

# 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 2



Search forums

## Forum 4

### Cartoons - Part 2

• [Subscribe](#)

◀ Cartoons - Part 2

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

Move

Pin



#### Cartoons - Part 2

by Joe Escobar - Thursday, November 30, 2017, 7:43 AM

This discussion thread is only for the Part 2 cartoons.

To write your post, click on the REPLY in this post. To reply to others, click the REPLY link in their posts.

Sum of ratings: -

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



#### Cartoon #7

by Banyan Ryan - Thursday, November 30, 2017, 5:51 PM

The point repeatedly made throughout our time in class is the fact that the U.S. Constitution was made for the sole purpose of LIMITING the power of Government. This comic depicts who appears to be Barack Obama reading the Constitution (as seen by the "We the people" written at the top) and Jefferson explaining to him that the point of it

is to note what the Government can't do, not what it can. It must be referring to Obama's attempts to heavily tax the rich so that it can be redistributed to the lower class.

It's hard for me not to agree with Obama on some level. It seems noble to want to help the poor by taking money from the rich. But you cannot ignore the flat out unconstitutional and arguably discriminatory action that would be. So I while it may have had good intentions, I'm afraid I'll have to agree with this comic and say that the less power the government has on how taxes are distributed (or on anything else), the better.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



### **Cartoon 8-Kaep's rights**

by Joel Pedroza - Thursday, November 30, 2017, 10:10 PM

Cartoon 8 is interesting to me due to my infatuation with sports. As we all know, Kaepernick has been on the news recently due to him kneeling during the national anthem before the football game. He has been receiving a lot of controversy, both good and bad. Even though I believe he should be protesting in another form; he absolutely has the rights to be kneeling. According to our country's fathers, 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." (law.Cornell.edu). So why the backlash? People are getting offended because they believe we should all stand for our troops that have been serving this country. That is not what Kaepernick is protesting. He feels that African-Americans are not being treated fairly, due to all of the police violence recently. He is "petitioning the Government", exactly what the Constitution says! He has the rights to protest, even if people do not agree with him.

As we know, this country was formed with many Christian beliefs. Even today, Republicans are solely Christians because that is what our fathers set the laws of this country due to those beliefs. That is what makes it interesting with Tebow. There was no backlash for his kneeling because he was praying. He was even praised, even remember ESPN showing him on TV because that is what audience wants to see. It just gets to show that the two main parties wont be able to get along. The division of the parties has been there since the start of our countries, with the federalist party and the democratic-republican party to start it off. I would love to discuss this subject with the classmates.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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

### **Cartoon #3 and Gun Violence**



by Rachel Gragg - Friday, December 1, 2017, 10:07 AM

From the new set of cartoons, cartoon #3 is one that stuck out to me. It shows two men, one saying, "Guns are bad!" and the other one replying, "The misuse of guns is bad!" They both appear to be middle aged men, the first one dressed in regular street clothes, and the other dressed in hunting gear. This cartoon is pretty straightforward, but it's up for interpretation what side it could be taking.

As we know and have learned, our Second Amendment right as stated in the Constitution says that, "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." According to the Constitution, Americans have the right to own guns.

However, with all of the violence around guns and shootings that have been occurring recently, many people side with the notion that guns should be outlawed.

I, personally, do not partake in owning a gun and I do not plan to ever attempt to own a gun or to shoot a gun, but I do think Americans should have the right to own one, however, I think the process of getting one needs to be way more strict. Guns are way too easily accessible to Americans and I think that is the biggest reason why there is so much gun violence. For a recent example, the tragedy that happened in Las Vegas just two months ago. A man opened fire on a large crowd at a music event in Las Vegas, Nevada and, according to CNN.com, killed at least 58 people and wounded at least 489 people. He had 47 guns set up in order to do this and it was the deadliest shooting in America according to Time.com. The fact that a man was able to attain 47 guns and no one questioned it is the issue. No one needs 47 guns. There is something seriously wrong with this system if a person is able to just have that many guns and there are no questions as to why. If someone had questioned it and some sort of search went on as to why he was getting all of these guns, maybe the shooting would not have happened and all of those lives wouldn't have been changed on that tragic night. I do agree that guns don't always have to be bad, and it is the misuse of them that is dangerous, but I also believe that the process of attaining one needs to be much more intensive and there should absolutely be no way a person is able to attain that many guns.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



### **Cartoon #1 Response**

by Maclain O'Leary - Friday, December 1, 2017, 11:31 AM

Cartoon #1 in the second set of cartoons is pretty straightforward. It depicts Native Americans in 1620 seeing settlers as they land on the shore of "Sanctuary City". One of the Native Americans, presumably the leader due to his head dress, is stating to the

other Indians "Let them all in, what could possibly go wrong?" As we know from our studying of history, this did not go as the Native American had planned. The settlers eventually took their land, wiped out massive amounts of Native Americans, brought war, disease, and drove many Native Americans from their homeland. However, I do not believe it to be as straight forward as the cartoon suggests. As we know, it wasn't just the settlers landing on the shore that caused all the turmoil that we know followed. There were many factors that happened over a hundred years that contributed to bad relations between the two peoples. In this sense I disagree with the cartoonist because it didn't just happen because the settlers landed on the shore like the cartoon might suggest.

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



### Re: Cartoon #1 Response

by Maayan Kirtner - Saturday, December 2, 2017, 3:31 PM

I completely agree with this, it really did not go as they had hoped in this cartoon. However, it is also making a simpler view on the matter, so it really makes you think. What really went wrong? And why did it all go so wrong. The Indians themselves were not all gifts and smiles they tried to send them away, as well, but the European settlers really went the wrong way in introducing themselves to the native population. It honestly could not have gone worse in the eyes of both Native Americans and the European settlers, but they were bad in completely different ways that this cartoon makes you think about.

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



### Cartoon #3 Response

by Maclain O'Leary - Friday, December 1, 2017, 11:39 AM

Cartoon #3 of the second set of cartoons is an interesting cartoon because it uses a common issue from today's society yet can still be applied throughout our history. It depicts two people (both of which I believe have a resemblance to President Trump) arguing about gun control. The person on the left (democrats) is saying that all guns are bad, while the person on the right (Republicans) who is holding a gun, is saying that it isn't the guns that are bad, it is the misuse of guns that are bad. While this is an argument from modern times, the concept of the cartoon can be applied all throughout history. Take any argument throughout history, whether it be taxes, slavery, property rights, whatever it may be, and you put two people in front of each other of opposing parties, and you are bound to receive a different argument from each of them. So while the argument may be a relatively new argument, the situation in the cartoon in centuries old, it's just in different context. In this way I agree with the cartoonist because I believe that he or she captured the essence of political party debate and what it is.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



#### **Cartoon #4 and National Debt**

by Rachel Gragg - Saturday, December 2, 2017, 11:26 AM

From the second set of cartoons, cartoon #4 is troubling. It shows a picture of the United States, with what looks to be a cancerous tumor growing from the center and spreading out across labeled as "\$19 Trillion National Debt." This is clearly displaying the horrendous national debt this country is under and how it is cancerous in that it continues to spread and grow and get worse until eventually it may kill us as a country.

The United States has been in debt from basically the beginning. Following the Revolution, we have always owed money and have always had difficulties getting it. Our textbook states that, "In 1789... the debt fell into three categories... the first was the \$11 million owed to foreigners... the second and third-roughly \$24 million each- were debts owed by arms, and other resources to the revolutionary cause" (*Liberty, Equality, Power* Page 241). That is about \$60 million in debt 13 years after this country declared independence. Even that number is unfathomable, but to think about how it has grown over time is tremendous. The national debt has fluctuated over time, but for the most part it has been on an exponential rise. According to USDebtClock.org, our current national debt is now well over \$20 trillion. Our debt is cancerous and large and continues to grow and it is something that is going to inevitably have to be fixed.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



#### **Cartoon #4**

by Maayan Kirtner - Saturday, December 2, 2017, 2:13 PM

In cartoon #4, the captions says "Speaking of Cancers" while the United states is covered in a tumor like substance of debt. I see this as very relevant to both today and the Early republic era. Alexander Hamilton brought the federalist party to fruition, taking in all the countries debts, this meant that he would need the money for that. Would he take it from his own pocket, or find a way to pay for it using the peoples money? The Democratic Republican party, new that to keep up the United States and continue to improve their country they would need money. The only way they could get that money was from their own people. These taxes were often fought then and now. Back during that era, people were afraid that by taking taxes they would become subjects of a monarchical government. But politicians new at the time that no matter the party you are in or the size of government you have, you will still need money to keep the government and the country going in a forward direction. I do agree with the message in the cartoon. No matter the party you belong to, no matter your ideas for the country, it will always need money and the politicians and parties will always need tax money to continue towards

their goals for the future. People might fight it and hate it, but in the end, taxes, in other words money of some kind, is need to protect, provide and move the country for one era to another. Back in that era, debt was always finished with and competed. It meant that taxes were always used to control the debt and with the smaller government and smaller military the debt would stay relatively small. Today, the debt is such that it is impossible the repay it. There are too many tax controls to get the money for it, and there is so much of it that by the time the government would start to repay it, we would have gained more debt. The country is so large and so diverse that to gain the money to repay such a debt is impossible. You cannot, as the government had once done, send debt collector to every person in the country for a percentage. There are just too any people and too much space to cover, unlike the republican era, where the country was small enough to collect he debt by force.

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



### Cartoon #2

by Hunter Coy - Saturday, December 2, 2017, 2:17 PM

#### Cartoon #2

I, personally, found this cartoon quite funny. The cartoon is making fun of the phrase "system of checks and balances", which is a concept in political science, usually used within the context of American politics, but the phrase can be partially applicable to other nations with a similar governmental setup. The phrase "system of checks and balances" refers to the three branches of US government, the judicial, executive and legislative that were constitutionally written to check and balance one another, ensuring that one branch does not hold a monopoly on power in the government. This cartoon, however, depicts a wealthy looking man holding a checkbook, writing a check. The check is written says something along the lines of "big corporate donation to political candidate." One arrow points to the bottom portion of the checkbook with the arrow "check" written on the bottom, and an arrow pointing to the top portion which says "balances", which is meant to imply corporate expenditures on political campagins has grown over the years. This is obviously a jab at corporate lobbyists and SUPER PAC members, implying that government institutions no longer legislate according to their constituencies or the powers delegated to them, but rather, legislate to the benefit of the political parties, and their various donors/lobbyists. The cartoon also makes a comment about how Americans, on the left and right, feel alienated by their government, and thusly, no longer feel represented.

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



### Cartoon #5

by Maayan Kirtner - Saturday, December 2, 2017, 3:27 PM

Cartoon five, shows the republican and democrat symbols of a donkey and an elephant arguing. They are arguing, once again, about immigration. Immigration has been an angering topic throughout United States history. Today the conversation is about immigrants coming illegally over from Mexico. In the republican era it was about immigrants from Europe, especially the Irish, taking job and housing. This cartoon is only just starting to be relevant during this time period. Before this conversation started about immigrants coming over and working for dirt cheap, immigrants made up society. Europeans had come over to America to start a new life and only after the War for independence did immigration become something concerning. People began to feel that this is their country and it is run by them, Americans, not immigrants coming from other countries. They were afraid of disrupting the currant status quo and losing jobs and less pay because of the immigrants. Today, this issue if even more apparent. People speak out much more and complain rather than taking in the fact that our country is better than where they are coming from. This immigration issue, began to cause problems. One party saw it a bad and illegal while the other, saw it as opportunity for advancement. Both parties had their own feelings and ideas about immigrants, but neither had a way of explaining why. It was always, "just because." Because they didn't want them here, or they are taking out jobs, or money. There was really no explanation and there never has been. You either think immigration is okay, or you don't.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



### Re: Cartoon #5

by Banyan Ryan - Saturday, December 2, 2017, 4:28 PM

You can't deny that both parties view immigration in general differently, but this cartoon seems strictly revolved around ILLEGAL immigration. The donkey (democrat) isn't satisfied with the elephant's (republican's) answer of why their side is against illegal immigration, who believes "Because it's illegal" is more than enough reason not to approve of it. And as a democrat myself, even I have to admit that I agree with him. Immigration has its place in any society and CAN be handled correctly. But coming to this country without meeting the bare minimum requirements to be granted access should not be defended. We have immigration laws in place for a reason and without them, dangerous people can and will make it through our borders.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



### Cartoon 1

by Jennifer Reyes - Saturday, December 2, 2017, 3:48 PM

It's funny because our country was founded by immigrants and in this comic, it talks about a Sanctuary city. A sanctuary city is a city in the U.S. that tries to protect illegal immigrants from being deported, especially ones that have families. The immigrants must report any crime, use health and social services and their kids must be in school. (Wikipedia) As we know, Trump is trying to put a wall between the U.S. and Mexico, and stop the funding for these sanctuary cities. I saw a documentary on the Trump family "Meet the Trumps" (Netflix), and they were immigrants. His family was given the chance to make their own American Dream.

In this comic, you have the Mayflower immigrants landing North American grounds and instead of landing in Virginia they landed in Massachusetts creating their own government. (Textbook Pg.60) The Native tribes had already been negatively involved with Europeans because they were trying to enslave them. (Textbook Pg.) For example, Squanto was captured and if he had never escaped he would have been enslaved and when he went back to his tribe they had died from plague.

So, I feel this comic isn't accurate. These Native Americans already encountered Europeans and they were seeing the negative impact it had on their people.



Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



### Cartoon 6

by Jennifer Reyes - Saturday, December 2, 2017, 7:34 PM

I this comic it shows an illegal immigrant from Mexico throwing an egg at a legal immigrant in the United States. In my opinion the writer is trying to say that the illegal has no respect for our laws on immigration and no respect for the ones who abide by them. I think if you don't want to give up your citizenship, then don't and you shouldn't have too; however, I think that people need to abide by the laws of our country. When you have states that try to help illegals from Mexico, I feel like it becomes enabling for them to get here illegally. At the same time, it wouldn't be America if we didn't let immigrants come here and try to make a life for themselves and their families. I don't know what its like to be from a 3<sup>rd</sup> world country, so I feel like I can't say illegals can't come into ours. We have been protected this long, I don't see our country falling or being in danger from letting illegals come from Mexico.

Joe Escobar 

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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

Administration

Navigation

Student Support



### Cartoon #1

by Rhyan Moncrief - Saturday, December 2, 2017, 8:09 PM



PoliticalCartoons.com

Cartoon #1 is representing the colonization of North America during the 1600's. This picture is specifically reflecting on the unequal and unethical treatment Native Americans faced from the settlers of the colonies. (60) Indian communities were ravaged by disease spread by European traders. As much as 90 percent of the region's Indians may have

died. Many Native Americans faced slavery as well as Africans. They both were seen as outsiders. The discrimination and unequal treatment of Native Americans and Africans still exists today in our present world. I think that what this artist has illustrated should be a reminder to us all of what our history has shown and what it continues to show, and I truly hope it can help us recognize the rights that tribal governments have to build and strengthen their communities. I also hope that collaborate on elevating enforcement and reaching out to help with educational opportunities concerning Native American issues throughout the country. For too long, Native Americans have experienced discrimination and injustice, and I believe that our government can and must stop such unequal treatment.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



### **Re: Cartoons3 part2**

by Zongyuan Shi - Saturday, December 2, 2017, 11:02 PM

This cartoons is obviously depicting about two person arguing about the use of gun. The person in the pink T-shirts with a small dog says "guns are bad" However, the other guy in a hunting suit with bigger dog respond" the misuse of guns is bad". I think this cartoon convey a simple and logical idea that limiting the people that use guns do bad thing is more easier and effective than simply take away everyone's fire arms. USA constitution Amendment 2 give people of united states right to bear arms, it's a policy that remain unchanged for two hundred years. As far as i am concerned, the Amendment2 was made base on idea of anti-federalist. People are afraid of the government will become so dictatorship one day that will jeopardize people's interest. Also, as we learned in class, the word firearm used instead of Musket has deeper meaning. It might be interpretation of loose constitutionist. Although USA is the most powerful and fast-developing country in the century, i personally believe changing some old rules is necessary with totally different situations now and back then. The massive shooting massacre in USA become so frequently these years and government seems have no control over it. Generally, I agree with the idea of this political cartoon which limiting the bad people rather than destroying guns. But we need more radical gun regulations to change the situation.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



### **Cartoon number 1**

by Joel Pedroza - Saturday, December 2, 2017, 11:20 PM

I believe that cartoon number one accurately described the historical event of the arrival of Christopher Columbus in South America. I think that the cartoon displays the point of view of the Native Americans and how they were open to relations with the newcomers.

What they didn't know was that "letting them in" would lead to many injustices to their people and many deaths. As the viewers and students of history, we are given a lot of context of the situation which is why some can find comedy in the misjudgment by the Native Americans. I think that the cartoon is supposed to put more empathy onto the Native American groups represented therefore the picture is biased and not providing both perspectives of the event. I do agree with the overall message of the cartoon which is to say that the Native Americans hospitality was taken advantage of and their people were abused and ruled over by the Europeans.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



### Cartoon #3

by Sam Reposa - Saturday, December 2, 2017, 11:54 PM

In *Cartoon #3* by Rik Dalvit, we see two perspectives on the ownership of guns in the United States. On the left, we see a flamboyantly dressed character exclaiming "Guns are bad". On the right, a more rural-dressed character rebuts "The misuse of guns are bad". The positioning of these characters is an analogy for the left-right spectrum, and satirizes the two common extremes when it comes to the topics of guns and gun control.

I believe the artist was trying to emphasize the two extremes of this topic in a somewhat satirical fashion, relying heavily on stereotypes on both sides to help convey his message. My opinion on this topic lies somewhere between these two extremes. "Guns are bad" connotates that there should be no ownership of guns and we should get rid of guns altogether. "The misuse of guns is bad" suggests that it's all about people misusing guns and that guns are fine.

The problem I have with this cartoon is that there is no solution proposed from either side, and I think that was the artist's intent. I believe there is a place in this country for guns, and back when the Second Amendment was written, guns were definitely necessary and proper; however, at that time all had were muskets, and minutemen needed guns. "The misuse of guns is bad", so how do we regulate and make sure that guns aren't being misused?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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

◀ [Cartoons - Part 2](#)

[Moodle Docs for this page](#)

[Accessibility at Lane](#)

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

