

HST 201: History of United States F17 (Escobar Meta 20887 23004)

Home ► My courses ► HST 201 F17 (Escobar Meta 20887 23004) ► Week 10 ► Forum 4 ► Cartoons - Part 1



Search forums

Forum 4

Cartoons - Part 1

• [Subscribe](#)

◀ Cartoons - Part 1

Cartoons - Part 2 ▶

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

Move

Pin



Cartoons - Part 1

by Joe Escobar - Friday, November 24, 2017, 6:40 PM

To write your posts and replies, click on my post below. This thread is for the first set of cartoons for the week.

Sum of ratings: -

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



gun laws

by Alexis Romo - Saturday, November 25, 2017, 3:58 PM

James Madison is known as “the father of the bill of rights”, who helped draft the first 10 amendments. Political cartoon #6 depicts James Madison writing the second amendment to the constitution, which is the right to bear arms. As he is writing this, a man comes in to the room where he is writing it and shows him a huge weapon he just bought.

The second amendment states, “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”. This is kind of comedic, regarding the controversy on gun laws today. This political cartoon is suggesting that the amendment the James Madison wrote is almost being taken advantage of and is being mocked, because it is so easy to buy a weapon that is almost unnecessary. I don’t think that James Madison intended this amendment to be taken into the context that it has been taken into today. This can be seen through James Madison’s reaction to the gun in the political cartoon.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: gun laws

by Alexandra Miller - Tuesday, November 28, 2017, 12:28 PM

I completely agree with you. In my response I mentioned that the founding fathers had no idea how much guns were going to evolve. I do believe that people should have the right to possess a firearm. But they should not be allowed to own an automatic weapon. There are so many different opinions opinions, but gun need to be regulated a lot better. Especially with all of the gun violence we are experiencing today.

Sum of ratings:0 (1) Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Cartoon #6

by Isabella Amaral - Friday, December 1, 2017, 10:24 AM

I agree with Alexandra Miller. When Madison first wrote the amendment, he (and the other founding fathers) had no idea that automatic guns would exist, much less be a thought in current society.

I also do agree with your statement that guns need to be regulated, “Democracies around the world regulate their guns, preserve their freedoms and achieve firearm murder rates that are a tiny fraction of the rates suffered in the United States. Other countries, like Australia, have made themselves much safer from gun massacres.” Jeffrey Sachs, from the HuffPost says.

Nowadays, guns can bought a lot easier and people use them for different reasons James Madison probably intended them for. Such as hunting or protection against wild animals.

Sum of ratings:0 (1) Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: gun laws

by Carly Kleefeld - Wednesday, November 29, 2017, 10:04 AM

I also think that this cartoon is almost comedic because when James Madison was writing the Second Amendment there's no way he ever imagined that guns would evolve into something so unnecessary and dangerous. Although yes I completely agree that the Amendment is being taken advantage of in today's age, but I do think that people are mocking and using the Amendment to their advantage because of how outdated the Amendment is.

Sum of ratings: 0 (1) Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Cartoons - Part 1

by Isabel Aguilera-Muro - Monday, November 27, 2017, 2:43 PM

The picture I am analyzing is picture number six regarding gun control, and the Second Amendment which reads in the constitution as "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." The second Amendment protects the right of the people to keep and bear arms. Although this is true, "a well regulated militia" refers to a well-equipped militia that is well disciplined, and maintained within the organization. Nowhere on the constitution did the founding father intend to give people the right to carry an assault rifle to protect ourselves from the "government" as many people like to argue. The political cartoon shows James Madison shocked when being shown the assault rifle as he is shocked at the misinterpretation of his words "a well regulated militia".



Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Cartoons - Part 1

by Benjamin Hawley-Gamer - Friday, December 1, 2017, 8:32 PM

I really found this cartoon to be humorous in the idea that no one could've seen where firearms would end up and the entire idea of this comic while funny is very serious. I agree with your analysis of this cartoon when you mentioned the well regulated militia and how there's no need for that anymore and how the constitution doesn't say you can be armed and not be in a militia. I liked how you interpreted the shock on Madison's face and the misunderstanding on his face. I'm curious if you think he would have written this in the same way if he did know how fire arms would eventually turn out.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

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



Cartoons #7

by Micah Phillips - Monday, November 27, 2017, 4:56 PM

This picture, to me, shows a lot of how we can be so caught up and manipulated by all that the media has to say about any political up rising that occurs in our lives. When the media is proven wrong no one makes any movement to rebuke or correct the media. The press. Yes, we all have the Freedom of speech and the freedom of press. with that we can all say and make a notion about and how we want. In this freedom to say whatever we want I believe that the actual truth to how thing happened in history can get lost in translation between factual truth and fiction truth. The this is how I "remember" it happening. Joe Escobar has shown us multiple times in class that any personal recollection of any historical figure can can get a bit exaggerated. For example "Amazing Grace," this was said to be written in the midst of a storm and that this effected John Newton so severely that he changed all his ways and was free from the sin of his slave trade. This couldn't have been further from the truth. Just make a quick wikipedia fact check and you can see that after the storm yes he did have a new found spiritual faith, but yet still continued the slave trade business for another 7 years and still did not write this song. It wasn't printed and shown to the public for another 25 years. I think seeing how manipulating the media can be is important because these are major differences and the media just brushes it off like its no big deal. It is and we need to pay attention to these things and be mindful of our history and our facts.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Cartoon 1, Jefferson's views on Government

by John Steil - Monday, November 27, 2017, 5:13 PM

The cartoon depicts Thomas Jefferson's view on the federal government. In the Hamilton video, we are told how Jefferson saw America as a rural, pastoral, and agrarian society. He wanted a nation with many independent farmers. He didn't like the large NorthEastern cities who traded goods with the British. He wanted a federal government that was limited in its powers (H.O.A.P,237). Jefferson was against the excise tax in order to raise money to pay off the national debt. He did not like the British and their systems of hierarchy. On his inauguration address he said, " A"wise and frugal" government would respect the powers of the states and preserve new ones, thus ending the need for taxation and cutting the ground from beneath the burgeoning Federalist state (H.O.A.P,255-56) Jefferson reduced the size of the federal employees and lowered the national debt from 80 million to 57 million by the end of his term (H.O.A.P.257). He and James Madison started a new political party called the Democratic Republicans. In the Hamilton video they discuss how they traveled up Hudson river to talk to other leaders to join their party.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Anti Fed #3

by Jack Swisher - Monday, November 27, 2017, 6:25 PM

Cartoon #3 “and we are thankful for a small unobtrusive government that doesn't try to ruin our lives.” I think that this cartoon means that this man obviously has an anti-federalist view on things. The Anti-Federalists had revolutionary ideas of a limited government. They believed in more state powers rather than a strong central power like the federalists. On page 255 it states that Jefferson believed “government would respect the powers of the states and preserve the bill of rights”. The bill of rights gave more power to the people. The Anti-Federalists opposed central government and were strict constitutionalists. When the pilgrim man says they don't try to ruin our lives I think he means taxes. On page 256 it says “thus ending the need for taxation”. But as Mr. Escobar has said in class, the government is always in our business. Like monitoring our phones and emails, and previously saying no to the legalization of marijuana here in Oregon.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Anti Fed #3

by John Steil - Wednesday, November 29, 2017, 3:09 PM

Cartoon 3

I agree with Jack. The Anti-Feds began calling themselves Democratic Republicans. The pilgrims sitting at the Thanksgiving dinner seem to be in line with Democratic Republicans. They would value the ideas of Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson was in favor of limited government and a citizenry of independent farmers (H.O.A.P. 237). The Federalists who were in the Whitehouse before Jefferson wanted the Central Government to be strong. Alexander Hamilton and his Federalist supporters insisted that centralization of power and a strong executive were necessary to the survival of the republic (H.O.A.P. 243). Hamilton wanted the power of the U.S. to be in the North East. He valued cities and not farmers. When Hamilton wanted to start a National Bank, Jefferson said it was unconstitutional. Jefferson's strict constructionism (his insistence that the government had no powers beyond those specified in the Constitution) revealed his fears of the de facto constitution that Hamilton was making (H.O.A.P. 243). Things are still the same in the United States. Some people want a country where the government stays out of our lives and others are happy when the government takes over.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Cartoon #5

by Carley Kramer - Monday, November 27, 2017, 7:17 PM

This cartoon relates to US history because it represents a fear present both today and in the time of the founding fathers. It depicts the three branches of government illustrated as branches on a tree being dominated by the executive branch, which is shown as cutting off the other branches with a chainsaw. This was a very real concern for the founding fathers, as many people of the time were worried that the executive branch, specifically the position of President, would simply be a new form of monarchy. For this reason, the authors of the constitution divided power with a system of checks and balances, with most decisions to be made in the bicameral legislature and vetoed by the executive branch. Today, it seems that those fears were somewhat justified, as the role of President and the executive branch often overshadow or absorb the powers of the judicial and legislative branches. It's simple to see that the role and responsibilities of the President today have become overblown compared to the intent of the founding fathers, and many feel that the president has too much power, as shown in this cartoon. In this way, Americans today share the fears displayed in this cartoon with early Americans.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Cartoons - Part 1

by Daniel Game - Monday, November 27, 2017, 9:40 PM

Security is supreme for the development of any nation. Today we are living in a world where security is increasingly being threatened by terrorists across the globe. The National Security Agency (NSA) working for privacy protection now has become a threat to American citizens. NSA is keeping track of every American's internet use, activities, and phone calls which is the violation of fourth amendment, Right of Privacy, of US constitution. Varvel is against this and uses privacy as the main theme of his cartoon.

Gary Varvel uses various rhetorical strategies to express his opinion that interfering with people's privacy is wrong. Cartoonist, Gary Varvel, appeals to logos persuading the readers against NSA's work as there will be one day when people's private information will be revealed through media. "I think it's important to understand that you can't have 100 percent security and then have 100 percent privacy and zero inconveniences. We are going to have made some choices as a society." (Barack Obama) President Obama's words are agreeable but we can't ignore the fact that people's privacy is not optional.

I would say I agree with this political cartoon because I do not want to see personal things being revealed to the whole world. Nobody wants that, nobody wants the world to know what is going on with their life. If privacy is no longer protected, crimes and

robbery are likely to occur. Cartoonist uses the event which is very likely to occur in coming days to reach its audience and leave a message that NSA is violating Personal Privacy Right protected by the constitution.

Works Cited

Varvel, Gary. "NSA Spying on Americans." Townhall.com, 21 June 2013. Web. 27 November 2017 <http://townhall.com/political-cartoons/2013/06/21/110228>

Obama, Barack. "22 Nauseating Quotes from Hypocritical Establishment Politicians about The NSA Spying Scandal." The Economic Collapse. N.p., 12 June 2013. Web. 27 November 2017. <http://theeconomiccollapseblog.com/archives/22-nauseating-quotes-from-hypocritical-establishment-politicians-about-the-nsa-spying-scandal>.



Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Cartoons - Part 1

by Alexis Romo - Wednesday, November 29, 2017, 10:51 AM

I find this political cartoon pretty comedic, because of how the NSA's justification in this cartoons just ridiculous. The people depicted in the cartoon are clearly not doing much but going gone with their daily lives. It makes me wonder if they are in fact monitoring everyone's activities for precaution, or just because they can and want to. But then again, what's the point of that? should we be ok with them taking extreme precaution to these "could-be terrorist threats" or is it just flat out a violation of our rights as US citizens?

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

Sum of ratings:1 (1)



Re: Cartoons - Part 1

by Daniel Game - Friday, December 1, 2017, 2:10 PM

I do understand what you are saying.

I am not only talking about U.S citizens, I am also talking about the whole world. We have no idea what NSA is really doing right now. There are not only targeting U.S citizens, including lawyers, president, and every single person who uses technology. But they also see all the information what is going on the globe. It's a similar story when it comes to U.S. spying overseas. At the level of principles, the Review Group provides practical and ethical arguments for recognizing that foreigners have at least some rights to privacy. If NSA is too aggressive, we might trigger serious economic repercussions for American businesses, which might lose their share of the world's communications market because of a growing distrust of their capacity to guarantee the privacy of their international users.

You have to see this video.<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0hLjuVyllrs>

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



cartoon 2

by Lindsay Schnell - Monday, November 27, 2017, 9:54 PM

I am going to pick cartoon number 2. The reason I am choosing this is because I feel like this cartoon represents how the government works today. I feel like this cartoon represents how the government has a handle in our taxpaying money before we can get it back the next year. Just look back when there was the Tea tax. The government taxed Tea and other goods only to have their hand in the revenue of it before it goes out to the citizens. Now take the marijuana tax, all the revenue of this is supposed to go to different groups, but not before the government takes out their high fees. I feel like this artist represents what we as Americans are dealing with as to back in the 1800s or so. They may have not been that high back then, but I feel like they are ridiculously high, but you got to love the big man. Always has their hand in something. This cartoon also represents so many other things. I do agree with this cartoonist but I can see so many different things that this one cartoon could represent. This cartoon i feel also is what im talking about the government is always is your pocket or business. weather it has to taxes, laws, rights or others the government has always been and will always be in your business weather we like it or not. I just hope one day the government isn't going to force us to have medical insurance or get fined. especially some people can't afford it or

just simple don't use is all the time, not everyone likes going to the doctor or even wants to go when we are sick. There are bigger things in this world that the government can keep more of their focus on.



Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: cartoon 2

by Jacob Spriggs - Saturday, December 2, 2017, 5:54 PM

Other than make people laugh like it made me, I think there is a lot to be said about the cartoon you posted above. First off, I'm a little confused why the person who looks like a writer from the press says "That's the GOP" after Uncle Sam asks him "Who's that suicidal loon?" I'm confused because the GOP is the Republican party, who's mascot is the elephant, but it is the Democratic party's mascot, the donkey, who is acting suicidal by driving the car off the cliff and taking the elephant with it. The only possible answer I could come up with is that the artist is trying to say that the press blames the Republican party for the Democratic party's actions that have a negative effect on the country. Another detail I found interesting in this cartoon is the money being left behind the car. My interpretation of the artist's message with this detail is that the government wastes too much money by arguing and trying to get the parties to come to a compromise. There is a lot more that could be said about this cartoon and it's an overall very interesting cartoon, so good find.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Cartoon 6

by Benjamin Hawley-Gamer - Monday, November 27, 2017, 10:31 PM

This cartoon represents the idea of loose vs strict interpretation of the constitution. The debate is about the 2nd amendment right to bare arms and what the founding fathers meant when they wrote this. This debate goes back to the founding fathers and the debate on the interpretation of the Constitution and what the powers of Government really has. I believe that the artist correctly captured the meaning behind this comic and they accurately portrayed the debate behind the 2nd amendment argument on how the founding fathers meant for this amendment to be taken.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Cartoon #7

by Kamrin Dodson - Monday, November 27, 2017, 10:38 PM

This cartoon covers the things we have studied in class, because in the Bill or Rights we still have a right to bear arms there isn't a news channel or newspaper that you can pick up today that isn't talking about gun control and that people should not be allowed to own guns because of all the mass shootings that have happened including the shooting in Las Vegas. The cartoonists does a wonderful job in interpreting the history in the drawing because he ties it to the Bill of rights when it was written to present day. I personally agree with the point of the cartoon, I do believe that we need some sort of gun regulation in this country but as far as the cartoon goes I agree with the overall ,message of this cartoon.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Cartoon #7

by Lindsay Schnell - Saturday, December 2, 2017, 10:48 PM

This was another one of my favorite cartoons because of what it is telling us about the 2nd Amendment and our right to bear arms. i certainly do agree with what you are saying about their needing to be changes in who should really be able to have ownership of guns but we know that their is going to be the government that wants to just take away that right and i hope that we as Americans and keep standing tall in this matter. A someone who has ownership of my own guns i hope that my right will never be taken away. the government is working on new laws to which some of them are good ideas but they have some wonky ones also.



Re: Gun Control & James Madison

by Carly Kleefeld - Monday, November 27, 2017, 10:53 PM

When looking through the given political cartoons, I decided to pick cartoon #6 because of the relevance of gun control in today's age. When reflecting back to historical events in our history I immediately think of the second Amendment. The Second Amendment is a well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and right to bear arms shall not be infringed. Although when discussed in class and given an example from textbook page 240, could there be a bias? The textbook states, "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." The cartoon shows James Madison writing the Second Amendment stating, "... a well regulated militia.." then meaning a way to unite against any threat, so all would have guns and we would be protected. Although now, citizens use this Amendment as a way to protect themselves against the government. When looking at the guns then vs. now. Guns now are automatic and can shoot multiple times but back when Madison was writing the Amendment guns were only single fire. When Madison was shown the new age gun in the cartoon, he said "WHOA!!" because he could have never imagined guns could have evolved that much. I believe that this is why his reaction of "WHOA!!" is in bright red and the rest of the cartoon is muted colors. I do believe that the cartoon correctly interpreted the history because if James Madison were to see what gun control is like now he would not only be unhappy but he would be shocked like in the cartoon. I agree with the overall message of the cartoon because it is important to understand the difference between a gun interpretation then vs. now.

Sum of ratings:3 (1) Permalink | Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Gun Control & James Madison

by Jacob Spriggs - Friday, December 1, 2017, 12:13 AM

I agree that the artist of this cartoon most likely drew the expression on James Madison's face and made him say "WHOA!!" to give the message that Madison never expected guns, that citizens had access to, to become as advanced as they have. However, I do believe that when Madison added "the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed" to the second amendment, he had some kind of idea that guns would evolve eventually and citizens wouldn't be carrying around muskets, if that was the only weapon he meant by "arms", for the next 200 plus years, while the government's military used more modern weapons like the one

pictured in the cartoon. James Madison probably would have expected that the weapons that the U.S. citizens had access to would always stay just a step behind that of the weapons that the military being controlled by the government has. He wanted the people to stand a chance against the government if the unfortunate situation ever arose where that became necessary, and as far as he and the rest of the Founding Fathers knew, that was a possibility. Obviously militias have become irrelevant for some time now, but no one knew that would happen back in the late 18th century.

I may be the only one, but I think James Madison's reaction to seeing the gun in the cartoon is very similar to the reaction most people have today when they see guns that look like an assault rifle, simply because they look dangerous. I own a .22 caliber semi automatic rifle that looks like a hunting rifle and my friend owns a .22 caliber semi automatic rifle that looks like an assault rifle. Some people would look at both of them and assume my friend's rifle would be more dangerous, even though .22 is a very weak caliber compared to other calibers, but the two guns are equally as powerful and have the same rate of fire. I agree that our government needs to do something to reduce the number of mass shootings in the U.S. like better requirements for who can own guns and banning unnecessary things to citizens such as bump stocks, silencers and fully automatic weapons and other things but citizens should be allowed to own guns still, and I believe that James Madison had those things in mind for the future when he wrote the second amendment.

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



Jefferson's Advice Cartoon

by Jacob Spriggs - Monday, November 27, 2017, 11:54 PM

Cartoon #1 sarcastically points out a few examples of advice given from Thomas Jefferson to the future government of the United States. The message I received from this cartoon is that Jefferson was giving good advice but our government today and in recent history has failed to take this advice. The top left and top middle quotes are the most relevant to today's government. Our nation has now accumulated about 20 trillion dollars of debt, and that debt has grown with a snowball effect from generation to generation. Jefferson's government was not free of debt either, but their debt was mostly from the American Revolution, so it was much more necessary in comparison to this country's current debt.

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



Re: Jefferson's Advice Cartoon

by Daniel Game - Friday, December 1, 2017, 2:59 PM

I agree with your point here.

I do really hope that current president can learn from the example of the Thomas Jefferson. As we can see today who is to blame for the debt of the U.S. government? Is it one person or more? And if so why do Americans have to suffer because of someone else's mistakes? These are all questions we ask ourselves every day. When will it end? Will we ever find an answer to these questions? Where did it start? if we take a closer look this Country is not the only one affected by this travesty of debt. The whole world is in turmoil over debt. It's like a domino effect when one falls down the others follow. So many people are suffering due to this debt and feel there is no hope and no way out. How can a government sit back and watch their people suffer? What are they doing? Because don't seem like they are doing their job. And also can they fix the fiscal crisis and the falling economy? Well, the answer to that would be no! It's just some more empty promises from wealthy, money hungry officials who just want votes and publicity to tell people how they are going to fix things and it will be different. They are in way over their heads and people are tired of listening to broken promises that will never be fulfilled. It just goes back to the beginning that's to blame? But the biggest question that none of our so-called government officials and leaders can answer is why?

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



Cartoon #6

by Alexandra Miller - Tuesday, November 28, 2017, 12:24 AM

There are two parts of the 2nd amendment the first is the right to bare arms, the second is a well-regulated militia. They wrote this amendment in case the federal government wanted control over the states. In order to protect themselves, and oppression. Weapons have changed. When James Madison wrote this the musket fired two to five rounds per minute. Now today we have guns that can fire up to five hundred rounds per minute. Back then it made sense because they wanted everyone to be able to fight against the government if it became to oppressive. Over the past couple of years, we've heard non-stop news titles of shootings happening all over the nation. That is a serious issue and it's sprung up a lot of controversial arguments about gun control in our country. My opinion is that a criminal background shouldn't be the only deciding factor of who should be allowed to own a gun. As I said before times have changed and so have firearms. There should be tests done to learn a person's mental health before they are allowed to purchase a gun. Again, this is just my opinion, I'm interested to see if anyone has a different perspective than me.

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

**Re: Cartoon #6**

by Carly Kleefeld - Wednesday, November 29, 2017, 10:28 AM

I agree that the process of purchasing a firearm should be taken more seriously. Especially with what has been going on in the world. Although I do believe that when the Amendment was being written, Madison was indenting it to be a protection against any threat to the country by having the people rally together to protect the countries freedom. Whereas now, the people are fighting against the country and our government and owning a firearm is a way to protect themselves instead of protecting the country as a whole.

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

**Re: Cartoon #6**

by Isabella Amaral - Friday, December 1, 2017, 10:42 AM

I love the use of the quote, Carly Kleefeld in your last post from the book! And I completely agree with your statement in this one. In Oregon, the guns laws state that you:

- Don't need a state permit to purchase
- Don't need a firearm registration
- You can openly carry both handguns and long guns.

Which is the, "practice of openly carrying a firearm in public, as distinguished from concealed carry, where firearms cannot be seen by the casual observer."

These are just a small portion of what you need, don't need, and what you can do in correspondence to owning a gun.

The whole reason the second amendment was put into the Bill of Rights was because it was used to "disarm the state militias, and replace them with a Federal standing army." Since this amendment was about militias in the 1790s, I feel it is irrelevant today.

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

**Re: Cartoons 6 2nd Amendment**

by Jack Swisher - Tuesday, November 28, 2017, 8:21 PM

Looking at Cartoon #6, it is easy to determine that the one is directed at the 2nd amendment. I think James Madison is a little shocked to see the man holding such a powerful gun. Above him it says "a well regulated militia". He is shocked because he

meant it to be a well equipped militia. The Constitution doesn't mention that the people can have rifles or assault rifles. (Whatever this gun is) The 2nd amendment states in the constitution: A well regulated Militia, being necessary to security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed. This coming from the back of the textbook on A-10. I think he is shocked as well because yes Americans have the right to bear arms, but the fact that the man is holding a rifle scares him and I think is a portrait of today. Assault rifles have been a big part of shootings today.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Cartoon #6- 2nd Amendment Bias

by Carly Kleefeld - Wednesday, November 29, 2017, 10:47 AM

When looking at cartoon 6 it is easy to automatically refer to the Second Amendment. In class we discussed how the Second Amendment could be bias. Especially on textbook page 240, it is stated "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." The goal of a well regulated militia was essentially for the U.S. to rid themselves of England because they wanted a democracy. Rather than a standing army they wanted a militia to be organized because it protects the freedom of the individual. Having armed citizens limits the power of the president or any singular ruler, with a standing army that could cause more power to a monarch.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Cartoons - Part 1

by Isabella Amaral - Wednesday, November 29, 2017, 3:53 PM

For this forum I've chosen Cartoon #6 to talk about.



Joe Escobar



LaneOnline

Administration

Navigation

This cartoon accurately reflects what we've learned in class because it visually tells how different the 2nd amendment was applied during the time the Bill Of Rights, compared to now.

"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." (Second Amendment to the United States Constitution)

The whole reason this was implemented into the Bill of Rights was because it was "drafted to provide for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States through the ability to raise and support militias." Nowadays, people are allowed to own a firearm openly as well.

When James Madison first wrote the 2nd amendment, he had no idea what it would be like today. Guns were mostly used to hunt and protect men from wild animals. Also, guns at the time were slow and required much more time to reload, so there was no way he would have anticipate modern firearms! So, I do believe that the cartoon was drawn correctly because In present day, this is not the case.

“We have a modern advanced police force and military for those purposes. The right to bear arms for the protection of your home, lives and property should be preserved with a limitation on what guns one can purchase for that purpose. The problem is guns of all kinds are being taken into the public domain and people are shooting other people making the lives of Americans unsafe.” one person writes on Debate.Org

In the end, I greatly agree with the overall message of the cartoon, as it shows Madison’s surprise as he looks at the modern gun compared to the amendment he has just written.



Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Cartoons Funny one

by Jack Swisher - Wednesday, November 29, 2017, 7:04 PM

This cartoon was quite funny to me. I hope this doesn't mean to offend anyone, but these men obviously talk about the first Amendment, "Our Wives don't have to know about the first amendment do they"? This cartoon is inferring that these two guys wives probably talk quite a bit and like to argue over everything about what they believe in.

The First Amendment states, 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. This Amendment has been portrayed on campus awhile ago. But again, the humor in this is the fact that these men are scared about their wives knowing that they can protest anything they think is wrong, and talk as much as they want!

Constitutional Convention



"Our *wives* don't have to know about the First Amendment, do they?"

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Cartoons Funny one

by Carley Kramer - Saturday, December 2, 2017, 10:00 AM

This cartoon is highlighting something that people take issue with about the Constitution and the founding fathers, which is the apparent hypocrisy of the constitution by today's standards. The constitution reads that "all men are created equal," and yet we know that at the time, not all people were treated as equal. Women were omitted from this statement, slavery was still practiced, and Natives were still killed and pushed from their lands. One of these constitutional hypocrisies that ties directly to the first amendment is the passing of the Sedition Act. The Sedition Act "...set jail terms and fines for persons who advocated disobedience to federal law or who wrote, printed, or spoke "false, scandalous and 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 contempt or disrepute." (p.252, pg.4) Although it was contradictory to the first amendment, the Sedition Act was passed and used to prosecute fourteen republicans. In regards to congress under the Adams administration, the punchline of this cartoon could easily be replaced with, "the Republican journalists don't have to know about the first amendment, do they?" Either way, this cartoon reminds us that at the time, rights promised by the Constitution were often conditional.

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



#2

by Kyle Shrope - Friday, December 1, 2017, 7:51 PM

This cartoon illustrates the two political parties in America taking money from tax payers. Both the parties are represented by their political animals. The elephant representing the Republicans and the donkey representing the Democrats. Throughout are nation's history, taxes have been a key component. Taxes from Great Britain is one of the reasons the colonist wanted to separate from the crown and create their own country. I think this cartoon references current conditions going on in our nation's government. Both political parties are reaching in to the taxpayers (the citizens of America) pockets and taking money to fund whatever it is they fund. This cartoon represents the idea of a strong centralized government, because it displays the government and both parties taking money from the people. Money the people don't want to give.

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



Cartoon #1 Spot on

by Christopher Zuercher - Saturday, December 2, 2017, 4:42 PM

Cartoon #1 reflects information that we have been studying in class in that it accurately describes some of the Jeffersonian ideals. In the cartoon it says, "To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves and abhors is sinful and tyrannical." This quote aligns with Jefferson's belief in strict constructionism. In the textbook it states, "Jefferson argued that the federal bank was unconstitutional, that a federal excise tax was certain to arouse public opposition, and that funding the debt would penalize ordinary citizens," (pg. 243). I agree with the overall message of the cartoon because it is laying out the ideals of the founding fathers and what makes it amusing is that the United States presently is the opposite of what they would have advised. Such as the "never spend your money before you have earned it." How many trillions is our country in debt?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



#1

by Kyle Shrope - Saturday, December 2, 2017, 6:23 PM

This political cartoon displays Thomas Jefferson's views on government and how it should be handled in the future of this country. The cartoon is titled the Founding Father's Advice, which means the cartoon is speaking to the current President and political leaders of this country. The views of Jefferson in the cartoon are historically accurate. The cartoon represents how he felt about government and is ironically speaking to our current government and political leaders. Our current political leaders do not follow the advice Jefferson gives in the political cartoon. In today's government America sits at about 20 trillion dollars in debt, the government is heavily involved in people's lives, and the institution of government has become stronger as time has gone on. The message behind this cartoon is that today's current government doesn't follow the teachings and the ideas of our founding fathers. I agree with the message of this cartoon. In today's world the government doesn't always follow the ideas and the teachings of our founding fathers.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



#6

by Kyle Shrope - Saturday, December 2, 2017, 7:41 PM

This cartoon represents the 2nd amendment to the constitution. In the cartoon James Madison is writing the 2nd amendment stating, "the right to a well-regulated militia" and then a fellow patriot walks in carrying an assault rifle. James Madison and fellow founding fathers wrote the constitution without knowing what this world and country could develop. He wrote the constitution not knowing where firearms would lead to or how dangerous they can be. The cartoonist's message is that the 2nd amendment

should be removed because of the weapons citizens can buy today. The weapons people can buy today can lead to deadly mass shootings as supposed to a musket (the weapons they had when writing the constitution). I agree with the cartoonist's overall message, we have to take into account that our founding fathers wrote the constitution with the idea of muskets as weapons and not automatic machine guns that can kill multiple people very quickly.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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

◀ Cartoons - Part 1

Cartoons - Part 2 ▶

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

Accessibility at Lane

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

HST 201 F17 (Escobar Meta 20887 23004)