Re/Situating the Digital Archive in John T. McCutcheon's "Publics," Then and Now

Tarez Samra Graban

Defining a Suffrage archive as *transnational* means paying attention to "how globalization has influenced the movement of people and the production of texts, culture, and knowledge across borders" in order to blur stark distinctions among them (Dingo 8). This in turn relies on a shared belief that the *archive* itself moves freely throughout multiple interpretive agents and multiple points of entry, occurring in multiple dimensions—for example, in the digital scrapbook pages Shirley has created and arranged *as well as* in the collaborative scholarship that has grown up around the McCutcheon Transatlantic Suffrage Cartoon Collection. If *archive* offers an emergent temporal and spatial picture—a layering of relationships between subjects, agents, and their socio-historical events—then *digital Suffrage archive* is more than the mere digitization of material artifacts or the digital expression of circulation practices and ideals inherited from print. Instead, it is a constellation of the various lenses and filters through which historical communities are both formed and examined around Suffrage topics.

The aim of this authorial collective so far has been to reveal a critical way of knowing and historicizing about the digital renderings of John T. McCutcheon's work on suffrage, and questioning traditional archival imperatives. Space (or location) is one such imperative we need to question. The McCutcheon Collection is not (merely) a digitized archive but a *net-worked* one, transnational in scope *as an outcome of its digitization* and not merely because it offers digital copies of a collection already related to transnational events. It shows the residual effects of an interspatial migration of ideas, and it suggests the pathways through which these ideas move through our historical consciousness. As a result, I argue for resituating McCutcheon's *transnational digital archive* as a kind of ecology that enfolds narratives of historical recovery alongside narratives of historiographic reflection, revealing various associations and dissociations that inform our sense of what scholarly practices are made possible in and between digital spaces.

The Networked Archive as a Data Ecology

At the 2011 Feminisms and Rhetorics Conference, Shirley K Rose argued for the various archival locations of McCutcheon's cartoons as evidence of their rhetorical placement, and for the act of archiving as exercising rhetorical agency. Inquiry into locations of McCutcheon's suffrage depictions and the significance of their placement, or "archival research in place," she

argued, is a feminist practice. By analyzing the whereabouts of several thousand McCutcheon cartoons, Rose noted that their various locations illuminate different thematic desires and, in some cases, connections to McCutcheon himself. For example, the fact that the University of Missouri established the world's first school of journalism attributes to their collection of 324 of the pen-and-ink cartoons that McCutcheon sketched for the *Chicago Tribune* (held in their special collections) a particular significance. Similarly, the Syracuse University Library holds 663 original drawings, some of which depict middle and late Suffrage and might be read as rhetorically significant because of the university's geographic closeness to the site of the 1848 Seneca Falls convention. These locations, in turn, reposition donors and archivists as agents in the cartoons' rhetorical circulation.

However, in addition to thinking about McCutcheon's cartoons as *situated* in terms of their various locations, we might consider the critical possibilities of thinking about them as *locate-able* in terms of the intellectual publics they incite. By "publics" I mean not only the reading and consuming publics of McCutcheon's cartoons, but also the new spheres of activity made possible for McCutcheon's drawings as a result of ongoing digital work, as well as the social and political questions that historians find themselves better equipped to ask. Reflecting meta-textually on McCutcheon's publics increases the archive's value by "creat[ing] a much more open and expanded view of rhetorical performance, accomplishment, and rhetorical possibilities" (Royster and Kirsch 29) specifically for working transnationally. For example, the digital mobility of "First One East of the 'Mother of Waters'" is best understood in its paradox of being a simultaneously stable and widely circulating artifact (Figure 1 and Figure 2). Once widely circulated in multiple copies of newsprint, and now preserved in limited copies, its digitization does not necessarily restore it to its former circulatory activity or liberate it from being a preserved object. Rather, its digital recirculation draws attention to the shifting temporal and cultural conditions under which the cartoon was, is, or can become a captured representation of some analytic desire—whether McCutcheon's readers' or our own. The simultaneous preservation of the once-circulating newspaper clip *and* its digital recirculation lend it a new quality of being. Analyzing and imagining become two necessary processes in this archive's formation and mutation, requiring an understanding of the multiple factors that bear on those searching as well as those being sought (Graban 188).

Thus, while the geospatial coordinates of McCutcheon's cartoons may include their actual and plausible circulation, the cartoons' publics signify more than just new audiences gained through a digital relocation of pen-and-ink drawings. They reflect tectonic shifts in our feminist historical landscape by drawing our attention to relationships between Suffragists and Suffrage

Figure 1.

Figure 2.

histories. These digital landscapes complicate—and cause us to critically ques-
tion—archival materials, their recirculation, and our role in their relocation.
The *locatable archive*, then, assumes a flexible reciprocal ecology that de-
scribes *how histories are performed*. For example, juxtaposing the "local preoc-
cupations" and "national characteristics" in her comparison of McCutcheon's
"Mrs. Pankhurst" (Gallery Image 6) to
McConnell's "James L. Hughes" (Figure
3), Jaqueline McLeod Rogers argues
that historiographic inquiry can show
how two cartoonists "domesticate" a
global problem (Rogers 37, this issue).
At stake in this analysis is the notion
that the cartoonists can be reread
not only in the context of sought in-
formation about their drawings, but
also according to how their digital
recirculation enables or disenables
their cross-cultural comparison. The
outcome is in our charting new rela-
tionships between the actual and vir-
tual places where digital images are
retained or have been exchanged,
and in the possibilities for recasting

Figure 3.

Suffrage histories as things that occur at the interface of the institutional, the archival, the digital, and the spatial.

In short, McCutcheon's intellectual publics reflect differences between practices, ideologies, and motives for how feminist recovery is done. As a result, the digital archive we construct through this special issue is transformative in several ways: it models a network that resists historical flattening, i.e., does not merely re-present or remediate material artifacts; it complicates even delimited spaces of circulation; and it offers a way to examine digital collections as historically dispersed sites for new critical possibilities.

Historical Unflattening: From Curation to Data Circulation

Ekaterina Haskins and Matthew Kirschenbaum urge us to re/imagine the digital archive within an information milieu that is dynamic and shared and to consider how accessing digital materials challenges our curatorial impulses, since—as the archival landscape becomes more digitally hybrid—our concerns about the optimal environment for preserving materials become more complex. I agree, but I also think that how we understand *working in digital spaces* depends on how well we can reinvent historiographic relationships through metadata. The Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) defines "metadata" as the "structured information that describes, explains, locates, or otherwise makes it easier to retrieve, use or manage an information resource."[1] Metadata can also be used to recreate *implicit relational networks*, enabling what Derek Mueller calls an inventorying or re-inventorying of those loci through which disciplinary knowledge circulates, gains attention, and gains or loses status (196)—for example, terms that approach the circulation of documents as a study in rhetorical agency, such as "participated in," "moved from," "finds/creates," or "is motivated by." Metadata can render history as relational by reflecting various slippages between physical and digital artifacts or repositories, by inspiring the construction of new digital environments, and by potentially reshaping available digital resources. In short, when we see the potential for metadata terms to disseminate rather than to curate and preserve knowledge, we can then understand the digital archive as an assemblage of ideas that draws attention to its own coming into being—its own process of historicization.

This rhetorical repositioning of metadata is demonstrative as well as inventive for something like the McCutcheon archive, *both* adapting our ways of knowing/searching to digital resources that come available *and* naming new ways of knowing/searching that emerge from these resources. But it requires a modified set of terms that privilege dissemination, inconstancy,

and portability, thereby supporting the shifting beliefs and motivations of McCutcheon researchers and their benefactors. These terms would probably not be derived from standard protocols like the Dublin Core (which assign tags to texts as if they were preserved artifacts or published work). Instead, as shown in Figure 4, these new standards might best be derived from terms that recognize the *vital movement of intellectual capital and curiosity in triangulated relationships* between McCutcheon, his subjects, their antecedents and audiences, and historians' contextualized motives for seeking them out. These terms might reflect questions such as: Where did researchers first learn about a particular subset of McCutcheon's cartoons and in what particular contexts? What broader Suffrage narratives or histories are challenged by the ways in which knowledge circulates about particular cartoons? What disciplinary ideologies are reinforced or challenged by the cartoons in these various combinations and recombinations? And, What are the various institutional and public motives by which the historicized cartoons get recirculated, or removed from circulation?

Dublin Core Metadata Standards	Alternative Metadata Relationships
1. Contributor	1. Researcher's affiliation(s)
2. Coverage	2. Geographic Locale(s)
3. Creator	3. Subject's Affiliation(s)
4. Date	4. Date(s)
5. Description	5. Relevant field(s)
6. Format	6. Related term(s)
7. Identifier	7. Related topic(s)
8. Language	8. Location(s) Found
9. Publisher	9. Ways(s) of Access
10. Relation	10. Purpose/Motive(s) for Access
11. Rights	
12. Source	
13. Title	
14. Type	

Figure 4. Table Comparing the Dublin Core Metadata Standards with Modified Tags that Reflect Circulation and Recirculation

While the Dublin Core describe *preservation* characteristics of distinct entities (objects, texts, artifacts), the "alternative" metadata standards can reflect relationships between entities by describing how those entities circulate, get used, or are constrained.

What this means for historians interested in archival metadata is a set of expectations defining relationships differently, and in turn requiring different

tagging practices to signal those relationships, how they occur, and how they can be historicized or traced. Purveyors of the digital archive might recognize in these alternative metadata tagging standards a useful historiographic methodology that better serves feminist and post-structural archival practices by representing datasets as fluid cultural forms mediating between readers, writers, texts, ideas, and the principles underlying their circulation. Most importantly, these tags derived from different "publics" help reframe revisionist histories, such as that of women's Suffrage, as acts of exposing perspectives that would otherwise be flattened in the process of digitization. Whereas curatorial database networks primarily re-present or remediate material artifacts, a feminist poststructural data network can continually reinvent historical events through *co-curation*—attending as Rebecca Dingo suggests, to "how arguments about women travel, shift, and change" as well as illustrating "these shifts in arguments, not just the arguments themselves" (14). This is especially useful for working in transnational digital spaces.

Complicating Circulation: From Tagging to Trusting

In part by inspiring this shifting activity, the metadata "publics" I identify in McCutcheon's archive form a *technogenesis of trust* by enabling us to recognize and participate in new "infrastructures of trustworthiness" (Miller 1) as we rewrite Suffrage histories within and across borders, observing how and when our own ideologies about transcontinental suffrage become circulatory filters or lenses. "Technogenesis," as N. Katherine Hayles argues, "is not about progress" or regression in the relationship between humans and their tools (or between historians and their technologies) but about *adaptation* and *engagement* (81). It is about the "coordinated transformations" of both humans and their various technologies or tools (81). In Hayles's scenario, historians' subjectivities and their abilities to trust in historical discourses are not contaminated by tools, but rather complicated through the spaces that tools help to illumine and delimit. What this means for the MTSCC is that its various tools of digitization don't only allow us to invent additional topical categories that account for McCutcheon's circulation; rather, we can invent new motives for doing Suffrage historiography by seeing the tensions and easements reflected in the terms that we seek and other terms we might employ.

The "publics" I introduce above work in much the same fashion. They are not necessarily determined according to the literal contents or portrayals in each of McCutcheon's cartoons, or intended to replace one normative interpretation for another, or to put one set of perspectives under erasure—that is, for example, diminishing the white male cartoonist's perspective in favor of the suffragist's or suffragette's. Rather, they are constituent portrayals that take into account how various agents interact through space and time, locally

and globally, over the whole archive. They allow us to arrive at a postmodern multiplicity of viewpoints and possibilities enabled by a flexible metadata model, and they are best realized in the archival interstices—the virtual and intellectual spaces between the cartoon portrayals and researchers' expectations of how those portrayals have worked, should work, or can now be understood as working. For the MTSCC, these interstitial publics portray multiple rhetorical situations, raising our reflective consciousness of various interpretive and dialectical inflections on *both* McCutcheon *and* his historians.

On one level (Figure 5), these publics reveal new or imagined metadata relationships between conservative and liberal oppositions to war; ethnophobia and ethnocentrism; oppositions to war and promotions of economic conscience; American and British conservatism; and promotion of economic consciousness, at home and abroad. For example, the locatability of "An Englishman's Home" (Gallery Image 1) is best realized in the various sets of political and historical issues around the British suffrage movement and how they are juxtaposed with discourses surrounding the threat of invasion by

Figure 5. Thematic Publics

German military forces. The cartoon references women's suffrage demonstrations in Parliament Square—the actual presence of women at the windows and breaking of windows of 10 Downing Street—over the preceding year. As

a result, we might see a public form at the intersection of war opposition and economic conscience, because it reflects Britain's preoccupation with warding off attacks by unnamed foreign powers (assumed to be Germany), and reflected in Britain's tendency to dramatize its own preoccupations, as in Guy du Maurier's 1909 threat-of-invasion play "An Englishman's Home," to which the cartoon alludes, and later in Alfred Hitchcock's *The Birds*, based on Daphne du Maurier's 1952 threat-of-invasion novelette by the same name. The resulting metadata tags for this cartoon might range from "British Conservatism," attached by a researcher who is empathetic to these cultural tensions; to "liberal ethnocentrism," attached by a researcher who recognizes that—on some level—the cartoon has been circulated and re-circulated among feminist groups to note the irony in Suffragettes being positioned as foreigners and liberals, both in 1909 and at historical junctures since then. Or it might be tagged "foreign invasion," by a researcher who is empathetic to cultural tensions or tagged "historical stereotyping," by a researcher who recognizes the irony of circulating this cartoon as a transnational artifact because it raises the question, Who stereotypes whom: America or Europe?

In "She's Been Kidded by Experts" (Gallery Image 8), we might see a public form at the intersection of conservative and liberal oppositions to war, not only because of McCutcheon's repeated motif that positions the American Suffragist as someone eager to avoid worldwide armament (and easily duped because of it), but because it reflects the desires of Suffrage historians and historiographers to mirror the political and strategic use of war in building campaigns and in tracing women's role as unintentional participants. Or, in "Mrs. Pankhurst" (Gallery Image 6), we might see a public formed at the intersection of liberal and conservative oppositions to war, not because McCutcheon's cartoons explicitly represent the 19th- or 20th-century citizen as acting out on her perceptions of conservatism or liberalism, but because this approach assumes a certain mutual understanding of the American and British positioning on civil disobedience and organizational leadership. These publics are similar to what Belinda Stillion Southard calls "movement constituencies," whereby ideological differences among supporters of the same movement can emerge as differences in lifestyle and political orientations, making it hard to claim Suffrage as either wholly inclusive or wholly disparate (130). Unlike database networks whose standards often define information by labeling and tagging what *has occurred*, interstitial publics reflect opportunities for complicating standards by labeling or tagging what *might occur given our pan-historiographic view of the whole digital archive*.

On another level or dimension (Figure 6), these publics emerge at the interstices of various role- or goal-based motivations and positionings, including

history, historiography, feminist criticism, social philosophy, rhetorical analysis, digital humanism, and archiving. Various triangulations make cross-disciplinary archival perspectives quite possible based on their converging and diverging expectations of transnationalism. Once realized or considered, these motivations and positionings can be used to discern new interstitial gaps and to articulate new entity relationships for further study in a limitless process.

Figure 6. Positional Publics

For example, in "The Women are Uniting Against War" (Gallery Image 9), the public formed at the intersection of ethnophobia and ethnocentrism in Figure 5 is discernable in more than one space between historian, rhetorical analyst, and feminist critic—again, not because McCutcheon's cartoons explicitly represent the 19th- or 20th-century citizen as acting rashly on her perceptions of others, but because this approach assumes that women's groups took an anti-imperialist stance across the world stage.

The interesting possibility this alternative metadata tagging creates for digital historiography is that these interstices may destabilize arguments about McCutcheon's portrayals of Suffrage as well as our digital re-appropriations of them, ultimately making it less clear to what degree he (and we) can, should, or even desire to be considered historical agents for Suffrage in the United States and abroad. Kristin Hoganson already complicates this

assumption in her histories of U.S. Suffrage discourse, by treating ethnophobia as a point of historical contention for turn-of-the-twentieth-century U.S. suffragists who, in the absence of a strong coalition with anti-Imperialists, couldn't justify their lack of attention to ethnocentrism. Hoganson argues that the American suffragist felt as politically hobbled as the Filipino (9), something that Mary Livermore admitted to at a November 1903 meeting of the New England Anti-Imperialist League in Boston. Another reason Hoganson offers is that the American suffragist's intense and inward examination of racial barriers and the need to overcome those barriers as a nation may have obscured the ways that her history was typical of other nationalist histories (11).

The interstices may also destabilize arguments about significant extant portrayals of Suffrage and Suffrage publics, such as those forwarded in Karlyn Kohrs Campbell's *Biocritical Sourcebook* as a result of women's involvements in public speaking from 1925-1993, a period she described as precipitated by the organizational differences between the National American Woman Suffrage Association and the National Women's Party, and a decade she said would "divide women activists along class lines and foreshado[w] more contemporary schisms" (xi). Rather than identifying Suffrage publics according to the schisms that stemmed from the 1913 ratification of women's vote to the gender gap which influenced voting through the 1992 elections (Cott 101-104, referenced in Campbell xi), examining the digital archive through the lens of interstitial publics may provide historians with a different way of reading how those activities were inextricably linked, difficult to disentangle, and moreover, difficult to engender given that they rely on several historical agents beyond the subjects they depict and beyond the audiences who presumably read them. Rather than link these Suffrage activities to past struggles, it is feasible to see them as indicative of *unarticulated* struggles, especially when those struggles imply complex roles for their viewing publics.

In considering how metadata publics present new possibilities for histories on McCutcheon, I am creating what Marlene Manoff has called the "archival effects" of McCutcheon's archive by indicating how the weight of its past can be justified in the gravity of its present. "Archival effects" reflect the intellectual "appetite" and "market" (Manoff 388) that the recontextualized and re-associated McCutcheon archive creates, becoming a historical object that new technologies can deliver and redeliver in its entirety. Rather than simply digitizing material artifacts and expecting them to reflect the same relationships that they do in print, the digital archive becomes a metaphor for nominating materials for historical examination, specifically to imagine what communities might have (had) access and what technologies, tagging practices, and publics should come next. By nature, these publics might resist grand narratives in favor of multilayered histories, they might be derived by an interest in quality

and depth of metadata rather than quantity, they might rely on the integration of historians and subjects in the same digital space, and they would most certainly reflect unfinished histories and histories in circulation. Our collective work on the MTSCC alters our sense of its history by causing what Manoff describes as a "proliferation" and recirculation "of historical artifacts in digital form" (388),[2] and in some cases creating a first-time circulation of the collection as necessarily *transatlantic*.

Critical Regionalism: Learning from Historically Dispersed Sites

While Manoff argues for the archive's ubiquity in the way it erodes boundaries between "virtual and material worlds " (392), I argue for its ubiquity based on what I can witness of historians' attitudes towards digitization and digital preservation and how they *evolve*. A methodological turn to the ubiquitous in feminist rhetorics is not only not *new*, it also unsurprising given our interest in the timeliness of practices, traditions, movements, and institutions—and hence our desires to realize a "greater awareness of place, manifested in specific sites where human action takes place" (Ayers 1). Such a methodological turn offers us a way to exploit digitally dispersed sites for the circulatory standpoints they make possible.

A recirculated archive leads to a kind of critical regionalism in research interests, working in contrast to the "flat" archival data that Jenny Rice says makes artifacts seem homogenous even when they reside in very different landscapes (202). For Rice, "critical regionalism" unflattens (or raises) those circumstances that would normally obscure not only what people *do* in particular space, but also how those spaces become or represent *rhetorical appeals to place*, i.e., how what people do marks them as part of the region, culturally or intellectually. Our treatment of McCutcheon's archive resembles critical regionalism because it demonstrates two of Rice's most critical traits.

Firstly, McCutcheon's involvements do not just mediate between the global and local—they mediate "between overlapping spheres of the local and global" by serving as regional interfaces (Rice 204). While I embrace Manoff's imagery that the inspired "creation of hybrid objects … provide[s] new historical contexts" (388) in something like the MTSCC, I take issue with the declaration that digitization simply causes our historical appetites for objects and artifacts to grow. In fact, the interstitial and transnational quality I argue for in the MTSCC is still primarily due to a recirculation and recombining of perspectives, and not so much to the invention or creation of distance between archival subjects as national vs. transnational, British vs. American, and global vs. local. Neither do McCutcheon's involvements occur inside of a smaller

geographic ring within a larger ring that signifies country or nation (Rice 206); in fact, his involvements are "non-concentric," reflecting multiple complicated and conflicting relations to his own national identity and that of his subjects (Rice 206). "Regions" in Rice's critical regionalism do not serve as territorial containers, but as "topological meetinghouse[s] for large-scale questions that have coalesced into an exigence in a particular time and place" (205). For example, Figures 5 and 6 are meant to illustrate regional assemblages that "are not permanent, nor are they ahistorical. Their proximity is temporary," and therefore they operate more as temporary folds for theorizing than they do statements about membership or identity bound up in certain spheres (Rice 209).

Secondly, McCutcheon's involvements are strategic, which means they constitute a strategic and rhetorical performance, "a strategic interface, which stands in a marked contrast to the perceived naturalism of the national, the local, and even the cosmopolitan" (Rice 210). By arguing for McCutcheon's archival effects as historical appetites or markets, and for the digital archive's data standards as *regions*, I suggest that out of digitization comes a transformative historical ecology that already demonstrates complex connections between users and their past, present, and future queries. In recasting this digital archive according to the unfinished nature of these connections, we can truly define it as transnational. Most importantly, the unfinished network is productive, collaborative, and operates according to what Cathy Davidson has called the many-to-many principle that is characteristic of "humanities 2.0" projects (709)—these projects demonstrate "a humanities of engagement that addresses our collective histories and [our collective] concern for history" (715). The MTSCC becomes characterized by its own dispersal—its own "interactivity and user participation" (Davidson 709).

Conclusion

As Cheryl Glenn and Jessica Enoch have argued: archival records are "inert until they are animated" (331), and thus historical research in archives necessarily must be more than a striving towards a truer more correct interpretation, i.e., more than a supposed reversal of damage or falsification (331). This is why I see our work—*networking* archives—as critically significant. Where Manoff sees a reconciliation of database, narrative, and archival metaphors in complex projects like these, we see an archive's ubiquity in the various publics (institutional, academic, social, feminist, and anti-feminist) that become evident when its transnationalism is an outcome of its digitality, and when we treat the cartoon as an archival subject in the abstract as well as the material sense.

However, my recommitment to *archive* and *ecology* as metaphors for tracing intellectual capital should not be confused with Michele Foucault's ecology

as a site for observing power shifts (*Archaeology*), or be understood as a simple nod to Bruno Latour's actor-network theory, which treats the social as visible only when it is being modified (159). Like Foucault and Latour, I embrace these metaphors as lenses and filters through which historical communities can be examined, and I think the social and political dimensions of a community can be recognized as immaterial forms in constant re/circulation. However, *unlike* Foucault's archival ecology and Latour's actor-network model, in the metadata relationships comprising McCutcheon's transnational archive, there is not necessarily a single extant body politic waiting to be discovered or noticed as emergent through the right kind of network that shows its own traces. Rather, the network of information *becomes evident as a set of contingencies that involve researchers' motives and interests*. This in turn calls for understanding a community of historians' role in not only mapping those territories but in obscuring territory in the first place. This is the tectonic shift that renders a new landscape.

As a case in point, what we have identified as our own subset of these McCutcheon cartoons focusing on transatlantic portrayals of Suffrage in the image gallery has been circulated and re-circulated, expanded, and even shortened over six times since the formation of our Feminisms and Rhetorics panel in early 2013, with each of those expansions and circulations dictated by our various motives and needs for the collection, as well as the ways we felt the collection needed to be brought into conversation with other cartoons from our research. In posing McCutcheon's digitization as transnational, we are investigating "the way any geo-political (ethnic, cultural) construct is criss-crossed and thus mutually constructed by others" (Bizzell and Jarratt 22). We are considering what the cartoons' metadata help us to complicate or to contest about how we study Suffrage, what are the ways Suffrage can be studied, and who we determine are leaders and pioneers in Suffrage's historicization, especially if they complicate what we have taken for granted as geographic relations or *a priori* relationships (Markoff 90).

In this way, digitization gives voice to a different set of contingencies. While we do value the construction and analysis of archives for accessibility, we are more concerned with the "decentering" of knowledge and authority (Davidson 711) that occurs when we acknowledge the archive as a work in progress contingent upon each other's discoveries. In our critical approach to the MTSCC, we can see revealed what John Markoff a decade ago called the "paradigmatic" history of women's suffrage—a history that relies on the ability to track Suffrage ideologies in time and space (90), to recognize the legislative ambiguities and disambiguities as they occurred (88) and continue to occur, and to realize the connections between natural and economic events and Suffrage (103), and between geography and "democratic innovation" (106).

Women's suffrage has always been a global endeavor whose local or regional successes and failures should not be evaluated distinctly from the global (91), and moreover, where historical narratives should not be read apart from the ideologies that help them to circulate.

Notes

1   For archival description, this typically involves the international Dublin Core, a set of fifteen terms used for naming preservation data fields, and intended for creators and users of open-access archives to achieve a certain level of coherence and stability among the records they describe or create.

2   I do depart from Manoff's argument about digital libraries and ubiquitous proliferation in that I am not primarily arguing for digital proliferation or archival *abundance*, but rather for archival *nuance*. I find the term *nuance* useful for presenting one way that McCutcheon's archive has shaped and can shape historians' thinking about *virtual spaces* as abstractions, "increasing the weight of the past while the present appears to shrink through accelerating cycles of innovation and obsolescence" (Manoff 388).

Works Cited

Ayers, Edward L. "Turning toward Place, Space, and Time." Bodenhamer, *et al*, eds., 1-13.

Bizzell, Patricia, and Susan Jarratt. "Rhetorical Traditions, Pluralized Canons, Relevant History, and Other Disputed Terms: A Report from the History of Rhetoric Discussion Groups at the ARS Conference." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 34.3 (Summer 2004): 19-25.

Bodenhamer, David, John Corrigan, and Trevor M. Harris, eds. *The Spatial Humanities: GIS and the Future of Humanities Scholarship*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2010. Print.

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. "Introduction." *Women Public Speakers in the United States, 1925-1993: A Bio-critical Sourcebook*. Ed. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell. Westport, CT: Greenwood P, 1994. xi-xxiii. Print.

Davidson, Cathy N. "Humanities 2.0: Promise, Perils, Predictions." *PMLA* 123.3 (2008): 707-17. Print.

Dingo, Rebecca. *Rhetoric, Transnational Feminism, and Public Policy Writing*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2012. Print.

Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge.* New York: Pantheon/Random House, 1972.

Glenn, Cheryl, and Jessica Enoch. "Drama in the Archives: Rereading Methods, Rewriting History." *College Composition and Communication* 61.2 (Dec 2009): 321-42. Print.

Graban, Tarez Samra. "From Location(s) to Locatability: Mapping Feminist Recovery and Archival Activity through Metadata." *College English* 76.2 (2013): 171-93. Print.

Haskins, Ekaterina. "Between Archive and Participation: Public Memory in a Digital Age." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 37.4 (2007): 401-22. Print.

Hayles, N. Katherine. *How We Think: Digital Media and Contemporary Technogenesis*. Chicago: U Chicago P, 2012. Print.

Hoganson, Kristin. "'As Badly Off as the Filipinos': U.S. Women's Suffragists and the Imperial Issue at the Turn of the Twentieth Century." *Journal of Women's History* 13.2 (2001): 9-33. Print.

Kirschenbaum, Matthew G. "The .txtual Condition: Digital Humanities, Born-Digital Archives, and the Future Literary." *DHQ: Digital Humanities Quarterly* 7.1 (2013): 1-12. Web. http://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/7/1/000151/000151.html.

Latour, Bruno. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. New York and London: Oxford UP, 2005. Print.

Manoff, Marlene. "Archive and Database as Metaphor: Theorizing the Historical Record." *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 10.4 (2010): 385-98. JSTOR. Web.

Markoff, John. "Margins, Centers, and Democracy: The Paradigmatic History of Women's Suffrage." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 29.1 (2003): 85-116. Print.

Miller, Susan. *Trust in Texts: A Different History of Rhetoric*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2008. Print.

Mueller, Derek. "Grasping Rhetoric and Composition by Its Long Tail: What Graphs Can Tell Us about the Field's Changing Shape." *CCC* 64.1 (Sep 2012): 195-223. Print.

Rice, Jenny. "From Architectonic to Tectonics: Introducing Regional Rhetorics." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 42.3 (2012): 201-213. Print.

Royster, Jacqueline Jones, and Gesa E. Kirsch. *Feminist Rhetorical Practices: New Horizons for Rhetoric, Composition, and Literacy Studies*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2012. Print.

Stillion Southard, Belinda A. "A Rhetoric of Inclusion and the Expansion of Movement Constituencies: Harriot Stanton Blatch and the Classed Politics of Woman Suffrage." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 44.2 (2014): 192-47. Print.

About the Author

Tarez Samra Graban is Assistant Professor of English at Florida State University, where she teaches rhetorical theory, composition theory, historical methodologies, and public discourse. Because of her interests in feminist theory and in how women's rhetorical practices get historicized in print and digital spaces, she often works at the intersection of archives and the digital humanities. Her historical work appears in *Rhetorica, Gender and Language, College English*, and various edited collections, including *Rhetoric and the Digital Humanities* (U Chicago, forthcoming), and *Working in the Archives: Practical Research Methods for Rhetoric and Composition* (SIUP, 2010).