



Search forums

Forum 2

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

Move

Add a block

Add...

**Editorial Cartoons**

by Joe Escobar - Saturday, January 24, 2015, 12:10 PM

This forum thread is for Editorial Cartoons posts and replies.

After studying the required materials, address the various questions. For purposes of encouraging discussion, you may decide to separate your responses into SEPARATE 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, and include the cartoon number. Do NOT simply leave it RE:Editorial Cartoons

Sum of ratings: -

[Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**"Am I Not a Man?" Racism in the 19th century.**

by Delaney Crook - Sunday, January 25, 2015, 3:02 PM

After studying and analyzing the editorial cartoons provided, the one that stood out to me the most was "Am I not a Man?" This cartoon drew me in the quickest and made me form an opinion of the cartoon and the artist immediately. I believe the cartoonist's main opinion of this drawing was that he was supporting the African-Americans in the 19th century and questioning slavery and racism by showing an African-American asking if he "is not a man and a brother?" He made this point by drawing the African-American man down on his knees with his hands in chains, almost begging or pleading that he is a man and should not be discriminated against because of the color of his skin. Just because he was African-American it did not make him any less of a man than a White male. The initial drawing of the man had me questioning what stance this cartoonist was taking, but the banner with the words "Am I not a man and a brother?" really led me to this interpretation because it showed the African-American man questioning why this was happening to him.

On the contrary, someone opposing this cartoon may have been a Southern slave owner in the 19th century. They would have opposed this view because they would have claimed that no, you cannot be a "brother" and a man. Southern slave owners would have thought that this idea of being both was absurd and would have completely contradicted the opinion involved in this editorial.

I think this cartoon would have had a large effect on nearly everyone during the 19th century. Whether it was African-Americans, fighting for their rights, Southern slave owners, Northern White men who were opposed to slavery, or even women in the 19th century. Every person had an opinion and stance taken on racism and slavery in the 19th century, and this cartoon would have caused interpretation and opinion from anyone who

saw it. As a student learning about U.S History, this cartoon has a great impact on me and my interpretation of this time period, because it shows how severe racism and slavery truly was back then, and it also produces the many different sides taken on the issue.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: "Am I Not a Man?" Racism in the 19th century.

by [Amanda Hagstrom](#) - Friday, January 30, 2015, 1:26 PM

I really like your interpretation of how both parties would react to this cartoon.

Nowadays we would have no argument against whether this person was a man or not but to think that in the 19th century they would actually try and state a plausible case of how he is not another human being is very unsettling. I could only imagine that a caucasian at this time in America would be incredibly insulted by the insinuation that this darker person was remotely related to him and let alone to call him something as intimate as a brother. The most curious response to me would be to hear a white person's attempt of explaining how he is not considered "a man". What would they're argument really be against him not being a man, if it walks like a duck, talks like a duck but it's still not a duck?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



"The Scale"... Nativism

by [Candice Oster](#) - Monday, January 26, 2015, 12:28 PM

Looking at "The Scale", this cartoonist saw the blacks and the Irish as equal, the poor, Catholic, white Irish from the north and the slaves from the south. The black character in the cartoon is smiling at the other as if he sees the irony in the whole situation. The scale is balanced so it is easy to see that the cartoonist was implying these two cultures as being equal.

Before the influx of Irish immigrants the feelings in America were not as focused on class as they were on race. "At least you weren't black." White was the race to be. The Irish are white, however they are perceived as poor and they were mostly Catholic. American Nativism is obvious in this cartoon, the intense opposition based on the minority. It seems that the Whigs would be more supportive of this message. They were less tolerant of poverty and their strong Protestant following would give more opposition towards the Irish Catholic immigrants.

In the 19th Century, this cartoon would have been effective as much of the population supported this same belief. As hard as it is for us today to think of how it must have been during this time in history, it was real then. The black population was thought to be the lower class and then came the white Irish that then were thought to be as "low" as them. As a student, it is important to see where our country stood on these issues. We know that race, class and gender still, unfortunately, are an issue by today's standards. . I feel that learning about the Nativism in our country is important and how it effects politics is true to this day.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: "The Scale"... Nativism

by [Amanda Hagstrom](#) - Friday, January 30, 2015, 2:12 PM

I really love your idea of how the artist draws the smiling face on the black man because he is seeing the irony of their situation. It almost seems as if he is saying

"haha you're screwed too." The smile in itself has some irony to it. The artist promotes the stereotype that southerners also tried persuade the public of, which was that the African Americans were **happy** to be slaves because they were provided with clothes, food and beds. The smile has the eerie presence of the stereotypical southern hospitality attitude, as if the smile was a mere façade and internally he really wants to grab a shotgun and demand his freedom, right after he burns the cotton gin. There is a lot to be said about a smile.

The artist of this cartoon really pushes the stereotypes of each of these ethnic groups from the exaggerated facial features to their apparel. He gave the black man a smile and the Irishman a very smug look. The Irishman's expression also says a lot about the stereotypical ideal of how the Irish were in the 19th century. They were categorized as violent drunks which doesn't necessarily come through in this cartoon but his mean mug at the African American could indicate that the Irish were racist towards blacks during this time. Knowing the history behind it, I'm sure the Irish immigrants that were in poverty voted against the freedom of slavery because it would put their low income jobs in jeopardy and would be considered equal to them just as this scale is in the cartoon is portraying.

Sum of ratings: **2** (1)

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



At The South

by [Erik Fischer](#) - Monday, January 26, 2015, 2:17 PM

This cartoon depicts a slave woman chiding her young son by saying that if he's not a well behaved slave that she would have the Abolitionists take him away. I believe that this is a proslavery cartoon because the slaves are being depicted as ignorant, not knowing what the abolitionists are, and encouraging them to know their place or else something that sounds scary will happen to them. Another reason I think that it is proslavery is the way the slaves and their clothes and house are depicted. They look healthy and like they get plenty to eat, the little boy is even chubby cheeked. Their clothing is clean and look high quality and new. Even the boy is dressed in clean white and having been a little boy once I know that only lasts about 5 minutes before that would be covered in dirt. The house seems middle class with plaster walls a nice table and chair, and a nice clean table cloth, with a pot full of food over the fire. All of these elements are shown to give the idea that the slaves have a good life and should be content where they are.

Sum of ratings: **3** (1)

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



Re: At The South

by [Jenefer Heredia](#) - Monday, January 26, 2015, 11:54 PM

I was actually a bit confused with which side the artist was on, but after reading your post I definitely can side with your conclusions that it was a PRO-Slavery cartoon. Thanks!

Sum of ratings: **1** (1)

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



Re: At The South

by [Delaney Crook](#) - Friday, January 30, 2015, 2:08 PM

I was unsure of what the overall message the artist was trying to convey in this cartoon. I thought the depiction of the individuals in the cartoon along with the quote at the bottom of the picture made is deceiving what the message was. But, I do agree with your analysis that it is proslavery and is trying to portray the idea that the slaves are treated well. Also, I like your idea that the slaves are ignorant and not sure of what really would happen to the young boy. I find it interesting that the artist would go about this way to show support for slavery. I think it was very creative, and your analysis of the cartoon was very valid and accurate!

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Re: At The South

by [Michael Leopold](#) - Saturday, January 31, 2015, 8:21 PM

I struggled with this cartoon as well. I wondered if maybe the cartoon was possibly directed toward slaves themselves, as if to demonize the abolitionists and scare black slaves into staying away from them altogether. But then I remembered that most slaves were banned from being literate, making the idea of printing cartoons for them to read be irrelevant. Still unsure but reading all of your thoughts helped a lot! Im interested in hearing how Joe interprets this particular cartoon next week, if not all of them. We'll see if there's class time for that...

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Re: At The South

by [Thea Van Kessel](#) - Friday, January 30, 2015, 2:21 PM

I really like your interpretation of this cartoon. I think that by portraying all these good things of nice clothes, food, and comfortable living, the cartoonist is trying to depict that if freed, the slaves would never be able to find a better quality of life and therefore they are doing them a favor by owning slaves. I also agree that the creator of this cartoon is portraying slaves as ignorant, especially when the mother says she will call the "Bobolisionists" and have them run away with him, as if being freed by abolitionists were something to be afraid of. They also are shown as being uneducated by the way the mother talks which I think would be important for people to see at the time because it would probably make them think even less of the slaves.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Re: At The South

by [Amanda Hagstrom](#) - Friday, January 30, 2015, 3:16 PM

I, like the other two responses, was slightly unsure of what this cartoon was portraying, I had to read the caption several times before I could really understand what was going on here and your post confirmed my thoughts. If it isn't proslavery then it is definitely anti-abolitionist. I disagree that the cartoon shows African Americans as ignorant. You pointed out the setting in which the mother and son live in, which makes me believe that these two could be house slaves. In the 1800's it was common for slave owners with big plantations to have domestic slaves live in their homes. If some of the stories I've read aren't too biased these slaves weren't actually treated as brutally as the ones out in the fields. They're duties were mostly cooking, cleaning and care taking the children and elderly of the house. They were expected to be presentable with good grammar and proper etiquette. They were no doubt, treated as a lesser human beings but they were the semi-exception to the dehumanization of slavery. In this cartoon, assuming they were the house slaves, these were the ones very unsure of their success as a free person, especially the women. A single mom present day, would certainly trade some of her rights so that she could feed and raise her child rather than be homeless and face the world with no resources. I believe an African American single mom in the 19th century would see that being a domestic house slave was an advantage over the uncertainty of being a free black woman in this racist and sexist time in America. I would say the slaves that were treated semi-descent, were faced with a much more difficult decision. They weren't ignorant, they were just struggling with the idea of what being free would actually entail for they're future and their children's future. Being free was so unfathomable to them because their ancestry had no recollection of what that was since the makings of America.

A story out of Richard Wrights book Uncle Tom's Children called *Bright and Morning Star*, is an entry about an elderly African American woman who was against her son

joining an abolitionist party because she knew if he got caught it would mean death or even worse, extreme torture. She did not want to see her son die. I think that this is a perfect example of how complex ending slavery was at that time. It brought so much heated conversation amongst white people but I can imagine the uncomfortable position it had put African Americans in.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



White.. Black.. who cares? They are the same!

by [Cody Garrison](#) - Monday, January 26, 2015, 6:07 PM

The Cartoon that stood out the most to me was the scale of the Irish man and the African American. What is amazing is the amount of ignorance that is purposed here. What is being said is that Irish men are just the same as African Americans, so therefore should be treated the same. The scale is labeled white and black, some may think that this means white men are just as equal as black men but look at the "white" mans facial features. What is sad is that the level of equality in the 19th century was totally skewed.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Re: White.. Black.. who cares? They are the same!

by [Delaney Crook](#) - Saturday, January 31, 2015, 11:16 AM

When looking at this cartoon the "white" and "black" labels made me confused as to what the artist was trying to convey. I thought it was interesting how the scale was equal for white and black men. But, as you said, the details of facial feature of the white man shows that he is Irish and therefore, Irish are equivalent to African-Americans during the 19th century. The artist of this cartoon obviously believed that Irish men are socially equal to African-Americans and should be treated the same as them. The detail I found most interesting was that the expression on the white mans face is that of disappointment and anger that he is being compared to an African-American, and the African-American is smiling and excited that the two are being compared. This shows the beliefs of the two in the 19th century. I agree with you that the level of equality during this time is completely skewed and sad for all that were impacted by this inequality and treatment.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Re: White.. Black.. who cares? They are the same!

by [Dongwook Lee](#) - Saturday, January 31, 2015, 11:50 AM

I totally agree with you that all people, no matter of their color of skin, should be treated equal. It is sad that slave owners at the time did not have a concept of human rights of blacks. Not only about slaves, but people in general did not have a concept of equality, which is very sad.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



The Scale: Happy vs. Angry

by [Cody Trimble](#) - Monday, January 26, 2015, 7:57 PM

After reviewing "The Scale", I have come to the conclusion that the black man is delighted to be compared to an Irishman, but the Irishman is angered to be considered "the same" as a negro. The cartoon is saying that an Irishman in the north is no better/equivalent to a negro in the south, and their equality both being less than that of a Protestant white man. I believe this cartoon was drawn by a southerner in the 19th century due to the fact that they were portraying a negro and an Irishman as equals, and supported by basically anybody in the time period except for the abolitionists.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



"Am I Not a Man and a Brother"

by [Thea Van Kessel](#) - Monday, January 26, 2015, 9:56 PM

I think that in the political cartoon "Am I Not A Man," the artist's opinion is clearly that slavery should be abolished. The main point being made by them was that black men regardless of the color of their skin are still men and that all men are "brothers." He also shows the man kneeling down with shackled hands and ankles begging which I think would possibly be offensive to an African American of the time to be portrayed as helpless and begging for freedom, however at the same time it shows humanistic qualities which may appeal to the white population. He also is represented as being strong and manly which could also portray that he is no less of a man than any white man. In addition, the word "brother" has some religious implication to it which is a very important aspect of the time because everyone was pretty religious. In the bible men are always being referred to as brothers and brothers are equals so if African Americans are men and brothers, then why are they being treated as slaves.

There would have been plenty of opposing views from slave owners of course, possibly claiming that black men are not in fact brothers and probably even being offended by being called brothers of black men. They also wouldn't want to lose their free labor so that would be another opposition, and some would use religion in the opposite way claiming that God didn't intend for black men to be equals. Whigs would have been in support of this cartoon because they typically support abolition of slavery so pretty much anyone who opposed slavery would be in favor of this cartoon.

I believe this would have been very effective during the time period because it represents the man as being just another human being and brings in the biblical aspect of being brothers. It also seems like the man has finally reached his breaking point and can't deal with being a slave anymore so he is begging for his freedom.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Am i not a man

by [Jordan Towe](#) - Monday, January 26, 2015, 10:39 PM

What catches my attention about this one is right within the writing. Back then people didn't view each other as equal and just because of their skin tone that meant they were less of a person? To me this is really hard to wrap my mind around because of all the places I have been and all the things I have been apart of most of the time people with a skin tone other than white tried and tried to be perfect even harder than all of the others but here it shows them having to beg to be even. When it talks about him being a brother I see that as being right. Sure people have their own opinions and views on race but when it comes down to it we are all equal no one person is above the others.

People are going to argue that this was the right thing for history and its apart of us. sure it is but its not apart of all of us. To put another human in shackles and to make him or her less of value is wrong anyway you cut it. But racism is apart of history and it happened we look at these pictures and try to depict history and figure exactly what the artist meant by them and for the most part we can get the just of it but What I see is a human being pleading to be seen not as a lesser but as the human and brother to humanity that he is.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



#1 The Fictitious South

by [Courtney Tullock](#) - Monday, January 26, 2015, 11:38 PM

I immediately saw anti-abolitionist drawn in this cartoon. His portrayal of a mother

disciplining her son by frightening him with threat of calling the bad abolitionists to come take him away is a clear picture of his stance. He renders slave life as comfortable depicted in the coat hanging on a hook, the giant kettle roasting over a roaring fire, the banjo hanging on the wall. He illustrates a privileged and well accommodated life for slaves.

Clearly this was not the case for a majority of slaves. Given about 1,000 slaves would runaway per year during the underground railroad days, I would say this is not an accurate depiction. I think the biggest supporters for this cartoon would be the Southern Democrats because they were the most avid about keeping slaves as property. Southerners went so far as to burn anti-slavery mail (p 434).

It is hard for me to imagine how effective this cartoon was partly because I don't know when it was published and partly because I think most people already knew what side they were on. Whether they believed in slavery or not I think they knew that slaves would choose something else if they could. Today, I find it both disturbing and ridiculous. It doesn't take much to know that literally belonging to someone else does not make for a very happy life. To think of abolitionists as monsters to punish your children makes me laugh because I could only imagine the relief I would feel if I were a slave and ran into an abolitionist. It is extremely hard to even picture a world like the one he shows to us in this cartoon.

Sum of ratings: **3** (1)

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



The Scale

by [Amanda Hagstrom](#) - Monday, January 26, 2015, 11:48 PM

The Scale is a very simple, yet powerful cartoon depicting the oppression of the Irish immigrants and the African-American slaves in the United states in the nineteenth century. The author is clearly exposing the truth of the widespread discrimination of a minority(the Irish immigrants or African slaves) by the dominant group of white anglo-protestant americans. The stereotype in this cartoon is that the Irish were the low-wage servants of the uppety northern business men in New England and the African Americans were the dehumanized servants of the plantation owners in the south. The cartoonist is trying to draw similarities to the two ethnicities by attempting to over exaggerate facial features and attempting to only contrast the two characters by ones skin color being "white" and the other being "black".

Sum of ratings: **2** (1)

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



What are your thoughts about..."At the South"

by [Jenefer Heredia](#) - Monday, January 26, 2015, 11:52 PM

The "At The South" post drawn by Erik Fischer stood out to me from the rest, for reasons being that I interpret it as bred brainwashing from one generation of slave to another. Unfortunately, I'm a bit confused to whether Fischer was a supporter of the slavery or the abolitionist movement:

1. The title is called "At the South" and I have an impression that Fischer wanted to provide a snap shot of the type of bred brainwashing between slaves.

2. HOWEVER, because the author refers to the abolitionists as "Bobolitionists" it leads me to another idea that Fischer opposed the group.

I believe if I knew which side Fischer stood with, I would be able to draw my own predictions if whether or not this cartoon was effective or not.

I would like to know what conclusions you drew from this political cartoon and which side you think Fischer supported.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



The scale: Black vs Irish

by [Montana Baxter](#) - Tuesday, January 27, 2015, 12:09 AM

The Cartoon that impacted me was "The Scale". The cartoonist displayed an Irish man compared to a black man and showed them as equals. You can see clearly that the Irish man is from the north and he is Catholic and poor. The black man next to him is a slave from the south and he is smiling to the Irish man because he is glad to be getting compared and he's not the only one being looked down on. At first glance I noticed a black man and a white man, but after looking deeper you can see the white mans face looks like a monkey and being showed as an Irish man.

An opposing view might see this cartoon showing the black man as superior to the Irish man simply because he is smiling and the Irish man looks angry. I'm sure this cartoon made a big impact during the 19th century because it angered Irish people by comparing them to slaves, but it also empowered black people and helped morale by showing them being compared to another group. It is effective for me because it shows racism evolving and not just being about color, but also wealth and social class.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



The Scale

by [Michael Leopold](#) - Tuesday, January 27, 2015, 8:59 AM

The artist here is purporting that the African American and the Irish American are of the same quality and value. The compass of sorts at the top of the scale is pointing to where the "problem area" lies for each of these nationalities in America. What I cannot figure out, however, is why the black man is smiling so largely and the Irishman is upset.

Is it perhaps because the Black man realizes that he's not the only culture of people being persecuted in America any longer?

This cartoon was probably created by a nativist and/or Whig who felt as though the Irish and their Catholicism and supposed drinking was hurting America. Im sure that this was a heavy topic in America during this time period, especially in the North. The Temperance movement was in full swing by this time and many had fears of Catholicism infiltrating their daily protestant lives.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: The Scale

by [Aj Glessner](#) - Wednesday, January 28, 2015, 11:14 PM

I think the reason for the difference in facial expressions is a racist statement all on its own. Depicting the Blacks as blissful in their ignorance, and the Irish as angry/violent. The Irish could be shown this way for a few reasons, a simple stereotype of Irish people having short tempers, or the stereotype of the Irish being drunks and belligerent. The Black man could also be smiling as a way for the cartoonist to hide the actual suffering that the slaves were going through at the time, as a common defense for slavery was that the slaves were actually happy, and better-off in slavery.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: The Scale

by [Harold Butler](#) - Thursday, January 29, 2015, 2:40 AM

I feel that the freedom of blacks in America as slaves to free was a business move more than moral or biblically a sin to the wgiters in America. It was the most evil

thing for a white immigrant to come to this land and also take it by blood from its Native American indians.. But overall a great strategy.. Even now I feel if the whites were truly about love and and God they would give these lands back to whom they stole it from.. Which was the blacks and native Indians. Such as John horse and wildcat!

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: The Scale

by [Cody Garrison](#) - Saturday, January 31, 2015, 6:12 PM

Very interesting that you point the facial expressions out! I didn't even think to what it means but now that I think about it I bet the black man is thinking " Welcome to hell you son of a bitch!". If I was in that young mans position I would feel the same and actually be slightly relieved that I wouldn't be stuck with all the ominous activity occurring in that time frame.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



"The Scale" racial issue equality

by [Evan Kossow](#) - Tuesday, January 27, 2015, 12:21 PM

Of these cartoons "The Scale" is the one that popped out the most to me. I believe i like it because it tells a very blatant point and i believe its one we often overlook. The absence of morality at this point in American history was evenly spread north and south, east and west. American Natavism comes to mind..

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: "The Scale" racial issue equality

by [Aj Glessner](#) - Wednesday, January 28, 2015, 11:09 PM

This is an interesting interpretation. I saw it as a negative view of both the Blacks and the Irish, saying that they were both equally bad for the South and the North respectively.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Holy Horror and my Depiction

by [Haley Anderson](#) - Tuesday, January 27, 2015, 3:57 PM

I really studied the Holy Horror cartoon. It seemed to be one of the least straight forward and I had a hard time figuring it out. I know that the woman on the right side is what looks to be an upper class black woman and on the left is a not as attractive boxy looking white woman probably in one of the lower classes in comparison to the woman sitting next to her. I am guessing this due to her clothes and the things in her basket, one including the two bottles of what I am assuming is alcohol. The alcohol makes me think that what the artist is trying to depict a woman of Irish decent due to the fact that the drunkenness was such a huge part of the stigma surrounding the Irish Catholics.

As for the caption, Mrs. McCaffraty has to be the Irish Catholic woman on the left due to the fact her husband, Mr. McCaffraty is voting against black suffrage. I think that this editorial is trying to make it so clear that white people aren't just good people because they are white, and that black people are good people in comparison to a lot of white people who have this right to vote. This was just my depiction and could be way off. But I find the cartoon to be bit confusing when it comes to the title "Holy Horror." Any ideas?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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

**Re: Holy Horror and my Depiction***by Aj Glessner - Wednesday, January 28, 2015, 11:07 PM*

I was also a bit confused by the title. My guess would be that it has something to do with the Irish being Catholic, and the Church having racist views. This would make for a very uncomfortable ride with a Black person as a Catholic.

Sum of ratings: (1) [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Holy Horror and my Depiction***by Candice Oster - Thursday, January 29, 2015, 5:20 AM*

I think this cartoon has to do with the differences of the party systems and the changes that were taking place.

On page 439 it is talking about the differences of the Whigs and the Democrats. It states that the Whigs thought success could come to those who were "morally worthy of it", whether black or white. The cartoon shows the black woman more proper and upstanding, maybe more moral, than the white woman. The Democrats did not think the same way. It says, "Theirs was a Jeffersonian formulation grounded in fierce defense of the liberty and equality of white men,"

Sum of ratings:1 (1) [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Holy Horror***by Aj Glessner - Wednesday, January 28, 2015, 11:04 PM*

I found this cartoon to be very interesting because the black woman on the right is depicted in a much more attractive way, as apposed to "The Scales," where both the Irish and Blacks were depicted as ugly. The woman on the right is obviously Irish. As shown by the wine bottles, her last name being McCaffraty, and the simian appearance. I find it ironic that the "horror" is belonging to Mrs. McCaffraty, when she is the much more horrifying of the two women. The cartoonist here is clearly more prejudiced towards the Irish than the Blacks. This leads me to believe that the cartoonist could have been an abolitionist, but I guess being an abolitionist doesn't mean that one isn't racist.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Holy Horror***by Thea Van Kessel - Friday, January 30, 2015, 2:07 PM*

When I looked at this cartoon, my assumption also was that it is called "holy horror.." not because Mrs. McCaffraty is horrifying but because she is horrified at the fact that she is sitting right next to an African American woman on the street car. And not just any African American woman, but one that appears to be better off than Mrs. McCaffraty is. It also mentions "Mr. McCaffraty voted against Negro suffrage" but here she has found herself sitting right next to a black woman. The way Mrs. McCaffraty is looking at the woman also leads me to believe that she is astonished and disgusted at the situation. I think it's also clear in this cartoon that the Irish woman believes that because she is white she is better than the woman she is sitting next to, and again you can kind of see this in the way she glares over at her. However, I think the person who created the cartoon believed differently. I also agree that he could have been and probably was an abolitionist and he goes about making his point by negatively targeting a different group of people.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Cartoonist's opinion***by Courtney Tullock - Saturday, January 31, 2015, 3:16 PM*

That's a good point. Chapter 14 in the book talks about the decline of the Whigs because they were split over the issues of slavery and racism. Abraham Lincoln basically says how can a person abhor slavery and yet support the oppression of Catholics. I was thinking that maybe the cartoonist was from the South because even though they had prejudices they would have been appalled to see a white person in a lower status than a black woman free or not.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Re: Holy Horror

by [Cody Garrison](#) - Saturday, January 31, 2015, 6:02 PM

I really like your interpretation of this cartoon! When I look at it now you are totally spot on. I am thinking maybe this artist could have also been an abolitionist. Why would they make just the Irish person ugly and not the black girl. It is interesting to me that the Irish person looks like they have an insidious agenda!

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



The Promised Land

by [Jenefer Heredia](#) - Thursday, January 29, 2015, 3:17 AM

I previously analyzed "At the South" depicting an African-American woman disciplining a toddler and warning the little one about the "Bobolitionists" from the North. I was unsure about my interpretation due to some conflicting questions so I've decided to take a look at another political cartoon: "The Promised Land".

1. The artist of this cartoon was definitely against Catholicism entering the United States, as seen by the evil intentions shown on the faces of the pope and bishops. Behind the large Cross, are a band of soldiers, at the ready, to pursue their religious manifesto. The main characters in the front are plump and have rounded faces and bellies, characteristic to the type of bodies drawn to depict selfish individuals [for example: corrupted political leaders]

I also believe the choice of title was definitely intentional and contributes to the cartoonist's opinion about this particular religion infringing the rooted traditions of Protestant America. The "Promise Land" (passage from the Bible) was a land provided by God promised to Moses and his persecuted followers to have as their own.

2. This cartoon would most likely fuel a large portion of White-Protestant American's existing grudges and anger towards Catholics. However, the same cartoon would intensify the social, economic, and political pressures for the minority, such as, a group like the Irish Catholics.

3. I believe this 19th c. cartoon would've been extremely effective in gathering patriotic support to preserve Protestant traditions and possibly America itself. This provides to me a glimpse of the types of fears and even the clear prejudice that stemmed from these fears.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

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



Re: The Promised Land

by [Jesse Bowman](#) - Saturday, January 31, 2015, 8:35 PM

I very much agree with your depiction on what is going on here, very nice analytical skills.

The cartoonist Thomas Nast clearly displays at least two of the main elements of American history in his artwork - "Anti-Catholic" and "Racism". Fun fact about Nast is that originally, he was baptized and taught Catholicism in New York City but after his marriage in 1861, he became a Protestant and an active Republican, continually to

voice his anti-catholic message.

Nast was also responsible for the creation of another cartoon Escobar showed us in class, The American River Gangs which depicted the bishops as alligators crawling up on the shore of America (along with other political issues in the background i.e public schools.) - which reinforces my belief that this particular cartoon was designed to infuriate the Irish Catholics of whom had a massive influx of immigration as well as bring white protestant support for anti-catholicism in America, the so called "Promised Land".

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Holy Horror Theory

by [Courtney Tullock](#) - Thursday, January 29, 2015, 9:10 PM

I only solidified my theory on this cartoon after reading page 476 which basically explains how there were hostilities between Irish immigrants and small black communities in the North because the Irish were a poor working class people but they couldn't get jobs (NINA). So a vast majority of immigrants were democrats who voted pro-slavery.

Mrs. McCaffraty is Irish, based off the last name. She appears poor, dressed kind of raggedy, the food she is holding looks on the verge of rotting; she has a disgusted look on her face as she stares at the woman on the right. The woman on the right is clearly black, wearing a really nice dress complete with hat and gloves as well as a parasol, she looks elegant.

"Holy Horror of Mrs. McCaffraty in a Washington City Street Passenger Car...Mr. McCaffraty Voted against Negro Suffrage." This really throws me off. When I read it I see two things.

1. Maybe it is a sign of support for women's suffrage because Mr. and against are emphasized but that's about the only reason.
2. It could be that the Irish woman is looking at the woman on the right as 'how dare you ask for suffrage when you are so well-off.' They are clearly of two different classes and for that time period I didn't expect to see a black woman in a higher status than a white one. The caption seems kind of sarcastic in that sense, Mrs. McCaffraty doesn't feel any moral horror for supporting the oppression of blacks because that would mean a better chance of opportunity for her husband and family.

With all of these elements I think the cartoonist was portraying what it was like from an Irish person's point of view.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



"AM I Not A Man"...Slavery

by [Dongwook Lee](#) - Saturday, January 31, 2015, 11:40 AM

For myself, this editorial cartoon is made for all black slaves at the time. In the 19th Century, black slaves were suffered. They were in poor surroundings, they could not eat well, they could not rest well, but yet they had to work non-stoply. Owners of the slaves forced slaves to work harder and harder. Even if any slave died, owners would just but a new one to replace the dead slave. Slave is not treated as a humankind.

However, this editorial cartoon is illustrating that slaves are also human being, just same as white people are. They are one's son and daughter, one's parents, and one's brother and sister, just like all other human are. This cartoon is illustrating that black slaves are people, and they should be treated as same as whites are.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Holy Horror Theory #2

by [Courtney Tullock](#) - Saturday, January 31, 2015, 3:54 PM

I feel like this cartoon is the most open to different interpretations. Every time I make a post about a theory something else pops up. I keep getting stuck on the caption where Mr. and against are italicized and I can't help thinking that maybe the cartoonist was focusing on voting rights. He could have been an abolitionist that supported Negro and Women's suffrage. Even though the black woman is better off than the Irish woman she is still oppressed and neither of the women really have any rights.

If this is the case I think he would be from the Northeast where the majority of Irish immigrants were settled because he seems more prejudiced towards the Irish woman in his depiction of her.

I also think that southerners would have opposed this message because they didn't want black people or foreigners or women to have the same rights as white men.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Editorial Cartoons

by [Kai Seltman](#) - Saturday, January 31, 2015, 11:53 PM

The cartoon that stuck out most to me was "Am I Not A Man." The depiction of a black person in shackles and chains with a banner that reads "Am I not a man and a brother?" is heart wrenching, and the point the cartoonist is trying to make is pretty straight forward. For the other four cartoons, I had to take the time to analyze its meaning and figure out the historical context, but anyone can see that this cartoon is clearly demonizing slavery by humanizing the slaves.

To our current generation, it is hard to believe that this is a message that had to be conveyed. However, at the time, most Southerners and some Northerners would clearly be against the sentiment expressed here. They may have even found it offensive to consider a African American a 'man' and moreover a 'brother.' On the other hand, abolitionists would have supported this message in their pursuit to secure the rights of the African American.

I believe that his cartoon would be effective insofar as a cartoon could be. The cartoon pulls at the heartstrings of any decent human being, and may have strengthened the condition of abolitionists and may even have stirred the guilt of those were pro-slavery, as a meat-eater may be convinced of vegetarianism after watching a movie about slaughterhouses even though he or she previously never gave much thought about the issue. (Although it may simply be idealistic naiveté on my part to believe this way.)

This cartoon is effective for me as a student of US history, because, as a foreigner, it gives me a glimpse of how deep-rooted race issues are in the US. It also provides students with historical context, proving that things that we assume about the way things are (e.g.; Southerners are simply horrendous monsters) are more complicated and that there are a lot of factors to be put into consideration if we are to discuss history in an accurate manner.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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

[Moodle Docs for this page](#)

[HST 202 W15 \(Escobar Meta 31045 31046\)](#)

