

Geopolitics in the Anti-Suffrage Cartoons of American John Tinney McCutcheon and Canadian Newton McConnell: Stopping Trans-Atlantic Flow

Jaqueline McLeod Rogers

Many feminist historians would agree that “one of the first major transnational struggles of women was over the right to vote,” an issue appealing to “global principles that transcended national boundaries” (Tripp 56). A key strategy in the cartoons of John Tinney McCutcheon—one that can also be seen in the work of prominent Canadian cartoonist Newton McConnell—is to deny the global appeal and relevance of the woman’s suffrage movement by depicting national barriers to its spread: neither the movement nor its leaders are given a smooth Atlantic crossing in these cartoons that offer geopolitical arguments against the importation of suffrage activism. While both McCutcheon and McConnell establish Britain as the home of female activism and depict suffrage as being out of place—unnecessary and even dangerous—on their respective home grounds of the U.S. and Canada, careful comparison of their cartoons reveals that each makes a unique place-based case energized by details of local and national character.

To depict suffrage activism as foreign to and unwelcome on home ground, McCutcheon depicts it as a British phenomenon and America as a place where women are winning the right to vote through peaceable means. He exudes national pride and confidence in a cartoon that reduces the energetic and charismatic British suffrage leader Emmeline Pankhurst to the role of being a student of the American women’s movement. Entirely lacking McCutcheon’s sense of the power of nation and culture to overcome imported suffragette ideals, McConnell imagines British-style activism as tearing apart traditional gender relations and civic calm in Canada. His cartoon of mob violence erupting on a Toronto street imagines a scene worse than any that actually occurred or appeared in media representations, for in it the women are uncontrolled and the men endangered. Both cartoonists say no to British-style activism: McCutcheon by imagining America as capable of exerting educative influence on the British-based political movement, and McConnell by imagining colonized Canada as unable to withstand the force of such disorder.

Despite making unique nation-based arguments against suffrage activism, McConnell and McCutcheon mount their opposition using a shared

overall strategy: depicting suffrage activism as foreign to their culture—unwelcome, unnecessary, even dangerous on their home ground. This same approach continues to be practiced today amongst those who want to make conservative claims to regional or national identity and defend their borders against change. A similar strategy can be understood, for example, as contributing to the Danish cartoon scandal, which called upon the Danish people to assert their identity as different from and even opposed to Muslim others, who were depicted as unsuitable outsiders in cartoons of varying vehemence. Most of us are familiar with the story of how these cartoons caught public interest and caused offense. In 2006, a series of political cartoons seized the imagination of people around the world, when the *Jyllands-Posten* ran a series of 12 cartoon images of Mohammed. Muslims made death threats against the paper and some of the cartoonists who contributed images, causing divisions between those who defended the secular value of individual liberty and those who defended the rights of Muslims to practice their religion without mockery they deemed blasphemous. In this latter vein, Giseline Kuipers pointed out that publishing these cartoons was an act of veiled aggression on the part of the Danish paper under the guise of humor and fun, targeting an already oppressed minority and depicting them in the process as humorless and dangerous (67). There is a link, then, between the strategies of exclusion used by early twentieth-century anti-suffrage cartoonists to show suffrage activism as geographically and culturally out of place and those used in the recent controversy to erect national borders against others on the basis of race and religion.

Cartoons with Borders: Sending Suffrage Back to Britain

In pre-WWI years, British-based suffrage groups, though themselves splintered rather than united, conceptualized their struggle as transnational and had expansionist aims to grow the women's movement across national boundaries. *Votes for Women*, the newspaper of the militant Women's Social and Political Union (WSPU), reported its progress as becoming "imperial" rather than national when a branch opened in British Columbia in 1912, "and suggested that 'There is much to be gained by making the Votes for Women agitation Imperial in its scope, for success in one part of the Empire will contribute to success in every other part'" (Fletcher 106). In London, the more moderate Women's Freedom League (WFL) held a four-day fair in 1912, calling for "Women of the Nations, [to] unite!" The fair was convened to symbolize and celebrate "the spirit of 'internationalism' unfolding across the world by serving as a meeting place for 'liberty-loving women from many lands (Fletcher 111). While suffragist networks spread quickly around the geographically connected

countries of Great Britain (from England to Ireland, Scotland and Wales) as well as to colonized countries like Canada, Australia and India, suffrage activists made additional efforts to connect to women in the United States, such as the invitation for American women to join in the Suffrage Pilgrimage of 1913. In sum, the movement's members self-consciously spread its reach by engaging other women wherever they were denied the vote.

As [Kristie S. Fleckenstein](#) points out in the first essay of this special issue, suffrage was a *fin de siècle* preoccupation within media as well as in lived political life, and cartoonists who tackled this subject drew from a media ecology whose networks crossed spaces and genres. In the process of transnational borrowing and circulation, individual cartoonists modify media images with place-based touches so that they appear to be “the same and different,” to borrow the phrase linguist Alastair Pennycook uses to describe the generative possibility of localization (49). We can see this process playing out in McCutcheon's cartoon that depicts the iconic figure of Emmeline Pankhurst on American soil, observing a dignified display of the political progress of American women, and quietly taking a backseat rather than a leadership role ([Gallery Image 6](#)). In this case, a sense of difference is emphasized as the powerfully energetic Pankhurst undergoes place-based transformation. McConnell's cartoons also transfer trans-Atlantic themes and images to a Canadian context, yet they do so in a process that explores misfit and the potential for conflict. For example, McConnell's depiction of a women's suffrage mob raging through the streets of Toronto alters popular media images of violence—which usually show women being physically restrained by men or arrested by officers—by portraying the mob as in control of the street while men are on the run. These cartoon adaptations of popular media images invoke a “not in our backyard” attitude by showing how key elements of the movement do not fit with—in fact, may jeopardize—local life and culture.

Conversely, visuals can also show regional problems as global issues. Several media critics have explored the general process by which stories and events from the world stage are captured in cartoons to make the exotic accessible for a local readership. Josh Greenberg points out many political cartoons set social problems in the everyday world, in an “ideological appropriation” that allows readers to mobilize local standards of meaning-making to make sense of events that otherwise belong out there to a wider world (1). Ray Morris uses the term “domestication”—introduced by Erving Goffman to discuss popular art—to explain how cartoons make persons and situations from remote regions more accessible by presenting them in recognizable ways. He defines domestication as “the process by which abstract ideas and distant, unfamiliar persons or events are converted into something close, familiar and concrete” (200) and says its purpose is to “translat[e] what is novel and hard

to understand into the commonplace by highlighting mutual elements and masking unique ones and by focusing on repetitive patterns to minimize novelty and mental adjustment” (201). Both Greenberg and Morris note that localization tends to oversimplify or distort complex external affairs, a point borne out in suffrage cartoons.

Yet the process of domesticating Suffrage in North American cartoons unfolds somewhat differently from what Greenberg and Morris describe: while these cartoons do localize abstract ideas and persons from far away, such ideas and persons are not made comfortably familiar or translated into a welcome “commonplace.” Close analysis of selected cartoons by McCutcheon and McConnell reveals a shared opposition to suffrage as it is understood through the British model, although place-based orientation leads each cartoonist to muster his own forms of opposition. In examining McCutcheon’s “Mrs. Pankhurst” ([Gallery Image 6](#)) in contrast to McConnell’s “James L. Hughes,” I trace how both find different grounds to reject the leadership of Emmeline Pankhurst. I will also look at how McCutcheon’s “An English Man’s Home” ([Gallery Image 1](#)) and McConnell’s “Mayor Oliver” (Figure 1) use different means to depict a suffragette mob as unwelcome on their home ground. When

the women’s movement comes to Toronto in McConnell’s cartoons, it threatens civic peace and social patterns. When the women’s movement comes to McCutcheon’s America, there is a need for surveillance, along with an opportunity to parade American solutions; the scenes of activism McCutcheon depicts belong to British geo-politics.

Most U.S. readers will be less familiar with McConnell’s work than with McCutcheon’s. Elisha Newton McConnell (1877-1940) is known to have worked for the

Figure 1.

Toronto Daily News from 1904 to 1912, and with 1170 drawings and 330 of his prints and engravings preserved as public documents, his archival presence establishes him as a figure of some historical significance. Yet not a lot of scholarly work has been done to analyze his impact on Canadian cultural or political life, and it can be observed that his artistic skills are not as strong as McCutcheon’s, which may contribute to their being comparatively less complex and creative. McConnell’s cartoons aim to engage or enrage, in the broad

satirical spirit of the British *Punch* and in keeping with an anti-suffrage stance popular in other Canadian cartoons. In a thesis tracing political cartooning throughout Canadian history, Bruce Retallack characterizes Canadian cartoonists as sharply negative toward suffrage, becoming increasingly pejorative as a way of “shower[ing] ridicule on [Suffragists] demands” (437):

The demand for women’s suffrage emerged as a major issue at the end of the nineteenth century, and became considerably more heated in the early twentieth. As a result the negative cartoon characterization of women, which otherwise might have cropped up only sporadically, appeared much more frequently than before, ... as (male) artists from coast to coast refined their vision of feminists and suffragists in order to shower ridicule on their demands.

While McConnell may not have the same national stature as McCutcheon does in the U.S., Retallack’s analysis helps to establish McConnell’s approach as representative of a Canadian approach to presenting cartoon images of suffrage.

McCutcheon’s and McConnell’s cartoons engage similar *topoi*—Emmeline Pankhurst and suffragette women. However, McCutcheon’s opposition to suffrage is more subtle. He delivers what has sometimes been called an American “cracker box” style of humor by showcasing American good judgment and wisdom in a non-derisive way that may provoke audience reflection. McCutcheon depicts America as modeling an independent and enviable approach to dealing with women’s rights—one unfolding without Mrs. Pankhurst’s guidance—but McConnell sees a threat in England as a threat to Canada, and is sharply intolerant of the cause itself and of male sympathizers.

McCutcheon’s “Mrs. Pankhurst” and McConnell’s “James L. Hughes”: Saying “No” to Trans-Atlantic Influence and Leadership

Emmeline Pankhurst was the lead figure and symbol of the suffragette movement in Britain where, by founding the Women’s Social and Political Union (WSPU), she openly advocated for the use of violence as a necessary tactic to move the cause for women’s franchise equality forward. She toured North America three times, raising money to fund her organization in England, as well as in support of internationalizing the women’s movement and influencing the political situation of North American women. She toured both Canada and the U.S. in 1909 and 1911, and then the U.S. only in 1913, visiting Chicago and Toronto. While the North American public had opportunities to encounter Mrs. Pankhurst in person, for most she remained a figure

known through media reports and images as the symbolic spokesperson for the movement.

It is possible to link McCutcheon's cartoon to the political controversy that developed around Pankhurst in 1913 when on her third attempt to tour America, she was detained at Ellis Island on the charge of "moral turpitude" (Bartley 171). Biographer Paula Bartley summarizes the event in this way:

When she arrived at Ellis Island, New York, on the French liner *La Provence* in October 1913, she was not allowed to land. ... [W]hen she confessed to the interviewing immigration officer that she had been in prison and had countenanced arson, she was refused entry.

On the intervention of President Wilson, Pankhurst was eventually allowed to enter the country for a shortened visit, but her detention and admission caused controversy. The arch conservative Chicago newspaper, the *Inter Ocean*, for example, opposed her entry asking whether "deliberate incendiaryism, ... the incitement of half-crazed fanatics to assault, arson, pouring acids in mailboxes and the destruction of the property of peaceful citizens does not present evidence of 'moral turpitude'" (172).

McCutcheon's cartoon responds to the controversy by arguing that Mrs. Pankhurst should be allowed to visit America. The top frame exposes the problem arising from turning Emmeline Pankhurst away, and the bottom frame reveals the good that can come from allowing her visit. Together, these frames suggest that she should be made welcome to avoid undermining America's claim to being a place of liberty and to seize the chance to educate this British woman in the ways of American process. The top frame on the right side of the cartoon depicts the relatively small figure of Christobel Pankhurst being welcomed in France. She strikes much the same posture as the larger statue of Marianne, the French symbol of liberty, conveying that while the Pankhurst women may belong in "monumental" company, they themselves have not attained such symbolic status: if Christobel's stance resembles the pose Marianne strikes, she is comparatively small and human. On the left side providing a contrast scene, Emmeline Pankhurst is being turned away by the Statue of Liberty who, unlike Marianne, has lost her dignified posture and is instead stooped over to manage the details of day-to-day security, holding up a sign that says "Keep Out." The transatlantic comparison in this top frame does not paint the U.S. in a favorable light, for France remains the untarnished representative of the freedoms that the U.S. now opposes. The American coast is littered with similar signs to the one Lady Liberty holds, in opposition to the open-handedness she usually represents.

McCutcheon's cartoon is calling for a revised approach to the impending visit of Emmeline Pankhurst and to the form of radical suffrage she represents.

She is welcome in America if she leaves her politics at home and is prepared to be guided by American leadership. The bottom frame shows Pankhurst in America, riding in the back of a touring car that has two banners "Votes for Women" and "Seeing America." She is observing and applauding ten women lined up representing suffrage states. In choosing to stage a parade as a persuasive spectacle in this cartoon, McCutcheon recreates a cultural reality for, as Jennifer Borda argues, suffrage parades were frequently used to sway members of the public and government (3). While on one level, McCutcheon's overall argument in favor of showing off America and the American way can be understood as an expression of civic and national pride, on another he may be more cynically implying that Mrs. Pankhurst's trip and tour are themselves media events that deal with reputations and optics more than with values and change. Implicitly, the cartoon asks the audience to think how they want the American nation to be perceived by others on questions of liberty and access.

The American woman serving as Mrs. Pankhurst's tour guide, standing and relatively dignified, is drawn as bigger than Mrs. Pankhurst, conveying in this visual trope that an energetic American woman outstrips a legendary British woman. Visiting America, being instructed rather than leading—taking a backseat—Mrs. Pankhurst may even lose her reputation for leading an international women's movement—at least one that includes women in the United States. The texts spell out what the visuals convey: it is better to let Mrs. Pankhurst in, for America has nothing to fear from her (except losing liberty by overreacting) and she has much to learn.

This cartoon is built on contrasts, which Medhurst and DeSousa refer to as the "basic form" of arrangement in visual rhetoric. Apart from the contrast images already discussed, there is also contrast established by the text. The first of two captions question turning Mrs. Pankhurst back, while the second asks, rhetorically, if it isn't better to show her the American way. Within the frames there are also signs to read. In the top frame, the U.S. side is littered with signs that say "keep out," ironically reversing the attitude of openness and welcome usually associated with Lady Liberty. On the French side, Marianne holds a flag that bears the three words: "Liberty, Fraternity, Equality." There is also strong contrast in the dialogue. The Statue of Liberty has abandoned statuesque pose and the duty of guiding ships to safe harbor and instead, using undignified vernacular—marked by contractions and an exclamation—she attempts to send Pankhurst away, fearing Pankhurst will teach "our girls" to be arsonists. Referring to women as girls is both informal and demeaning—further aligning with thoughtlessness, even ignorance, the argument of those citing American values as reason to bar Emmeline Pankhurst from entering the country. In contrast, the second frame depicts the statuesque dignity of the American women who represent suffrage states and the animated yet

striking presence of the female figure who is showcasing the accomplishment of winning voting rights in ten states without violence.

Turning to McConnell's "James L. Hughes" (Figure 2), we have a cartoon that undermines suffrage activism not by rendering its leader powerless but by depicting the impending visit of Emmeline Pankhurst as dangerous to Toronto citizenry. The cartoon caricatures a minor political figure, James L. Hughes, so it is difficult to pin down the controversy that may have triggered this image. Archival information describes Hughes as committed to educational reforms.

He wrote, for example, about the need for both sexes to receive physical education. For his public engagement in promoting women's rights, he is skewered in this caricature as a man who is confused about his own gender representation, off balance and shameless. Feminizing men by cross-dressing them in women's clothing was a frequent gesture used by several Canadian cartoonists—a staple as to be considered a category onto itself by one analyst of the

Figure 2.

form (Morris, *Jester*). Their gendered identification as male is not obliterated or erased, for physiognomy is basically unaltered even in costume, which at the time was thought to convey a humorous sense of incongruity. What is undermined is their understanding of socially-coded gender difference and behavior.

If we set aside what McConnell may have meant by making Hughes his particular target, we are compelled to ask about who or what is missing from this frame. In this cartoon whose purpose is to denounce suffrage, the main target is a male figure, and women are entirely absent. This captures the extent of McConnell's male-dominant world view—he depicts a woman's issue by examining how it affects men. Women are neither fit to participate in actual political life, as his antagonism to the principle of suffrage demonstrates, nor in his fantasy cartoon world, where those who bear the lash of his pen are male actors.

The most interesting stylistic elements in McConnell's caricature are the lines indicating motion and body position. The circular lines around Hughes convey that he is whirling around in a jig, another sign of his having abandoned sense at the prospect of Mrs. Pankhurst's arrival. The dance, coupled

with the dress, paints those who anticipate or support Mrs. Pankhurst as dangerous transgressors, precariously off balance. He raises one tiny-heeled foot in the air, and stands on the toes of his other foot, another way of depicting him as off balance. The tome he holds aloft in his left hand is unidentifiable, signifying an absence of meaning; it counterbalances the umbrella as weapon that he wields in his right hand. The figure chants “Votes for Women,” indicating his commitment to a slogan rather than anything more complex. His grim facial expression conveys that dedication to this cause leads to misery.

The date for this cartoon is not firm. A biography of Mrs. Pankhurst points out that her 1909 tour was a media triumph in Toronto, eliciting praise for her appearance, demeanor and counsel: “The Toronto newspapers echoed the reporter who spoke of his surprise at ‘meeting instead of the Amazon type he had expected, the very reverse, the woman of palpable culture and refinement, low-voiced, courteous, and well-bred. She is the last woman you would imagine leading band of shrieking sisterhood against the bluecoats of Westminster’” (Bartley 166). On this trip, the force of her presence overcame negative prejudices. We can speculate that the cartoon appeared either before her tour as part of a furor of opposition or that it appeared soon after as a reaction against her unexpected popularity. In either case, in McConnell’s view suffrage is linked to foolishness and violence, a view that gained support in Canada in the years following 1909 when acts of WSPU violence increased.

McCutcheon’s “An Englishman’s Home” and McConnell’s “Mayor Oliver”: Keeping Suffragette Mobs Out

To depict the growth of the suffragette movement, McCutcheon chooses England as the setting, conveying that women’s sense of being treated unjustly is not so much a transnational as a British problem. In “An Englishman’s Home” ([Gallery Image 1](#)), Prime Minister Asquith sits in his home, in a seat of power and comfort, his back turned to the woman problem outside his window and coming into his home. This is a home “invasion” in Edwardian times—but the homeowner remains oblivious. Asquith is consumed by reading about traditional patriarchal domestic governance under the comforting gaze of a predecessor’s portrait.

For their part, the women in the cartoon appear to be assertive and determined, but not overly aggressive or angry. They are both well-behaved and well-dressed, wearing hats and fur pieces. This relates to another of McCutcheon’s suffrage cartoons, “A Modern Martyr Goes to Jail” ([Gallery Image 2](#)), showing a wealthy suffragette being taken to “gaol” under what appears to be the helpful escort of two “bobbies”; she wears a crown and a maid

and nanny follow behind. She is wealthy, and the drawing suggests her wealth protects her from any real danger. The arrest is like an adventure, and she is shown striding forward, almost leading the way. This cartoon strips British suffragette protest of any heroism: protesting women in England are protected by their wealth and class from the full force of the law and government, and their protests and arrests may be more about public performance and personal adventure than about dedication to principled equality. The women outside the Prime Minister's windows in this cartoon, however, are not unsympathetic characters. This is no irrational or ragged mob, but a group that is mannerly and orderly—some appearing more curious than determined as they peer into the Prime Minister's home. In this picture the deliberate oblivion of the powerful male is the target of satire, and the women are shown as interested in gaining some access to this comfortable seat of power.

Whereas Asquith is well defined and holds the central position in the frame, the women are in sketch form, barely filled in. This reinforces the relative power positions, with Asquith ensconced in a room of his own. Stylistically, the section of the cartoon depicting Asquith is well defined. He has settled into a chair whose curved feminine lines hold him in a comforting embrace and is warmed by the gaze of a male ancestor in portraiture. He is protected from the crowd of women that remain outside. They hold simple signs, but he has the company of books.

If McCutcheon implies that mob activism takes place only on British soil and not in America, then McConnell—in "Mayor Oliver"—images it taking shape in Toronto with a force and vehemence that exceeds both historical records and common media depictions. Whereas cartoons showing suffragist activism often show women under the escort and control of police, McConnell envisions a mob of women running wild, chasing men as their victims rather than policed by them. McConnell's cartoon is dated around 1910, and we know that he was a mayor who did not stand for reelection in that year. As was the case in analyzing McConnell's caricature of the local political figure Hughes, this cartoon is also difficult to analyze because the Mayor and his sidekick are not well known with the passage of time. Mayor Oliver may have had a reputation for attempting to withhold information from the public, which seems to be the jibe that underlies his pondering this question: "Wonder who told them we didn't encourage the suffragette movement in Toronto?" This sounds like a politician who depends on secrecy and who is unpleasantly surprised that women have discovered or guessed that he has in some way opposed suffrage. The caption is further interesting for suggesting that the women have not amassed for the political purpose of seeking the vote. They are

after revenge rather than rights—they are pictured as reacting in anger to rumor or a leak, rather than taking reasoned action.

Also notable in this cartoon is the way McConnell depicts the angry mob. They appear to be middle-class, mostly middle aged, and dangerous: brandishing umbrellas and canes and wearing high-heeled boots and wide-brimmed hats, with pointed feathers designed to harm. Located on the upper right is a man's top hat floating over the crowd—without supplying grisly details, this visual detail hints that it is dangerous for men to get caught up in this crowd. Momentum is on the side of the mob, and the men are on the run. As in the other cartoon by McConnell, again women themselves are not the central figures. This is not presented as a woman's story but as a *man's*—or at least, the cartoon is clearly drawn from the perspective of male experience. We are given a close up of those in jeopardy—men who wield political power but who are now on the run.

McConnell's representation of suffrage supporters in Toronto as a violent mob is not based on any actual Canadian scenes of violence. Historian Paula Bartley emphasizes the relative passivism of the Canadian suffragists who "disagreed that militancy was the way forward. In contrast with both the British and the American women's suffrage movements, Canadian suffragists generally behaved rather decorously in their campaign for the vote, lacking the flamboyant militancy of some of their British and American counterparts" (164). McConnell's drawings appear to respond to controversies raging in the British press against the suffragette threat and against Mrs. Pankhurst's endorsement of civic violence. In the Canadian colony, legal bondage to the Empire was still on the minds of many who had been involved in the commitment of some 7000 soldiers sent as part of the Boer War effort, which had only ended in 1902. A mere decade later, traditional and conservative Canadians would view Emmeline Pankhurst as a public enemy for being criminalized in England. Those who followed her endangered themselves and the social and civic order.

By contrast, as a U.S. citizen, McCutcheon inherited a view of the U.S. as independent of English influence and a view of citizens as "those who did not support British patriots. . . . [so that] women, like men, have technically been citizens since the birth of our republic" (Ramsey 12). While his cartoons do not advocate for women's rights, they also do not depict suffrage supporters as figures of foolishness. Instead, McCutcheon targets the class-based British response to the suffragette movement, and he makes privilege the object of folly in several of the frames. Yet he is not fearful that problems in England will automatically become American problems. He does not depict Emmeline Pankhurst as a dangerous and influential figure, but as one who can learn from American women about orderly change.

While McConnell is the more conservative of the two for re-inscribing without challenging hegemonic or dominant anti-suffrage views, McCutcheon can also be understood as conservative in protecting the status quo by inviting viewers to admire slow and orderly change.

Yet differences in how each depicts the transfer of suffrage activism from Britain to their homeland may also reflect differences in the nationhood status of America and Canada, the former independent and the latter still a colony. McConnell's concern that trouble in Britain will lead to trouble in Canada reflects the vulnerability of a nation that continues in the service of another, whereas McCutcheon's sense of American invulnerability reflects the confidence of a nation growing powerful in independence.

Using Political Cartoons to Map Boundaries: Being In and Out of Place

Elisabeth El Refaie points out that the word "cartoon" appeared mid-nineteenth century in the British satirical publication *Punch* to refer to illustrations criticizing government plans for opulent parliament buildings when so many citizens were struggling in poverty (185). She describes how the publication of such cartoons caused a sensation because the public, used to text, was strongly affected by the visual impact of the images. By contrast, contemporary readers tend to take editorial cartoons for granted, a staple of newspapers rather than innovative. Only occasionally do editorial cartoons catch the public attention, as in the case of the Danish cartoon scandal, which touched on contentious global issues of mass immigration, post-secularism and pluralism, deepening divisions between various groups: those defending free speech and/or modernist ideals of nationhood and identity and those committed to the project of loosening geopolitical borders and asserting religious rights. Apart from sparking scholarly and political debates about human rights and national identity, the cartoons affected a global audience by fostering a sense of victimization within the Muslim community and fueling anti-Muslim sentiment amongst those upholding the ideal of a fixed national identity.

Cartoons can be used a vehicle associated with humor to isolate and ridicule an oppressed group within the nation and to incite ill will. This is the context for understanding early twentieth century anti-suffrage cartoons that likewise adopted the strategy of depicting the oppression of women as part of the national interest. At root, the Danish cartoon scandal can be described as an act of aggression against a group with global affiliations whose local presence had become for many a national irritant; similarly, anti-suffrage cartoons expressed national ill-will against a group and movement whose power spanned beyond national borders, arguing they should keep out (McConnell)

or be prepared to follow house rules upon entry (McCutcheon). Like the Danish cartoons, the anti-suffrage cartoons of McCutcheon and McConnell similarly place a transnational problem on a national stage in order to make a case that the foreign element cannot be domesticated and jeopardizes social and political order. There is a problem with fit.

In our time, we have seen Muslims portrayed as humorless and dangerous; in the anti-suffrage cartoons of McConnell and the subtler McCutcheon, women linked to radicalism are similarly drawn as humorless and in need of containment. If Denmark claimed free speech as key to national identity in a way that disenfranchised Muslims concerned with religious rights, McCutcheon and McConnell each make claims about local and national character that oppose the claims of the suffrage movement. In McCutcheon's cartoons, those agitating for suffrage must be acknowledged as part of a process of containment, a step required to maintain slow process in the American way. In McConnell's cartoons, suffrage is dangerous, upsetting the gender decorum of peaceable society.

Of course, there are important differences between the cartoons and their public influence. As Oring argues, we need to consider that the Danish cartoon scandal was caused less by the cartoons themselves than by the political threats and controversies that followed (58). Yet what is interesting as a common feature is that in the face of a global threat, a shared strategy of all these cartoons is to invoke national standards and identity to demean persons pictured as *Others* and to combat their claims to rights. They rely on "humor's capacity to mark hierarchized national characteristics rather than to encourage global solidarity" (Kuipers 65). The cartoons represent an attempt to protect a geopolitical space against a flow of global influence that has already found successful points of entry.

Works Cited

- Bartley, Paula. *Emmeline Pankhurst*. London: Routledge, 2002. Print.
- Borda, Jennifer. "The Woman Suffrage Parades of 1910-1913: Possibilities and Limitations of an Early Feminist Rhetorical Strategy." *Western Journal of Communication* 66.1 (Winter 2002): 25-52. Web.
- El Rifaie, Elisabeth. "Multiliteracies: How Readers Interpret Political Cartoons." *Visual Communication* 8 (2009): 181-205. Print.
- Fletcher, Ian Christopher. "Women of the Nations, Unite!" *Women's Suffrage in the British Empire: Citizenship, Nation and Race*. Ed. Ian Christopher Fleming, Laura F. Nym Mayhall, and Phillipa Levine. London: Routledge, 2000. Print.

- Goffman, Erving. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. New York: Harper and Row, 1974. Print.
- Greenberg, Josh. "Framing and Temporality in Political Cartoons: A Critical Analysis of Visual News Discourse." *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 39.2 (May 2002): 181-98. Web.
- Kuipers, Giseline. "The Politics of Humor in the Public Sphere: Cartoons, Power and Modernity in the First Transnational Humor Scandal." *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 14:63 (2011): 63-80. Web.
- McConnell, Newton C. "Mayor Oliver: Wonder who told them we didn't encourage the suffragette movement in Toronto?", [ca.1910]: C 301, 9999. Archives of Ontario. 25 October, 2014.
- McConnell, Newton C. "James L. Hughes, one of Toronto's lading suffragettes rehearsing for the coming of Mrs. Pankhurst." [between 1905 and 1914]: C 301, 4845. Archives of Ontario. 25 October, 2014.
- Medhurst, Martin J., and Michael A. Desousa. "Political Cartoons as Rhetorical Form: A Taxonomy of Graphic Discourse." *Communication Monographs* 48 (1981): 197-236.
- Miller, Bonnie M. "The Image-Makers' Arsenal in an Age of War and Empire, 1898-1899: A Cartoon Essay, Featuring the Work of Charles Bartholomew (of *Minneapolis Journal*) and Albert Wilbur Steele (of the *Denver Post*)." *Journal of American Studies* 45.1 (2004): 53-75. Web.
- Morris, Raymond. *Behind the Jester's Mask*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1989. Print.
- . "Visual Rhetoric in Political Cartoons: A Structuralist Approach." *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 8.3 (1993): 195-210. Print.
- Oring, Eliot. "The Muhammad Cartoons and Humor Research: A Collection of Essays." *Humor* 21.1 (2008): 37-40. Print.
- Pennycook, Alistair. *Language as Local Practice*. London: Taylor and Francis, 2010. Print.
- Ramsey, E. Michelle. "Inventing Citizens During World War I: Suffrage Cartoons and The Woman Citizen." *Western Journal of Communication* 64.2 (Spring 2000): 113-47. Web.
- Retallack, G. Bruce. *Drawing the Lines: Gender, Class, Race and Nation in Canadian Editorial Cartoons. 1840-1926*. Ph.D. Thesis. Department of History, University of Toronto, 2006. Web.

Tripp, Aili Mari. "The Evolution of Transnational Feminisms." *Global Feminism: Transnational Women's Activism, Organizing and Human Rights*. Eds. Myra Marx Ferre and Aili Mari Tripp. New York: New York UP, 2006: 51-78. Print.

About the Author

Dr. Jaqueline McLeod Rogers is Professor and Chair of the Department of Rhetoric, Writing and Communications at the University of Winnipeg. She is currently co-editing a collection of new articles for a book, *Finding Marshall McLuhan: The Mind, The Man, The Message* (2015), to which she has contributed an article on "McLuhan and the City" and a section of interviews with Michael and Eric McLuhan and Douglas Coupland. In addition to exploring writing about local urban place, she has recently published on mommy blogging and privacy ethics and on post-prison literacies and community building.