

# HST 202: US History W20 (Escobar)

[Home](#) / [My courses](#) / [HST 202 W20 \(Escobar Meta 30603 30604\)](#) / [Week 4 January 26 - February 1](#) / [Forum 2](#)  
/ [Interpreting Editorial Cartoons](#)



Search forums

## Forum 2

### Interpreting Editorial Cartoons

[Subscribe](#) [Settings](#) ▼

◀ [Hollywood History & Mythology](#)

[Hollywood History & Mythology](#) ▶

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

Move



#### Interpreting Editorial Cartoons

by [Joe Escobar](#) - Friday, January 24, 2020, 9:36 PM

This thread is for discussions on the Interpreting Editorial Cartoons topic.

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, which clearly describes the cartoon name you are addressing. Do NOT simply leave it RE: Interpreting Editorial Cartoons

Sum of ratings: [\\_](#)

[Permalink](#)

[Edit](#)

[Delete](#)

[Reply](#)

**Am I Not A Man**by [Beth Trower](#) - Saturday, January 25, 2020, 4:22 PM

My first impression upon taking a look at the image was the blatant use of racist stereotypes, the juxtaposition of the two men, and a seemingly obvious racist opinion.

First looking at the juxtaposition, on the left side, we have a black man who is in chains, which portrays him as a slave. He is kneeling, his hands are up, and his head is tilted up in a manner that shows a sense of praying or begging. The message underneath says, "Am I not a Man and a Brother?". The words are shown on a banner. This half of the picture is trying to evoke sympathy and empathy for a slave.

However, we see the same man on the right, and he is portrayed as a killer, as an animal. The facial structure of the man is a clear reference to the racial stereotype of black people being compared to apes or monkeys. The mouth is jugged out and the teeth are visible, his forehead is flattened and sloped back, and his nose is also flattened with wide nostrils in an attempt to depict his features as those are usually characterized with apes. His stance also shows this. Humans don't typically stand with one leg up and the other leg on tiptoes. That's more of an animal stance, a monkey stance. His eyes are large and bulging, wild and crazed in appearance. He holds a sword in his right hand and a torch in his left. A look at the lower left of the picture illustrates a group of dead white people, and we can conclude that they were killed by the man with his sword. Following the smoke from the torch leads us to the background on the left, where we see plumes of smoke rising from a village or a building. This implies that the man burned the village with his torch and then proceeded to kill the white people. The message at the bottom says, "Am I a Man and a Brother?" This half of the picture is trying to show you what this man was before, or what this man will become if he is set free.

The comparison between the two pictures illustrates a sharp contrast between the man in chains, and the man with the sword and torch. On the one hand, the slave is begging to be set free. On the other hand, the same man is a killer, a destroyer, and an animal.

Based on the details that I described and then interpreted, the main conclusion that I can draw is that this cartoonist has a very negative view on black people, as shown by the racist stereotypes, the amount of detail shown to the second picture rather than the first, and the message at the bottom that asks us if this savage is a man and a brother? Or is this an interpretation of cause and effect? If there were no slaves, then would there not be any savages?

What are your thoughts on this? What conclusion did you guys draw?

Sum of ratings: [3 \(1\)](#) 
[Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)
**Re: Am I Not A Man**by [Ailah Altemus](#) - Monday, January 27, 2020, 6:34 PM

I think your cause and effect analysis is very interesting. However, my analysis was a little bit different. I think it is obvious these two pictures were not illustrated by the same artist. In the first picture, the slave is pleading and asking "Am I not a man and a brother?" He is wrapped in chains with little clothing. The second picture depicts a barbaric man that almost looks animal. He states the same phrase. However, it is obviously sarcastic as he has just committed evil crimes. The illustrator of the second picture was trying to perpetuate fear into the onlooker's eyes as if saying "this is what will happen if we free them." Using fear to sway people's opinions is something we still see today.

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

**Re: Am I Not A Man**by [Beth Trower](#) - Monday, January 27, 2020, 10:24 PM

I like your take on there being possibly two different artists. That does make sense, especially with your point about fear. Fear is an extremely powerful tool that can cause someone to be influenced easily, whether it is fear of a threat, or fear of the unknown, or perhaps both. When people can properly utilize fear, that's when they get their way.

Case in point: the second picture. I'm not necessarily afraid of the man in the second picture, I understand that the purpose of that picture is to scare people and make them stay or become anti-abolitionists. The artist is preying on racist stereotypes that I pointed out in my original post and emphasizing them. "Democratic cartoonists featured minstrelsy's bug-eyed, woolly-haired caricatures of blacks. By the time of the Civil War, Democrats mobilized voters almost solely with threats of 'amalgamation' and 'Negro rule.'... In the 18th and early 19th centuries, whites had stereotyped blacks as ignorant and prone to drunken-ness and thievery" (online textbook 341). This second picture served as a part of those threats.

The aspect of fear and how it's prevalent in the picture reminds me of a certain song lyric: "Fear is only in our minds, taking over all the time" ("Sweet Sacrifice" by Evanescence). However, because fear is so powerful, it only takes a couple of words or a picture in this case, to change the mind of one person, or tens, hundreds, say, thousands of people if it is wielded effectively. With this picture, in the setting and the words accompanying it, I would say fear was used quite well.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#)

2

[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: Am I Not A Man**by [Beth Trower](#) - Monday, January 27, 2020, 10:24 PM

A minor point that I want to make is that both pictures don't say the same phrase. The second cartoon has "Am I a Man and a Brother?" at the bottom. The "not" isn't in the phrase. I think the changing of the phrase makes the second picture even more sarcastic.

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#)

0

[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: Am I Not A Man**by [Ethan Rubus](#) - Wednesday, January 29, 2020, 10:50 PM

My initial thought and conclusion were that it was just an anti-black drawing not much else. However, having read what others have said it made me go back and look again. I do like the take that Ailah made about there being two different artists Which is something I didn't even think about. It makes a lot of sense and is something that I definitely see now.

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#)

0

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



### Holy horror

by [Ailah Altemus](#) - Saturday, January 25, 2020, 8:27 PM

The image I have decided to interpret is Holy Horror. I've chosen this illustration because the portrayal of the white woman, Mrs. McCaffraty, illustrates how black people were commonly drawn in the 1800s. In the painting, Mrs. McCaffraty is drawn in an animalistic vulgar way, while the black woman she is glaring at is drawn in a more graceful light. Not only is this black woman graceful, but she is also beautiful and well dressed. Whereas, the white woman is large and piggish, with plain unflattering clothes and a basket of food in her hands. The illustrator was obviously a supporter of the abolitionist movement. The white woman is glaring at the black woman with a hatred that can almost be interpreted as jealousy. This relates back to how white southerners justified slavery, considering black people less than whites, and justifying racism with any excuse they could find. This picture is a reflection of how their actions could be depicted from a different lens.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#)

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



### Re: Holy horror

by [Melanie Green](#) - Tuesday, January 28, 2020, 8:12 PM

Hello Ailah! That's so interesting! I honestly was stuck on that cartoon. I couldn't figure out what point it was trying to get across. Your explanation makes a lot of sense though!

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#)

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



### Re: Interpreting Editorial Cartoons

by [Marcus Mantanona](#) - Sunday, January 26, 2020, 2:32 AM

Am I Not A Man And A Brother

Each one of these pictures holds a very important message. The main point of these images were to persuade and show what was occurring at the time. It was also a way to get their expressions out there and being Anonymously. For example, the most powerful political cartoon is " Am I Not A Man and A Brother, "I feel like this image was made in the purpose to move hearts and minds. The Man is strong, however his circumstances has down on his knees begging for basic rights. I feel like this image is asking whether or not a black man is human. The Americans in the south were probably not for this because they believed in having slaves. Members of Congress from the South passed resolutions banning any discussion of slavery in the House of Representatives. I believe that this was most important to the abolitionist. The abolitionists are the ones who lead the slaverly movement in the 19 centuries. This image was powerful because it's a whole hearted. The image is incredibly crucial to understanding how to make people understand the problems they wish not to see. This image is very effective for me as a student. As I am learning about slavery, this image makes me realize the emotions and heartache through this process. Our culture now in 2019 is way different. We now believe that all men are created equal. This means all people are created equal, regardless of their sex, race or class.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#)

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



### Am i not a man interpretation

by [Brett Lee](#) - Sunday, January 26, 2020, 1:09 PM

A quick glance at the image shows how emotional it must have been at the time. The person is strong and muscular; yet his circumstances have bent him in two, making him beg for the basic rights that should be his. His wrists are shackled to his ankles, unlikely able to stand up to full height shows a defiling nature of the race. Even if he were not in this position of begging, he would not be able to stand as someone should be able to do. His facial expression is nearly blank, numbed; but his lips are slightly apart, as if to speak the words at the bottom of the image

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#)

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



### Re: Interpreting Editorial Cartoons

by [Ethan Rubus](#) - Sunday, January 26, 2020, 5:51 PM

The cartoon that I choose to write about is called the Scale. The cartoon it has a scale on the scale is a black man and a white man. The scale is labeled black and white on the bottom and north and south on the top. The scale is even neither side is higher or lower. Based on that I think that the author was against slavery. The author was trying to make the point that black and white people are the same and that there is no difference between them. It wouldn't be that far fetched to say that the author was part of the abolitionist movement.

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#)

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



### Re: Interpreting Editorial Cartoons

by [Alexander Marx](#) - Tuesday, January 28, 2020, 5:26 PM

Hi Ethan,

My impression of this cartoon is a bit different than yours. While the scale is indeed equal, I believe the figure on the right is depicting an Irish immigrant based on the other cartoons we saw in class where the Irish were depicted as ape-like humanoids. With both the black and white side being unpleasantly caricatured, I would suggest that the author's comparison is that the Irish are as "bad" as the blacks, as opposed to the blacks being as "good" as the whites. However, in a recent Ethnic Studies course I was taught that during this time period, despite skin color being similar, Irish immigrants weren't considered "white" because of their perceived inferiority, so I would say the black and white labels at the bottom could support your point of view.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#)

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

**Re: Interpreting Editorial Cartoons**by [Hunter Weast](#) - Wednesday, January 29, 2020, 5:28 PM

Hey Alexander,

I interpret the cartoon in a similar way to Ethan and Melanie. However, I'm curious what you see as the "objective" of this drawing? In my opinion I think that the illustrator was trying to show the equality of all men, due to the lack of a third figure in the picture.

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#) 0[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: Interpreting Editorial Cartoons**by [Alexander Marx](#) - Thursday, January 30, 2020, 7:02 PM

One aspect that makes me question your conclusion is the fact that the scale has south and north clearly written on it. If the goal of the drawing was to oppose slavery and promote equality, why would the cartoonist depict a northern white person in such an inhuman way? Shouldn't the degradation be targeted towards a southern white, as they were the main proponents of slavery at this time? I think Melanie's thought of the possibility of them being drawn like that to bring down the white man's ego would make more sense if it weren't a split between north and south. I also believe that if equality was the goal, then raising the black man up (metaphorically, not tipping the scale) by portraying him as a more sophisticated individual to match a similarly sophisticated white man would be more effective in that regard. The fact that he has no shoes while being hunched over with the opposite figure doing the same makes it hard for me to view this cartoon as advocating for people of color.

I am quite convinced that the person on the right is supposed to be Irish, since he so closely resembles the ape-like features we saw in class of cartoons also depicting Irish immigrants. You ask an important question in what I think the "objective" of the drawing is, and reading a bit into chapter 14 has given me something new to go off of. According to the textbook on pages 462-463, most immigrants became Democrats as it was a more welcoming party to them, most of them leaned on the pro-slavery side of the party, and seven-eighths of them settled in free states. The authors also state that "Irish American mobs sometimes attacked black neighborhoods and rioted against black workers" (Textbook p. 463). I originally posted that I thought the comparison was the Irish being as "bad" or as low on the totem pole as the blacks, and I still think that is the message of the post but the context for me has changed. I believe it is possible that the illustrator is both pro-slavery and anti-immigrant, therefore sending the message of both peoples being inferior. I also now think it is possible that the author is anti-slavery and is targeting the Irish with the cartoon using a message saying "You're no better than the people you persecute." It's almost as if the devilish grin on the black man's face is meant to be mocking the Irish person by saying "You're just like us" while the expression of the Irish person is one of both shock and realization. This could be supported by the cartoon looking like a mirror image. Or perhaps I am wrong in my analysis all together, and the person on the right isn't even Irish. Either way, thanks for inciting discussion!

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

**Re: Interpreting Editorial Cartoons**

by [Melanie Green](#) - Tuesday, January 28, 2020, 8:52 PM

Hello Ethan!

This is the same interpretation I had as well! I do want to see if this idea sticks though... I noticed that both of them were drawn with the gorilla like faces. What if they were drawn like that because the artist was trying to bring down the white men's ego. White men weren't made better, they are the same sinful creatures like the Africans. It was normal to see a black drawn with an animal face but not a white man. It grabs the readers attention immediately and either humbles them or makes them angry. I think the idea was to say, we are equal at the black man's level.

Sum of ratings:[0 \(1\)](#)

[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: Interpreting Editorial Cartoons**

by [Ethan Rubus](#) - Thursday, January 30, 2020, 11:03 PM

Hey Melanie!

I thought the same thing! I think that the author was going for it all and wanted to make a statement that wasn't just pushed aside by the viewers. I thought that is could also be a southern artist and he is trying to compare blacks to a northerner and saying that northern whites are the same as blacks in his eye. I say this because on the side with the white man it is labeled north. If this cartoon was made right around the start of the Civil war it would make sense considering how tense both sides would have been.

Sum of ratings:[0 \(1\)](#)

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



### Am I Not a Man and a Brother?

by [Melanie Green](#) - Sunday, January 26, 2020, 7:43 PM

I chose the "Am I Not a Man and a Brother?" cartoon. Mostly because it makes me sad. It shows a cartoon most likely drawn from the North depicting a slave in chains begging to be let go with the caption "Am I not a man and a brother?". The other side has an animal like human, destroying everything asking "Am I not a man and a brother!" "Democratic cartoonists featured minstrelsy's bug-eyed, woolly-haired caricatures of blacks." (Textbook pg. 417) The other side can only be assumed to be a product of a democrat. The slave has a gorilla shaped face, oddly shaped feet that reminded me of drawings of werewolves. In the hands of the slave, he has a torch and a sword. Under him is a family, murdered in pure hatred, and behind him is a house engulfed in flames. Judging the awfulness of this side of the cartoon, I would assume it had been drawn a little bit after the Nat Turner revolt. It was a political cartoon to try and show people that slaves weren't human. They have no humanity, no soul, only hatred and love of blood and violence. The artist gets his point across well. Even the facial expressions on the slaves' face was powerful. The leering look in his eyes and the malicious smile on his face is enough to make me afraid of him. I think it's also important to note that the people lying on the ground looks like a woman and children. It's tugging at the reader's emotions. If you were a man, women and children were what you treasured and protected. For a woman, it was terrifying to see someone destroying your home and family. And those were the emotions the artist was trying to pull out.

These days, this much hate on a race would not be tolerated. But back in the nineteenth century, people enjoyed looking at cartoons and this was what they had to look at. And I think that's the saddest part. Not only did people look at it though, they agreed with it and believed the story it told. It brought doubt that the slaves were humans and brothers like the previous cartoon had said.

Sum of ratings: [3 \(1\)](#)

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



### Re: Am I Not a Man and a Brother?

by [Jahaziel Reyes](#) - Tuesday, January 28, 2020, 12:55 PM

You went into an interesting direction with the second cartoon being an admonishing view of slaves for abolitionists with the first image. What I took from this was that it was a tactic not only for persuading the north but also reinstating ideals within slave owners of the south at the time. Not all slave owners explicitly needed hundreds of slaves for field work or other tasks and as lines began being drawn between abolitionists and non the reaffirmation and support for southern ideals to me must have been a driving factor to remind the south that they were correct and the northerners were interfering with something they knew nothing about in reality. This is especially after the Nat Turners revolt the south became increasingly strict and belief that slaves were dangerous and needed to be controlled grew as such revolts became more common or widespread.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#)

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



### Am I Not a Man?

by [Alexander Marx](#) - Sunday, January 26, 2020, 8:45 PM

I believe that this cartoon dates back to the early 1830's, and was illustrated by a southern anti-abolitionist. Shown on the left is a British anti-slavery cartoon, depicting a black man in chains with a very humanizing posture and a desire for his freedom with the quote "Am I not a man and a brother?". The cartoonist has countered this original image with a new one shown on the right, altering the text to say "Am I a man and a brother?" and depicting a black man holding a sword and torch as wild and animalistic. At the man's feet are what appear to be dead white women and children and a house burns in the background, which leads me to believe that this man is supposed to be Nat Turner and the author's counter argument to the original cartoon is the Nat Turner's rebellion, as a way of saying "this is what will happen if we allow emancipation." According to the week one Nat Turner video, this rebellion greatly escalated the fear of a wide scale slave uprising, especially where it took place in Virginia with around half of the population consisting of slaves. I believe this cartoon would have been very effective at the time, especially for those who lived in Virginia and the surrounding states. The strategy of using fear to push an agenda or ideology is still widely used today for the reason that it is very effective.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#)

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



### At the South Cartoon

by [Phoebe Fergus](#) - Sunday, January 26, 2020, 8:54 PM

While looking over the "At the South" comic, there were many things that spoke out to me.

The first was the mother and child's surroundings. If you compare the surroundings of the room they are in to those of a higher status, it is easy to tell they are not wealthy, and are most likely slaves. The paint on the side of the wall is cracked and peeling. They also have a very minimal amount of furniture and items in the room, such as the banjo on the wall, the candle on the table, and the picture/poster hung up on the wall with nails.

The next thing that I noticed was the way the writer of this comic portrays the mother. They use words like "den" instead of then, "yer" instead of you are, and "bobolitionist" instead of abolitionist. This shows that the mother is supposed to be seen as an uneducated women.

Lastly I noticed what the mother was saying to her son. To sum it up, she says, if you aren't good the abolitionist will come and take you away. This was made to paint abolitionists in a bad light and make slaves feel as if they have no choice and their only safe option in the world is to be a slave.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#)

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

**Re: At the South Cartoon**by [Melanie Green](#) - Tuesday, January 28, 2020, 8:38 PM

Hello! This is a super interesting take on this cartoon. For me when I looked at this I thought it was the South showing that the slaves don't want to be freed. They had simple but good enough shelter. In other history books, I read about how slaves after a while didn't want to be free. Maybe that's not true but it makes sense. Once they were free it was difficult to find a job that would hire them, difficult to find someone to rent to them, and difficult to live in a white society. Why would you want to leave food and shelter even though you're enslaved, for freedom when you had to provide for yourself. And if you think about it, this change was just as radical to the slaves as it was to the whites. So my interpretation was that the mom was scolding her child and telling him that if he didn't stop she would call the abolitionists and he would be sent to freedom. This cartoon was trying to tell the North that the slaves didn't want to be free so they needed to stop freeing them.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#)

1

[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Re: At the South Cartoon**by [Phoebe Fergus](#) - Tuesday, January 28, 2020, 9:36 PM

Hi Melanie!

I'm so glad you responded and gave your opinion. When I read through your post I realized how much sense your perspective made, and I don't think I would have thought of that on my own. When I originally looked at the cartoon, my first thought was how much this one stood out to me, and then I struggled for a little bit to interpret it. I think it definitely makes more sense that the slaves wouldn't have wanted to leave because they wouldn't have had the support to survive. Something I also did not catch until reading through your post, was that the mother was talking about herself. I originally thought she was talking about the mother of the house (wife of the slave owner). I'm not totally sure why this was my first thought but I'm really glad I got another perspective on this.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#)

1

[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Edit](#)[Split](#)[Delete](#)[Reply](#)**Interpreting The Promised Land**by [Jahaziel Reyes](#) - Monday, January 27, 2020, 12:04 AM

From what I can see the cartoonist doesn't think highly of christianity and is possibly one of the many Protestants in America at the time being the dominant religion. Depicting Christians as being on high with portly figures above even their own country and in the clouds with robes and eyeing the Americas is a clear warning to other Protestants that the religion they sought to escape by coming to America in the first place has its eyes on this country too. That the greedy head priests and pope will come and ruin America, the imposing cross in front of pikemen suggesting an armed occupation and conversion of anyone that doesn't follow their scripture. We can see this tension manifested in the 1844 riots in Philadelphia that "pitted avowed Whig Protestants against Catholic immigrants, ostensibly over the issue of Bible reading in schools, killing 13 people" (407). The general smug atmosphere coming from the priests would also connect with the American people who at the time were actively trying to stomp out the old stuffy ideals of the english through schools and in the Democratic party at the time.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#)

2

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

**Re: Interpreting The Promised Land**

by [Beth Trower](#) - Wednesday, January 29, 2020, 3:09 PM

Hi Jahaziel,

I really like your take on this. I was looking at The Promised Land picture and I didn't get much from it, other than Catholicism coming to North America. After reading your post and taking another look at the picture, I understand it much better now.

The weapons in the back portray violence, perhaps by a militia. The telescope is pointing towards North America, and the priests, bishop, and the Pope have these smirks on their faces, as if they've spotted their next treasure site. You don't get a sense of humbleness from the priests. Instead, you get a sense of trickery and greed.

I am curious as to what you mean in your last paragraph about the smug atmosphere. I don't see how that connects with the American people and them getting rid of English ideals. I see their smugness as confidence and ego. It seems like they know, or think they know, that they can push their religious beliefs into North America and onto the American people. Would that not be the opposite of connecting with the American people? What are your thoughts?

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#)

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

**Re: Interpreting The Promised Land**

by [Jahaziel Reyes](#) - Thursday, January 30, 2020, 4:10 PM

Thanks for the Reply Beth,

The connection I saw was that the illustrator was trying to reignite the fears and hatred of corrupt institutions. The protestants originally were catholic, until the protestant reformation that was in response to the corruption of the catholic church, causing the groups to splinter. Now immigrants and preachers who are predominantly catholic are coming to the United States. Its here that I thought of the active teaching against such behavior by Democratic institutions. The connection being a camaraderie in hating the corrupt and blasphemous Christians. I could have probably used a different word than connect though or made it clearer.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#)

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

**Re: Interpreting The Promised Land**

by [Beth Trower](#) - Friday, January 31, 2020, 3:37 PM

Thanks for the clarification, Jahaziel. It's appreciated, and I understand much better now.

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#)

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

**Holy Horror**by [Hunter Weast](#) - Monday, January 27, 2020, 7:48 PM

This cartoon has a few key features that stand out to me. First of which, is that it seems to have "extra" content. Almost everything in each of the cartoons seems to be thoughtfully placed, or has some sort of deeper meaning to it. But I cannot seem to find any sort of deeper meaning to the contents of Mrs. McCaffraty basket. As far as the overall meaning behind the cartoon, it seems to me like the artist is trying to depict that African-American population are continuing to gain rights, regardless of what the McCaffraty's vote for or against.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)**Re: Holy Horror**by [Melanie Green](#) - Saturday, February 1, 2020, 11:43 AM

Hello!

I see what you are saying about the "extra content". Mrs. McCaffraty has a basket full of food while the black girl is holding a parasol. My interpretation of this, was that Mrs. McCaffraty had taken on the role of being a servant or slave, so she had to go do the grocery shopping instead of going to a friend's house or social like the other girl appears to be doing. I don't think the stuff in the basket has anything to do with anything, but I do think the basket itself shows that Mrs. McCaffraty has become low enough to have to do the chores around the house.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)**holy horror cartoon**by [Brett Lee](#) - Tuesday, January 28, 2020, 8:04 PM

The cartoon depicts the racial prejudice that demonstrates the black woman on the right is depicted as a lady of beauty, refinement, and wealth. On the left, the Irish-American woman (safely assumed to be Catholic) is stereotyped with ape-like features and working-class attire. A servant or housewife, she seems to have been to the market to purchase fresh produce and fish. Her basket also holds two bottles of alcohol, frequently associated with Irish-Catholics. The bracketed remark lets viewers know that she represents the type of disreputable person who opposes black manhood suffrage.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)**Re: holy horror cartoon**by [Melanie Green](#) - Saturday, February 1, 2020, 11:37 AM

Hello!

After reading through everyone else's posts about Holy Horror, I find yours the most intriguing. I struggled trying to interpret this one and still kind of do. But one thing I noticed was that you are the only one who suggests that Mrs. McCaffraty was Irish. I like your connection to the alcohol in her basket as well, however I do see a flaw in your idea. It says at the bottom that "Mr. McCaffraty voted no against Negro Suffrage" which suggests that her husband is in politics or at least well known. So I struggle to think that she is Irish, and I lean more towards her being a white woman.

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#) [Permalink](#) [Show parent](#) [Edit](#) [Split](#) [Delete](#) [Reply](#)



### The Ballot Box

by [Melanie Green](#) - Thursday, January 30, 2020, 9:09 AM

I haven't seen anyone do the Ballot Box Cartoon yet so I thought I'd take a shot at it. In the cartoon we see two men wearing a beer and whiskey barrel, carrying the ballot box away from an angry mob. The people who introduced whiskey to America were the Irish so we can assume that the person in the whiskey barrel is an Irish man. And the people who brought beer were the Germans, so we can also assume that the man in the beer barrel is German. Now here's where things get sticky in the interpretation for me. I can't decide if it's the alcohol stealing the vote or the men. I can see how the artist is trying to say that these immigrants are going to steal the votes in America. They were coming without the set of beliefs that people had in America, so they were dangerous in government decisions. The people behind them were angry that they didn't get the vote that they wanted because the German's and Irish were numerous enough to tip the scale in politics. If we were to get down to the nitty gritty stuff, we could say that the artist was painting them in a bad light by saying these men were bringing in alcohol and that's all they are, alcoholics.

But I wonder if there's a small double meaning. What if he was trying to say that alcohol was stealing the votes? This time period was when the Temperance movement was sweeping the nation. Maybe the artist was part of this movement and tried to show how alcohol could badly affect the nation. And I remember how cartoonists tended to draw the Irish with disformed faces as well, but their faces look normal enough to me. So maybe it's just two white men who are drunk and not making the best decisions.

What do you guys think??

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#)

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



### Re: The Ballot Box

by [Hunter Weast](#) - Thursday, January 30, 2020, 7:30 PM

Hey Melanie,

I think your assumptions on where the two men are from are spot on. I really like your take on the alcohol stealing votes. Looking at the Ethnicity and Alcohol section in Chapter 12 of the textbook, it does set the stage for your double meaning question quite nicely in my opinion. Also looking at Immigration and Nativism in Chapter 14 and looking at the huge fluctuation of immigrants entering into the United States, accounting for approximately 15% of the population at the time I think it is safe to draw the conclusion that the illustrator was showing the influence that the Irish and Germans had on politics.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#)

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



### the promised land

by [Brett Lee](#) - Thursday, January 30, 2020, 5:38 PM

The artist had depicted the pope, and potentially a bishop both standing on top a what looks to be a basilica (totally did not have to google this), which he made to look like a ship's crow's nest making it close to the ocean helped make this connection. From that vantage point, the pope and a huge group of clerical minions look across the Atlantic to American shores with an eye for conquest. Almost makign it look like a captain proudly standing tall viewing the new land. i know its not historally accurate nor does it bring anything to this post but the protruded arm the pope is extending looks awfully similar to a nazi salute.

Sum of ratings: [1 \(1\)](#)

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



### At The South Analysis

by [Tanner Hermanson](#) - Saturday, February 1, 2020, 11:38 PM

While the other prompt in this forum really sparked my interest and I devoted most of my time to that topic, I would like to take a crack at analyzing an editorial cartoon. The "At The South" cartoon created by Ben Day seems to be an anti-abolitionist take on slavery. The mother is telling the child to be good and to be fearful of the abolitionists, who will try to take him away from his mom. She uses the threat of abolitionists separating them to scare her son into behaving properly. On another note, Ben Day portrays blacks as having incoherent English skills as shown by the language he uses for the mother. The bottom line for this cartoon is that Ben Day portrays abolitionists as being a source for fear for blacks, particularly for young black slaves, rather than what they should be viewed as, which is a source of freedom. I believe that Southern slave owners and slave owners, in general, would support this cartoon as they would clearly be against the abolitionists. On the other hand, I'm sure abolitionists everywhere were outraged by this cartoon as it tried to tarnish and degrade what they stood for.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#)

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

[◀ Hollywood History & Mythology](#)

[Hollywood History & Mythology ▶](#)

[◀ Chapter 13 Quiz](#)

[CLICK HERE for Forum 2 Materials & Questions ▶](#)



 Moodle Docs for this page

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

HST 202 W20 (Escobar Meta 30603 30604)

[Get the mobile app](#)

[Policies](#)