

HST 202: History of the United States W14 (Escobar Meta 31101 31100)

Home ► My courses ► Winter 2014 ► HST 202 W14 (Escobar Meta 31101 31100) ► January 27 -

February 2 ► Forum 2 ► Editorial Cartoons



Search forums

Forum 2

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

< Previous (Editorial Cartoons)

(Hollywood History & My...) Next >



Editorial Cartoons



by Joe Escobar - Friday, January 24, 2014, 9:58 PM

This forum thread is for Editorial Cartoons posts and replies.

After studying the required materials, address the questions in your posts.

To make your POSTS, click the reply link in this, MY post.

To reply to another student's post, be sure to click the reply link within in THEIR post.

IMPORTANT - SUBJECT LINES

BE SURE to use an informative subject line for your post, such as the cartoon name and number you are referring to. Do NOT simply leave it RE: Editorial Cartoons

Sum of ratings: -

Edit | Delete | Reply



Truly An Iconic Image



by Kenneth Green - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 9:43 PM

In the cartoon Am I Not A Man, the cartoonist is most certainly an Abolitionist and according to the link,

<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/aia/part2/2h67.html>

the design was created by Josiah Wedgewood as an identifiable emblem for the Abolitionist Movement during the late 18th Century. He reportedly sent this image in the form a medallions to Benjamin Franklin in Philadelphia where it gained popularity and became one of the great iconic images of the Abolitionist Movement. The design was later updated to include "Am I Not A Woman And A Sister." (Again, according to this website.) It is a stirring cartoon, and the main point obviously is that slavery is inhuman and immoral. It speaks directly to the sentiment that we are all related as either children of God or humanity. Wedgewood makes this point by showing a slave on bended knee shackled by the bondage of slavery. It is easily interpreted as Abolitionist's propaganda. It begs the

question of how humans can hold other humans (brothers and sisters) as property.

The opposing viewpoint in the 19th Century, was that the man in the cartoon is most certainly not a brother. Nor even a man. Even many of the founding fathers did not consider blacks as "full" men and women. (I believe they were actually only accounted as 3/4's.) And as Eric Phoner mentions in his review of the movie Amastad, not even the 19th Century courts would have called blacks "brothers and sisters." So it would be easy to see why this cartoon might be dismissed outright by the advocates of Slavery, based solely on its premise. Of course, its supporters would be either Abolitionists or at least sympathetic to the plight of slaves. The above mentioned website describes many in the Abolitionists Movement as Quakers. They would believe in the idea that all humans are brothers and sisters linked by Creation.

Personally, I am moved by the cartoon. Chapter 13 was a hard chapter to read. However in terms of its effectiveness, again it would depend on whether a person in the 19th Century agreed with its premise. The additional reading I've done about this cartoon does suggest that it did make an impact in spreading the Abolitionist viewpoint. The website says that women even wore the image on trinkets in their hair, or as bracelets. It is a very effective tool for learning about this time period in United States History. It capsulizes sentiment of the time in one single image. We've yet to study the Civil War, but there is still a debate in some political circles about whether the war was a battle over slavery, states rights, or regionalism. But this image shows me that passions over the issue of slavery ran deep.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Correction



by Kenneth Green - Saturday, January 25, 2014, 10:04 PM

Small correction, actually a huge one for you Artists, sorry. Joseph Wedgewood along with William Hackwood and Henry Weber are attributed on many websites, however the original designer of the image is unknown. I apologize for the error.

Sum of ratings: (1)

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



Re: Truly An Iconic Image



by Brian Davis - Monday, January 27, 2014, 5:12 PM

Off topic-- I immediately looked for a like button after this post. Shows how much we are creatures of habit.

Sum of ratings: (1)

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



Emotionally Stirring



by Connor McCabe - Sunday, January 26, 2014, 11:54 AM

The Cartoon "Am I Not a Man..." is of great importance to the abolitionist movement of the

late 18th century. The image was used as the face of the Society for the Abolition of the Slave Trade and as a medallion which was donated and later used in bracelets and hair pins. The image began with great importance and impact bringing to question slavery and racism against Blacks. I say began due to the fact the image became common place and worn like any other piece of jewelry, as a fashion item and therefore deducting from its merit. A modern example of this might be the Breast Cancer Awareness campaigns. More specifically the "I Love Boobies" slogan which was used to raise awareness which slowly became common place and just worn as jewelry and fashion.

The image is particularly striking to people of this generation such as myself. You can really feel the pain in his eyes and displayed in his posture. You can truly believe in the cause to fight the racism and ignorance that leads one brother to put another in chains. You feel bad for the chained man and you are stirred to do something about it.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Emotionally Stirring

by Danny Lopez - Friday, January 31, 2014, 3:47 PM

I didn't know this cartoon was actually a medallion, and then converted into pins and bracelets. I agree with you on the part this drawing brings an important part in the abolitionist movement of the late 18th century. I looked this cartoon, and it was a symbol of slavery, and the blacks were treated poorly. This for sure made everyone feel the harsh and terrible times African American people suffered by the hands of their owners, and this for made an awareness like you stated.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Hard to imagine...

by Jesse Nichols - Sunday, January 26, 2014, 8:00 PM

The cartoon that had the greatest influence on me was the "Am I Not A Man And A Brother" cartoon, and it really wasn't even close. It's very clear that the cartoonist who drew this image is an abolitionist demonstrating their opposition to slavery. I believe their main point was to illustrate the inhumanity, the viciousness, and also the immorality behind the slave trade. The fact that a man is depicted on his knees with his arms and legs shackled together, pleading for his equality, is what led me to this conclusion. This is a powerful image that really pulls at your heart strings, and it's hard to imagine a time where we allowed people to be treated so cruelly.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Hard to imagine...

by Jesse Nichols - Monday, January 27, 2014, 8:49 PM

Obviously the opposing viewpoint to this topic would be that this is man is neither a brother nor a man, he is a slave, and according to our 19th century government standards, that would only make him three fourths of a person. This message was

shared by all those who were pro slavery, so mainly Southerners. With such a deep root in our economy, and such a large impact on our economy, I don't agree with it but I can understand why these people wanted to keep slavery in existence.

I believe this cartoon was a very effective message during the 19th century. It was widely circulated by putting it on medallions, bracelets, and hair pins, and it basically became one of the most recognizable and iconic images of the abolitionist movement. I think it could be considered somewhat more effective today simply because we are rarely if ever exposed to seeing people who are the property of another person.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Hard to imagine...

by Haden Peterson - Saturday, February 1, 2014, 11:26 PM

I agree with this, it's almost hard to look at honestly. It really put it out there that what they were doing to slaves was inhumane and disgusting. Probably woke some people up on what was actually going on (even though most probably still didn't care)

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



"At the South" - a shot at Abolitionists

by Thomas Stevens - Monday, January 27, 2014, 2:48 PM

Obviously, not a very veiled attempt to insult the Abolitionists in the North. What's interesting is that cartoon shows the slaves as fully clothed and civilized in addition to living in comfortable surroundings, but yet still showing ignorance. This cartoon was drawn by a Southerner who supported slavery.

Abolitionists would probably be offended by this cartoon and while in the minority, usually in the North, would probably be quite vocal in their dissent of this. Abolitionists would argue that slavery is wrong and that the children of slaves should grow up free. They would also dispute the favorable conditions that most slaves lived under.

I am not sure how effective this would be to someone who already had an opinion on the issue of slavery, more like preaching to the choir. If there were a "fence sitter" than perhaps this might stir them inside to form an opinion. However, I really do not see most people as taking a side to this issue; perhaps how people thought of the Viet Nam War, you really only cared if it affected you. The slave owners had an enormous economic interest in maintaining the status quo, the Abolitionists were probably driven by religious convictions.

There was a considerable amount of "Anti-Tom" literature that originated from the South during this time period:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anti-Tom_literature

What surprises me is that the South would actually defend there institution of Slavery with arts and literature, being that slavery is very stupid.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: "At the South" - a shot at Abolitionists

by Brian Davis - Monday, January 27, 2014, 5:09 PM

You have to remember that to them it wasn't stupid. I wrote in my post how to us it is obvious, slavery is wrong, but back then it wasn't so black and white (no pun intended). There are many people today who adamantly defend certain behaviors and they always have reasons for doing so. Whether they are good reasons or not is what is up for debate. But calling something that someone usually holds very close to the chest stupid isn't the best way to persuade one to change. However, most times in matters such as these, the people simply cannot be persuaded because it is ingrained in them. Which is why I completely agree with your approximation that this was mainly a piece that was "preaching to the choir." I'm sure we'll look back 100 years from now and think the same about some of the hot topic political items of our time.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: "At the South" - a shot at Abolitionists

by Evan Lawrence - Wednesday, January 29, 2014, 1:34 PM

That's a very interesting point you made about the slaves living in comfortable housing, and having clothing but still being ignorant.

It's interesting, but makes sense, that the Southern slave-owning population would want the Abolitionists to think that they live in good conditions and have proper clothing, but are still somehow lesser.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



The Racism that still exists today

by Thomas Stevens - Thursday, January 30, 2014, 10:52 AM

When I read about Phil Robertson (Duck Dynasty), and he was quoted as saying that "Blacks were happier pre civil rights", he's just playing into that racial stereotype and unfortunately many people in this country still believe that Black people are genetically inferior.

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/12/19/phil-robertson-black-people_n_4473474.html

I would suggest that it's the other way around that Black people are in fact more

genetically diverse whereas many white people in the South, who still continue to preach racial hatred, like Phil Robertson, are in fact more inbred. I mean who would want to create families with that chip on their shoulder? Ironically though, it does seem, also in my opinion, that the South is trying to diversify by recruiting Northerners to attend Southern universities. I have seen that occur with a several female friends of mine who have relocated to Alabama and South Carolina to attend Alabama and Clemson.

But, yes the slave owning population of the South had a vested interest, if not their own ego, in postulating that Black people living under Racism and Slavery were happy.

I also believe that comparisons could be made to South Africa. Apartheid existed in South Africa not that long ago, but they actually elected a Black President before the U.S. did, Nelson Mandela.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



We've Come a Long Way (and have farther to go)

by Brian Davis - Monday, January 27, 2014, 5:01 PM

The cartoon that had the largest impact on me was Am I Not a Man. I have a feeling most students will say the same. The cartoonist is clearly an abolitionist and drew upon the logos of the viewer by simply asking the question, "Are African Americans not people deserving of the same respect and rights as those enslaving them?" To me it seems like such a silly question but it really resonates with me because it feels like an easy "yes", and yet, to so many in the 19th century, it was a resounding "no."

I don't feel the cartoon would've been very effective in convincing someone who personally owned slaves or outright thought slavery was okay. Through all of our readings we have clearly seen that they were very adamant about keeping their slaves and the very notion of having a slave hinges upon the belief that that person is not of equal status as the owner. Therefore, by admitting that slaves were men and women of equal status, one would have to call into question the very act of owning slaves. That being said, I do think the cartoon would've been effective in persuading someone who was on the fence about the matter because it really draws on a logical conclusion that yes this person is a man just like we all are men (mankind), thus he deserves the same treatment as everyone else. Even though it still took another 100 years post-slavery for black people to be considered equal and, even then, it is a constant struggle to be treated truly as equals.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: We've Come a Long Way (and have farther to go)

by Erik Long - Monday, January 27, 2014, 9:53 PM

I agree with you, today in our society it is obvious that blacks are people who get same rights as anyone else. But back in the 19th century and even before, slavery was actually a right to white men. Today it seems crazy, and it was crazy, but it was apart of everyday life. For most southerners it would have been a very unattractive political cartoon. I think Josiah Wedgewood made a very good point in this cartoon.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Not a right, but a purchase



by Thomas Stevens - Friday, January 31, 2014, 3:04 PM

They had to purchase their slaves and the poor could not afford that "luxury".

Very few people owned slaves, but frequently, those that did owned many. It was like the corporations of today purchasing capital, now mostly machines, to do work and earn money for the slave masters. The slaves shared nothing in terms of benefits, like the workers of today.

The slave masters also had expenses in maintaining their slaves, much like the workers of today having to be paid, at least minimum wage for them to have shelter, food and clothing. The difference that exists now was that slaves did not have free will to leave as we might quit a job today.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: We've Come a Long Way (and have farther to go)



by Danny Lopez - Friday, January 31, 2014, 4:11 PM

I agree with you about how this image does put a impact on you, and how the black people were used at slaves, and not treated equally as the white people in the 19th century. White people seemed like they can own any other race, and use them as their own slave, and be treated poorly as well. Yes, it would be hard to change a white person mind that they are doing wrong owning a slave. Now we are all equal, and I am glad that has changed, but with a lot of sacrifice and struggle to get where we are at now, but for there is now a lot of minorities in the county, and it seems like some don't like the growth of that, but we all have the power to vote.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Powerful images



by Samuel Tapfer - Monday, January 27, 2014, 5:02 PM

The cartoon that stood out to me the most was the "At The South" one. The sentences that the cartoonist used had very poor grammar. This showed me that the cartoonist wanted to make a point that the mother was not very educated. She also used the N word to describe her son, which is something a mother would not have done back then. I know it is common sense, but it is a very demeaning word that the slave holders would use to describe the

slaves. Slaves would not use that to describe their children because the mother and father gave that young boy a name and would not want him to be called anything else. Especially something so terrible.

I could see how this cartoon could be taken multiple ways. The cartoonist could be making a stance about how people viewed slaves. Manly slave holders could take this cartoon as the truth. I can also see where the cartoonist is making fun of slaveholder's views on black slaves.

When I first saw this cartoon I thought it was terrible. It took me longer than normal to read a sentence of that length just because of the terrible grammar. I would like more information on the cartoonist to see his or her stance on slavery, because I could take the meaning of this cartoon multiple ways.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Powerful images

by Melissa Moser - Monday, January 27, 2014, 5:51 PM

In seeing that cartoon, I felt that the author/artist was trying to weaken the arguments against slavery by portraying the abolitionists as a contemporary boogeyman. Just as *Uncle Tom's Cabin* was made strong by the heartwrenching tale of a family who was separated, this comic is implying that abolitionists and people who are part of the Underground Railroad are out to rip families apart. They want to take the children up north, where they will have freedom, but it comes at the price of their families and everything they have ever known. I think the artist was banking on hitting those same sentimental nerves that Stowe was aiming for in her novel.

As for the argument against the mother's word choices, I totally agree, but then again, I'm appalled that the word still exists in pop culture today and is used in contemporary pop music. Hurray for Kanye West and Lil Wayne. </sarcasm>

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Memes= Editorial Cartoons?

by Brian Davis - Monday, January 27, 2014, 5:16 PM

This is just a bit of a side discussion if anyone wants to indulge but are memes on social media a more mainstream form of the editorial cartoon? Not the cat haz cheezburger ones, but there are many that I have seen that seem to do the same thing that an editorial cartoon is designed to do. They both use symbolism, exaggeration, humor and satire to make us think about the pressing topics of our day.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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

The Scales: "The Ignorant Vote"

by Melissa Moser - Monday, January 27, 2014, 5:44 PM



Looking at Thomas Nast's comic "The Scales" is honestly somewhat difficult in this day and age, which is why I've chosen it as the most effective to me, personally. This particular cartoon shows a very different perspective than we normally see in Nast's work, and I think that speaks a lot to his point. Thomas Nast was and abolitionist and staunch supporter of African American rights prior to and during the Civil War, and had generally always displayed them in a dignified and sympathetic light in his work. However, we see in this cartoon a very different angle -- Nast has now portrayed southern blacks with exaggerated features, is playing up the "poor farmer" aspect, and stranger still, is putting them on par with the northern Irish Catholics who he has depicted poorly since day one. I think that Nast is trying to show his displeasure with the whole partisan system in this comic. Published in 1867, this came at a time when the Republican Idealism left from the Reconstructionist era was all but exhausted. The political machine of the North, Tammany Hall, was a huge mess of corruption and greed, backed by an uninformed and emotionally driven (read: Easily Duped) Irish Catholic vote, but wasn't much better than it's counterpart in the south. The Republican state governments of the South were charged with corruption similar to that up north, and these governments had been largely supported by the new black vote. The cartoon portrays how, to each of their respective parts of the country, these groups were seen as an ignorant bane on the Anglo American voter base. Part of politics for years and a bit more jaded by political misgivings, the standard White Male voters saw an uptick in governmental wrongdoing with the influx of minorities to their political parties -- rather than seeing this as the fault of seedy, opportunistic politicians, they put the blame on blacks and Irish. I feel that it is for that Anglo American base that this cartoon was drawn, and I feel that it came to be out of Nast's disappointment in the outcome of a cause he believed in.

I think that, in it's time, this Harper's Weekly cover probably made a quite a statement, causing other abolitionists to reflect on these outcome. It may have even set back relations and rights that Nast had previously fought for by making those abolitionists and supporters question if they had made the right choice, after seeing the governments largely chosen by the minority votes charged with such heinous and extensive corruption. For myself, I think it's effective in that it really makes me think about voters' rights, the choices we make (and why), and it helps me to connect with modern times. In modern elections, we are still just as swayed by promises that may or may not mean a damn thing to the politician uttering them. We even have elections shown to be swayed one direction or another largely by an ethnic or minority base. Seeing cartoon panels like this help to bring the troubles of that era into a clearer perspective nowadays.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: The Scales: "The Ignorant Vote"



by Bart Golden - Saturday, February 1, 2014, 1:46 AM

Excellent analysis, I think that what your saying answers a lot of questions that I have had with regards to this cartoon. It does seem as though Nast has had something of a disheartening towards the freed slaves he often defended earlier in his career. What I am wondering is if Thomas Nast was drawing these cartoons today who would he be compelled to feature and how would he depict them.

This was the cartoon I found myself most drawn to as well. I think that you may have enlightened as to why .

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Am I Not A Man And A Brother?

by Evan Lawrence - Monday, January 27, 2014, 6:34 PM

Now clearly the artist of this cartoon is in favor of abolitionism. In the cartoon a slave is in chains, kneeling, and pleading "am I not a man, am I not a brother?".

The main point of this cartoon is to humanize slaves. Many people looked at slaves as a piece of property to be owned, bought and worked. It was a machine for labor. But the artist is showing this man pleading to a master, an overseer, or just somebody who sees him as property; this other person isn't pictured but I felt it was implied.

This point is made by the way the artist portrays the slave. He is chained at the hands and feet, kneeling, looking up with both hands clasped together. At first glance I thought the man was crying, adding to the idea that he is indeed human.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



"Am I Not A Man And A Brother?"

by Jessica Skidgel - Friday, January 31, 2014, 1:49 PM

I completely agree. I think the main purpose was to humanize slaves. Now when we see this image it obviously stirs up some emotions and starts a conversation but how about back when it came out. I am really curious on how much conversation this image created and if it actually persuaded some people that slaves were in fact not property but equal human beings.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: "Am I Not A Man And A Brother?"

by Michelle Coming - Saturday, February 1, 2014, 2:42 PM

The cartoon must have made some sort of impact, the American abolitionists even created a female version (pictured in the text, pg 433) to incorporate "the participation of women and the emerging centrality of women's issues in the American antislavery movement."

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



"Holy Horror"

by Jessica Skidgel - Monday, January 27, 2014, 8:05 PM

The cartoon "Holy Horror" stood out for many reasons. The Irish woman was the first thing in that cartoon to catch my attention because I immediately recalled our class discussions on how large the issue of nativism the Americans felt towards the Irish and German immigrants. I feel like the artist of this cartoon captured the emotion behind nativism based on the way the Irish woman was drawn. Her primate looking face, rough attire, and the basket of food and alcohol she carried with her made the Negro woman look well collected and educated.

I believe this cartoon was plenty effective when it was drawn because it represents some of the evidence we all have seen throughout class and the chapter for this past week in the textbook. The way Irish families were almost always drawn with alcohol in their hands, and how they were thought of as a different type of white folk are examples of this evidence. It is also effective looking at it now because you can clearly see the hatred this artist, along with many Americans, felt for Irish immigrants.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: "Holy Horror"



by Matt Blackshear - Tuesday, January 28, 2014, 12:42 AM

Agreed. The fact that Irish people though white, were drawn with simian faces, shows the hatred for the Irish. But with the Irish it wasn't just racism, I believe it was also class difference. As we were told in class the Irish made up a lot of the poorer/lower class citizens. The Irish were also taking up most of the workforce in Laborers and domestic servants, which I am sure angered many Americans in the same work field (I tried uploading the percentage photo of workers from class for a source, but I couldn't get it to work). Americans look at them as a hassle and a need to be extinct.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Why the hate?



by Thomas Stevens - Friday, January 31, 2014, 2:48 PM

I don't get it, they hated white people? How could this be? Was it because they were poor? "The Scale" depicts the Irish as being equal to Blacks, could this have been done by a white Southerner? I don't see how. And, why the reference to "North" and "South"? Many of the slave owners were Scottish, located not far from Ireland where the Irish emigrated from. The Irish, in many cases, were fleeing hunger, but even their leaders in Ireland were ignoring their pleas for help, perhaps this could be researched separately. However, in any case it shows prejudice against poverty, perhaps much like today's war on the poor propagated by the rich in this country.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



American Nativism

by Matt Blackshear - Friday, January 31, 2014, 6:14 PM

I dont believe it was precisely just cause they were poor. You have to think about American Nativism. Back in the 1800's we were an Anti-Catholic nation and Irish were dominantly Catholic. That strikes another chord in the hatred they had for the Irish.

As far as the North and South deal goes it was cause most of the immigrants were located in the Northern part of America. There was a slide in class showing the percent difference and it was clearly higher in the North due to the south.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: American Nativism

by Michelle Coming - Saturday, February 1, 2014, 2:29 PM

I think that this particular cartoon also touches a bit on racial nativism with how the Irish woman was drawn. She looked more like a beast than a human as previous cartoons had depicted the slaves. The cartoon seems to say that maybe slaves aren't so different from us (or rather can conform to society better than the Irish immigrants), but we still hate those Irish-American Catholics.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



I am not understanding the reference to the title

by Thomas Stevens - Friday, January 31, 2014, 2:56 PM

Are you saying that Blacks were held in higher regard than the Irish?

Being of mixed European ancestry; English, Irish, French and German as I am, I cannot understand how people can be defined that way. When I see a Black person I see a difference, but I cannot differentiate between the Europeans, how could others do that?

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: I am not understanding the reference to the title

by Timothy Wilson-Haley - Saturday, February 1, 2014, 9:55 PM

I think that "Holy Horror" is noting the irony of racial requirements for voting. It shows that one's level of education, behavior, or over-all ability to function in society makes no difference, but skin color makes all the difference. As the

caption describes the situation, a crass white person is horrified that an African American, who seems to be much more civil, is in the cabin with her. It is obviously prejudiced against Irish Americans, who are portrayed as crass, uncivil, and the reason why African American male suffrage was frustrated.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: "Holy Horror"



by Danny Lopez - Friday, January 31, 2014, 3:59 PM

I first when I looked at this cartoon I really didn't get it, just saw to fancy ladies all dressed up, but one with a angry look in her face. Which I agree with your forum in which involved nativism towards the Irish and German immigrants, and the reason why was how the amount of the minority was growing day by day, and this picture does capture that anger. This was for sure including the African american also. This is great because it shows the female side about nativism.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



At The South



by Michelle Coming - Monday, January 27, 2014, 9:35 PM

In this cartoon the artists depicts a slave mother scaring her child into behaving by threatening to call the "Bobolitionists". The artists portray the abolitionist as a sort of monster that's going to snatch the slave child from his mother if he doesn't do as he is told. He portrays the abolitionists to be feared by the slaves, specifically the young ones.

I can see how this cartoon might be effective in the 19th century. After everything that the slaves have been through, some might just see the abolitionists as more white men manipulating them to do their bidding. As a child the threat of being taken away from their families was probably an extremely scary thought at the time.

As a student today it shows the political cartoons geared more to the slaves at that time. Propaganda to keep them from siding with the abolitionists. Through middle school and high school I remember seeing mostly cartoons against slavery and very few rooting for the South. It helps to see the other side of things.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



At The South And The Fugitive Slave Law of 1850



by Kenneth Green - Tuesday, January 28, 2014, 6:50 PM

Indeed, it would be interesting to know more about the background of this cartoon and if it were published before the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850? The Text (461-466) offers some grim stories about the "Slave Catchers" who would have no doubt have been on the trail of those "bobolitionists." It seems the message is clear in hindsight that this little boy had few options but to "mind his mother." But you're right, we don't see many

cartoons from the Southern perspective and I suppose it speaks to the old saying that "History is written by the victors." As spoken in class, the Abolitionists were on the right side of History when it came to Slavery but it's hard without seeing a cartoon like this to understand from a modern perspective how the institution existed in the first place. I think us moderns just see a cartoon like this and think, "Wow. That's highly offensive." But it can offer perspective into the mindset of the Southerners, I suppose.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Ignorant vote-Honors are Easy



by Erik Long - Monday, January 27, 2014, 10:20 PM

I thought that The Scale cartoon was very interesting. It was hard to understand for me at first but after researching a little bit I found that this was a cartoon drawn after the election of 1876. This illustration depicts an African American man on a scale with no shoes, portrayed to be unfit to vote, and an ape looking man, that of an Irish man. Thomas Nast is portraying these two men on the scale of equality, being unfit to Vote. Nast was an abolitionist, so I thought this was an odd cartoon for an abolitionist to draw.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Ignorant vote-Honors are Easy



by Matt Blackshear - Tuesday, January 28, 2014, 12:54 AM

I was also having a hard time understanding this cartoon so thanks for clearing it up. Interesting that an abolitionist drew this indeed. He was bringing up the issue at hand for his abolitionist followers to see the issue at hand and note that it needed fixing. This comic reminded me of the "'Scientific Racism" from an American magazine, Harper's Weekly" slide presented in class. Showing that blacks and irish are equal.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

1

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Ignorant vote-Honors are Easy



by Jesse Nichols - Wednesday, January 29, 2014, 5:03 PM

This cartoon was and still is difficult for me to comprehend. While I agree that your interpretation of the African American man, and the Irish man being equal on the equality scale meaning their both unfit to vote could very well be true, I just have a hard time wrapping my head around the idea of an abolitionist like Thomas Nast trying to convey such a message. There are multiple ways for someone to decipher this cartoon so it's hard to say what's right because it's not like we go straight to the source and ask Nast for the real meaning behind it. I could definitely see your idea being true if he wasn't an abolitionist but my gut feeling tells me that it has to do with something along the lines of them being equal because of the racism and mistreatment that African Americans and the Irish suffered from, or maybe even that their equal in a sense that they're both immigrants here deserving of their own free will to pursue the

American dream? But who really knows, I could be totally off!

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Ignorant vote-Honors are Easy

by Bart Golden - Thursday, January 30, 2014, 2:25 AM

I think that Thomas Nast didnt like the Irish very much, remember the cartoon in class were they were deplicted as apes. Maybe Im missing the point, it just seems that way to me.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Powerful message

by Haden Peterson - Tuesday, January 28, 2014, 2:04 AM

This one was the one that stood out the most to me and probably others too. It was also one of the only 2 that I could understand. I believe the message in this is strong. The cartoonist seemed to have sympathy for the slaves and understood that they have a right to be equal as well with the whites. With the shackles it really makes the slave look trapped and completely powerless, like all slaves were prisoners.

The only opposing view I could see on this would be that slave owners didn't like it because they we're the ones using slaves and they didn't want them to think that they were equal. Some slaves were taken good care of though so I could see those slave owners seeing a negative side of the cartoon, but for the most part the painting is pretty accurate.

This cartoon probably opened some peoples eyes in the 19th century. It probably caused some sort of controversy with it supporting the slaves. It was pretty affective to me just because it got the message across plain and simple. It also helped because it was a little less political and more morality and human nature related.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Powerful message

by Bart Golden - Tuesday, January 28, 2014, 5:14 AM

I'm pretty sure that all slaves were prisoners. And I keep hearing how not all slave owners were horrible to there slaves but does that justify slavery??? I mean If I'm nice enough can I keep midgets as pets!! Come on, sure its funny but probably not to midgets and I don't seem to hear to many Black people jumping up saying how some slaves were happy to be in chains. I guess I'm just putting something out there to think

about.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Powerful message

by Haden Peterson - Saturday, February 1, 2014, 10:37 PM

Good point to bring up, yes all slaves were prisoners, but there were some slaves that were owned by very wealthy people that didn't require such manual labor for their slaves. They would even dress them in nice clothes and treat them with somewhat of respect. This is a very rare case but there were slave owners like that.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Don't really get it

by Bart Golden - Tuesday, January 28, 2014, 5:00 AM

After studying all the cartoons I have to say that whatever point the artist of both The Promise Land and the Holy Horror cartoons were trying to make went right over my head. I don't get it I guess, maybe someone can enlighten me. I get that there Irish /Catholic, but the message, very unclear.as far as the others I guess the scale was the most obvious to me that the artist saw northern white Irish as equal to southern black slaves and of course the simple four words (black, white, north, south) were the main source of my interpretation that along with the manner that they are drawn, however; I would imagine it could have stirred up a little emotion back then as well as today

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



The growth of the minority vote

by Danny Lopez - Tuesday, January 28, 2014, 11:57 AM

After I looking over the editorial cartoons the one that got my attention was "The Scales" of North and South by Thomas Nast, and its over the Civil War era. I selected this because how things have changed over the decade, and how in that era there was the separation in South and North, and how the south used the African Americans to work on the fields as slaves, and white person on the North side were educated, and about political views. In Thomas drawings, he supported the abolition of slavery, and he also opposed racial segregation, but in this drawing it shows a different side to Thomas cartoons. Its shows an Irish man and an African American, and they are both are immigrants in this scale that is why they are equal because they want the American dream.

The point of view in 19th century in this cartoon shows both Irish and African American on the scale both equal because they are immigrants into the new America, and how both had a part in the building America. It supported the American political views during that time of separation between the south and north in the American vote, it got

interesting in voting when the arrival of huge number of Irish and African Americans came to the country, and were considered the minorities which cause lots of problems in political parties, so it included the minorities votes into the political parties increase in votes in which the white weren't happy with.

I think the cartoon "The Scale" did make an impact in the 19th century even though it wasn't Nast normal work and belief. It showed that the people coming to the country in a fast growth (minorities) had a big affect in the political groups in the government, and how white were noticing that change, and did not agree with the direction it was going. After seeing this cartoon I can relate to this because it's still the same way with minorities being part in the elections, and having a vote in the country. I myself a minority and have voted in the past elections, and the number of minorities is growing more and more by the day.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: The growth of the minority vote



by Brian Davis - Thursday, January 30, 2014, 8:10 PM

That is a very interesting interpretation of the cartoon. I didn't see it pertaining to the vote at all. When I look at this cartoon I see him describing how Irish and black people are both equal, but only equal in the sense that they are considered less of a person than the white population. A lot of people from the north thought how the south treated the black people was unjust but I believe he is pointing out that the people of the north treated the Irish in the same manner.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: The growth of the minority vote



by Jessica Skidgel - Saturday, February 1, 2014, 10:24 PM

I like that and I agree with you. It seems after reading what you've said and looking at the picture, it makes the most sense. Both slaves and the Irish were thought of as not fit to vote but this pictures seems to be more pointing to the fact that the North and the South are facing a similar situation in the way they are viewing the people around them.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Scale



by Haden Peterson - Saturday, February 1, 2014, 11:16 PM

The picture with the black and Irish man on the scale was an eye opening cartoon for me. Learning about how the irish weren't seen as white but were seen as equal as blacks was something I've never heard before this class. The cartoon draws it out perfectly how blacks and irish pretty much were equal value at that time. And how the artist drew the big lips on the black man and made the irish man look like an monkey enforced negative but popular stereo types of these 2 races on the whole nation. Very powerful image.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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

[< Previous \(Editorial Cartoons\)](#)

[\(Hollywood History & My...\) Next >](#)

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

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

