

HST 201: ONLINE History of U.S. F18 (Escobar Meta 20748 22964)

[Home](#) / [My courses](#) / [HST 201 ONLINE F18 \(Escobar Meta 20748 22964\)](#) / [Week 10](#) / [Forum 4](#) / [Cartoons - Part 2](#)



Search forums

Forum 4 Cartoons - Part 2



[Subscribe](#)

[◀ Cartoons - Part 1](#)

Display replies in nested form



Move this discussion to ...



Move

Pin



Cartoons - Part 2

by [Joe Escobar](#) - Thursday, November 29, 2018, 2:29 PM

To write your post, click on the reply link in this post. This forum topic is for the SECOND set of cartoons for the week.

As usual, be sure to change the subject line of your post to the cartoon number and some descriptive text.

Count of ratings: -

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



Prayers and Protests

by [Clifford Lyon](#) - Thursday, November 29, 2018, 7:23 PM

Cartoon #15 is an interesting one to me that I had not seen before. It shows a drawing of Tim Tebow in his football gear kneeling, apparently in prayer, as the crowd shouts "Offensive! Offensive!" Next to it is a drawing of Colin Kaepernick kneeling, we can assume in protest during the National Anthem, as the crowd shouts "First amendment rights!" I believe that the first amendment protects both acts, as it offers protection for free exercise of religion, as well as freedom of speech, and the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

Tebow is simply exercising his religion. Many people find this offensive, but it is a protected right in this country and has been since the Bill of Rights was ratified. Kaepernick is the more infamous of the two I think for his actions. I often get asked about my opinions surrounding these types of protests because I am a Marine Corps veteran, and my response has always been the same: Colin Kaepernick has just as much right as any other American citizen to protest his government peaceably, and that is what he is doing. I may or may not agree with his motives, but I am certain that this is one of the rights guaranteed to him and to me by the Bill of Rights. I argue that while I have always stood and removed my hat while the National Anthem is played, I take pride in knowing that I served a country that allows its people the freedom to engage in such protests, however unpopular.

This has been a very emotional issue for a lot of people and I can understand why. But at the end of the day, the Bill of Rights says that both men have the right to demonstrate in these ways. When the Bill of Rights was ratified and became the law of the land, the American people were agreeing that these are the rights that we agree every citizen should have. Even if I disagree with the religion that someone is practicing, or the reason they are peaceably protesting their government, I agree with the right that they have to do so. This seems to be forgotten more often than not in modern America. My hope is that we as a country can get back to a place where we agree that these types of demonstrations are okay because, like it or not, they are rights afforded to all of us.

Count of ratings: (1) 3

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



Re: Prayers and Protests

by [Ian Epperson](#) - Friday, November 30, 2018, 9:52 PM

I couldn't agree with this post more. In the situation presented in comic #15, it points out a hot topic (or at least was during the moment, since then I don't hear about it anymore) in whether Colin Kaepernick should be allowed to peacefully protest or Tim Tebow should be allowed to pray on the field/sidelines. I can agree with what Gordon Wood says at 20:45 in the video 'the constitution & ratification', "Even if we come out on different sides [of the issues] we still all agree on the authority of the constitution." Many arguments can and have been made on which football player has the right to take a knee for different reasons, even though we all agree that the constitutional right exists for both. I find it unfortunate however in today's world, citizens can use their opinions about rights to try and professionally or socially condemn others for practicing their constitutionally legal beliefs we inherently agree exist to ultimately protect us.

Count of ratings: (1) 2

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

Re: Prayers and Protests



by [Nargis Safi](#) - Saturday, December 1, 2018, 2:59 AM

I totally agree with you, that these types of demonstrations are ok . The first amendment of bill of rights says that "The Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." As we all understand That United states is home to different people from different backgrounds so it is obvious that religion , culture and social differences exist among the people. However it is up to the people to respect the bill of rights and live peacefully despite all the differences.

Count of ratings: (1)

1



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



Madison and Jefferson's Fears Become Reality. [comic #2]

by [Ian Epperson](#) - Thursday, November 29, 2018, 7:39 PM

I would strongly agree with the comic depicting a hypothetical warning to Americans to not let greed intermingle with our government practices and hold those in power responsible to those they serve. I believe that this depicts the fears of Madison and Jefferson outlined in the textbook on page 243. When Hamilton proposed consolidating the nation's wealth (taxes) and debt, Jefferson responded with, "The ultimate object of all this, is to prepare the way for a change, from the present republican form of government, to that of a monarchy, of which the English constitution is to be the model." They had successfully made a compromise to move the political capitol away from the New England commercial hub in 1789, however, commercialism and politics grew from there to where we are now, time and growth made it possible for the two forces to co-mingle with one another.

In the background we can see three examples on the students bulletin board showing current tactics used to sway our political landscape. Lobbyists are paid huge sums by giant business and interest groups to influence politicians to legislate in their interests. Campaign donors bet on politicians like horses to ensure their motives are properly address in spite of lower classes. Finally, money and power is shown which (in my opinion) is the reason why we fought the British in the first place, excessive taxes. It is posted for all the children to see as to indoctrinate and normalize this type of behavior. Their faces show a sense of unease as if they are not quite sure what all this means, but know they have to follow along to it and to a parity of our pledge of allegiance, "with liberty and justice for sale".



'...with liberty and justice for sale.'

Count of ratings: (1) 3

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



Cartoon 15 Free Speech

by [Sarah Mackenzie](#) - Thursday, November 29, 2018, 8:11 PM

In regards to the Alien and Sedition acts, the fourth law set jail "terms and fines for persons who advocated disobedience to federal law or who wrote, printed, or spoke "false, scandalous, or malicious" statements against the government of the United States or the President of the United States, with intent to defame or to bring them or either of them, into concept or disrepute." (252)

There were 14 Republican's that were prosecuted for a violation of the Sedition Act. The Republican's then fought back stating that the Alien Sedition Acts violates the first amendment. The First Amendment is: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances". (A-10)

In the year 1931, playing the National Anthem before sporting events, and standing during it became an important patriotic ritual and unfortunately, over the years some athletes have chosen to protest racial injustices in American society by turning their backs on the flag, refusing to stand or taking a knee. The playing of "The Star-Spangled Banner" is an important part in history. It was written by Francis Scott Key, after the Battle of 1812. This war played a crucial role in establishing Americas identity. This war for independence inspired the national anthem and allowed founding fathers to pave a new way. It gave the United States a new standing in the world. (War of 1812 Part 1 1:33)

This cartoon has been extremely controversial and I have actually had the chance to really dive into it for other classes. So, what does this have to do with history, well it has come into question if the two gentlemen were protected by the First Amendment, for

taking a knee during the National Anthem. Both individual player contracts give the owners expansive powers to discipline or fire players for a wide variety of reasons, including for conduct that diminishes public respect for the game which is a broad term that could easily be interpreted to include controversial political protests. First Amendment argument is null and void. It only limits government officials, and not private businesses. I think there is no definitive answer for the First Amendment anymore.

Technically, when the players take the field they are doing so as private citizens employed by a private company. The right to protest is covered under the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. But the right has limits. The First Amendment prohibits the government from restricting free speech. As a private company, the NFL is not subject to the same standard. If the NFL required players to sign contracts that restricted their free speech, and the players violated their contract, they could be fired with little legal recourse. In an article in the Washington Post, Peter Shane, law professor at Ohio State University, points out that “government pressure to fire the players would be against the law.”

Count of ratings: (1) 3

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



Cartoon #8- America built on death and disease

by [Evan Brewer](#) - Thursday, November 29, 2018, 8:13 PM

In cartoon #8, the cartoon is illustrating the migration of the European englishmen coming to America and the reactions of the Native Indians. There is dialog among the cartoon and it is of an Indian greeting these new arrivals saying “Let them all in. What possibly could go wrong?” After seeing this cartoon for the first time, I believe the cartoonist completely captured this historical event correctly. The native Indians surely didn’t know what was in store for them after these new arrivals colonized the new land. Indian’s welcomed the colonists with open arms and thought they would respect their ancestral ground. Unfortunately, that wasn’t the case. In our textbook, “Liberty, Equality, Power” the book says, “the Indian communities of the area had been ravaged by diseases spread by European traders”(60). When the colonist first arrived, the spread of new diseases soon would take over and many Indians would soon die because of sickness. This wasn’t the only thing that killed off Indians. The growing retaliation between colonist and indians in the years following caused more war between the two groups and America would soon belong to the colonists in the end. Sadly, the land that was once only occupied by Native Americans was now owned by immigrants from Europe. I do agree with cartoon #8’s point of view because the indians did accept these new immigrants at their own expense. If the indians knew what would happen in the end, I believe they would have treated these new arrivals in an entirely different way.

Count of ratings: (1) 2

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



Re: Cartoons - Part 2 # 8

by [Nargis Safi](#) - Thursday, November 29, 2018, 11:57 PM

I believe that cartoon # 8 featuring drawings of Native Americans and early settlers are fairly accurate based on what we know about the Native American and early settlers. In the earliest days of New World settlement, relations between the natives and the newcomers were friendly. Native American culture valued trade as a means of binding two tribes and increasing general cooperation, so the tribes were welcoming. They provided food, clothing, and shelter for the dependent settlers in exchange for metal tools like knives and hatchets. However, the natives were clueless of the upcoming disaster. As the European settlements began to grow cultural differences became more insurmountable. Large numbers of Native Americans died from European diseases. As stated in our book Liberty, equality, power "Spanish brought deadly microbes with them. Smallpox". Measles, typhus, cholera, and other crowd diseases, often spreading in successive pandemics, devastated the Indians. The most dangerous were small pox and influenza against which they had no immunity (page 30).

Count of ratings: (1) 2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Cartoons - Part 2 # 8**by [Nargis Safi](#) - Friday, November 30, 2018, 1:44 PM

Rectangular Snip

Cartoon #8

Count of ratings: (1) 0

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

**Re: Cartoons - Part 2 # 8**by [lan Epperson](#) - Sunday, December 2, 2018, 9:45 PM

Although I agree with the end result of a pandemic being the most destructive cause for bad blood between the two cultures, I disagree that the relationship was as cut and dry symbiotic relationship that I am pick up from your paragraph. According to our textbook on page 40, "The English had two models for successful colonization. The conquistador model, based on coerced exploitation of native populations, had yielded Spain massive profits and possessions with moderate investments." And the colonization model which is, "the English trying to impose their agriculture, language, local government, legal system, aristocracy, and religion." It seemed like it was always going to be a mixed bag as far as the greed or moral issues the natives had to deal with, and which settlers fall into either category. For example, if you were a native and would be going to welcome in Spain to the land, you would be dealing with the conquistador model. If it were the British settlers, it could really be either.

Count of ratings: (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Cartoon #8 Missing the Point**by [Asa Tellschow](#) - Friday, November 30, 2018, 12:25 PM

I had a problem with a few of the cartoons this week, but I decided to talk about #8. In this panel, Native Americans are watching European settlers landing on the beach, and voicing the opinion that they should "let them all in, what could go wrong?"

It seems to me that the comic echos the modern liberal stance that immigrants should be allowed into the US, especially relating to the current "debate" (I hesitate to call it that because I feel that it is largely a manufactured talking point for conservatives to rally around.) about whether we should allow asylum seekers into the US. (in accordance with US law and international conventions.) However, this is clearly a false equivalency for several reasons:

1. The European settlers were from a far more different culture than the Natives than Central Americans are from US citizens.
2. European settlers did not wish to assimilate into Native American culture, or contribute to its well being in any meaningful way.
3. Europeans weren't fleeing from violence in their home country, at least not in the same way that Central American refugees are.

I do appreciate that the cartoon illustrates that those of European descent who are now calling for the Central American refugees to be kept out, are from a group who was once on the other side of the question. "Remember, remember always, that all of us, and you and I especially, are descended from immigrants and revolutionists." (*The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt*, 1938) This dichotomy was certainly not lost on our founding fathers, who at least partially foresaw this situation.

Count of ratings: (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Cartoon 8 analysis**by [Kathy Holmes](#) - Friday, November 30, 2018, 5:07 PM

I chose to analyze cartoon #8 because it really spoke to me in regards to history as well as out current political climate. I do believe that this represents the way the events played out in American history. Way back in the beginning of the term we learned about the separatists coming to America and how they played out. This cartoon depicts native Americans standing on a ledge overlooking the land below that has stereotypical pilgrims coming towards them. One native says to another "let them all in. What could possibly go wrong?" This parallels with the text. "The much- diminished Wampanoags sought an alliance with the settlers" (pg 60 pr 3) as the text states the two groups peace prevailed for several years but overtime the newcomers pushed the natives further and further west and killing many. The natives depicted in the cartoon are probably thinking that it is their land, and they have control over it so letting others in wouldn't hurt anything but in the end it did not lay out as planned. I do believe the artist portrayed this accurately and I think with some adjustments it could be applicable to many different situations and groups of people.

Count of ratings: (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Cartoon 8 analysis**by [Asa Tellschow](#) - Saturday, December 1, 2018, 10:08 PM

I agree that this comic accurately reflects the Native Americans' open-minded approach to the Europeans, but I disagree on some other points. Firstly, I find it unlikely that the Natives felt as they did because they felt secure that "it is their land" (as you said). Native Americans generally didn't have a concept of land ownership. In fact, I think they even believed that it was impossible to own something like the land. I heard an interview recently on NPR in which a Native man was explaining that the traditional belief is that you can only own something that you created- so it was possible to own things like houses, clothing, or canoes, but no one could ever own the land, or a river, or the sky. Our textbook says, "Even sedentary Indians did not own the land as individuals. Clans or families guarded their 'use rights' to land" (Murrin p 18). This might explain some of the treaties that they made, for instance trading land for firewater. They may have agreed to such a bad deal because the notion of land ownership simply didn't translate.

Count of ratings: (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Cartoon 8 analysis**by [Asa Tellschow](#) - Saturday, December 1, 2018, 10:19 PM

The other point I would make is that if you apply this cartoon to other situations (most notably, the migrant "caravan" that's been in the news lately), then you could reach some distorted conclusions. In hindsight, we know that Native Americans

who believed that nothing "could go wrong" were naively mistaken. (In fact, they may have had significant worry at that time, but they still acted with humanity toward the newcomers.) As Howard Zinn writes about the Arawaks who greeted Columbus (yes, I know- different natives than shown in this comic, but still representative of the time in question), "These Arawaks of the Bahama Islands were much like the Indians on the mainland, who were remarkable (European observers were to say again and again) for their hospitality, their belief in sharing." (A People's History of the United States, p. 1)

In contrast, the modern comparison is different because the migrants who would approach the US are people that we have encountered before, and about whom we know a lot. They carry no novel diseases, or devastating weapons, and their lifestyle is relatively the same as our own. (for instance they think of land ownership similarly).

Count of ratings: (1) 2  [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

**Re: Cartoon 8 analysis**

by [Kathy Holmes](#) - Sunday, December 2, 2018, 12:36 PM

I may have misspoken when I said "their land" once you brought up the fact that they may not have had the belief that they could own something it reminded me of the "creatures of empire" audio we listened to weeks back (I am unable to see work from the beginning of the term or I would directly quote) the speaker stated something about the Natives having disputes with the English when they arrived with their animals and I think that parallels to this and gives me a little more insight on that past forum. The animals the English brought with them were encroaching onto the Natives area of residence and eating the crops they had planted, but as the English were okay with prosecuting the Natives, the Natives may have been thinking that even though they were living in a certain area of land it was really the land of all who lived there so they couldn't really be upset with the English. That was a great correction you made and it made me change my thinking about the cartoon a bit. I do think even without the belief of ownership over land they may have felt as though they had in a way "set up shop". I would love to listen to the NPR interview you are talking about! That is a great point that they believed they could own things they created such as shoes, clothing etc. but not things such as land or sky as they were not created by the Natives. I really appreciate your post, it made me think more in depth about my analysis.

Count of ratings: (1) 2  [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

**Cartoon # 14 and the redistribution of wealth**

by [Clifford Lyon](#) - Friday, November 30, 2018, 6:07 PM

Cartoon #14 shows what appears to be President Obama reviewing the Constitution and saying to James Madison, "Mr. Madison, I detected a flaw in your Constitution, nothing in it allows the government to confiscate wealth for redistribution," to which Madison replies, "That's not a flaw sir, that's the point." I agree with this cartoon because it demonstrates both the wishes of many politicians in modern America to find a legal way in which to redistribute wealth to make things "fair," but also that this sort of wealth redistribution was not intended to be allowed by the Constitution. The Founders intended for the people of this country to make their own fortunes, not rely on a small percentage of people to amass a large amount of wealth only to have it "redistributed" to everyone else. This idea has been a popular one with certain politicians lately, some of which have based their entire campaign on the notion of "equality" through redistribution. However, this was not the intention of the Founding Fathers and that is reflected in the documents that they left behind to guide us. They did leave in place a system for making amendments the Constitution if enough people thought that this would be a good idea, and this has been used throughout history as attitudes toward certain issues have changed, such as slavery and women's suffrage. This system ensures that the Constitution may be revisited from time to time and updated as needed, and it is one of the best aspects of the government that these men left behind.

Count of ratings: (1) 2 ◆

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



The Great Debate: Gun Control

by [Clifford Lyon](#) - Friday, November 30, 2018, 6:46 PM

Cartoon #10 represents a seemingly never-ending debate in America: gun control. In the cartoon, one man who is dressed like a hunter and holding a shotgun (pointed at the ground, finger off the trigger) is standing with his dog in front of another man dressed in casual clothing with his dog. The man in casual clothing has both arms extended as if afraid and is saying "Guns are bad!" The hunter has one arm partially extended as if to say, "Take it easy" and is saying "The *Misuse* of guns is bad!" This is an argument that has caused a great deal of emotional debate, especially the last twenty years. In my opinion, these men are very similar. Both are Caucasian males, both are dog owners, both agree that people have been hurt and killed by guns. The difference, in my opinion, is reaction. The hunter has been trained (probably from a young age) at least two important rules of weapons safety: 1. Never point a weapon at anything you do not intent to shoot, and 2. Keep your finger off the trigger until you intend to fire. This is shown by the way that he is handling his weapon (Yes, it is a weapon) while interacting with someone who he clearly does not intent to shoot. In the mind of the hunter, his weapon is a tool which he uses to harvest game in order to eat. In the mind of the other man, we can assume, the hunter's weapon represents all the weapons that have been misused in order to cause death and severe bodily harm to innocent people. Both these men agree that weapons can be used for this second purpose if that is what the shooter intends. The hunter would probably even concede

that death and severe bodily harm can be inflicted unintentionally if the person handling the weapon is not being responsible. The “anti-gun” person in this cartoon is suggesting that *all* “guns” are bad because they can end up in the hands of irresponsible or malicious people. The hunter is suggesting that these weapons, when handled and stored responsibly do not harm anyone, and in fact are very useful to his way of life.

I think it is safe to say that neither of these men wish to see innocent people harmed by firearms. The difference in their reactions to this issue is simply perspective. The “anti-gun” man has obviously decided that if the firearms were made unavailable, then the malicious people who intend to misuse them would then be disarmed and therefore no longer pose a threat to others. The hunter is not denying that these terrible things have happened and that firearms were used, he is simply suggesting that if they had not been used by irresponsible or malicious people, these terrible events could have been avoided. The issue then boils down to control. There are obviously people in this and every other country who should not be using firearms for various reasons. I do not like to over-simplify this issue, but the same is true for alcohol. Alcohol is available in the United States to people age 21 or older, there are however people who have a problem with alcohol, and therefore probably should not consume it. There is no law saying that these people cannot purchase and consume alcohol (with the exception of those in prison or on parole). Likewise, the right to keep and bear arms is extended to every law-abiding citizen over the age of 18 in America. There are again exceptions when it comes to people who have shown an unwillingness to obey the law. Just because gun ownership is a right extended to everyone, that does not mean that everyone is responsible or mentally stable enough to own a firearm. This again is an issue of how to control it. The Founding Fathers issued no such warning in the Bill of Rights, they simply wanted to protect the rights of citizens to keep and bear arms. I do not pretend to have a solution for this ongoing debate, I simply wish that people would stop blaming the weapon for the actions of the user. I am curious where other students weigh in on this issue though, and I am hoping for some feedback on this very long post.

Count of ratings: (1)

3



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



Re: The Great Debate: Gun Control

by [Evan Brewer](#) - Sunday, December 2, 2018, 3:56 PM

After reading your response, I do agree with you in regards of your argument that guns aren't the problem, people are. There is a big difference between people who own guns to hunt and supply themselves with meat and people who just own guns for pure enjoyment. However, this wasn't particularly an issue in the 18th and 19th centuries. The thought of gun control is a 20th and 21st century ideal and was not thought about

when the bill of rights were ratified. Saying this, cartoon #10 doesn't accurately reflect any historical events that we studied in class but does integrate an amendment that was created during this time. In 1791, the first 10 amendments were ratified. On the website, "The Second Amendment", Nelson Lund and Adam Winkler write about the second amendment saying, "the government could rely on a militia that consisted of ordinary civilians who supplied their own weapons and received some part-time, unpaid military training"(Lund/Winkler). This new second amendment would in theory help the government and allow citizens the bear arms. While reading the textbook, I never once read about gun control because Americans back then weren't misusing guns (ex. Mass shootings). I do agree with the overall message of the cartoon but it doesn't seem like the cartoonist was intending to bring historical value to the cartoon. This cartoon was made for a 21st century audience and was intended to stir the emotions of people who believe in gun rights and gun control. Cartoon #10 was not created to represent 18th and 19th century ideals.

Source: <https://constitutioncenter.org/interactive-constitution/amendments/amendment-ii>

Count of ratings: (1)

2



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



Re: The Great Debate: Gun Control

by [Clifford Lyon](#) - Sunday, December 2, 2018, 6:10 PM

You make an excellent point, gun control is not mentioned anywhere in our text up to this point, and I agree that the reason is because this is a 20th and 21st century issue. I don't think that the author of this cartoon was trying to make historical connections either. I think it is simply a commentary on a contemporary issue. In the 18th and 19th centuries, as you said, the use of firearms as a means of survival was much more prevalent than it is for a lot of Americans today. There are still plenty of people in America who rely on these tools to provide food for their families, law enforcement and the military certainly use them, I even use them in my occupation almost daily. The difference between these uses and those of the mass shootings that you referenced, is whether these tools are being used in a responsible way, or a malicious way. It is safe to assume that as long as there have been firearms, there have been firearm related accidents, but the malicious targeting of innocents is something fairly new to the American experience. This rightfully has provoked a lot of conversation and debate in modern America surrounding whether weapons with the capabilities to inflict mass murder should be available to the average citizen. I can see value in both sides of the argument, and I respect that a lot of people are coming at this debate from both sides with a lot of emotion. I would argue that the very fact that we as Americans are able to debate these issues with such emotion and no fear of being jailed or killed for our beliefs (when things are working as they should) is precisely what makes this country great. These are the rights that are afforded to us all under the first amendment, and these rights say that it's okay if we disagree, as long as we disagree peaceably and within the limits of the law. I'm glad that you brought up the fact that this is a more contemporary issue, I appreciate your perspective.

Count of ratings: (1) 2  [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Gun Control

by [Sarah Mackenzie](#) - Sunday, December 2, 2018, 6:57 PM

I understand where you are coming from and how you agree that people have been fighting over gun rights for far too long, but regardless how anyone feels about guns we are protected by the 2nd amendment. "A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed." (A-10). Instead of more gun control they can do fire arm safety, education, and a more in depth background check. I've taught thousands of people how to shoot a rifle and pistol and if people are aware and comfortable around guns they might have a different perspective. It also doesn't help that the news is constantly calling every gun an AR-15 and they also cherry pick the statistics that work in favor of the anti-gun movement. "When Americans think about violence from guns, we tend to focus on homicides. Latest figures from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention show there were a total of almost 33,600 deaths from guns in 2016 - of which more than 22,900 were suicides, 14,400 were homicides, and only 71 were to mass shootings" (BBC). You also mentioned that guns can be viewed two different ways and that's true I see where you are coming from there. Everyone is entitled to their own opinion on guns. I enjoyed your post.

By the way you forgot the third and fourth weapon safety rules. Keep weapon on safe until you intend to fire and treat every weapon as if it were loaded. 😊

Count of ratings: (1) 3  [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Cartoon #9- Making fun of Checks and Balances?

by [Evan Brewer](#) - Friday, November 30, 2018, 6:56 PM

In cartoon #9, the cartoon illustrates a businessman holding a checkbook. There is writing within the cartoon that is showing the businessman's checks and balances. This cartoon doesn't theoretically represent historical events learned in class but it does bring up the creation of checks and balances in the U.S. Even though the cartoonist didn't interpret the history of checks and balances in the drawing, some could say that the cartoonist was making fun of this historical system. In our textbook, "Liberty, Equality, Power" we learned about the 3 branches of government and how checks and balances could help regulate them. John Adams thought that, "Government should be divided into three branches—an executive armed with veto power, a legislature, and a judiciary independent of both"(225). Since government would be split into 3 separate branches, each branch could keep the others in check which would soon become a system of checks and balances. With the checks and balances in effect, each branch couldn't control the other or take too much power. This system worked wonderfully for when it was created (1788, written in constitution) and is still used in our government today. Even though the cartoon doesn't

have much historical representation, I do enjoy the cartoon and understand its appeal to the audience. For what it is, I agree with the cartoon and its meaning but it doesn't mean it is historically correct.

Count of ratings: (1) 2

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



Re: Cartoon #9- Making fun of Checks and Balances?

by [Asa Tellschow](#) - Saturday, December 1, 2018, 10:36 PM

Unfortunately, I think this comic depicts a situation that is visible today, and throughout our history. Thomas Jefferson, for instance, believed in a "wise and frugal government... [which] would be smaller and it would pay its debts without incurring new ones." (Murrin p. 235) More recently, Eisenhower warned the US to "Beware the Military Industrial Complex," which in my mind is a reference to those people who stand to profit from warfare, and who might have conflicts of interest within the government. (Quote from <https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/eisenhower-warns-of-the-military-industrial-complex>)

Sadly, I think the comic is most relevant to the modern presidency. The New York Time recently published a lengthy piece of investigative journalism that revealed, "possible tax schemes involving President Trump and his family" and "a judge is allowing a second emoluments lawsuit against the president to move forward." (from the following website: <https://sunlightfoundation.com/2018/10/04/this-week-in-conflicts-search-the-first-familys-potential-conflicts-of-interest-possible-tax-schemes-and-another-emoluments-lawsuit-moves-forward/>) It seems clear to me that there are many in Washington who are looking after their own "cheques" rather than "balancing" the branches of government, as the comic suggests.

Count of ratings: (1) 2

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



Cartoon #10

by [Michelle White](#) - Saturday, December 1, 2018, 8:22 PM

I chose cartoon 10 because this is an important issue to me. This cartoon is about gun control. The cartoon depicts an ordinary citizen that probably doesn't own a gun, has never had an interest in shooting one, or depend on using one to kill game to feed their family. This person has probably seen a lot of gun violence and accidents in the media that makes them think guns are bad. So, this cartoon character is saying "Guns are Bad!" To another cartoon character that is portrayed as a hunter with a gun. The hunter is replying "The Misuse of guns is BAD!" I agree with this cartoon. I come from a long line of hunters. Generations of my family have hunted for meat for our families to get us through the winters. Like the Indians and pioneers before us have. We still do. We have taught our children for generations how to handle, shoot and respect firearms. We have taught our children to hunt as young as 12 years old. This cartoon relates to what we have been studying because it is about the 2nd amendment to the United States Constitution, that protects the right of the people to keep and bear arms. In "Liberty, Equality, Power", (pg. 239) Madison proposed 19 constitutional Amendments to the House. The Second and

Third Amendments prompted by old fears of a standing army, guaranteed the continuation of a militia of armed citizens and stated the specific conditions under which soldiers could be quartered in citizens' households."(pg. 240)

Count of ratings: (1) 3

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

**Re: Cartoon #10**

by [Asa Tellschow](#) - Saturday, December 1, 2018, 10:42 PM

Have you seen that the Trump administration is planning to ban bump stocks? "The Trump administration plans to announce the long-anticipated federal rule officially banning bump stocks" (<https://www.cnn.com/2018/11/28/politics/final-bump-stock-ban/index.html>) Of course, I'll believe it when I see it, but I imagine that more than a few conservative gun owners are experiencing some mixed feelings right now. As I see it, the debate has been mostly between people who think we should limit access to the most deadly weapons, for instance those with large magazines, or "assault" style design; and those who are hunters, or sport shooters. (And, I suppose, the back-country militia folks.) In my opinion, banning bump stocks is a good idea because it allows for a huge range of legitimate gun use, while limiting the extent to which guns could be deadly in mass shootings.

Count of ratings: (1) 1

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

**Re: Cartoon #10**

by [Michelle White](#) - Sunday, December 2, 2018, 9:48 AM

Yes, I couldn't agree with you more, banning bump stocks is a good idea, it would allow for a huge range of legitimate gun use, while limiting the extent to which guns could be deadly in mass shootings. This is why I agree with the cartoon, it's not that guns are bad it is the Misuse of guns that is Bad.

Count of ratings: (1) 0

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

**Re: Cartoon #10**

by [Clifford Lyon](#) - Sunday, December 2, 2018, 11:07 AM

I think that there is a middle ground in this debate that is rarely discussed. There are plenty of responsible gun owners in this country who own AR-15s, many with bump stocks. These weapons are not necessary from a hunting perspective, in fact I believe it is not even legal to hunt with them. They are quite effective as a means of home defense, and they appeal to a large number of Americans for this reason. I do not own an AR-15, but as a veteran who has spent many hours training with this type of weapon and years carrying one, I would be more comfortable defending my home with this type of weapons system than any other. I would argue though, that these type of weapons could be better regulated if the owner were required to obtain an additional license similar to the "Class 3" license that is required for firearms

dealers to carry. This license also makes the licensee potentially subject to searches by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms. This means that a government agency can enter your home and perform a search to ensure that you are responsibly following the guidelines which have been put in place for those citizens who are issued this license. I do not know how often these searches actually take place; and they do not fall under the category of "Illegal search and seizure." This is simply a system that has been put in place to keep people honest. If AR-15s or the bump stocks are outlawed, that does not make them go away, it simply makes them more expensive. There is certainly a percentage of the population who would be willing to surrender these items if they were made illegal, but I think there is a larger percentage who would simply go on owning them, despite their being illegal. If the Federal or State government were to make a compromise though, and agree that these items can be legally owned as long as the citizen has the appropriate license, then I think that the responsible gun owners who are interested in doing things legally would be likely to cooperate. If there were the added potential for a home search with this type of license, this would encourage people to follow the guidelines which have been set in place.

There are always going to be people who choose to do things illegally, and in this case it would be no different. It would however open the door for more punishment to those who were caught owning these items outside the bounds of the law. It would also allow for better screening of people who choose to purchase these items and therefore the licenses that go along with them. This would be a difficult thing to implement in a country where so many people already own these items, but I don't think that it would be impossible. This would allow for both sides of the argument to have some give and take, better regulation of these weapons and enhanced screening of potential buyers, while still leaving open a legal avenue for responsible ownership.

Count of ratings: (1)

2



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



Re: Cartoon #10

by [Michelle White](#) - Sunday, December 2, 2018, 8:00 PM

Hi Clifford, you have made a very good point. I never looked at it from your perspective. I agree that there should be special license for people that own those types of weapons. Thank you for this information, I was unaware. Yes, there are always going to be people who choose to do things illegally.

Count of ratings: (1)

1



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



Re: Cartoon #10

by [Emily Barber](#) - Sunday, December 2, 2018, 11:40 PM

I didn't choose #10 to talk about but I was scrolling through the feed and couldn't help but not reply to your post. Gun control is also very important to me and also hits close to home for me as well and I also come from a long line of hunters. Everyone has there own opinion on gun control and that's completely understandable, but I think guns have always been an important part of our history, they have taught us more than we know. Perspectives on gun control is also very wide and once again I respect that but we are simply doing what our ancestors have done from generation to generation which is hunt and gather.

Count of ratings: (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**The Realities of Duty and Debt**by [Clifford Lyon](#) - Saturday, December 1, 2018, 10:09 PM

I find cartoon #11 interesting as both a modern-day issue, and an example of how far off course this country has come according to the wishes of the Founding Fathers. The cartoon shows a map of the United States with a large tumor in the center of it. In the tumor is reads "\$19 trillion national debt," and below the drawing it reads "Speaking of cancers..." I think that a cancer is an appropriate way to describe debt of this magnitude. Because of my age, the first time I really recall any discussion of the national debt was during the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. At the time, I did not understand that drawing the U.S. into a very long and drawn out war was precisely the strategy which Osama Bin Laden was (successfully) employing. Knowing that he had no army which could stand up to the U.S. and its allies in traditional warfare, he observed the lessons (that should have been learned) from the Vietnam War. He wanted to run the national debt and the body count so high that the American people would say enough is enough, and the U.S. would withdraw. I hate to say that the U.S. played right into his hand, and we continue to do so because, like Vietnam, how do you quit now when so many have given what President Lincoln elegantly called "the last full measure of devotion?" This is only one of the factors that has put us in the position which this cartoon describes, but it is a big one. I am not an anti-war person, I am not ashamed to say that I supported and served in the War on Terrorism in both Iraq and Afghanistan, but I also understand the immense cost that has come along with those commitments.

When I think about \$19 Trillion in debt, I think about Thomas Jefferson. Here was a man who, from his first moments in the office of the President, sought to reduce the national debt. He even "forbade the pomp and ceremony that had ushered Washington into office" when he went to take the oath (Murrin 255). Jefferson cut costs in almost every way he could because he believed that this should not be a nation that was ruled by debt (as it is now). Jefferson believed in a "wise and frugal" government (Murrin 255). There are many wonderful examples offered in our textbook of the ways in which Jefferson *chose* to reduce the cost to the taxpayer. Even though he was taking charge of a fairly new nation which had barely won their war for

independence, he decided to reduce the size of the Army and Navy in order to save money (Murrin 256). The Colonies did not even *have* a navy until the start of the Revolutionary War, and this President wanted to *reduce* the size of it 25 years later in order to save money. During the time that this man was President, the national debt fell by \$23 million, even after he spent \$15 million on the Louisiana Purchase (Murrin 257). If this feat were accomplished by a President today, they would be hailed as a hero. This is because we as Americans have somehow come to accept the fact that the national debt is something that we are stuck with and it is only going to get worse. Jefferson did not wish this future on his country. I have mentioned in my earlier posts that this man was prone to excessive spending in his personal life, but in his public life he was an example of frugality.

Going back even further, in his farewell address, President Washington (with help from Alexander Hamilton) warned that the long term “entangling alliances” which America has grown so fond of in modern times would be damaging, and that American should act independent of international affairs (Murrin 249). These are ideals that seem extremely foreign and impractical in modern America, but they could have saved us a lot of blood and treasure along the way. Most Americans have believed since about the Second World War that we have the answers that everyone else has been searching for. This has led America to become entangled in conflicts throughout that world for the “right” reasons, but at great cost to the American taxpayer. This is precisely what President Washington was warning against. Our intentions may be in the right place as we understand it, but the price that we have been required to pay in lives and currency has left a scar (or cancer) on this country that has lasted far longer than the Presidents that set those actions in motion. These are not the ideals that Washington and Jefferson wished to pass on to future generations. I apologize for the length of this post, and I salute anyone who was willing to stick with me to this point, but I think this is an important topic. We cannot survive as a nation if we continue this pattern of behavior. At the end of the day someone has to pay the piper, and that someone, more often than not, is us, the American taxpayers.

Count of ratings: (1) 3

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



Immigrants and Intent

by [Clifford Lyon](#) - Saturday, December 1, 2018, 11:03 PM

I understand the points that have been made by my classmates regarding cartoon #8, the “Sanctuary City” cartoon, but I want to offer another perspective. I acknowledge the fact that the Pilgrims of 1620 were invading a land that was not theirs, and this led to many of us being here today. The question I would pose to the group, with the hope of some responses is, how is this different than illegal immigration today? I know that this question has been turned on its head lately and people have asked, “How are illegal immigrants any

different than the Europeans who came here in 1620?" I say look at the evidence. They are no different but look at the destruction that was caused by the Europeans arriving on this continent. In this cartoon, the Native Americans ("Indians" as they are called in the earlier chapters of our text) are welcoming them with the question "What could possibly go wrong?" as so many Americans are proposing today. I ask the thoughtful student of history to consider what did go wrong when this policy was adopted by the Native Americans. Aside from the rampant diseases which destroyed many of these ancient inhabitants, the presence of the Europeans forever changed the way of life which, for generations, had been the lifeblood of these great people. As History 201 students, we have studied the damage that the Europeans had on this ancient way of life, and I do not condone it, I simply accept it as historical fact. I simply ask, if we allow this to happen to our culture, what have we learned from the history which we created? This is not a popular viewpoint in the modern American political environment of acceptance and equality, but it is still a viewpoint worth analyzing. If the Native Americans were in fact the original proponents of the "Sanctuary City," what is it that we have can learn from them? We, as modern Americans do not have to worry as much about disease wiping us out, with the exception of Ebola and other diseases which modern medicine have not found a way to control, but we face a very similar issue as the Native Americans with respect to our way of life. Most Americans still believe that this is the land of opportunity, that anyone can "make it" here if they simply work hard enough. This is clearly the case with many legal and illegal immigrants who come here simply to work and to make a better life for their families. The problem arises when there are masses of people coming here, not to work, but to drain the lifeblood out of our system by living off the government. The Europeans came here and laid claim to a land that was not theirs, historians have accepted this fact. But they made the land work for them, they did not usurp a system that was already in place and manipulate it to benefit them. This is the argument of the anti-illegal immigration crowd as I understand it. It is not about race, or any other trivial aspect over which people have no control, it is about intent. Do these people intend to come here legally, go through the process like so many before them, and contribute to this great country in tax dollars and otherwise, or do they simply want to come here and gain whatever they can off an otherwise healthy system like a common disease? This might sound racist to some, but race has nothing to do with it. Again, it is about intent. I admit that the Europeans had no right to the land that they claimed as their own, but I can't help that now. What I can try to help are people coming into this great country which those Europeans (eventually) fought and died to create and trying to buck the system. America is a nation founded by immigrants, I understand that. The Europeans had no right to this land, I understand that. But the system has been put in place in this country, and those who wish to come in legally are welcome. Otherwise, we are just inviting a bunch of unknown people in and asking, "What could possibly go wrong?"

Count of ratings: (1) 2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Legal vs. Illegal Immigration**by [Clifford Lyon](#) - Sunday, December 2, 2018, 2:41 PM

I believe that cartoon #13 is suggesting that illegal immigration is an embarrassment to those who have come to this country through the legal process that has been put in place. In the cartoon, an arm which is clothed in the colors of the Mexican flag that reads "Illegal Immigration" in the center is throwing an egg in the face of a person who appears to be of Hispanic descent and clothed in a shirt featuring an American flag and the words "Legal Immigration." To have egg on one's face is an expression which means: "To look foolish or to be embarrassed" (Random House Dictionary of American Slang). I think this is an appropriate representation of the feelings that a lot of legal immigrants might have toward those attempting to come here illegally. According to the Pew Research Institute, as of 2016, there were 34.4 million lawful immigrants and 10.7 million unauthorized immigrants in the U.S. That means that there were over three times as many legal immigrants as there were unauthorized immigrants in the U.S. during this time. The immigration process is not easy, and it is not quick. It stands to reason then that those who choose to go through the long process and come to this country legally would rightfully feel embarrassed by the number of people trying to come here illegally. Unauthorized immigrants, as I mentioned, represent the minority in the overall picture, but they help perpetuate the misconception that most immigrants want to come here illegally. This is clearly not the case. If I had spent the time, money, and energy to come to this country legally, I would feel embarrassed and infuriated by the people who were trying to come here without going through the recognized legal process. I would absolutely feel that these people were giving a bad name to all immigrants because of the perception that they were helping to perpetuate. I think this cartoon demonstrates that case well, and I agree with it.

Count of ratings: (1) 3

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



Cartoon #11

by [Emily Barber](#) - Sunday, December 2, 2018, 10:05 PM

After analyzing all the cartoons, I have concluded that #11 can accurately reflect the debt that has accumulated over the years for the U.S. It appears the U.S has always been in debt and spending large sums of money on wars or other issues that arise. The illustration looks as though it's a giant tumor on the U.S and it all the debt that we have created and its consuming more than we know. It doesn't consume the land, it consumes us. Its what is constantly talked about and its constantly growing out of control. I believe that debt has always been an issue and it always will be, its growing continuously.

Count of ratings: (1) 1

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



Cartoon #8

by [Jessica Eckley](#) - Sunday, December 2, 2018, 10:28 PM

I chose to examine cartoon number 8. This picture truly does speak a thousand words. Obviously, as Indians, letting the colonists into their native land was immensely harmful to their people. One of the first examples is by letting the colonists in it brought a huge amount of diseases that killed a lot of their people. "...the killer diseases such as smallpox and bubonic plague took hold first among domestic animals and then spread among

humans” (**Liberty, Equality, Power** Ch. 1 page 5). “Indian populations had been depleted by war and disease, the survival of the Iroquois became dependent on their ability to assimilate captives. There were often initiated by grieving clan matriarchs who commanded warriors to go on raids and bring back enemy captives, who would be absorbed into Iroquois families” (**Liberty, Equality, Power** Ch. 2 page 42)

Another reason why it would have been a mistake for the Natives to let the colonists into there is because of the war it caused. “In 1675 violence erupted between Indians and English settlers in New England...The fighting began in the frontier town of Swansea in June 1675 after settlers killed an Indian, they found looting an abandoned house” (**Liberty, Equality, Power** Ch. 3 page 81). “The settlers put Metacom’s severed head on display in Plymouth to mark he end of the war that, in proportion to population, has proved the most fatal in American history” (**Liberty, Equality, Power** Ch. 3 page 83). I do wonder what it would have been like if the Indians never allowed the white man to override their native land. I know that settlers came in guns blazing with a clear goal, but theoretically I’m quite curious to the what it’s about the beginning of America.

Count of ratings: (1) 2

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



Re: Cartoon #8

by [Emily Barber](#) - Sunday, December 2, 2018, 11:23 PM

I didn't really stop and look at #8 until I started reading your post and I went back to review it and I think its a pretty iconic comic. I agree with you that it speaks a thousand words. The Indians really didn't know what they were getting themselves into when letting the colonists onto there land, they had no idea but you cant blame them for not knowing what they were doing. They killed a lot of there own people by letting the colonists in not only by disease but also, like you said, with the wars it caused. The colonists did a lot of damage on the Indians land.

Count of ratings: (1) 1

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

◀ [Cartoons - Part 1](#)

◀ [CLICK HERE for Forum 3 Materials & Questions \(hidden\)](#)

Jump to...

[CLICK HERE for Forum 4 Materials & Questions \(hidden\)](#) ▶

[Moodle Docs for this page](#)

You are logged in as [Joe Escobar](#) ([Log out](#))
[HST 201 ONLINE F18 \(Escobar Meta 20748 22964\)](#)

? GET HELP

[SHED \(Student Help Desk\)](#)

[ATC \(Instructor Help Desk\)](#)

[How to use Moodle \(Basics for Students\)](#)

[IT Services](#)

[Computer Labs](#)

[Tutoring Services](#)

[Library](#)

[Get the mobile app](#)