needed all that much anymore. There's adult websites all over the internet, rated-R movies for sexual content, rap songs about drugs and sex, and models show off clothing made to leave little to the imagination, prostitution happens I'm guessing very minute, every day in the Untied States. The men and women selling themselves are typically in desperate situations and don't care too much about the legality of the act. Revolts can happen when the government tries to control citizens too much. I think an unintended consequence was the case where the man got charged because his lady and him were opposite colors. It's hard to try and protect one group without another group opposing some parts or getting offended because they feel this new act took away a freedom or right of theirs. (Radio show/ NPR report)

An example that comes to my mind because my father was just talking about him, is Tiger Woods. He was shamed publicly after his big cheating scandal. I think in this case it shows we are somewhere near the 1900's culture still, but when you look at someone like Kim Kardashian who pretty much got famous for her big sex scandal, you can see it obviously doesn't affect women the exact same way. She makes a lot more money than anyone I personally know so it obviously didn't hurt her career too bad, if anything, it promoted her name out to everyone.

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

2

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

 Why so much censorship? Part 2
by [Baylee Crowson](#) - Monday, April 15, 2019, 4:20 PM

Part 2:

I think I fall somewhere between moderate to conservative. I'm not too hardcore into politics. I disagree that people are conservative because are are in fear or aggressive, or intolerant, or trying to control people with terror. I don't see why people automatically assume you're intolerant of other people and things. It leads people to believe you can only socialize with others of the same political party. I believe it would benefit the researchers to have information only from people who identify as conservatives because any other party would use their biases and effect the truth to the findings. A liberal can't tell someone how a conservative feels or what they think, especially not what they truly believe in.

The similarities I see between Sapho and PMRC censorships, is that they are both being harshly judged for something that has truly, physically affected anyone. Just watching a play with sexual undertones isn't going to turn someone into a sexual predator and listening to heavy metal music isn't going to force people into cussing everyone out and throwing stuff. I believe there is a fine difference between the two though, one is for bad words and a revolting attitude and the other is for womens' sexuality finally coming to the stage. These are both showing conservational measures being taken, they are both showing groups of people that come together to help stop the evolution of entertainment towards what it has become today. I would say these heavy metal artist are optimistic reformers. The guy was intelligent and made intelligent remarks in the courtroom, surprising people. He didn't stand up and start cussing at them and aggressively tried to get them to let him win, he was respectful. It showed a new depth to these people. I think it didn't actually cause the artists any harm, the guy said it actually made the music more popular to the kids to have the advisory label on the CD cases.

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

2

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



A glance compared to an understanding
by [Christopher Bischoff](#) - Monday, April 15, 2019, 8:00 PM

What I find most compelling about Sapho is that when Olga was initially charged with violating public decency and faced a fine and jail time. When the case went to court the jury examined it, they decided that she was not guilty within fifteen minutes. The reason I find this compelling is because a lot of modern news stories are similar in that they critique stories harshly without first looking at the all of the facts, and without considering what others think about the same event.

I think a modern day connection would be the Covington controversy. This video explains it well https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cm80MKn_ZQ8 . Basically when the story first came out, a lot of people were calling for violence or punishments against the kid wearing the MAGA hat, he and his family even received death threats because of the way the story was reported. Others called the kid names and denounced his parents for raising him the way they did. After more videos came out that showed more of the incident, it became clear that the teenager wearing the MAGA hat was innocent and many public news reporters retracted their statements (<https://www.mediaite.com/online/journalists-and-celebs-rush-to-delete-tweets-slamming-maga-hat-kids/>)

The similarities between the two stories are that judgements were made too quickly, and that the news sensationalized the story further.

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

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



Re: Censorship & Morality
by [Dago Franck-Nathan Kouassi](#) - Monday, April 15, 2019, 8:43 PM

With regard to the Mann Act, was that law necessary then? the left side tends to be Democrats, progressives, liberals and favors a stronger government with policies that benefit the general population at the expense of those in positions of power. the left believes that the most important function of the government is to ensure the general well-being of its citizens by paying by taxing the population. But the Mann Act, mentioned in the NPR (audio files on the Mann Act) and your (chapter 21 of the manual), was a law adopted by the "progressives" to reduce immorality. I think this does not make any sense because the same political party tends to fight for the freedom of the people, favoring minimal government interference in the economy and prefer private sector-based solutions to problems. This law for me wasn't necessary, because he goes against the party ideology first. And also, was condemned according to the government any action for them seemed to be sexually infringing at the public. But what about the viewpoint of the public about the subject? it wasn't taking on consideration. And also I believe the law was to punish people of color in the century, or immigration people because, in the forum material how heavyweight fighter Jack Johnson and one of the white women with which he had a relationship. He was convicted of violating the Mann Act in 1913. and recognize guilty. but in (video clip of Sapho and resulting court case). the character on Sapho, Olga had to be punished on the real life for her letting herself be carried at the end of the scene. but the jury didn't find her guilty. Also in the audio (3_npr_mann_act.mp3) "1944 Charlie Chan was prosecuted because of his action involved a prostitute, He was acquitted".

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

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



Re: Censorship & Morality
by [Sebastian Garcin](#) - Monday, April 15, 2019, 9:56 PM

Censorship is nothing new in the United States. It has been used since the beginning of the United States to uphold certain religious or political standards but also to control the population. While censorship isn't anything new, the focal point has changed. In the past any censorship was generally pro-religion, taking Christian values and principles. However in present day censorship is very anti-religion, taking efforts to remove any and all religion from schools(the education system), politics, and in the general American way of life. Today many acts that wouldn't be considered the norm in the past(gender change, sex in general, homosexual marriage, etc..) are actively engaged in and discussed. On the other hand anything religion based is seen as a taboo and regarded as inappropriate. Censorship has completely switched from the past.

If anyone has any questions or a conflicting opinion, I would love to discuss it with you.

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

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



Re: Censorship & Morality
by [Patryce Miller](#) - Tuesday, April 16, 2019, 11:33 PM

I agree with you on that, but what about the man act. I think at that time it was needed and today. We just need to twist it a little bit. Remember the cause of that act in the first place. "It was originally supposed to combat force prostitute and debauchery" (0:14 NPR audio radio). We still need it because I know that there are people out there still being forced into prostitution and we need to help stop that. People might not like it when that government tries to protect certain people like that this act and try to protest it or still do it. But those people protesting have even try to see it from the victim point of view. If they did, they'll leave the act alone. Also, know back the people as Jack Johnson got arrested because of the act. (Wikipedia entry on Jack Johnson) But it did a lot of good back then too. Now, I really don't care about the debauchery side of it. Debauchery is crazy parties, wild nights that have a lot of alcohol. People will do it and no law is going to change. If the government did try to attempt to regulate the behavior of its citizens today. People will go on and retaliate against the government for it until they get rid of it. So, we can get rid of that part of the act. Overall we still need that act in place.

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

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



Re: Censorship & Morality
by [Sebastian Garcin](#) - Friday, April 19, 2019, 7:12 PM

Why personally I also agree that overall we need the act in place, part of me is hesitant as well. My concern is in the fact that some people would rather go into prostitution because it will provide more for their families. Similar to prohibition which was meant for a moral standpoint, it didn't take into account how alcohol was part of the culture of many people. Now, I want to make it completely clear that I don't believe in prostitution and I don't think that anyone should have to resort to that but the fact is that sometimes those people can make more money in a single night than they could make in weeks, and they desperately need that money. Even with the Man Act, people would still find ways around it and break it because it is in humans nature. Even if the government did enforce it more harshly it could do more harm than good, taking away a source of income that the people so desperately need. The government should do whatever it can to stop people from being forced into prostitution, but it also needs to help those people find jobs to provide for themselves/their families.

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

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



Re: Censorship & Morality
by [Will Taylor](#) - Thursday, April 18, 2019, 11:41 PM

To be honest, I wish I could disagree (for the sake of conversation). I thought coming into these forums that there would be a lot more debate and disagreement, but so far I feel like everything being said I understand and agree with. And while that is a good thing, it does make it a little more difficult when trying to get that every other day post requirement. So to add on to what you were saying about how roles have switched, just like how censorship in the past has been very religious based, and now being very anti religious, many other roles seem to have been reversed as well. Just 50 years ago, blacks were fighting for the right to use the same water fountain as whites. Now, blacks (obviously not all, this is a very small group meant to represent a larger movement) are fighting for the right to have separate water fountains as whites. At USC there's actually a "movement" to create separate black housing from the rest of the students (<https://www.latimes.com/local/education/la-me-usc-black-house-20150331-story.html>) I think this represents a much larger series of problems with the way censorship is headed, and while it does go to show just how far we've come, just how good its gotten that people are fighting for such petty things, I do think it's something that needs to be kept firmly in line.

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

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



Sapho
by [Grace Parker](#) - Monday, April 15, 2019, 10:52 PM

I thought the most compelling part of the video on "Sapho" was the fact that the actress was prosecuted for playing her "role". I also thought it was a little appalling that women were not supposed to "enjoy" sex and it was just for the gratification of the man. I see this in today's society with things like magazines, women being half naked on the front cover of at almost every grocery store, catering to the male eye in a way.

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

1

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



Re: Sapho
by [Adam Moore](#) - Friday, April 19, 2019, 4:16 PM

Throughout history it is a common thread that sex is not to be enjoyed but an act to be endured. Most of these are generally directed at women but it was also directed at men for many years. Sex in the United States has been a very taboo topic of conversation until recently. At second 29 of the clips on Sapho it says, " Directed and starred". So, she was not merely playing a part she was the one making decisions. I am in no way saying what they did was right for that time or this, but she was not just an actress in a play.

Today sex is a huge marketing strategy for both men and woman. When you pass by the magazines at the store you will see scantily dressed men and women, it is not just a one-sided marketing strategy. Right or wrong that is the way society is heading.

The moral implications of this piece at the time where very radical by any stretch of the word, and as professor Escobar has said countless times The United States treats radicals rather harshly.

Thank you for your comment and opinions.

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

2

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



Censorship Instagram vs. Sapho
by [Gabe Sorber](#) - Monday, April 15, 2019, 11:05 PM

While watching the video about the play Sapho I found myself laughing and having to rewind because of how different things are today. I thought it was hilarious that the actress,Olga Nethersole, was arrested for just doing her job, Acting! Nethersole was arrested for, "violating public decency," because the character she was playing didn't resist being carried to a bedroom. Again I was laughing because I had just gotten off instagram and my friends were posting their videos of spring break. In those videos they were partying and people making out at bars and posting it for everyone to see. Also I was watching the TV show World of Dance and the some of most beautiful dance routines were seductive and emotional, and to think that an actress playing in a role was arrested for just seeming sexual is mind blowing. I would like to know if any of your guys's favorite shows have an example of a woman being "sexualized", My guess is it probably does.

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

2

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



Re: Censorship & Morality [Sapho - Censorship then and now]
by [Will Taylor](#) - Monday, April 15, 2019, 11:30 PM

In the 1900s, there seemed to be quite a lot of censorship in the United States. And much like everything else in progressivism then, it ended up benefitting the middle and upper class citizens, rather than the lower class ones it claimed to be helping. This case is a little different, as it claimed to be on the side of "morality", but it was working along the same lines. Though there was a lot of seemingly racist and sexist censorship in the 1900s I personally feel like (though it was poorly executed, and shouldn't happened anyway) it wasn't the worst idea, nor was it fueled by greed, racism, or sexism. Yes I know there was a lot of things that were, but in this case, and other cases similarly I think that there were real concerns about the well being of the people affected by this play. As an example, these kinds of censorships have long been abolished completely leaving things like dramas, soap operas and porn accessible to everyone. Though obviously not proven, I think it's pretty commonsensical to say that they've definitely contributed to the rising rates of single motherhood, and pregnancies out of wedlock. In the 1900s, the single parenthood rates were estimated to be at about 9.1 percent (<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/036319909101600201>) whereas now, it's jumped up to 26 percent (<https://www.verywellfamily.com/single-parent-census-data-2997668>). So while I do think it's the right thing to keep government enforced censorship to a minimum, I don't think a poor choice either. I find it to be more of a "which is less bad" scenario. While the 1900s might have had its issues with censorship, it's certainly changed a lot over the years, especially the past decade or so. While the 1900s had government enforced censorship, we've

moved into an era of social censorship. It's no longer about what is being said, it's about if someone is offended by it or not. As our nation becomes richer and more peaceful, people start to look for something to fight for, something to stand together behind. I think this type of feeling is well stated by Ben Shapiro in an interview he did with Dave Rubin. He says ""Young people are always looking for a way to fight... ..when the world's pretty good what do you change?" (4:57 <https://youtu.be/vNHSaU8tCbY>). He then goes on to say how because people no longer have a clear outside force to fight against, they turn to the inside, to their emotions. Personally I think it's a really stupid form of censorship that creates a divide between people, and I could rant about this all day, but I need to wrap this up. In the end, censorship doesn't look too bad from the outside, but the biggest problem with it, is that it always seems to do the opposite of what it was intended to do. While it's supposed to protect the victims and potential victims from the issue, what it ends up doing is bringing even more attention to it. As said in the Sapho video "the censors who had gotten it closed down succeeded only in expanding the audience far beyond what it would have been without the arrest." That was true in the 1900s, and it's certainly true today.

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

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



Re: Censorship & Morality [Sapho - Censorship then and now] - Mueller
by [Will Taylor](#) - Friday, April 19, 2019, 7:27 PM

I just wanted to touch on a very recent topic that I thought was interesting, that being the redacted Mueller report, released yesterday (april 18th). The reason I wanted to talk about this on the censorship forum, was because even though the report clearly states evidence and facts to prove that Trump had no affiliations with Russia, the media is still slamming it, calling it (ironically) fake news, and saying that Mueller is corrupt as well. Now obviously there's no way to truly know, but that's the point. The media has been hammering into the minds of the public that Trump was colluding with Russia, and that the Mueller report was a lie so hard, that when the facts come out, they're still sticking to their guns, with claims that have no basis to them. And that's the censorship. The media is censoring the fact that Trump did not collude with Russia, by claiming the Mueller report as false, and even going after him too. ("Americans Agree on One Thing About the Mueller Report: Disgust With the Country's Leaders"

<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/04/19/us/the-mueller-report-voters-reactions.html>

I know there's a lot more to the Mueller report besides Trump and Russia, and I probably missed some applicable info. if you want a quick summary I recommend this video (



)

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

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



Re: Censorship & Morality
by [Joe Kiefer](#) - Tuesday, April 16, 2019, 11:31 PM

The similarities between the Sapho video and the PRMC video are evident. They both had women that thought that what they considered morally outrageous had to be stopped. The funny thing is that they both had the same outcome, making the Sapho play and the Heavy Metal music even more popular. I have a rather unique point of view on the PMRC issue as I was a high school student at the time and Heavy Metal was my preference in music. I have seen the entire documentary about the PMRC that originally aired on VH1 music channel. The one difference I see between the two is that there were some of the Heavy Metal bands that wanted the warning labels that the PMRC were trying to get the record labels to put on the music. There was a part that is not in this video clip that is in the

full documentary where Nikki Sixx, of the band Motley Crue, came out in favor of the warning label because he knew that it would increase their record sales and he was right, record sales for this type of music did increase, as did ticket sales for the Sapho play. The problem with using morality as a reason to ban something is that morality is subjective, what you may think is immoral might not be to someone else.

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

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



How much really has our sense of morality changed?

by [Anna McNutt](#) - Wednesday, April 17, 2019, 4:49 PM

Picture this: someone is running for office, in any position, and their sex scandal all of a sudden brought to light and they drop out of the race. Its easy to picture because this happens. Approval ratings seem to drop, and the scandal gives the opposing side a reason to actually dislike the candidate.

The Mann Act, put into place over a 100 years ago, is still in a effect today. In 1913 Jack Johnson was thought to have violated the Mann Act, serving time in prison. And recently, in 2008, Governor Eliot Spitzer left his job because of relations with a prostitute, violating the Mann Act. (NPR audio on the Mann Act) In just over a year his approval ratings dropped from 62% to 35% (Forum Materials- *NY Gov Eliot Spitzer Job Approval*)

With this one example it seems that our values have not changed a whole lot from the turn of the century to 2008. Even when someone hasn't violated the Mann Act, when a sex scandal is brought to light it seems like the candidate does not have a chance. It seems that we still value morality, or maybe just judge immorality.

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

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



Re: How much really has our sense of morality changed?

by [Sebastian Garcin](#) - Saturday, April 20, 2019, 9:33 AM

I believe that the whole issue regarding morality has changed since 20th century. While political candidates being exposed to breaking the Mann Act and then removed was more on the moral stand point, in present day it has become less about morality and more as a way for the opposing politician/group to use the act of immorality to their advantage. Each political party/candidate want to succeed and win, it is not so far fetched to say that each one is willing to take advantage of the smallest mistake using it against their opponents. I doubt that morality was in any of the minds of political parties using sex scandals against their opponents, it was just a means to an end.

This shows that the morality of the United States has changed. Our overall morality has been replaced with a mind set of using whatever we can to our advantage.

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

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



The Mann Act

by [Levi Savage](#) - Thursday, April 18, 2019, 11:27 PM

The Mann Act was a law passed to prevent sex trafficking supposedly done by immigrants in 1910. The Act came in response to growing books and narratives claiming that white women were being seduced and forced into prostitution in a form of "white slavery" around 1907. The reality of this is much further from the truth. America is entering this great economic boom that we learned about in chapter 20 where people began to flock to the cities en masse for the growing jobs and economic prosperity it could offer. Along with the innovation and cultivation of new technology which allowed women to be more independent and not rely on their husband or father to proved for them but to make their own life and success. That scared a lot of conservatives along with the progressives considering this act was championed by them. Women of that time were starting to gain freedom over their own lives and not having to rely on a man to provide for her. Which in turn meant expanding the view of women from just being the stay at home mom who takes care of kids and cleans granted if the family could afford to and in most cases, these were middle-class families. and it was most likely midclass people that pushed for the passage of this Act since it was their moral obligation as prostatitis. Was their good intention of this Act? I do believe so but in the cases that it has been used in to convict people I would say it could be used as a form of blackmail and discrimination look at Jack Johnson who was one of the first people to be charged under this act but he was convicted by an all-white jury for something that happened before the passage of the Mann act it would seem to be way to destroy this mans career. Even today the Act has been used against the former governor of New York for going to brothel suspected of trafficking women.

Sum of ratings:

3 (1)

3

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



Are there better ways of handling censorship and the idea of morality regarding World War I?

by [Alex Davis](#) - Friday, April 19, 2019, 5:25 PM

After going through the text and doing research the US practiced censorship in an interesting way. I didn't realize how much information was out there but couldn't be said in public. I understand that any nation going to war wants to win, but telling your own people what they can't do and instead just telling them what they should do to help their side win makes you think. For example it seems that Americans are allowed freedom of speech but it was taken away in a sense. When people had different opinions they were arrested or even deported when stating their own ideas and thoughts. Do you think that the US did the right thing regarding the war or should they have taken a different route?

Sum of ratings:

1 (1)

1

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



Re: Are there better ways of handling censorship and the idea of morality regarding World War I?

by [Baylee Crowson](#) - Friday, April 19, 2019, 6:16 PM

Isn't it crazy how hardcore the government was during this time? Just think of all the Americans who would loose their minds if the government tried to arrest people for having an opposing opinion. As for the government telling people they can't have wheat, sugar, or meat or whatever because they were sending it to the troops or wanted to, I think that was a bit overkill. I also think they should have made it a suggestion like you said. I think it may even inspire people more to know they are helping their country with their CHOICE. I think it would be a bit more rewarding that way. Pretty much all of that applies to their speech getting censored, ESPECIALLY the part about how people would react towards it. I've read Twitter and other social media posts about how people feel censored and things in the recent years, so it kinda of makes me laugh because they have idea what hardcore censorship is. After all that, I think that they definitely should have approach the situation differently, but we did end up helping win the war. Without the US, France and Britain were weak so that they would have failed and even though the censorship was inconvenience to the people, it may have been what gave us the ability to help keep soldiers alive to fight the fight.

Sum of ratings:

1 (1)

1

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



Sapho and Heavy Metal

by [Amanda Francis](#) - Saturday, April 20, 2019, 5:16 PM

There are many similarities to draw between Sapho and the progressives and heavy metal bands and the PMRC. Although I don't necessarily agree with the progressives and the PMRC one hundred percent, I do think they believed that they truly were protecting people and had the best intentions in mind. For instance, Jane Addams "was troubled by the emerging sexual revolution, which she worried would lead many more poor women into prostitution" just as she believed drinking was creating tension and harming working-class families. With these worries, Addams and the Women's Christian Temperance Union aided in passing the Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution (textbook p. 690). Addams saw first-hand what was dividing families and keeping them in poverty. She spent her life and career lifting the poor to their feet. It's easy for me to see that a play like Sapho doesn't lead to more prostitution just like I don't believe listening to heavy metal makes you a rapist, sadomasochist, or commit suicide like the video suggests. Like Addams, the PMRC felt they needed to protect their children. I'm happy that the First Amendment prevailed in both cases, and compromises were made because neither side villainous. To me, that is the American system working as it's intended.

Sum of ratings:

2 (1)

2

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

[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