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Introduction

Around midnight on November 4, 1605, a thirty-five-year-old weapons expert sat impatiently in the basement of the House of Lords with thirty-six barrels of gunpowder rigged to blow. In under twenty-four hours, once his king arrived upstairs, the man would light the fuse and run, obliterating Westminster Palace and all the men and women in it. The king now dead, one of the weapons expert’s co-conspirators would start an uprising about one hundred miles north, taking the king’s nine-year-old daughter and installing her as the new Catholic head of state. Of course, the weapons expert was caught before he had a chance to set the bombs off and was executed the following year, only to be remembered as one of the most famous traitors in British, if not world, history.

About 260 years later, as evidenced by the cover image, “The Fenian Guy Fawkes,” citizens of Great Britain feared they were facing a reincarnation of this turncoat through the Fenian movement (Figure 1). Fenians were a group of radical Irishmen who advocated the violent overthrow of British rule in Ireland. Present in both Great Britain and the United States, Fenians had been active since the late 1850s, but had only in the mid 1860s begun to live up to the brutality they claimed to espouse. The cover cartoon is a response to the then-most recent act of Fenian violence, the Clerkenwell bombing, where in an effort to blow a hole through a prison wall and free their fellow rebels, the Fenians killed about twelve and injured over one hundred people who lived nearby. The cartoon shows a Fenian sitting on top of a gunpowder barrel surrounded by women and children, ready and waiting to blow. The cartoon suggests that the Fenian does not care who he is about to kill; he simply does it because he wants to.
The Fenian’s clothes and facial features in the cartoon are typical for anti-Irish caricature in the 1860s. He wears a long coat, short pants with high socks, a top hat, large neck collar; he stores a gun in his belt, and he has facial hair with an ape-like mouth that hangs open and a short wide-set nose. Throughout the 1860s, cartoonists in both the United States and Great Britain created this image as a response to growing Fenian activity in their respective countries. This paper looks at the growth of this image in Anglo-American cartooning from 1861 through 1872. I have chosen this time period for several reasons. First, these eleven years span the Civil War to the ratification of the Treaty of Washington between Britain and the United States, which settled all disputes that arose between the two nations over the course of the American conflict. Anglo-American relations flip-flopped over this timespan, moving from consistent cries for war and threats of an American invasion of Canada in the early-to-mid 1860s to a rapprochement in the summer of 1872. The end of this period engendered a feeling of safety and security for which many in both countries had longed for many years. This created, for the first time since the American Revolution, a peaceful transatlantic diplomacy. This celebratory moment, however, had significance beyond mere diplomatic efforts. For many observers, these efforts not only unified nations, but also unified the Anglo-Saxon world.

In writing about the inhabitants of this world, I use the demonyms “American” and “British” to refer specifically to the Anglo-Saxon members of this population. By “Anglo-Saxon,” I mean to indicate white, native born, middle- or upper-class Protestant men and women. My use of the term in this sense is not aimed to promote any personal beliefs about what Anglo-Saxonism is or is not, but rather to reflect the opinions of the
individuals, mostly men, who were in charge of this discourse throughout the 1860s. In the United States, these were primarily members of the Union during the Civil War and later members of the Northern Republican Party. In Great Britain, these were mostly members of the Conservative Party. These two groups participated in an effort to define the various aspects of the then nebulous notion of Anglo-Saxonism and I have chosen to use this definition in order to precisely understand the demographic they hoped to unite. No doubt Southern Americans and Liberal Britons had a sense of Anglo-Saxonism themselves, but these were not groups the publishers and intellectuals I am writing about included in their classification.1

In the mid nineteenth century, the idea of a shared origin between Americans and Britons had reached significant mainstream popularity in intellectual circles. In spite of its presence in these circles, this belief was lacking in diplomatic arenas between the two governments, where hostility continued to be the order of the day. However, over the course of the 1860s, Anglo-American relations came to reflect a much greater sense of this shared origin, both at the cultural and political level.

In her book *Critical Americans*, historian Leslie Butler argues that this decade was a period in which a community of British and American publishers and intellectuals began to throw off their nationalist ties and establish a new transatlantic social and political discourse. Having found common ground on what they believed a liberal society should look like, she contends, these Anglo-Americans established an intellectual alliance that developed this liberal agenda and used their public platforms to promote its realization. The consequence, she notes, was a “new concern with joint ventures and initiatives that might overcome some of the traditional barriers between recognizably

---

1 For more on Southern or Democratic Americans and British Liberals and their own Anglo-Saxon sentiments, see Hugh
‘American’ and ‘British’ manifestations of public opinion,” thus creating a blend of these two cultures.²

This paper adds to Butler’s thesis by analyzing the development of the anti-Irish image in Anglo-American political cartoons as an important byproduct of this alliance. It focuses on the important role this image played in solidifying this union in the 1860s and its maintenance in later decades. In addition, it looks at this alliance through a visual medium, while Butler’s analysis is limited to text alone.

This paper also fills a void in existing literature on American and British anti-Irish caricature over the course of this period. Several works have focused on this caricature exclusively in Great Britain or the United States, but these do not look at how the image worked as a joint effort between the two countries.³ This paper seeks to combine these nationally framed discourses into a larger transatlantic one, in which both Americans and Britons used cartoons to create a world in which the Irish were distinctly non-Anglo-Saxon.⁴ I argue that the use of this nearly identical Irish image these cartoonists created allowed Anglo-Americans to build an entirely new, non-Anglo-Saxon Irish race. In doing so, both nations set up the criteria for cordonning off allegedly superior Anglo-Saxons from the larger pool of white men and women.

---
⁴ Historians in the past decade have been looking more at the Irish from this transatlantic perspective. Two studies in particular helped me greatly in viewing them in this light: Jonathan Gantt, Irish Terrorism in the Atlantic Community (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009); and David Sim, A Union Forever: The Irish Question and U.S. Foreign Relations in the Victorian Age (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013).
Throughout the 1860s, the Irish served as a foil for the growing Anglo-Saxon bond between the United States and Great Britain. Standard Anglo-Saxon discourse linked the Irish to Celtic origins, not Anglo-Saxon ones. While they coexisted with Anglo-Saxons, then, they were thought to lack important Anglo-Saxon traits, namely self-control, high intellect, and self-governing capabilities. In both countries, but especially in the United States, Anglo-Saxons were living with more Irish men and women than they had at any previous time period.

Since the Potato Famine in the late 1840s, millions of Irish had fled their homes to settle in various parts of the United States, Great Britain, and continental Europe. Many Americans responded to this influx of Irish with outspoken rage. Americans in the mid-nineteenth century, when not worried about the Civil War or Reconstruction, were in the midst of developing a very strong anti-immigrant ideology. This appeared in the form of groups like the Know-Nothings, whose national campaigns aimed to stop seemingly limitless immigration. Separate groups attacked the Irish for their Catholic and drunken image. At the same time, urban business leaders welcomed the arrival of new disposable employees willing to work long hours for little pay. The onset of the Civil War further improved the general view of the Irish, as Irish males registered eagerly and both Northerners and Southerners praised the Irish for their dedication and courage.6

The British, in general, possessed a much more negative outlook on the Irish. This animosity multiplied after the growth of the Irish population in London and other major

---


6 For a discussion of the Know-Nothings and their role in the formation of the Republican Party in the 1850s, see Michael F. Holt, The Fate of their Country: Politicians, Slavery Extension, and the Coming of the Civil War (New York: Hill and Wang, 2004). For information on the Irish in the Civil War, see Cal McCarthy, Green, Blue & Grey: The Irish in the American Civil War (Cork: Collins, 2009). For a more general look at how Americans perceived the Irish during this period, see William D’Arcy, The Fenian Movement in the United States: 1858-1886 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1947). Despite its age, this book remains the authoritative text on American Fenianism.
British cities in response to the Famine in the 1840s and 1850s. These anti-Irish advocates saw the Irish as violent, rowdy, and drunk and believed any additional migrants would only harm British urban centers. However, contrary to this view, many British men and women believed their government had mistreated the Irish over the course of these years, specifically during the Famine, and they felt a significant amount of sympathy for them. Like their American counterparts, British urban industrial leaders also welcomed an increase in the laboring population.7

In addition to their split views on the effects of a growing Irish presence in society, both Americans and the British were divided over the question of Irish Anglo-Saxonism. Over the course of the 1860s, however, the debate became increasingly one sided. In gauging the discourse around this debate, I have chosen to use two of the most popular magazines in each nation over the course of these years: *Punch* in Great Britain and *Harper’s Weekly* in the United States. I examined each issue of the two magazines from 1861 through 1872, as well as several issues from a few years before and after, gathering together all cartoons that depicted or somehow related to the Irish or Anglo-American affairs. In total, this came to approximately one-hundred-fifty cartoons from which I pulled together a group of twenty-two that I believe best tells the story of these relations and all their constituent parts. The structure of the paper therefore is primarily chronological. However, I chose to organize certain sections of the paper, especially those toward the end, thematically in order to more cogently analyze reoccurring symbols or trends in the cartoons I chose.

---
7 See de Nie, “’A Medley Mob of Irish-American Plotters and Irish Dupes,’” for a discussion of British sympathy for the Irish and the response to Irish immigration into Great Britain.
Magazines serve as a useful tool for analyzing this period for a few reasons. Publications like Harper’s and Punch had been growing in popularity since the development of the penny press in the 1820s and 30s. Both magazines reached new heights in their circulation and cultural influence by 1860. This growth was especially marked in Great Britain, where the repeal of advertising and paper duties in the 1850s created a massive boom in the periodical industry.\(^8\) Cheaper printing costs, along with improvements in technology, enabled a significant increase in the number of cartoons that publications could include in each issue.

This change is especially evident in Harper’s, where cartoons grew enormously in their detail over the decade, with larger spreads and darker, more distinct marks on each image. Cartooning in the United States was not as common or sophisticated as Great Britain’s in the 1850s, and American publishers spent an enormous amount of time trying to catch up to their European counterparts.\(^9\) They finally caught up in the 1860s, and as a result this was one of the first decades in which these magazines had a high enough circulation for their cartoons to have a significant social, political, and cultural impact in their respective nations.\(^10\) The spread and accessibility of political cartoons was a phenomenon that enabled an entirely new group of people to have an opinion, however contrived, of current affairs with one glance.

Magazine editors had a keen awareness of their influence over national discourse and made a very conscious effort throughout the decade to increase their power. In the United States, where the majority of publications were in the North, the outbreak of the Civil War motivated editors to use their platforms to create a radical anti-slavery}


\(^9\) Butler, *Critical Americans*, 76.

ideology that would push the general public to advocate for winning the war and creating a free South as an absolute moral imperative. As Leslie Butler writes, they saw it as their duty to “broadly establish principles, to push elected leaders toward important goals, and to instruct the entire citizenry on the true meaning of rapidly changing events.”11 This thirst for additional influence stemmed from a genuine desire to shape their country in the way they thought best. They strongly believed that the best way to arrive at any social change was not militarily but intellectually. Therefore, while the Union Army was fighting over slavery on the battlefield, it was their job to debate this issue in the houses of each and every American household. The physical side of war was only half the battle.12

I chose to use Harper’s and Punch as source material because they had the highest circulation in their respective countries in the 1860s.13 Both had rivals, especially Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper in the United States and Puck in Great Britain.14 Harper’s was not as dominant in its circulation as Punch – which had twice Puck’s circulation in the early 1870s – but it still had a more commanding presence in the American market than any other publication.15

Punch and Harper’s also took the lead in creating new imagery and new caricature, often expressly borrowing from one another. In the United States, this borrowing was very intentional, as American editors were concerned with elevating the

11 Butler, Critical Americans, 64.
12 Ibid., 54-71.
13 Circulation numbers for Harper’s exploded in the late 1850s and early 1860s. In May 1857, the magazine had a circulation of 60,000. This number went up to 120,000 by the end of 1861 and remained above 100,000 for the rest of the Civil War. The average circulation for weekly publications from 1850-1865 was around 2,400. Frank Luther Mott, A History of American Magazines, 1860-1865, vol. 2 of History of American Magazines (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938): 10, 473, 475-76.
14 One caveat must be included for Harper’s and Frank Leslie’s. In 1860, Frank Leslie’s had a higher circulation than Harper’s at 164,000. However, by 1865 this number had dropped down to 50,000. I have chosen Harper’s because it had the greatest highest circulation over the course of the eleven years, although it did not have the highest circulation in each one of these. Ibid., 458-60.
level of their nation’s journalistic output and looked to Great Britain as their guide. The two magazines were engaged in a conversation with one another in which no other publications were allowed, acting as their nation’s cultural representatives to one another. As a result of the influence they had on one another, neither magazine was strictly American or strictly British. They both retained their core elements, but slowly drifted toward a more Anglo-American, or Anglo-Saxon, hybrid. This acted as an inherent expression of shared and compatible culture and went on to play a role in establishing the basis for a shared political culture.

That said, the use of only one magazine from each country limits the capacity to use cartoons to gauge public opinion, as each held very strongly to its political convictions. *Harper’s* was based in New York and frequently represented the voice of Northern Radical Republicans. As a group these Republicans held strongly egalitarian beliefs about the lives whites and blacks should have the right to lead, but at the same time they were staunchly anti-immigrant, especially regarding the Irish. *Punch* was a similarly influential force for Britain’s Conservative Party, which favored protectionist policies over Ireland, supported Britain’s aristocratic legacy, and refused to sympathize with poorer, working-class subjects like their Celtic neighbors.

Impressions of Irish racial status were undoubtedly colored by prejudice, but they were not predetermined by it. A spike in anti-Irish imagery came suddenly and absolutely in the middle of the 1860s. Much of this shift resulted from the rise of the Irish

---

16 Butler, *Critical Americans*, 76.
Republican Brotherhood, an Irish nationalist group in Great Britain, and its American wing, the Fenian Brotherhood.\textsuperscript{18} Fenians in the United States staged invasions into Canada, while British Fenians invaded important government buildings in Ireland and broke into prisons in England. Though support for Irish independence existed in both countries, the violent tactics of the Fenians turned Anglo-Americans away from this sentiment. In addition, it helped the United States and the British establish a mutual understanding of what types of political activism were or were not appropriate.\textsuperscript{19} In turn, this cooperation set a foundation for settling all other disputes between the two governments.

From this point in late 1866 until the summer of 1872, both Harper’s and Punch shifted from visual exploration of Irish identity to the construction of a very specific anti-Irish image. This construction began in newspapers and public forums as a descriptive categorization, based entirely on behaviors and attitudes, but it morphed into a true visual representation through cartoons. The anti-Irishness that had originally been a text-only discourse based on stereotypes became a fully-fledged visual identity that developed a distinct morphology to represent these behaviors and attitudes. This development allowed the anti-Irish image to become racially charged, creating a reality in which the Irish were truly non-Anglo-Saxon, and thus clearly excluded from this community.

This image emerged not only from agreement between Anglo-Americans on what the Irish should look like, but also through the development of a new style of cartooning. The United States and Great Britain of the 1850s and 1860s witnessed a shift from

\textsuperscript{18} The Irish Republican Brotherhood and the Fenian Brotherhood were the respective British and American wings of the Fenian movement. Therefore, I used the word “Fenian” to refer to members of the movement as a whole and specify which wing they belong to either by using the name of that organization or by calling them American or British Fenians.

\textsuperscript{19} See M.J. Sewell, “Rebels or Revolutionaries?: Irish-American Nationalism and American Diplomacy, 1865-1885,” \textit{Historical Journal} 29 (September 1986): 723-33, for more on this.
dialogue- to image-oriented cartoons. Up to this point, most Anglo-Americans exhibited similar sentiments toward opponents, but they did so primarily through speech rather physical form.

The 1846 cartoon “Ultimatum on the Oregon Question” presents an example of this kind of image (Figure 2). It shows seven people standing together with little emotion or excitement, with their names above their heads to identify them, and an arm or two are in the air, but there is no clear indication of anger or frustration on their faces – in fact, the characters look more similar to one another than different. Adding to this, the action of the cartoon takes place through the tiny cursive print in the bubbles above their heads. The characters are not in any sort of conversation with one another, but instead are shouting out toward the reader, hoping he or she will identify with what they have to say over the competing figures. The cartoon reveals the motives of each figure and his or her nation and allows the viewer to compare and contrast them. Some characters make more amusing statements than others and are definitely objects of the artist’s derision, but the image is more informational than it is satirical.

To a cartoonist of the later 1860s or 1870s, this type of image would have had an unfamiliar air to it. It requires thought, attention to detail, background knowledge, and, more than anything, reading. Cartoons from the 1860s and later require very little of this. They frequently refer to specific events, but the viewer’s understanding of the cartoon does not always rely on knowledge of the depicted occurrence. These new cartoons require no reading and little thought or background knowledge to absorb the cartoon’s surface level message.20 They have become more accessible, and are therefore able to

---

20 This was more the case in Harper’s than Punch. Punch cartoons frequently made subtle references to politicians of the day. However, though knowledge of these politicians is important in understanding these cartoons at a deeper level, their message was still very apparent on the surface.
impact a wider audience. This new accessibility, propelled by experimentation with this anti-Irish image, allowed cartoonists to attack the Irish – and any other ethnic or racial groups – in ways previously unimaginable.

An important development of this new, image-oriented cartooning style was an entirely reshaped Anglo-American cartoon family. This family consisted of personified figures representing each nation, usually depicted as mother and father or husband and wife. Great Britain was depicted through the figures of Britannia and John Bull, the United States through Columbia and Brother Jonathan, Canada through Miss Canada and Johnny Canuck, Ireland through Erin or Hibernia.21 This family had existed since much earlier in the nineteenth century, but caricaturizing each figure provided cartoonists new means of expressing certain ideas about each individual and his or her country. Many of the cartoons during this era had reoccurring props, physical traits, and slang to make implicit suggestions about each nation’s power, relative masculinity or femininity, size, financial status, and a variety of other characteristics.

Between 1861 and 1865, Erin was consistently represented as single in these cartoons. This single status aligned with a curiosity about the true nature of the Irish people and a reconsideration of their exclusion from the Anglo-Saxon community. During this period many Americans sought to help the Irish fight Britain and overthrow its rule, while many Britons questioned growing anti-Irish policies. The mythical male counterpart with whom Erin would begin a new Irish nation had yet to be fully decided. Anglo-American cartoonists were, colloquially, playing the field for her; they were trying

---

21 Thomas H. Bivins, “The Body Politic: The Changing Shape of Uncle Sam,” *Journalism Quarterly* 64 (1987): 13-20. Bivins dates the first appearance of a character named Uncle Sam to 1832, and argues he came into his modern form in the late 1860s. In the interim period, Sam and Brother Jonathan were regularly used interchangeably, until the fully developed Sam replaced Jonathan. Also see Alton Ketchum “The Search for Uncle Sam,” *History Today* 40 (April, 1990): 15-25, for a history of Samuel Johnson, the man upon whom Uncle Sam was allegedly based.
to figure out if she could find a new mate with the same self-governance capacities that she possessed. But by the end of the decade, the Fenian had become her counterpart in the larger Atlantic family tree. This placement of the Fenian – classified as a rapacious, ungovernable Celt – as Erin’s counterpart ruled out any chance for the Irish to convince the Anglo-Saxon community that they too possessed disciplined self-control and the ability to self-govern within this popular and influential cultural framework. After a brief period during which cartoonists considered including the Irish among the self-governing, Erin’s quasi-marriage to the Fenian Celt squashed any hope of this possibility. This placed both her and the Irish as a whole back in the non-Anglo-Saxon category and reinforced Ireland’s status as a colonial dependent. Moreover, the continuing presence of the Fenian image throughout the rest of the century testified to the finality of this exclusion.

**The Trent Affair**

Tension between the United States and Great Britain grew exponentially almost immediately after the outbreak of the American Civil War in April 1861. For Great Britain, the conflict split its international interests in two. Since the end of the eighteenth century, Great Britain had been the Atlantic’s foremost opponent of slavery and had provided major support to Frederick Douglass and many other American abolitionists. Its economy, however, was dependent on Southern cotton, and the United States was the world’s largest producer of the crop. Wanting to protect British interests and reputation in both regions, Queen Victoria and her government declared British neutrality in the conflict one month after shots were fired on Fort Sumter.
Like Americans, many British political leaders originally believed the war would soon fizzle out. Neutrality, then, while safeguarding their own interests, also avoided the possibility that their interference would prolong what they hoped would be a quick domestic skirmish. This angered many Northerners, as the neutrality proclamation granted the Confederacy belligerent status, meaning it could dock warships at all the same British ports as the Union. According to Union officials, the Confederates were not belligerents but rebels.

The distinction is that a rebellion is a domestic conflict, in which a group that is within a state is pushing for an overthrow of the government, but that group does not have any international rights or recognition. In other words, the conflict is not deemed one that shifts the political boundaries of a state. A belligerency, on the other hand, is still a rebellion, but is one that is recognized by international law to be between two separate groups with distinct governments and political boundaries – much more like the average two-state war, where one party is an official state, and the other is on its way to becoming one. Britain’s recognition of the Confederacy as a belligerent power, then, led many Northerners to believe it approved of the establishment of an independent Southern nation.

Tension over this issue came to a new height in the winter of 1861-1862. In November 1861, an American naval ship, the USS *Jacinto*, boarded the RMS *Trent*, a British mail-carrying vessel on its way to Britain. The *Trent* was carrying two

---

22 There is an abundance of literature on the growth of an Anglo-Saxon connection among anti-Union Britons and Confederate Americans during this period. See RJM Blackett, *Divided Hearts: Britain and the American Civil War* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2001): 15-18 for more on this. Also see Dubrulle, “‘We Are Threatened with...Anarchy and Ruin.’”

23 This was of particular importance simply because of the number of ports Great Britain held throughout the world.

24 See Walter LaFeber, *The American Age: American Foreign Policy at Home and Abroad, 1750 to the Present* (New York: Norton, 1994), for more on this distinction between belligerents and rebels, and what the consequences of belligerent status were for the Confederacy.

Confederate diplomats, James Mason and John Slidell. US naval personnel from the Jacinto boarded the Trent, captured the diplomats, and took them to Boston to face treason charges. Since the Trent was not a military vessel, the seizure of the two men violated international neutrality law. After hearing of the incident, the British Navy immediately began to ready for war, while the public furiously pushed for an attack. One fiery British editorial noted that, with the seizure of Mason and Slidell, “a challenge has been deliberately thrown down to this country, and it shall be remembered when the United States is but a tradition of the past.”

The end of the United States was not a farfetched possibility in most people’s minds in Great Britain, as many believed the war was heading toward its end after the Union’s crippling defeat at Ball’s Bluff just a month prior to the capture of Mason and Slidell. Even Britons who were reluctant to go to war believed the United States could see its final hour, with one London Times editorial unrepentantly advising the United States to “calmly and dispassionately to consider their own true and lasting interests, and how they would be affected by wantonly forcing us into a war to avoid which we would willingly encounter everything except dishonour.”

British officials acted in line with the demands of their public, demanding that the Union government choose between releasing Mason and Slidell or preparing for a British attack. The most challenging aspect of these negotiations for American officials was trying to convey to the British that they had no knowledge of Mason and Slidell’s capture before it took place, and that they had never issued orders for any American naval ships to seize British vessels or other property. The man who had taken the Confederate diplomats, Charles Wilkes, had been ordered to look for Confederate ships docking at

26 London Times, November 29, 1861.
28 London Times, December 1, 1861.
British ports in Bermuda, but not to engage them. Lincoln eventually disavowed Wilkes, but the damage was still done, and at the end of December the US government had no choice but to order Mason and Slidell’s delivery to England to complete their diplomatic missions.

On January 11, 1862, a few days after the Trent affair had come to an end, Harper’s published a cartoon titled “Pat on the Mason and Slidell Affair” (Figure 3). The cartoon shows the sphere of Atlantic influence, with Brother Jonathan, Jonathan’s Southern incarnation, Pat, Louis Napoleon of France, John Bull, and an anonymous soldier. Pat’s presence in this cartoon is worth noting. The cartoonist portrays him as an Irish national figure, akin to Jonathan or John Bull. Pat, however, quickly faded out of existence after this cartoon and only reappeared later in the decade as the fully formed Fenian.

This is Pat’s first appearance in any Harper’s cartoon since the start of 1861 and his timing at the end of the Trent affair is not surprising. Most Northerners were relieved once Mason and Slidell were released, but they still remained steadfastly anti-British. Through Pat, the cartoon expresses some American willingness to team up with the Irish in opposition to Great Britain. Pat’s line to Jonathan, “will ye Plaze to just go on Crushin’ the Rebellion, an’ lave the Starvin’ Ould Curmudgeon to Me?” indicates that the Irish and the Americans are able to cooperate over larger transatlantic political issues because they have identified John Bull as a common enemy. Pat, in this situation, defends the United States by offering to take care of Bull while Americans deal with their domestic problems.

---

29 In Britain’s defense, the House’s resolution describing Wilkes’ actions as “brave, adroit, and patriotic,” made this argument a tough sell. Cong. Globe, 37th Cong., 2nd Sess. 10 (1861).
Pat threateningly sticks out his shillelagh toward John Bull to justify his claims to Jonathan. The shillelagh is a type of cane used regularly in Ireland around which a martial-arts culture had formed in the early nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{30} In political cartoons throughout this period, the shillelagh was one of the key components of Irishness, employed to signify Irish rage or aggression. It also provided an easy opportunity to express ideas about masculinity, perhaps giving its placement on Jonathan’s waistline additional meaning. In teaming Jonathan with Pat, this cartoon reverses the usual criticism that comes with the shillelagh, encouraging its use against Great Britain.

Moreover, this cartoon presents one of the kinder depictions of Irishness in Harper’s. Pat lacks many of the specific references to Irishness that became so intrinsic to the Irish caricature later in the decade. Still, his general image is laced with signs that indicate his inherently different nature. He is shorter than Jonathan, hunched over, and timidly pokes or points at him as he speaks in the traditionally derided Irish dialect. He shows some early signs of future elements of the Irish caricature as well: the large ape-like jaw, short, pudgy nose, and a face that is not clean-shaven. It is difficult to tell if he has the stereotypical Irish beard, but the darkness around his face is one noticeable marker of difference between him and John Bull or Jonathan. Thus, while the cartoon lacks the deliberate anti-Irish themes that would be taken up in later years, it still proposes a fundamental difference between Anglo-Americans and the Irish. The Irishman’s darkness indicates an impurity of Anglo-Saxon qualities, giving him a look that is half black and half white, half good and half bad, half trustworthy and half dependable.

\textsuperscript{30} For a detailed discussion of the shillelagh and this culture, see John W. Hurley, \textit{Shillelagh: The Irish Fighting Stick} (Pipersville: Caravat Press, 2007).
Interestingly though, John Bull does not look much like Jonathan either. In fact he bears a much greater resemblance to Pat. His nose is similarly snout-like and blackened, and his rounded, ape-like jaw resembles Pat’s. This similarity to the Irishman expresses doubt in any coordinated representation of Anglo-Saxonism, while his lighter tone represents its future possibility. In fact, it is possible that the artist is pointing out flaws not so much in who John Bull, and the British, are, but in what they have done. John Bull’s body looks like it normally does: round and short with a large British flag on his chest. Cartoonists typically used his circular and globe-like midsection to indicate the worldly reach and influence of the British Empire. However, this cartoon shows him with snapped suspenders, indicating that Britain has reached too far and is no longer in the same tightly controlled holster it once was. By threatening war with the United States, the artist suggests that Bull has gone beyond the limitations of his empire and will soon, quite literally, be caught with his pants down.

**Growth of the Fenian Movement in Great Britain and the United States**

As the war went on, the Irish managed to increase their influence in both the United States and Great Britain through the Fenian movement. The Fenians were organized under the Irish Republican Brotherhood, a group founded in Ireland by James Stephens in 1858. Formed out of the ashes of previous Irish nationalist groups, it sought to end British rule in Ireland and establish its own independent, republican government. Getting its start in the late 1850s, the timing was propitious for the group to rebel on a larger Atlantic scale. Anger stemming from the Potato Famine of the late 1840s was still fresh,

---

31 This device was used regularly in the cartooning world, most notably in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century to use Uncle Sam as a representation of America’s growing imperial presence. See Bivins, “The Body Politic: The Changing Shape of Uncle Sam,” 14-16.
and a new generation of Irish men and women who had grown up with the blight were on
the vanguard of a new wave of anti-British sentiment.

These Fenians established a brand new form of transatlantic Irish identity that
rejected the British constitutional system and encouraged the use of physical force to
overthrow it at all costs. No longer debating between violence and non-violence, these
Irish revolutionaries believed that the level and extent of British oppression they had
faced justified retaliation in whatever fashion they liked.\textsuperscript{32}

Much of this Fenian discourse was played out first in the United States among
Irishmen who fled Ireland during or after the Famine. These Irishmen founded their own
American wing of the Irish Republican Brotherhood called the Fenian Brotherhood.
Founded by John O’Mahony, a friend of Stephens and a fellow Irish exile, the Fenian
Brotherhood had the same commitment to the violent overthrow of British rule in Ireland.
Given the distance from Ireland, the original mission of the group was to serve as a
fundraising organization for efforts back in Great Britain. Not long into its existence,
however, the Fenian Brotherhood began to take on American Revolutionary rhetoric, and
its members attempted to forge a bond with Americans over their shared past as British
colonies. Echoing Lincoln, these Fenians passed an official resolution stating,

\begin{quote}
we deem [the United States of America’s] preservation and success of supreme
importance, not alone to ourselves and our fellow-citizens, but to the extension of
democratic institutions, and to the well being and social elevation of the whole
human race.\textsuperscript{33}
\end{quote}

These lived experiences in the United States and the ideology that came with
them soon provided the Fenian Brotherhood with a much different image and role than
had originally been planned. In addition to the mass of Irish exiles who had fled to the

\textsuperscript{32} Gantt, \textit{Irish Terrorism in the Atlantic Community}, 30-31.
United States at the end of the famine and established themselves in major US cities, Great Britain began to expel scores of Irish revolutionaries to the United States in the late 1850s and early 1860s. Many of these new exiles were prominent newspaper editors and authors and took their writing with them to the United States.\(^{34}\) Made possible by the same technological development as Harper’s and Punch, these papers enabled a small group of individuals to produce a widely distributed publication for a very specific audience. They exploited an existing yet underrepresented pro-Home Rule mentality and quickly disseminated the revolutionary Fenian message, bringing new national attention to the Irish plight. Through this process, Fenians were able to foster a diasporic nationalism that, no longer beholden to British legal jurisdiction, could finally flourish in the United States.

Fenians quickly recognized the extent to which they could use the United States as a military training ground for the planned overthrow of British rule in Ireland. Unlike Great Britain, where the Irish were not permitted to assemble in large groups in certain areas, the United States provided them with the freedom and the land to practice military tactics.\(^{35}\) Early in the 1860s, most American officials did not mind the fact that the Irish were training on American soil; some Americans even encouraged further Fenian radicalism out of animosity toward Great Britain.\(^{36}\) This training became even more marked once the Civil War broke out in 1861; Irishmen quickly volunteered, using the war as further practice for the eventual battle with Great Britain.\(^{37}\)

\(^{34}\) Adams, “The Negotiated Hibernian,” 57.

\(^{35}\) Ibid., 71; Gantt, Irish Terrorism in the Atlantic Community,” 27.

\(^{36}\) Jenkins, Fenians and Anglo-American Relations During Reconstruction, 27-28.

All of these experiences in the United States shifted the traditional fundraising role of the Fenian Brotherhood into a military force. Not only did this expand the originally domestic Fenian movement into a transatlantic one, the Brotherhood also fostered Anglo-American tension. Even before the war began, British government officials and the British public began to blame the US government for the growth of American Fenianism, claiming its free speech laws and democratic practices established the perfecting breeding ground for Irish revolutionary ideology. Not only did these Britons believe the United States was fertile ground for this ideology, but they also believed the American government actively encouraged dissent and rebellious activity as payback for the *Trent* crisis.\(^3^8\) Fenians advanced this discord between the two governments through their activity during the Civil War. By volunteering en masse, Fenians hoped not only to impress Americans, but also to secure the United States as an ally in the war against Great Britain. In this war, Fenians hoped Great Britain would remove its forces from Ireland, leaving the island defenseless from an Irish takeover.

Simply by suggesting the feasibility of American involvement in a war against Great Britain, the Fenians exposed the non-existence of any truly Anglo-Saxon politics in the early 1860s. Adding to existing issues over neutrality, Fenians were pointing out differences not only in individual policies, but also in the principles behind them. To cite one example, as historian Jonathan Gantt suggests, by trying to force Great Britain and the United States into a conflict over Ireland, the Fenians were attempting to engage American officials not only in an anti-British discourse, but an anti-colonial one as well.\(^3^9\) The Fenians needed to keep the governments of the United States and Great Britain officials and the British public began to blame the US government for the growth of Anglo-American tension. Even before the war began, British government officials and the British public began to blame the US government for the growth of American Fenianism, claiming its free speech laws and democratic practices established the perfecting breeding ground for Irish revolutionary ideology. Not only did these Britons believe the United States was fertile ground for this ideology, but they also believed the American government actively encouraged dissent and rebellious activity as payback for the *Trent* crisis.\(^3^8\) Fenians advanced this discord between the two governments through their activity during the Civil War. By volunteering en masse, Fenians hoped not only to impress Americans, but also to secure the United States as an ally in the war against Great Britain. In this war, Fenians hoped Great Britain would remove its forces from Ireland, leaving the island defenseless from an Irish takeover.

Simply by suggesting the feasibility of American involvement in a war against Great Britain, the Fenians exposed the non-existence of any truly Anglo-Saxon politics in the early 1860s. Adding to existing issues over neutrality, Fenians were pointing out differences not only in individual policies, but also in the principles behind them. To cite one example, as historian Jonathan Gantt suggests, by trying to force Great Britain and the United States into a conflict over Ireland, the Fenians were attempting to engage American officials not only in an anti-British discourse, but an anti-colonial one as well.\(^3^9\) The Fenians needed to keep the governments of the United States and Great Britain
Britain aware of these issues, as the basis of their movement required a tension between the two powers, as well as the prevention of the establishment of any type of shared Anglo-Saxon political structure that may have shut them out.

The New York City Draft Riots

Early in the Civil War, both nations were too divided over the Fenian movement and the issues they brought up over free speech, colonialism, and neutrality to find any solid ground on which to build an Anglo-Saxon political order. Noting this, Fenians began to seek out an Irish-American order at the first national Fenian convention in Chicago in November 1863. This was the first official meeting of the representatives of each regional Fenian chapter throughout the country, and it served as a means to plan out the future of the organization. Throughout the convention, Fenians appealed to their similarities to Americans and their common enemy in Great Britain. One resolution from the convention noted,

We deem the resurrection of Ireland to independent nationhood to be of immediate interest not alone to Irishmen but to all sincere lovers of human freedom, as well as of especial advantage to America, whose vanguard she stands even to-day against British aggression, with her organized sons keeping watch and ward for the United States at the thresholds of the despots of Europe, nay in their very citadels.40

The biggest accomplishment of the convention was the drafting of a constitution that established an independent Irish government in exile. Fenians used this constitution to try to shake off the notion of the Irish as Celts who were unfit for self-governance through a written declaration of their liberal values. In doing so, they offered themselves

---

40 First National Convention of the Fenian Brotherhood.
up to the United States as another liberal democracy with which to establish a shared political order.\textsuperscript{41}

However hopeful the tone, the image of Irish illiberal violence had reappeared in the mainstream media a few months prior to the drafting of the Fenian constitution, when the New York City draft riots erupted in July 1863. Even Americans who were in favor of the Fenian movement were affected by this violence and interpreted it as a sign that the Irish may not fit in with American, or Anglo-Saxon, non-violent social norms, limiting the possibility of an Irish-American political order.\textsuperscript{42} The riots broke out in response to the Enrollment Act Congress had passed in March, which had set up a national conscription. This draft, the first in the nation’s history, included a controversial buyout option. This gave any draftee the opportunity to hire a substitute to take his place in the army for a fee of $300. A significant amount of money for working-class men, this option set off tensions between upper and lower classes that precipitated the riots in New York in July.\textsuperscript{43}

The riots lasted four days. Initially composed of Irishmen burning down churches, hotels, and other buildings, they quickly escalated into race-based beatings of African-American men, women, and even children. The Irish fought off police forces, and the Union Army eventually sent men from Gettysburg to subdue them. However, the troops did not arrive until over one hundred individuals had died and approximately 2,000 had been injured in the riots.\textsuperscript{44} “How to Escape the Draft,” a Harper’s cartoon published a

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{41} Jenkins, \textit{Fenians and Anglo-American Relations During Reconstruction}, 25-31; First National Convention of the Fenian Brotherhood.  
\textsuperscript{42} M.J. Sewell “Rebels or Revolutionaries?,” 725.  
\textsuperscript{43} The act was passed in March, but confirmation that it would be enforced in New York City came in July. See Barrett, “On Forgetting,” 28.  
\textsuperscript{44} Iver Bernstein, \textit{The New York City Draft Riots} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990): 5; Injury count is from James M. McPherson and James Hogue, \textit{Ordeal by Fire: The Civil War and Reconstruction} (New York: McGraw Hill, 2010): 389. McPherson also notes that the majority of deceased were rioters who had engaged with police officers or members of the military.
\end{flushright}
few weeks after the riots, provides an example of the type of anti-Irish image that stemmed from the event (Figure 4). The image shows a group of Irishmen in the act of beating an African-American man and his daughter with their shillelaghs. Instead of the timid Pat of Figure 3, the Irish in this cartoon are depicted as increasingly angry and ruthless. Where the earlier figure of Pat intimated a controlled, focused Irish violence that was in favor of the United States, this cartoon suggests the wild, Celtic nature of this violence and argues that its dangers outweigh any potential positive outcome.

While the Irish in this cartoon have shifted in terms of the objects of their violence, they have also shifted in their appearance. The man on the left has a distinct Irish image with, as in Figure 3, a short nose and noticeable facial hair. The man on the right, however, lacks this resemblance. He possesses thick, clown-like lips that are suggestive of an African-American character in a minstrel show. This suggestion is the beginning of the Harper’s cartoonists’ effort to elucidate a distinct Irish image, and it reflects American ambivalence about what Irishness actually was. The figures in the cartoon are not meant to look Anglo-Saxon, nor are they African-American. Instead, they are part of an attempt to experiment with stereotypes to see where precisely the Irish fit within them.

However, this cartoon is not linked only to negative African-American imagery; there are some positive connections as well. Unlike the Irish-black hybrid, the image of the African American man on the ground presents a peaceful individual who is in control of his emotions. His posture evokes Englishman Josiah Wedgwood’s iconic abolitionist image, “Am I Not a Man and a Brother?” which he crafted in 1787 as part of an anti-slavery campaign and had since been adopted by many American abolitionists (Figure 5).
As in Wedgwood’s drawing, the African-American man in this cartoon is kneeling down, his head held in the air and arm extended out in a gesture of peace. Placing this image in the context of the cartoon, it serves to distinguish real African Americans from their minstrel show incarnations. Advocacy for a reconsideration of traditional African-American stereotypes was not a rarity for pro-Republican Harper’s, but the magazine did not always use the Irish in this message. By putting the Irish in the anti-black role, the cartoon emphasizes the belief that whites and African Americans had a shared enemy in the Irish.

Furthering the pro-African-American message is the child in the man’s arms. Nineteenth-century Victorian culture placed an overwhelming emphasis on marriage and family values.\textsuperscript{45} In contrast to the stereotype of the Irish as wild and single, the African-American man’s desire to protect his child holds with it the implication that he is married and family oriented. Both his and his daughter’s clothing indicates that he has done well to provide for them, and is therefore performing the assumed duties of a successful husband and father. The Irishmen, on the other hand, wear clothing with almost no detail – plain pants, boots, shirts without collars or buttons, placing them in a lower class than their African-American counterpart.

However, though Irish-Americans were represented as physically male, they embodied mostly female traits. Nineteenth-century gender theory often categorized women as emotional, irrational, passionate, unable to control the range of human feelings, and unfit to vote or self-govern. The Irish in Harper’s express the most extreme point of these characteristics, despite their masculine physicality. Though this physicality

\textsuperscript{45} For more on family values see Nancy Cott, \textit{Public Vows: A History of Marriage and the Nation} (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002).
is highly evident, they are unable to perform the roles associated with their gender and instead act on the more stereotypically feminine characteristics of impulse and emotion.

In other words, Irish men are considered capable of distinctly male actions, such as violence, beating, and drunken rioting, but they are also seen to be driven by stereotypically female impulses such as emotion and irrationality. This abnormal gender performance serves to provide a place for the Irish along the civilization versus barbarism divide. Nineteenth-century Victorian gender norms were designed not only to explain how men acted, but how civilized men acted. Falling short on gender norms acts as an indicator of Irish inability to exist within a civilized society and serves as an argument for their classification as barbaric and primitive. In British and American minds, were the Irish capable of self-governance, self-control, and rational forethought, they would be able to prove this by exhibiting a proper understanding of civilized gender norms.46

“Something for Paddy”

Despite the growing anti-Irish tilt in the United States, many young Fenians in Great Britain wanted to move across the Atlantic and join the Fenian Brotherhood. In the early to mid 1860s the Irish Republican Brotherhood was a very casual organization and many members wanted more to do for Irish emancipation.47 Noting the growth of the Fenian Brotherhood and the possibility of authentic combat training, these Fenians believed they could have a much greater impact on the movement in the United States.48 Additionally, for members of the Irish Republican Brotherhood living in Ireland, a move to the United

47 R.V. Comerford, in The Fenians in Context: Irish Politics and Society, 1848-1882 (Dublin: Wolfhound Press, 1998) argues that the Britons were correct in their assumption, and that Fenians who joined the Irish Republican Brotherhood were bored and seeking social activity.
48 De Nie, “‘A Medley Mob of Irish-American Plotters and Irish Dupes,’” 223.
States presented an opportunity for social advancement they did not have at home. Still in the midst of lingering poverty from the Famine, Ireland lacked the same promise America held.

Many older, more seasoned Irish nationalists believed these younger Irishmen were doing a disservice to the movement by leaving the very land they sought to regain. Though expression of this sentiment was more marked in Ireland, many Fenians in England opposed the exodus to the United States as well. This set off a conflict in the movement in Great Britain between the domestically oriented, older Irish, who focused on staying close to home, and the internationally oriented younger ones, who wanted to get involved in Atlantic geopolitics. One *Punch* cartoon from August 1864, “Something for Paddy,” captures the essence of this generational divide (Figure 6). The cartoon features an interaction among the ghost of Daniel O’Connell, an Irish nationalist from the early nineteenth century; a younger Irishman; and Jonathan, who loosely resembles Abraham Lincoln. This cartoon explains the pull British Fenians felt: two figures, towering over them, demanding mutually exclusive actions. This specific Irishman is leaning toward heading to the United States, as evidenced by the newspaper below him that says “New York Emigration” and the words “men” and “[h]igh wages” underneath.

O’Connell, the figure on the right, spent most of his political career campaigning for the end of restrictions on Roman Catholics in Ireland and the repeal of the 1800 and 1801 Acts of Union, which brought Ireland into the United Kingdom. He represents the voice of the older generation of Irish Home Rule activists. In telling the young Irishman,
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49 See Foster, *Paddy and Mr. Punch*, for more on Ireland’s social and economic climate in the mid eighteenth century.
50 Gantt, *Irish Terrorism in the Atlantic Community*, 29.
51 Bivins, “The Body Politic,” 15-16, gives a brief overview of the frequency with which British cartoons represented the Brother Jonathan/Uncle Sam figure as Lincoln. Bivins argues that Uncle Sam’s wiry frame is based largely on Lincoln’s stature, and that his development in the late 1860s and early 1870s served as a way to memorialize the former president.
“it’s a repaler ye call yourself, and you’re going to die for the union,” he’s articulating the belief of this older class that a good Irishman would stay at home and fight for emancipation directly, rather than getting involved in larger international politics. The second portion of the line, “and you’re going to die for the union” expresses his moral shock and outrage at the idea that an Irishman would sacrifice his life for a conflict in the United States. It also acts as a play on the word “union.” While O’Connell suggests that the Irishman is going off to die for the continuation of the American Union, the use of this word implies his belief that the young Irishman will actually be dying for the continuation of the union between Ireland and England as well.

Jonathan’s appearance is fairly similar to his Harper’s depiction in early 1862 (Figure 3). He still has the same clothes, long and slender nose, and thin frame. However, he has a much more meager frame – his hipbones are sticking out, as well as his shoulders and knees. This thin, wiry frame is suggestive of Abraham Lincoln. The cartoonist uses Lincoln here to imply that the US government was going to great lengths to bring Irishmen into the United States for the Union cause, implying that they were desperate for more soldiers. In addition, Jonathan’s placement in the cartoon mirrors Figure 3: where Pat was trying to get Jonathan’s attention in that image, Jonathan is now trying to get his, grabbing his arm and attempting to pull him away. The Irishman is not as willing to help him in this case, though. He is indecisive and afraid. Much of this feeling is clear in the contrast between the tall, proud, and erect O’Connell and the Irishman’s fearful, frozen stance. Unlike the upright and pointed shillelagh in Figure 3, the Irishman’s shillelagh now droops, stripping him of the confidence and masculinity he displayed in the earlier American image. The message here is that the Fenians are weak,
spineless, and confused. Instead of portraying them as overwhelmingly violent and
dangerous as Harper’s had, Punch now claims that the Irish are too timid in the face of
authority to reach success in their movement. By showing Jonathan and O’Connell
controlling the Fenian, the cartoon reinforces the belief in the lack of independence in the
Fenian movement and with this presses the notion that Great Britain can too have a hand
in guiding Irish affairs in its favor.

Anglo or Apeman?
The 1864 depiction of the Irishman in Figure 6 is one of the first uses of the distinctly
anti-Irish image that came out of this decade I could find in Punch. “Mr. G-O’Rilla,” an
1861 cartoon from Punch, shows the development of this image over the course of these
three years (Figure 7). The cartoon depicts the Irishman as an ape, which, though biting,
was not a reference used exclusively to indicate Irishness, but a blanket non-white
carcature Punch used to refer to African-Americans as well. This caricature was fairly
new in Great Britain, and owed its surge in popularity in the early 1860s to the discovery
and scientific classification of gorillas in Africa.

Before this took place, gorillas had been considered mythical creatures whose
existence was validated only through legend or anecdotes of questionable authenticity,
but this sentiment shifted in the middle of the nineteenth century. This shift began with
the debate over the theory of evolution as championed by Charles Darwin in his 1859
publication, On the Origins of Species. This notion had been tossed around in intellectual
circles for many decades prior to this, but Darwin’s book brought it to a mainstream
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52 See “Monkeyan’a [sic],” Punch, May 18, 1861. Historically, the ape has been used to represent other races as well in both
Great Britain and the United States.
audience. Two years after this work, in 1861, French explorer Paul Du Chaillu, the first westerner to officially confirm the existence of gorillas, brought dead specimens from Africa to be put on exhibit in Great Britain. These two events had dramatic impacts on the perception of race in both Great Britain and the United States, as many scientists began to pose the question of whether non-Anglo-Saxon races were simply less evolved humans. By taking these simian features and attributing them to the Irish, cartoonists exploited the common Victorian belief that moral character was manifest in the physical body, especially in the face. Through their rugged and apelike features, cartoonists highlighted the apparent lack of Irish moral fortitude and essentialized the “true” Irish figure.

**The End of the Civil War: Alabama Issues and the Fenian Brotherhood Split**

Although the Irish had lost some support in mainstream American discourse, the Fenian Brotherhood managed to increase its ranks over the course of the Civil War. By the time the conflict ended, American Fenians had the numbers and the support to serve as a powerful player in Ireland’s push for freedom, but they were too tied up in their own internal politics and disagreements to proceed in any unified direction. Some members, such as founder John O’Mahony, noted the Fenian Brotherhood’s original role as a fundraising organization and proposed the Irishmen use their newfound support and military experience to send money, soldiers, and ammunition to Great Britain. Others,

---


54 Anglo-Saxons had posed similar questions before based on the theory of polygenism, which argued that the existence of different racial groups stemmed from humankind having multiple points of origin. No single human form existed in this theory, but rather each race indicated a fundamentally different genetic background and variation from one another. The theory of evolution, however, was very useful for cartoonists to use the presence of the gorilla to depict a rendering of what a “lesser” race actually looked like by suggesting that its members had more ape in them than Anglo-Saxons.

inspired by the Brotherhood’s growth and its military capacity, proposed an invasion of Canada.

As noted above, the Fenian plan for taking Ireland envisioned it as the byproduct of war between the United States and Great Britain. By 1863, American Fenians had come to believe that such a war was inevitable.\(^{56}\) However, noting their momentum, recent combat experience, and the fact that the US government had Irish involvement in the Civil War fresh in its mind, the Fenians aimed to bring a military conflict between the two Atlantic nations as soon as possible.\(^{57}\) They settled on Canada as the proper target to precipitate that war. The US government had been eyeing Canada since the Revolution and had already tried once to annex it during the War of 1812. American statesman, such as Secretary of State William Seward, were very interested in expanding American territory, which made Great Britain increasingly sensitive to any issues involving the US-Canadian border. Fenians hoped to expose the tension over this border by invading Canada from US territory. With an invasion, Fenians believed, the British government could claim that the US government had tacitly consented to the raid by allowing the Irish to train on American soil. This would constitute a violation of American neutrality and thus set the grounds for an Anglo-American war.

The Fenians also hoped that an attack on Canada would weaken its defenses and help clear the way for the US military to take it for themselves. This would, in theory, help grow the Irish-American alliance the Fenians were pushing for. In striving for this alliance, Fenians even altered their constitution at the end of the Civil War to look like

\(^{56}\) “Whereas, From the hostile attitude assumed by the English oligarchy, merchants, and press, towards the United States, since the commencement of the disastrous civil strife that has devastated this Republic during the past three years, it is all but certain that war is imminent, or at least fast approaching, between our adopted country [the United States] and England, our hereditary enemy.” Proceedings of the First National Convention of the Fenian Brotherhood.

\(^{57}\) At its peak, the Fenian Brotherhood had around 45,000 members. See Breandan Cathaoir, “American Fenianism and Canada: 1865-1871,” The Irish Sword: The Journal of the Military History Society of Ireland 8 (1967): 77.
the American one to further highlight their similarities.\textsuperscript{58} However, not long after this the Fenians unofficially split into military and fundraising factions. This undermined the movement’s coherence and organization and prevented them from staging an attack in 1865, as the military wing now needed to raise additional funds for an invasion.\textsuperscript{59}

Though Fenian organizational setbacks dealt a major blow to morale, war between Great Britain and the United States appeared inevitable at the end of the Civil War. Soon after Appomattox, the US government proposed a joint commission with Great Britain to settle the \textit{Alabama} claims. The \textit{Alabama} was the most famous of the many privately British-made ships sold to the Confederacy as commerce raiders. The US government claimed these ships were a clear violation of Britain’s neutrality. At war’s end, American officials suggested the establishment of a joint commission to decide how much Great Britain owed the United States in reparations for damages caused by the \textit{Alabama} and similar commerce raiders. British Prime Minister John Russell immediately rejected this offer. This angered both the American public and its government, leading Secretary of State William Seward to declare that the US government would refuse to defend the Canadian border from Fenian attacks until Britain expressed a willingness to negotiate.\textsuperscript{60}

\textbf{“Erin’s Little Difficulty”}

\textsuperscript{58} Jenkins, \textit{Fenians and Anglo-American Relations During Reconstruction}, 29.
\textsuperscript{60} Jenkins, \textit{Fenians and Anglo-American Relations During Reconstruction}, 42-44.
While the Fenian Brotherhood’s presence was growing in the United States, the British government was taking dramatic action to stop Fenian growth at home. While most of the British media attention had turned to the Fenian Brotherhood’s infighting, the Irish Republican Brotherhood pulled together an army of around 6,000 men with approximately 50,000 firearms.61 Wary of this growth, the British government shut down The Irish People, one of the most popular radical Fenian newspapers, in September 1865. Great Britain’s efforts earlier in the decade to quiet radical Irish publications had largely been successful, and the People was the last true source of revolutionary news for the Irish working class in Great Britain.62 As an additional measure, the British government arrested many high-profile Fenian leaders in London, effectively eliminating any revolutionary presence from the British capital.

As these draconian efforts comforted the British populace, anti-Fenian rhetoric and imagery continued to grow. With this rhetoric came the reiteration of the apeman from Figure 6 as the official caricature of the Fenian movement in Great Britain. “Erin’s Little Difficulty,” a Punch cartoon from late September 1865, expresses this growth (Figure 8). The artist takes the Fenian from Figure 6 and builds on those hybrid simian features. The Fenian's clothes are exactly the same, and he still has a long, ape-like jaw; his mouth hangs open, his nose is short and stubby, and his eyes are noticeably closer to his nose than his Anglo-Saxon counterparts. The cartoon adds no new features, but the emphasis on each one is much greater and more deliberate.

One significant departure from Figure 6 is in the reduction of the Fenian to a child. His drum looks more like a children’s toy than any type of troop-rallying

---

61 James Murphy, Ireland: A Social, Cultural and Literary History, 1791-1891 (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2003), 117.
instrument, and Erin easily grabs him by the collar to whip him with a birch rod. The birch rod was the tool of choice for beating schoolchildren in Victorian England, and its use implies that Britons should see the Fenian movement the way they would a rowdy child in need of discipline. The cartoon depicts Erin doing this disciplinary work as a young governess with Britannia, her employer, watching behind her. Many wealthy households in Victorian England hired governesses to live with their family and teach their children to read, write, and follow basic social norms. These young women were generally middle class and well educated. Occasionally these women came from similar backgrounds as their employers, but as working women were still regarded as having a lower rank than the families who hired them. This placement of Erin as a governess negates the claim that the Irish and British are flesh and blood, distancing any familial connection between them. In addition, Erin’s caretaking of the misbehaving Fenian children puts a new spin on this apeman idea, suggesting that, while Britons believed the wild ape of the jungle could never be tamed, the hybrid Fenian has enough human in him to respond to punishment appropriately.

As a governess, Erin’s relationships to the Fenian and Britannia reflect certain aspects of Ireland’s colonial status. For an average Victorian governess, any issue she had with her employer’s children was ultimately hers alone to solve. If displeased with a governess’s job performance, a parent could step in to direct her behavior and ultimately had the final say on all matters, but at all other times the governess had total control over how she approached handling the children under her care. By referring to the Fenian as “Erin’s Little Difficulty,” the cartoonist sets up a similar power dynamic. Britannia,
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64 Ibid., 4.
looming over the political situation, has full jurisdiction over Ireland and all of its affairs. However, she chooses only to guide Erin’s hand in dealing with this issue, rather than getting involved in it herself. By coaching Erin, she avoids getting herself involved and forces Erin to continue to do the job she has been selected to do, which in this particular image is to control Ireland and keep it behaving in a manner that meets with Britannia’s approval. The cartoon thus suggests that Britain has much more important matters to attend to than the revolutionary Irish, whom it depicts as savage, childish, and ineffective. That the Fenian has no teeth implies that the British still believe he is part of a weak and “toothless” movement.65

A few months later, however, the situation with the Irish became serious enough for Britannia to show willingness to possibly step in and help clean up the mess (Figure 9). British fear of the Fenian movement turned to paranoia in the winter of 1865-1866, as ranks on both sides of the Atlantic grew stronger and the US government appeared even more willing to let an Irish revolutionary force move into Canada without restraint.66 This cartoon, “The Fenian-Pest,” now depicts Britannia as Erin’s sister, who has come into Ireland to help Erin manage the Fenian growth. The cartoon’s title is a play on rinderpest, which was a fairly common disease among cattle in the mid 1860s. The recommended treatment for any infected livestock was isolation followed by slaughter.67 Britannia’s line, “try isolation first, my dear, and then…” adopts this treatment for the Fenians. This exposes a divide between the two women: while Erin refers to the Fenians as “these troublesome people,” Britannia’s solution suggests that treating the Fenians like people is part of the problem.
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65 Punch cartoonists give him these later in the decade as the Fenians become a much more serious threat to British society. See Figure 1.
66 Gantt, Irish Terrorism in the Atlantic Community 42-44.
67 Douglas et al, Drawing Conclusions, 68.
In coming to Erin’s aid, Britannia has an entirely new look from Figure 8. Though still adorned with the same warrior’s helmet and dress, this new Britannia is no longer matronly, but muscular and tall, with a toned jaw, a strong Roman nose, and clenched fists. She holds herself in a very traditionally masculine pose: she stands tall and proud (like Jonathan in Figure 3 and O’Connell in Figure 6), ferociously leering at the oncoming Fenian, with the smaller, timid Erin clutching onto her for safety. Not only does she appear increasingly masculine, but increasingly Anglo-Saxon as well, as the artist appeals to this traditional image in a time of potential conflict with the Celtic Other. However, although she maintains the ideal protective, masculine stance, she still expresses reluctance at the idea of directly getting involved in Fenian activity in Ireland, thus perpetuating Great Britain’s colonial relationship to Ireland. Britannia’s advice is to deal with the Fenians through isolation; she proposes to let the Fenians run amok until hopefully they calm down. She comforts Erin and expresses support for ending the Fenian movement, but avoids any discussion of actual British involvement in accomplishing this. This colonial stance is further emphasized in the extent to which both Figures 8 and 9 suggest ways in which Erin is still inferior to the British. In both cartoons she appears much poorer, with a short, ragged dress and exposed feet. She constantly needs help, which acts as an affirmation of Ireland’s dependent status. In addition, including Erin in the Anglo-Saxon family in one cartoon but not the other exposes ambiguity in Punch cartoonists over the decision to include the Irish in the Anglo-Saxon community or not.

Debate over the possible existence of Irish Anglo-Saxonism continued in Punch for much of the decade. One narrative argued that some Irish men and women were
already as good as Anglo-Saxons and the rest could learn, while the other posed a theory of the Irish as static Celts. In Figure 9, as Britannia’s younger sister, Erin still has time to grow and develop into a woman with Britannia’s bravery and confidence. This set-up has a positive, auspicious outlook for Erin’s future. Figure 8, on the other hand, removes Erin from this bloodline and removes from her any potential to grow into a strong Anglo-Saxon woman. Governesses frequently had bitter relationships with the mothers of the children they worked with. But even if this relationship was not bitter, a governess’s exposure to the wealthier class would not help elevate her social standing. Women who worked for wages were looked down upon in Victorian England, and this stigma prevented them from joining the ranks of the “ladies of the leisure class.” Even without this stigma, these women earned as much as a butler at best, excluding them from this class on financial grounds as well.69 These two cartoons, then, offer two separate narratives for Irish racial development. One theory gives the Irish room to develop and eventually work for independence, while the other has them stuck in the mud.

From this point on, *Punch* began to regularly include images of Erin and the Fenian as a couple, ultimately becoming a duo as essential in the cartooning world as Jonathan and Columbia or John Bull and Britannia. The only difference, however, is that Erin and the Fenian are utterly incompatible. Erin married poorly. She and the Fenian argue, fight, have little in common and are portrayed as near complete opposites. Regardless of whether cartoonists believed Erin was truly in the Anglo-Saxon family, she was always depicted as belonging to a race very close to it in both looks and behavior. The Fenian Irishman, on the other hand, is the epitome of Celtic greed and lust. This

---

69 Ibid., 8.
union, then, in the combination of their races, helps explain the reasoning for the hybrid apeman Irish figure.

Twenty-first-century logic may dictate that Anglo-Saxons might have viewed this mixing of Anglo-Saxon and Celt as a way of improving the Irish. However, there was a growing fear of miscegenation and racial mixing in Anglo-American culture in the nineteenth century. Some theorists posited that the Anglo-Saxon race lost its special, superior qualities when it mixed with another. Jonathan and Columbia as well as John Bull and Britannia are perfect examples of a pure, unsullied Anglo-Saxon bloodline, while Erin and the Fenian represent the horrors of what can go wrong if a woman with Anglo-Saxon blood marries someone outside of her “stock.” This logic also serves to maintain the perceived impurity of the Irish race, keeping them inferior and subservient. An Irishman or woman with some Anglo-Saxon blood could claim a right to move toward Irish independence, but a pure Celt could never do this. This conviction reinforced the separation between Celts and Anglo-Saxons at the most basic racial level.

Postwar United States: Irish vs. African-Americans

Americans too grappled with this question of what exactly defined a Celt and used African Americans to help get gain a better understanding. With the abolition of slavery, questions about African-American rights abounded in postwar America. These questions asked whether blacks were entitled to all the same rights as whites, or just some, and whether the end of slavery was enough to guarantee equality or not. With a radical transformation of American ideas about what it meant to be black, American cartoonists

---

turned to the Irish for comparison, reusing the strategy employed in Figure 4 after the
draft riots.

Across the nation, neither the Irish nor African-Americans won this debate with
an overwhelming majority. However, in the pro-Republican, pro-black, and anti-
imigrant Harper’s, the Irish almost always lost. This was not surprising, as the Irish
were traditionally immigrant Democratic Party supporters who advocated for the
expansion of the franchise and feared the addition of new black laborers into the market.
Traditional anti-Irish Republican rhetoric came out of the anti-immigrant and anti-
Catholic tendencies of nativist Know-Nothing supporters whom the Republicans had
added to their political base before Abraham Lincoln’s election to the presidency in 1860.
However, Harper’s anti-Irish fervor also stemmed from an increasingly radicalized
Republican Party coming out of the war. One of the primary issues after Appomattox was
managing the readmittance of Confederate states into the Union. After Lincoln’s death,
this fell into the hands of Andrew Johnson, a Southern Republican who, despite his party
affiliation, established a lenient readmittance policy and refused to sign any pro-African-
American legislation. Johnson’s stubbornness hardened Republican resolve and pushed
them to further their efforts toward civil and political equality for African Americans.

One Harper’s cartoon from early 1866 considers this equality (Figure 10). The
image depicts two women sitting next to one another on a street passenger car. The
woman on the right is African American, while the one next to her, Mrs. McCaffraty, is
Irish. The women have strikingly different appearances. The African American woman

---

71 The Mrs. McCaffraty in this cartoon could be a reference to John McCafferty, a well-known figure in the Fenian movement.
McCafferty was of Irish descent, but was born in Ohio in the early to mid nineteenth century. McCafferty had fought for the
Confederacy during the Civil War, and almost as soon as the war ended, travelled to Ireland to participate in an uprising. He was
captured upon arrival was tried for “treason-felony,” despite his claims that he was an American. He was acquitted at his trial in
December 1865, but was later sentenced to death in 1867 (though he was later freed in 1871). I cannot find any information on
whether McCafferty was married or not. However, coming only three months after his acquittal, and mentioning that “Mr.
appears wealthy, with her well kempt hair and bonnet, nice dress, and her parasol to protect her from the sun. Mrs. McCaffraty’s only protection from the sun comes from her own hat, which is a style normally associated with domestic servants. Underneath this hat is a ragged dress (similar to Erin’s in Figure 8), which, along with her bag of groceries, further emphasizes her status as a lower-class domestic.

Through the conflation of stereotypical facial features, the cartoon brings to the fore novel interpretations of what it means to be African American or Irish. Unlike most depictions of African Americans at the time, even the ones in Harper’s drawn by the most radical Republicans, the African American woman has primarily Anglo-Saxon features. Like Jonathan in Figure 3, she has a prominent Roman nose, a strong jaw line, and thin lips; in every way but the color of her skin, she looks like an Anglo-Saxon woman on the passenger car. The Irish woman, on the other hand, has the stereotypical facial characteristics of an African American. Like the black-Irish hybrid in Figure 4, her eyes are close together and sticking out from her face, her nose is short and wide, and her lips are thick. Even her skin is not completely white. If it were not for her darker-skinned counterpart and her standard Irish name, she would almost certainly be considered black.

However, this cartoon does not aim to dismantle the entirety of anti-black prejudice in favor of anti-Irish prejudice, and by no means pushes a view of blacks as entirely Anglo-Saxon. At best, the cartoon makes the claim that compared to the Irish, even blacks look white, and that a public encounter with them is far superior to a public encounter with the Irish. Still, some black inferiority is inscribed in the African-American

---

McCaffraty” voted against suffrage for African-Americans, something Southern-sympathizing Democrats were known for and Harper’s was regularly critical of, this cartoon could very well be referencing the famous Fenian leader. If this is the case, the cartoon takes on additional meaning as an attack on Democratic politics as well as the Irish. See Niamh Howlin, “Fenians, Foreigners and Jury Trials in Ireland, 1865-1870,” *Irish Jurist* 45 (June 2011): 51-81.

*Harper’s* was also not afraid of mocking the wives of men in the media through its cartoons. See the “Miss Slidell on the Ramp-Page” cartoon from the January 18, 1862 issue, which includes the not so subtle line, “I say, with my hand on my heart, that Miss Slidell, in her agony, did strike Mr. Fairfax three times in the face. I wish that her knuckles had struck me in the face.”
woman’s behavior. Despite her properly feminine characteristics, she still glances down demurely away from the Irish woman, signifying that she understands that as a non-white, her place in the public realm is one that requires she go unnoticed. This provides a stark contrast to the more masculine Irish woman, whose head is raised up, talking alone, suggesting an “uppity” nature. Unlike the rowdy, obnoxious Irish, African-Americans know that it is not their place to make any type of scene in public, or to draw attention to themselves. They know how to follow these basic norms of public decency.

These public norms were fairly new in 1866. The horse-drawn public streetcar first came to American cities in New York in 1832, but did not catch on in popularity until twenty years later. In Washington, DC, where the cartoon is set, the first streetcars began popping up in late 1862. Slavery had only been abolished in DC earlier that year, and now that the war was over, Americans could finally begin paying a close eye to the racial politics of this new public transportation. Like trains, midcentury streetcars acted as a new arena in which to play around with and observe how different races behaved and cooperated with one another. Through the African American woman’s demure posture, this cartoon suggests that African Americans have a very innate understanding of how this system works. Segregation in public transportation had yet to become the norm, and, as a result, Americans expected non-whites to restrain what they considered their dangerous or noisy impulses. Thus, the African-American fits in with Anglo-Saxon expectations of her (and perhaps her Anglo-Saxon facial features are a recognition of the fact that she has been molded by these expectations), while the Irish woman completely fails to perceive these and has replaced the stereotypical African American role as
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72 For more on the role of trains in American racial politics in the nineteenth century, see Barbara Welke, Recasting American Liberty: Gender, Race, Law, and the Railroad Revolution, 1865-1920 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
“uppity” and disrespectful. The cartoon is thus not entirely clear in how it represents blacks compared to whites, but readily presents the notion of the Irish as a much more dangerous threat to the social order than African Americans. Similar to their inability to grasp the Anglo-Saxon political norms of self-government, this cartoon indicates that Irish women are also unable to grasp basic Anglo-Saxon social and cultural ones.

Prior to this cartoon, women had rarely appeared in Harper’s in such a caricaturized form. The Irish had generally been represented as men, with cartoonists focusing on their apparent violence and their role in the Democratic Party. By focusing on just the men, these cartoonists noted the main, macro-level issues with the Irish: the Irish voted for the Democrats and were therefore a political problem; the Irish rioted and were therefore a safety problem. Mrs. McCaffraty shows that the Irish do not need to travel in groups to make trouble: it takes only one Irish woman to cause “holy horror” in the passenger car. This horror provides a powerful argument for the Irish as a social problem in addition to the political problems they allegedly posed. According to this logic, even when the men are not in the voting booth or rioting in the streets, the presence of a single Irish woman is enough to disturb an entire group of individuals in a public place. As a domestic servant Mrs. McCaffraty brings this social threat into the homes of Americans across the country, disrupting the social order in both private and public spheres. While African Americans in this cartoon are shown to be able to fit in with American society at the most rudimentary level, the Irish can only upset its balance.

The culmination of this idea is that Irish women, in addition to men, fail the Anglo-Saxon standard. Punch and Harper’s differ in their precise opinion on this issue. In Britain, the figure of Erin serves to highlight a partial Anglo-Saxonism of the Irish.
She is not overly sexualized, but she retains significant feminine features: her maternal instinct with the miniature Fenian, her timidity in looking for help in the arms of the strong, masculine Britannia, and her attractive, well kept hair. The American version of the Irish woman lacks these features – she is ugly, brutish, and indelicate, no better than a man. She exists to perpetuate the belief that no Irish, male or female, fulfills the standards of Anglo-Saxon gender roles.

**Fenian Raids in Canada**

Toward the end of the Civil War, British officials had begun to regularly arrest Irish-American Fenians in England and Ireland and refused to repatriate them back to the United States. Though many of these men had officially sworn their oath to the US Constitution, British law did not recognize the possibility of naturalization – once a subject of the British Empire, always a subject. Americans thought otherwise. Similar disputes over the status of the countries’ respective citizens had played a major role in the outbreak of the War of 1812, when Great Britain regularly impressed British-born American citizens. Since the end of that conflict, citizenship issues between the two governments had not produced any major clashes. There had even been some progress in the 1860s, with US minister Charles Adams able to negotiate a release of naturalized Americans in Irish prisons in 1865.

However, this negotiation did not deter the frequent arrests of Irish Americans, and it inspired several US Congressmen to go on missions to Ireland to demand the release of more American citizens. Even if these Congressmen were anti-Irish,

73 This was the act of taking these Americans and recruiting them into the British Navy.
74 Sim, *A Union Forever*, 106.
75 Sewell, “Rebels or Revolutionaries?,” 725.
imprisonment of American citizens on foreign soil was an affront to US sovereignty. Many American prisoners in Ireland sent long letters for publication in American newspapers that detailed the circumstances of their arrest.\(^76\) This often aroused pro-Irish sentiment, which, though faltering, was still significant in the United States in the mid 1860s. In addition, these letters also fueled ever-growing anti-British sentiment. The situation with Great Britain was only exacerbated in February 1866, when the British government suspended habeas corpus in Ireland, opening up a brand new wave of Irish-American incarceration.

In addition to the problem of American arrests, neither government exhibited any willingness to change its position on the Alabama claims negotiations, which many American statesmen, Adams included, held as a much higher priority than the conflicts over the incarceration of Americans abroad. Furthermore, as hope for diplomatic success began to evaporate, the Fenian movement grew even stronger, prompting three major raids into Canada during the late spring and summer of 1866. The first raid took place in April, when John O’Mahony and a gang of seven hundred men tried to take Campobello Island in New Brunswick but were quickly redirected back to the United States by the British Navy.\(^77\) In June, the Fenians regrouped for two more raids, but they were again pushed back into American territory with little success.

One of the major reasons for these June failures was the presence of American troops on the Canadian border. Fenians believed they had the unofficial sanction of the US government going into the raids, but a few days after the first attacks President

\(^76\) Sim, *A Union Forever*, 104.
\(^77\) O’Mahony was opposed to a Canadian invasion largely because he did not think it would have any chance of success. However, he was still tempted by the idea, once saying, “the Canadian raid I look upon as a mere diversion...Unless it drags the United States into war with England it can only end in defeat to those that engage in it. But it is worth trying in the hope that it may lead to such a war.” Cathaoir, “American Fenianism and Canada, 1865-1871,” 77.
Andrew Johnson issued a proclamation requiring the enforcement of all neutrality laws.\(^7\) Since Fenians were crossing the border into British territory, this served to publicly acknowledge the illegality of the Fenian raids and, more importantly, to declare the US government’s intent to stop them. Following Johnson’s proclamation, American troops assembled at the border and easily quelled the Fenian resistance. These Fenians were mostly trained soldiers with some combat experience in war, but they did not have the numbers or the weapons to stand up to an Anglo-American opposition. The raids soon ended, and Fenian significance or presence in American life quickly declined.

Johnson’s proclamation to defend the border was a major stepping stone in Anglo-American relations. The raids had put the US government in a position where it had to very directly and consciously choose to support Ireland or Great Britain. By initially refusing to defend the border, the American government explicitly stated its desire to allow the Fenian raids and destruction of British property to continue. But, by altering its position and securing the border, the American government sided in direct opposition to the Fenians and chose to strengthen its ties with Great Britain.

This move had two main consequences: first, it was a way to highlight the speed and effectiveness of the American armed forces without actually entering serious combat. Second, and more importantly, it was a moral power play. Johnson’s proclamation begins by noting that the Fenians were engaged in a military expedition against “people of British North America within the dominions of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with which said colonies, districts, and people, and Kingdom, the United States are at peace, and whereas the proceedings aforesaid constitute a high misdemeanor,

\(^7\) DeRosier, “Importance in Failure,” 184.
forbidden by the laws of the United States as well as the laws of nations.” The language here is fairly basic, but the significance of this whole statement is underscored by the last phrase. Johnson justifies his commitment to ending the Fenian raids not because he finds them personally distracting or considers them an impediment to domestic policy, but because they violate the law of nations. This framing may not have expressed his true motivation, but it is important that he phrased it this way, because it allowed the movement of troops and the elimination of the Fenian raids from the border to be presented as a message of obedience to international laws and a commitment to peace treaties that one makes. By stressing its own adherence to international law, the US government emphasized its need for Great Britain to return the favor and show a willingness to resolve the Alabama claims.

Though coming together on the same side of an international conflict was a turning point for their relations, Americans still had some reservations about getting closer to the British. One Harper’s cartoon from June 1866 captures the essence of these doubts (Figure 11). Titled “The Fenian Expedition,” the cartoon shows an eagle with a halo over its head, perched on a stump, gazing forward. The eagle possesses a clearly majestic air that contrasts with the British lion, who covers behind it and ducks under Columbia’s red, white, and blue shield. With Fenians approaching in the distance, the cartoon indicates British dependence on American military strength.

The cartoon takes this message further in the text. The eagle’s perch says “American neutrality” in bold letters. The fact that these letters are carved into the sturdy wood suggests permanence and a belief that the American government sticks to its word.

79 WC Chewett & Co., The Fenian Raid at Fort Erie, June the First and Second, 1866: With a Map of the Niagara Peninsula, Shewing the Route of the Troops; and a Plan of the Lime Ridge Battle Ground (W.C. Chewett & Co., 1866): 93.
The wall behind the British lion, on the other hand, suggests Great Britain has a similar belief in its word, but that word comes with a few caveats. The wall has “British neutrality” written into it as well, but beneath it the cartoonist adds the litany of diplomatic sins Great Britain committed during the Civil War, including “Alabama pirates,” and “belligerent rights.” In turning its back to the lion, the eagle shows the lion, and therefore the British government, that it is willing to give the lion another chance at diplomacy, hoping it will act honorably this time.

_Punch_, on the other hand, showed much less reluctance at the prospect of working with Americans. This is not a surprise, as Britain had much more on the line than the United States in the raids, and they clearly appreciated American assistance. “The Yankee Fireman Keeps his Word,” a _Punch_ cartoon from a few weeks after the raids, expresses this appreciation, but with a hint of skepticism as well (Figure 12). Like the previous cartoon, this image depicts two figures at the border fending off the Fenians, but they are now fighting side by side, with Jonathan having arrived just in time to assist Miss Canada. She shoots her rifle as he sprays Fenians away with a fire hose, thrusting them into a cloud of water and smoke while the “Fenianism Forever” banner waves in the distance. Jonathan lets Miss Canada know that he is “ready when wanted,” which, coming from Great Britain, is a sign of confidence in American reliability. An image of Jonathan going to lengths to defend the country from foreign invasion, then, expresses a newfound trust that the American government will not go after the nation north of its border.

At the same time, an alternate reading of the cartoon suggests the artist wants to indicate that Great Britain has some lingering doubts as to the purity of American
intentions in helping Miss Canada. Jonathan’s line, “I’m ready when wanted,” is ambiguously open-ended. It does not indicate what exactly he will be ready for, or what Canada wants from him. The body language and instruments in the image suggest that he is referring to taking Canada – whether that means the United States will try to annex the country is not made explicit, but is implied through the flirtatious nature of the cartoon, as he leans over to Miss Canada and whispers into her ear. His line also plays on a longstanding idea in American politics that Canada was interested in joining the United States, but had been taking a while to make up its mind. The cartoon, then, suggests Americans may still have their eyes on Canada, and the British government should not get too comfortable with these Americans spending time there.

While the Fenian movement slowed down in the United States, the Irish Republican Brotherhood in Britain continued to grow in 1867. After a British spy within the Fenian ranks spoiled one planned uprising in 1866, the Irish revolutionaries made their first major attack in February 1867 on Chester Castle in England. The goal was to take weapons from the castle’s armory and then flee quickly back to Dublin. Like the 1866 raid, however, the Chester Castle plan had been discovered by British spies. This one still got off its feet though, and although the men mobilized quickly on the day of the raid, they were met by a force of policemen who arrested them on the spot. Early in the next month, Fenians returned to the spotlight, attempting a coordinated uprising in several major Irish cities. This movement failed as well, again because of British spies in the Fenian ranks.
Though they failed, these raids confirmed the violent and rebellious intentions of the Fenians in the eyes of the British public. This increased an already high level of paranoia, and the British government responded by extending the suspension of habeas corpus in Ireland. The increase in arrests continued to gall American statesman, who were already frustrated by the stagnant progress on the Alabama negotiations over the course of 1866. While no worse than they had been at the end of the Civil War, Anglo-American relations had seen only a slight improvement. War no longer seemed imminent, but it was still a distinct possibility, and the lack of progress on naturalization policy as well as the Alabama claims only served to strengthen this existing tension.

**St. Patrick’s Day Riots and the Completed Irish Image**

Diplomatic developments and increased anti-Irish sentiment helped relieve some of this tension over the course of 1867. In the United States, anti-Irish ideology hit a turning point in March at the annual St. Patrick’s Day Parade in New York City. The parade was an annual event that celebrated Irish heritage and culture with bands, booze, and “processions of Irish societies” up and down the city streets.\(^80\) The motto of the parade was “sobriety and industry,” and the majority of the floats in it were manned by organizations involved in efforts to limit the use of alcohol in the United States.\(^81\)

The actual parade, however, did not reflect these values. The initial outbreak of violence was precipitated by the entrance of a confused deliveryman onto a parade road. Upon entering, the man apparently did not block any traffic or slow down any of the floats behind him, and reports of the event indicate that a group of policemen asked him

\(^{80}\) *New York Times*, March 19, 1867.

\(^{81}\) Ibid.
to move out of the way and began directing him toward an exit. As he was slowly backing away from the parade, a group of Irishmen grew impatient and ambushed him. The police immediately went to the man’s defense, but more Irishmen arrived and beat them down, a brawl between the Irish and the police officers quickly ensued. The violence ended almost as quickly as it began, but not before the Irishmen “seriously wounded” fifteen police officers.82

Later that afternoon, in an unrelated incident in a separate section of the parade, police forces tried to arrest an Irishman for attempting to incite a second riot of the day. After an initial struggle, police eventually apprehended the man, but his fellow Irishmen quickly pounced on his capturers and another melee broke out. The Irish only injured two officers in this skirmish, but they wielded “bludgeons, clubs, swords, pistols, muskets, &c.,” and one Irishman was detained for repeatedly trying to kill a police officer with a sword.83

Like the draft riots in 1863, news of the attacks at the parade strengthened the general American understanding of the Irish as violent and fundamentally uncontrollable. Unlike the 1863 riots, however, there was no longer a successful counter to this image. Then, the pervasive figure of the Irish soldier who fought bravely alongside his American comrades partially exonerated the Irish in the public eye. That image set up two distinct narratives: the dirty, poor, riotous Irish and the courageous, soldier Irish.

The end of the war restricted the hold of the soldier narrative on the American public, but the armistice alone did not inexorably fix upon the Irish the image of the dirty, poor, and riotous narrative overnight. This took place slowly over the course of the next

82 Daily Eastern Argus, March 19, 1867.
83 Ibid.
two years, as the Fenian raids gave evidence to justify this viewpoint. By virtue of American troops having gone up to the border to arrest the Irish rebels, the Irish had become, in a limited sense at the least, enemies of the state. This enemy, however, was not one that was regularly perceived or feared in most parts of the country; the Irish posed a threat at the border, not in the majority of American towns and cities. This changed with the St. Patrick’s Day Parade, as the threat of Irish violence came to America’s front door, and the Irish no longer had anything to defend themselves with.

It is difficult to say whether the St. Patrick’s Day riots forever destroyed the image of the Irish as brave and loyal soldiers, but Harper’s assuredly wanted the melee to play that function. In early April, Harper’s issued a full page rendering of the massacre (Figure 13). Up until this point, neither Punch nor Harper’s had depicted the Fenian image in such vivid and brutal detail. Like previous cartoons, the Irish have short noses, simian gaping jaws, and eyes so close together they almost touch. But where the depiction of the 1863 race riots in Figure 4 was ambivalent, on this, this cartoon casts no doubt on its belief in a distinct Irish racial class, whose non-Anglo-Saxon nature is reinforced through the long noses and sharp jaw lines of the policemen. The image brings to life the most provocative elements of the Irish threat: the men use clubs, spears, swords, and even bricks right off the ground in their assault. The variety of these weapons – only a few of which appear improvised – suggests that, even if the Irish had not actually planned the attack, they had certainly shown up to the parade expecting some sort of violent altercation. Their violence, then, the cartoon suggests, was in some way premeditated. This implies that not only are the Irish ready for violence anywhere at anytime, but that they are always armed with its most appropriate tools. To hammer this
point home, the cartoon, titled “The Day We Celebrate,” includes the words “rum” and “blood” at the corners, hinting at a claim that murder and liquor are the lifeblood of the Irish.

Figure 13 is the culmination of the anti-Irish imagery that cartoonists in *Punch* and *Harper’s* had been developing over the past decade. All the anti-Irish images, props, and symbols are finally in place. From *Punch*, the artist borrows the elongated face and narrow eyes, in addition to the long coat and high hat, as seen in Figures 6, 8, and 9. From *Harper’s*, the artist borrows the deformed faces and jagged, vicious teeth, as seen in Figure 4. These teeth are an especially important addition to this image. As I noted in my discussion of Figures 8 and 9, the British caricature lacked these, which allowed for two critical interpretations: that the Irish act like babies, so young and undeveloped that they have yet to grow teeth; or that the Irish are not a true threat, and Fenianism is thus a “toothless” movement. Either way, the addition of sharp, jagged teeth in Figure 13 demands a reconsideration of both of these viewpoints. It confers legitimacy upon the Irish threat that most Americans already felt, but that much of Great Britain was reluctant to acknowledge until the botched Chester raid earlier that year.

However, the Fenian image in *Harper’s* goes beyond a criticism of Fenianism alone, acting as a critique of *all* Irish men and women. Figures 6, 8, and 9 in *Punch*, all of which use this caricature, employ it specifically in order to raise awareness of the Fenian movement, but they simultaneously limit this image from application to all Irish people through the Anglo-Saxon qualities in Erin (8 and 9) and the depiction of the “Loyal Irish” (Figure 14). Figures 3, 4, 10, and 13 in *Harper’s*, on the other hand, make no mention of Fenianism, using the image to make a blanket statement about anyone with any Celtic
heritage. According to *Punch*, the Fenians were only a small sect of the Irish race as a whole, and despite the belief that the Irish were not entirely Anglo-Saxon, the magazine did not believe they all posed a threat. *Harper’s*, on the other hand, in taking the Fenian image and applying it to all of the Irish, suggested that there was no separating the two.

**The Fenian Guy Fawkes**

Events over the course of the next two years brought *Punch’s* Fenian image closer to the American version in both its form and the feeling behind it, in large part because of a rise in Fenian activity. Before 1867, all Fenian plans had been stopped before they could even get started by British police forces with inside information. However, in the fall of 1867, the Irish Republican Brotherhood finally carried out two of its planned attacks. This is not to say that they succeeded in these missions, but that they were finally able to get past the starting line.

The first event was an attempt to free two Fenian prisoners from authorities in Manchester in September. These prisoners, Thomas Kelly and Timothy Deasy, were Fenian leaders who helped plan the failed uprising in Ireland the previous March. After the uprising failed, they fled and successfully evaded authorities until September 1867 when they were finally apprehended. Fenian leaders quickly got word of their arrest and drew up a plan to set them free while en route from the courthouse to the local jail. Between thirty and forty Fenian men met at the rendezvous point and successfully stopped the carriage, but they could not figure out how to unlock the door. Frustrated, one Fenian shot through the keyhole, hoping to scare the policemen in the van into letting them go; instead, he accidentally killed one of the guards, who had placed his eye to the
hole to get a better look at the situation. This enabled both Kelly and Deasy to successfully escape, but it lead to murder charges for three of the men involved in the jailbreak.

These men were publicly hanged in November in front of a crowd of about ten thousand people; they quickly became known as the Manchester Martyrs. The addition of true martyrs to the movement reignited the energy of the Irish Republican Brotherhood. Public masses were held throughout Ireland and much of England, revamping support for the Fenian cause. Funerals for individuals convicted of treason were against the law in Great Britain so Fenians put on mock funerals throughout the country. Armed with this revitalized anger, the Irish Republican Brotherhood came up with a plan to exact revenge by freeing two of their men who had been arrested three days prior to the Manchester executions.

The men were locked up in Clerkenwell Prison in London. Clerkenwell was in a lower- to middle-class neighborhood, and it had high yet particularly weak walls. The plan called for setting off a bomb that would blow through these walls while the prisoners were exercising, allowing them to run off into a nearby safe house. When it came time to stage the attack, the Irishmen successfully detonated the bomb and blew a sixty-foot whole in the wall. However, the blast was much stronger than the Irish had expected, and the force of the detonation reached many of the houses in the surrounding area, killing twelve and injuring up to one hundred. This reversed any of the sympathy the Fenians received after the Manchester executions, with many Britons arguing that the bombing showed a blatant disregard for British property and British lives.
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84 For more on mock funerals and the means by which Fenians honored their dead, see Brian Jenkins, “The Rule of Law: Murderers and Martyrs,” in The Fenian Problem: Insurgency and Terrorism in a Liberal State, 1858-1874 (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2008), 118-46.
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In the same vein as the St. Patrick Day Parade riots, the Clerkenwell explosion brought the Fenian threat directly into the lives of average British citizens. Though the threat had been much less abstract than in the United States, no single event had expressly shown the Irish as such a potential danger to daily life in Great Britain. The result, historian Jonathan Gantt notes, was a public othering of the Irish, formally removing them from Anglo-Saxon culture and placing them into a category normally only reserved for Asian or Middle Eastern ethnic or racial groups. In other words, as in the aftermath of the St. Patrick’s Day riot in the United States, the Fenian threat was applied to all Irish in Great Britain.

“The Fenian Guy Fawkes,” a cartoon from *Punch* in late December 1867, shows the extent of this intensified perception of the Fenian threat (Figure 1). As noted in my introduction, Guy Fawkes was a British Catholic who had been part of the failed Gunpowder Plot in 1605, in which he and a group of fellow devotees attempted to blow up Westminster Palace as part of a larger plot to assassinate King James and put a Catholic monarch back on the throne. Fawkes was convicted of treason and eventually hanged, and until 1859, an act of Parliament had listed November 5, the day British officials had stopped the bombing, as a day of national thanksgiving. Eight years after this act was repealed, however, Fawkes still had a negative image as both a traitor and a Catholic, and thus the cartoon makes a powerful claim for the Fenians as the heirs of this infamous legacy. As the inheritors, the cartoon classifies the Fenians as enemies of the state, tarring them with an image and reputation similar to the one they had in *Harper’s*. The cartoon proposes that the threat is now much greater; in addition to the traditional Fenian props and facial features, he has the teeth the Americans had put on him earlier in
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the year and is on his way to blowing up a group of innocent children and a breastfeeding mother. However, unlike Harper’s, which associated all Irish with Fenian activity, the cartoonist explicitly notes that the Guy Fawkes-like man is a Fenian, and thus limits the criticism only to them.

*Punch* took a step back from this aggressive anti-Irish imagery one week later with its cartoon “A Hint to the Loyal Irish” (Figure 14). This cartoon shows Irishman lining up to help Prime Minister Gladstone fend off the Fenian threat. The Irishmen in the cartoon show distinct Irish characteristics in their clothes and facial hair, but have distinctly Anglo-Saxon faces, with long, sharp noses and defined jaws. By depicting the Irish in this fashion, and noting that there are “hundreds o’ the boys” who are willing to help, the cartoon suggests that England is replete with these loyal Celts, rejecting the notion of all Irishmen as Fenians. However, because these Anglo-Saxon-resembling Irishmen have to identify themselves to authorities and their allegiance cannot be assumed on looks alone, the cartoon leaves room for many Irish who look Anglo-Saxon but are in fact participating in Fenian activities.

**Diplomatic Challenges**

Despite the surge in anti-Irish opinion on both sides of the Atlantic throughout 1867, diplomatic negotiations remained at an impasse. Part of this tension came from the British government’s tireless pursuit of Irish Americans involved in the Fenian movement. The issue came to light most noticeably with the Jacmel expedition in April 1867, in which approximately forty-five Irishmen sailed from New York to Ireland with
2,000 muskets and plans to overthrow the British government in Ireland.\textsuperscript{87} The plan met with about as much success as one would assume it would from this brief description.

After getting to Ireland, the ship went sailing up the shoreline as the crew argued over which city they wanted to invade first.\textsuperscript{88} British troops quickly discovered the ship, apprehended the men, and returned them to shore, transferring them to the nearest prison. The arrest of such a large number of Irish Americans infuriated US officials, leading Secretary of State Seward to start insisting on the solution of the naturalization problem as a prerequisite for negotiations on the \textit{Alabama} claims.\textsuperscript{89} Noting this pressure, the British public advocated for a change in their policy. A British lawyer writing in the \textit{London Times} under the name Historicus spearheaded this campaign. Historicus traced the origin of this form of naturalization back to the “feudal tenure” of the Middle Ages and argued that it was created as a means to deny peasants the opportunity to amass the requisite wealth to leave Great Britain.\textsuperscript{90} Through Historicus’ meticulous detail and rhetorical force, his viewpoint quickly gained a popular following and many British ministers soon came to agree with the United States that solving the naturalization issue was a prerequisite for solving all others.\textsuperscript{91}

The two governments made some progress on the naturalization issue in March, when Lord Stanley, the British secretary of state for foreign affairs, announced that the British government planned on repealing the doctrine of immutability for British citizens,

\textsuperscript{87} Sim, \textit{A Union Forever}, 111. See D’Arcy, \textit{The Fenian Movement in the United States}, 243-47, for a detailed explanation of the Jacmel expedition.

\textsuperscript{88} Sim, \textit{A Union Forever}, 111-13.


\textsuperscript{90} Historicus was a wealthy lawyer with a keen interest in international law named William Vernon Harcourt. He traces British naturalization policy back to the reign of Edward III, who ruled from 1312 until 1377. Largely untouched for centuries, the British government began adding provision onto the law that would make it more difficult to get rid of British citizenship in the early eighteenth century. \textit{London Times}, December 11, 1867; article found in Jenkins, \textit{Fenians and Anglo-American Relations During Reconstruction}, 258.

\textsuperscript{91} Jenkins, \textit{Fenians and Anglo American Relations During Reconstruction}, 278.
but only after thorough research in the consequences of such a repeal to the country. This relieved American statesman, but only to a point. Timing was a factor in negotiating the treaty, and some American statesmen feared the British government would go back on Stanley’s decision in a year or two. In addition, many of these same statesmen believed the research into the treaty’s consequences was a guise for Britain to continue arresting Irish Americans.  

Relations were tenuous at this point, but the situation grew even worse over the course of the next month. By mid April 1867, rumors of another Fenian invasion into Canada grew to their most threatening since the attacks the previous June. As relations slowly began to deteriorate over the estimated timeline for the naturalization treaty, Americans threatened to shirk their duty to defend the borders during this potential upcoming Irish attack. Americans had promised they would keep the borders secure after the 1866 Fenian raids, and to neglect this now would potentially set relations back to where they had been then or worse. The British government, worried about the effects of another Fenian raid, deployed spies along the Canadian border to gauge how ready Canadian armies were. These spies, however, noted that American troops had in fact mobilized and that the threats to leave the border unguarded had little truth behind them. The United States had bluffed, and the British government felt little pressure to concede much of anything for the treaty.

The fact that US troops went to guard the border in spite of the growing animosity between the two countries acts as evidence for the significant development in Anglo-Americans relations since the end of the Civil War. Both nations had experienced a rise
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in anti-Irish prejudice, accepting the Fenian threat as a very real and very serious possibility. In addition, as historian Jonathan Gantt has noted, both governments were coming together on anti-terrorist policies, as evidenced by the mobilization of American troops along the Canadian border.\footnote{Gantt, \textit{Irish Terrorism in the Atlantic Community}, 61-65.} Although the US government tried to convince the British they would not send troops north, it felt strongly enough about protecting the border from invasions from a rogue group like the Fenians to stop them, regardless of the state of Anglo-American relations. Americans had established a set principle that it would no longer allow Fenian groups to invade a friendly country, spelling the end of any possible Fenian support from the United States. They had chosen Great Britain over the Irish, and with it set in stone an anti-Fenian mindset as part of their Anglo-Saxon political alliance.

Despite this preference for Great Britain over Ireland, Anglo-American relations still lacked the harmony they would later achieve. By January 1869, conflict over the naturalization treaty had begun to die down, and both governments came together to establish a framework for resolving the \textit{Alabama} claims, the proposed Johnson-Clarendon Convention.\footnote{Named after Reverdy Johnson, US sinister to Great Britain, and the Earl of Clarendon, British secretary of state for foreign affairs.} Despite its initial promise, the treaty sparked controversy among members of Congress and the American public, as it proposed to hear all potential claims between the two nations and did not isolate or give any special consideration to the \textit{Alabama} damages. In particular, Charles Sumner, chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, spoke vehemently against the proposal and helped eliminate it from consideration in the US Senate with little debate.\footnote{Jenkins, \textit{Fenians and Anglo American Relations During Reconstruction}, 288-89.} Sumner argued that the lack of any special attention to the \textit{Alabama} claims indicated that the British government had no
remorse for what the *Alabama* and its fellow ships had done, conveying the image of a nasty, cold-hearted John Bull.

This type of criticism was run-of-the-mill for Americans, but Sumner played a significant role in the debate with his demand for the inclusion of indirect claims in the negotiations. Indirect claims consisted of any additional costs the United States had to weather as a result of the British raider ships beyond any physical damage they caused – a category covered by direct claims. According to Sumner, these new claims included increased insurance costs, a decline in import and export business, and a drop in expected American economic growth. In addition, Sumner included what he considered the extra funds the Union had to spend repressing the rebellion for the two years between 1861 and 1863, before Great Britain stepped up to enforce neutrality laws and capture domestic ships fighting for the Confederacy.97

These claims had been brought up previously by American statesman, but never with such a high price or much popular support. Sumner’s estimate of the total indirect claims fell at $2 billion dollars, in addition to the $15 million for direct claims.98 He suggested that if Great Britain did not want to pay this sum, it could give Canada to the United States instead. Both of these were extraordinary – if not ridiculous – requests, but Sumner’s plea for including indirect claims hardened American resolve, convincing members of Congress and the public at large that Great Britain had tried to shortchange them in the proposed Johnson-Clarendon convention.

Sumner’s words easily persuaded the Senate to reject the treaty in April, opening up an entirely new wave of anti-British rhetoric in the American press. However, as good
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relations with the Irish and the British were increasingly mutually exclusive, this
ewfound discontent with the British largely manifested itself through pro-Irish activity,
such as promises to support Fenian revolutionaries, a rejection of the diplomatic promise
the US government had made to support the British against the Irish.

This occurred at a time when the Irish were losing the backing of American
politicians.99 American Fenians were losing money and power, and many sections of the
Irish American population had lost the political influence they had possessed earlier in
the decade.100 With a wave of animosity toward Great Britain, however, the American
federal government began supporting petitions for Irish-American prisoners in Ireland, an
action citizens had been urging officials to take for years.101 State politicians in New
York started organizing mass meetings of angry Irish citizens calling for war with the
British Empire. Local politicians began courting Irish votes in a way they had not done
since the Civil War, promising to improve their social standing with each ballot cast.102
The British and Canadian governments did not fail to notice this change. During the
summer of 1869, the Canadian government considered deploying its troops along the
American border, “ostensibly to give them the benefit of cooler weather,” but really to
fend off a possible attack. As fear of an attack grew, the British media renewed its furious
cries for war.103

The new Grant administration helped resolve some of this tension. Ulysses S.
Grant was sworn in on March 4, 1869 after a long campaign under the slogan “let us have
peace.” At the time, this referred specifically to lingering domestic issues between the
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100 Between October of 1868 and April of 1869, Fenian reserves dropped from $20,000 to under $3,800. Ibid., 293.
North and the South and between the federal government and Native American tribes, but it could be used to describe his approach to diplomatic efforts with Great Britain. Guided by Secretary of State Hamilton Fish, Grant rejected the philosophy that Sumner and members of the Johnson administration espoused that the United States should annex Canada. Grant argued instead that a stable and positive relationship with Great Britain was significantly more important than acquiring new land.\footnote{While he rejected the policy of previous administrations that all new land was good land, Grant was by no means anti-annexationist. He had his sights set on Cuba in 1870, just one year into his presidency.}

In theory, Grant’s view on Canadian annexation should have pleased the British government. However, the man he appointed to serve as US minister to Great Britain, John Lothrop Motley, shared Sumner’s ideas on the Alabama question, and he had not ruled out the possibility of trying to take Canada from the British.\footnote{Sexton, “The Funded Loan and the Alabama Claims,” 461.} A well-known Anglophile in his own right, Motley was never able to look past British neutrality during the Civil War, and he disobeyed Grant’s orders for the peaceful negotiation of the claims. He chose instead to prophesize to British officials the inevitable outrage in the Senate in response to any arguments from the British government against the claims or the negotiation process. Whether or not Motley believed this was true, he deliberately misrepresented Grant’s position on the Alabama issue and set back Anglo-American diplomacy efforts.\footnote{Lawrence S. Kaplan, “The Brahmin as Diplomat in Nineteenth Century America: Everett, Bancroft, Motley, Lowell,” Civil War History 19 (March 1973): 17-23. Also in Bingham, “The Alabama Claims Arbitration,” 13.}

“The Motley Crew,” one cartoon from the summer of 1869, expresses British disdain for Motley and acts as evidence of his undermining Grant’s peaceful intentions (Figure 15). Though the image appeared in Harper’s, it had originally been published in Great Britain a month earlier as part of a group of four cartoons commenting on the
situation with the United States. Spotted hanging outside a member of parliament’s office, a British correspondent for the *New York Tribune* wrote a brief piece about the cartoons for American audiences. The piece did not contain the images and failed to make it into most of the larger American papers. Still, many Americans expressed disgust at the cartoons on the basis of their descriptions alone, one of which referred to John Bull as “facetious in his old age” and called him out for “basely seeking to intimidate the noble [bald eagle].” A few weeks later, *Harper’s* obtained a copy of the cartoons and published them. True to its form, the magazine introduced the cartoons with more humor than distress, noting sarcastically that, “as they illustrate a pleasant phase of John Bull’s character, it would be scarcely fair to withhold them from our readers.”

Like many other British cartoons, “The Motley Crew” grafts specific political figures onto Jonathan and John Bull; in this case, Jonathan is Motley and John Bull is Clarendon. The image depicts a scene in which Motley must actually try to negotiate the claims, rather than throw empty threats at the British government. Looking at its basic layout, the cartoon itself is similar in form to the earlier *Harper’s* cartoon starring Jonathan, John Bull, and Pat (Figure 3). However, it reflects a change in Atlantic power relations. Unlike the tall, confident Jonathan with Pat by his side, this cartoon presents a weak John Motley, cowering in fear with an equally terrified Fenian-black hybrid behind him. They are face to face with Clarendon, who sits with a relaxed confidence, holding a gun in one hand and dog leash in the other, restraining his barking bulldog.
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107 Though this cartoon was not published specifically for *Harper’s* or *Punch* I still think it is a legitimate source for this project. Although it does not represent *Harper’s* views on the matter, it still contributes to how Americans were thinking about the conflict by giving them an explanation of what Great Britain thought about them at that time. Thus, it completely retains its value as a piece of propaganda, and is used the way any other *Harper’s* or *Punch* cartoon was used.
108 *Richmond Whig*, June 6, 1869.
The British government did not know the extent of Motley’s disregard for the Grant administration’s diplomatic philosophy, but it did know enough for the cartoonist to express disdain specifically for him, rather than for Grant or Secretary of State Hamilton Fish. The cartoon’s main dig is directed at Motley’s masculinity. This comes across not only through his timorous stance, but the placement of his sword as well. Unlike Figure 3, in which Pat willingly sticks his shillelagh out for Jonathan, Motley holds his blade like a tail between his legs, drooping and powerless. Amplifying this impotence is the sword’s relationship to the gun. More powerful than the sword, Bull points it straight at Jonathan’s chest; it has stripped him of all the charisma, confidence, and determination he possessed back in Figure 3.

The cartoon explicitly refers to the situation with Canada through the two envelopes in Jonathan’s hand, with “Alabama” on the top one and “Canada” on the card below it. These refer to the two choices Sumner wants to give to the British: either financial settlement of the Alabama claims or Canadian cession. The cartoon suggests, accurately, that Motley is the heir to Sumner’s foreign policy at the federal level and uses the gun pointed in his face to indicate Britain’s refusal to go along with any of Sumner’s plans.  

The cartoon suggests that Motley is doing much more than just reminding Britons of Sumner; he is threatening the entirety of the diplomatic arrangements both governments have made since the start of the Civil War. The bulldog jumping out from between Bull’s legs has knocked over his trash bin, spilling the contents of the past decade of Anglo-American relations onto the floor, into the light of present day once again. Bull’s gun again becomes important here. By aiming it at Jonathan he promises he
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is willing to resort to force and ignore the diplomatic solutions of the past ten years “if necessary.” The gun is not just a threat to the physical, corporeal Jonathan and the nation he represents, but to the entire diplomatic relationship between the two countries.

Outside of these diplomatic issues, the image provides an important insight into Britain’s view of “Irish” as a racial category. The man standing behind Motley has stereotypical elements of both Irishmen and African Americans. Based on his clothing – pants, hat, jacket – the character looks Irish, but his dark skin color and distinctly thick lips tell a different story. Based purely on the recent growth in sympathy for the Irish cause among American politicians, a cartoon suggesting the two were in cahoots would have made sense. However, the cartoon depicts a Fenian-black hybrid, which complicates this potentially clear narrative.

One *Punch* cartoon from September 1869 sheds more light on this issue and clarifies the movement toward distinct images for African Americans and the Irish in Great Britain. The cartoon “Am Not I a Brute and a Brother?” plays on Wedgwood’s “Am I Not a Man and a Brother?” (Figure 16 and Figure 5). Instead of an African American begging for mercy and equality with an implied white man, the cartoon depicts a cow down on her knees begging for these same measures from an Irishman, whose beard, ape-like jaw, white skin, and hat all indicate an implied Celtic heritage. At the broadest level, the use of Wedgwood’s phrase suggests the artist’s belief in an implicit connection between the African-American and Irish racial experience. Regardless of which one trumps the other, this cartoon (as well as Figure 15) aims to express the idea that neither blacks nor the Irish have a place in the Anglo-Saxon family. Throughout the decade, this discourse had grown to use increasingly specific stereotypes or themes to
indicate how each group fell short of Anglo-Saxonism. While cartoonists earlier in the 1860s used a simple ape to represent both the Irish and African Americans, they learned to use images that were specifically tailored to one or the other over the course of the decade. This development suggests that over this time period, *Punch* cartoonists, and by extension the British public, became increasingly aware not only of what they believed made the Irish and African Americans different from Anglo-Saxons, but what they believed made the Irish and African Americans different from one another as well.

Looking further, this cartoon argues that the Irish are in fact on a level below African Americans by placing them on the other side of Wedgewood’s image. In its original form, the image implicates anyone who is outside of the frame, who hears the African-American man’s plea for mercy and lashes his whip down on him anyway. This is an excellent technique; it gets the viewer to either see himself or herself as the person whipping the African American or to see the African American being whipped by somebody else as they do nothing to stop it. Figure 16 places the Irishman as the man outside the frame, arguing that the Irish, through their violent rioting, are refusing to treat other individuals as their equals and are crushing fundamental rights and liberties.

The cartoon thus goes a step beyond Figure 4, where the Irishmen beat down on a black man in a position evocative of Wedgewood’s image. Figure 4 still has yet to decide on one distinct racial category for the aggressors, rendering a few of them with classic Irish characteristics, and one with thick, protruding lips, indicative of an African-American stage performer. Figure 16, on the other hand, knows the exact race of the aggressor and unequivocally offers up this information. Though it does not use the Fenian image, it still uses a distinctly Irish image, which serves to push toward a blanket
understanding of the Irish as violent and aggressive and limit the presence or perception of any loyal, Anglo-Saxon Irish of previous cartoons.

**Turning Fenianism into Irishness**

*Punch’s* next step in this development of an all-encompassing Irish image came in response to two major Acts of Parliament in 1869 and 1870. In late 1868, William Gladstone, a liberal, was elected prime minister. Gladstone championed reform of Britain’s rule over Ireland in order to improve the lives of Irish citizens and put an end to their violent attempts at revolution. His first major effort was the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland from the Anglican Church of England. After Ireland’s incorporation into the United Kingdom in 1801, the Churches of Ireland and England had merged into the United Church of England and Ireland. As a state church, the British government had installed a tithe on all Irish citizens to fund it, despite the fact that only a small percentage of the Irish attended any of its services. Parliament passed the act with the hope that it would appease the Irish at both a religious level, as they no longer had to live in an expressly Protestant state, and a financial level, as they would no longer have to pay the tithe.

However, this act was not enough to relieve Ireland’s growing mass of poverty-stricken peasants. To focus on this issue, Gladstone pushed for the Landlord and Tenant Act in 1870. Unlike the Church Act, this bill did not have the same public mandate in either Britain or Ireland, and it was met with a significantly greater degree of criticism. At its core, the act aimed to limit the power of Irish landlords and provide more tenants with the opportunity to purchase their own land. Prior to the act, landowning policies in
Ireland had given landlords the legal right to set land use prices as high as they liked, leaving many in the Irish peasant class poor and unable to earn enough to buy their own land. The bill proposed a few possible solutions to this issue, such as policies that would prevent arbitrary eviction of tenants and fewer restrictions on loans from the British government. None of the provisions created any radical change or threatened the stability of Great Britain’s hold over the island, but the act still faced strong opposition in Parliament. Conservatives argued that Gladstone was giving in to Irish demands and that Britain needed to teach the Irish to abide by the diplomatic, Anglo-Saxon tradition in order to get what they wanted.\footnote{De Nie, “A Medley Mob of Irish-American Plotters and Irish Dupes,” 227.}

In March 1870, as Parliament debated the bill, one 
*Punch* cartoon expressed this anti-Irish, anti-Land Act sentiment (Figure 17). The cartoon, titled “The Irish ‘Tempest,’” uses a scene from the Shakespearian play of the same name to convey its message. The Irishman’s character, Caliban, is a half-man, half-demon who has spent most of his life governing his small island by himself. The play tells the story of how Prospero came to Caliban’s island with his daughter, Miranda, and claimed it for himself. Prospero, depicted as William Gladstone, noting Caliban’s half-man, half-demon state, perceives him as inferior and teaches him the customs and rituals of his former society. But Prospero also gives Caliban language, which Caliban uses to rail against his treatment and to try to rebel against Prospero’s colonial rule.\footnote{Douglas et al, \textit{Drawing Conclusions}, 74.} Gladstone’s bill aimed to improve the Irish situation in their colonized state, but the cartoonist claims that the Irish are too ungrateful to accept Gladstone’s help and will continue to refuse to adapt to Anglo-Saxon norms.
Prospero’s daughter, Miranda, represents another aspect of the Irish colonial situation. Represented as Erin, Miranda holds tightly onto Prospero, displaying her usual need for protection that so many Punch cartoons emphasized. Throughout the play, Caliban is a constant sexual threat. He declares in one scene that he wants to use Miranda to “people this isle with Calibans.” If Caliban were able to take Erin out of Great Britain’s protective hands, Figure 17 argues, the island would lose the last hint of its Anglo-Saxon purity and grow replete with more violent, Fenian Irish.

Figure 17 shows Punch strongly associating the Fenian image with all Irishmen. One Punch cartoon, “The Irish Treason Shop,” from December 1869 illustrates this development (Figure 18). The cartoon shows three Irish men in a shop: a traditional Fenian, a priest, and a shopkeeper. The store sells all the proper goods for conducting a rebellion: the canonical gunpowder barrel from Figure 1, guns, and a copy of the radical Irish People newspaper. Though the Fenian is the one buying the goods, the cartoon argues that all of the Irish, whether a high priest or a lowly shopkeeper, have some level of involvement in Irish rebellion. The same priest figure had appeared in previous cartoons fighting alongside the Fenians and the shopkeeper has distinct stereotypical Irish features: scruffy beard, flat nose, and an ape-like jaw. Though the Fenian is the one fighting in the front lines, the cartoonists contends that every Irishman is involved in working toward his success. Despite having the look of loyal Irishmen from Figure 13, the cartoon associates all of the Irish with Fenian values and goals.

Creating the New Irish Race

113 William Shakespeare, The Tempest, I.i.503.
114 Another cartoon showing a Fenian and an Irish priest joined together in violence is “Justice to Ireland,” Punch, January 16, 1869.
By 1870, both nations had come to an agreed-upon Irish image with similar attitudes, behaviors, and personality traits. They established new stereotypes for the Irish, new prejudices, a new physical look, and through these a new race. This race was not precisely defined or consistent, but its depiction in these cartoons was good enough to create a world in which the Irish were distinct from the Anglo-Saxons around them. Cartoonists used these distinctions to explain the course of previous Irish behavior and also to give license to Anglo-Saxons’ continued feelings of superiority. Cartoons are important here because they allowed this racial difference to play out through a visual medium, rather than a textual one. The visual aspect of this racial difference was not apparent in the real world, where Irish, British, and Americans do not look strikingly different, but average Anglo-Saxons could seek this difference out in their country’s most popular publications. This difference suggested that even if a group of individuals were unequivocally white, this did not mean they were Anglo-Saxon, rupturing any chain of connection between these two racial categories. This break has consequences beyond the Irish, as plenty of nations in Europe fell into the category of “white but not Anglo-Saxon.” Through the development of these categories, these magazines used cartoons to create hierarchical distinctions among whites.  

Both American and British governments came together over this developing view of the Irish in the summer of 1870. Over the course of these few months Anglo-American officials worked to put down yet another Fenian raid on Canada and ratified a new naturalization treaty, which was the final step in putting an end to all conflicts over British or American citizenship. This treaty settled the question of which Irish
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nationalists could be arrested where and enabled the repatriation of hundreds of Irish-Americans to the United States.

Figure 19 expresses the cooperation between Great Britain and the United States over the Fenian threat. Just a year earlier, after the failed Johnson-Clarendon Treaty, American politicians were threatening to give aid to the Irish in their next attack on Canada. In reality, however, such aid was hardly a possibility. American aid to the British in putting down the raid proved that the US government had a legitimate interest in and plan to sign the new naturalization treaty and try to figure out the *Alabama* claims as peacefully as possible. As historian Rising Lake Morrow writes, after a US marshal found John O’Neil, the leader of a Fenian raid in 1870 on his way to Canada, he hastily “bundled [him] into his carriage and drove him away between the Fenian ranks to answer charges of violating the American neutrality laws.”\(^{116}\) This incident indicated to the British government that any American with plans to aid the Irish in overthrowing British rule was either bluffing or part of a small minority. The US government had shown its desire to protect its relationship with Great Britain, and Britain knew it was not bluffing.

Three months after that Fenian attack, in August 1870, Great Britain and the United States officially ratified the new naturalization treaty.\(^{117}\) This treaty allowed citizens of the British Empire to renounce their citizenship and become naturalized citizens of the United States. It also called for the pardoning and return to the United States of Irish Americans arrested in Ireland, a process Great Britain completed by


\(^{117}\) Delegates from both nations signed the treaty in May.
January 1871. Historians have tended to ignore this treaty and its significance, treating it more as a footnote in the larger *Alabama* negotiations narrative.\(^{118}\)

However, the treaty played a vital role in moving the two governments toward a negotiated settlement of the *Alabama* claims. In addition to solving the lingering issue of impressment that had festered since the War of 1812, the treaty, though it did not explicitly mention the Fenians, guaranteed that the two governments would not bend to any more of their geopolitical meddling.\(^{119}\) Fenians had been working to get the United States and Great Britain into a war with one another through either a raid on Canada from the US border *or* through conflicts pertaining to the rights of American prisoners abroad. The treaty eliminated the possibility of a war over prisoners in its entirety and it greatly reduced the chances of a war over the Canadian border. Consequently, the probability of the Irish as a third party in any Anglo-American armed conflict crumbled.

The treaty also placed the United States and Great Britain on the same Anglo-Saxon racial plane. The United States had been engaged in naturalization treaties with other countries since 1868, but this was the first time Britain gave its citizens the legal right to renounce their British citizenship.\(^{120}\) Great Britain did not agree to get rid of immutability for its citizens in its entirety; the government only allowed them to exchange their citizenship for American citizenship. The two Anglo-Saxon nations used the treaty to declare a special relationship, confirming the notion that the blood in the two countries was the same and could be exchanged freely and easily. Consequently, while

\(^{118}\) The only article I could find that deals exclusively (or even significantly) with the treaty as its subject is Morrow, “The Negotiation of the Anglo-American Treaty of 1870,” from 1934, while the only significant presence it plays in any book is from Jenkins, *Fenians and Anglo-American Relations During Reconstruction*, from 1971. Though both are thorough in detailing the players and circumstances of the treaty negotiations, they do not convey as clearly as possible the treaty’s significance in the process of Anglo-American rapprochement. Jenkins is particularly guilty of this, as he ends an entire book on postwar negotiations with the treaty, neglecting to analyze the following two years of *Alabama* debate.


\(^{120}\) The United States signed treaties with Austria, Prussia, and other German states by 1870. Known as the Bancroft Treaties, these agreements were the first in a long line of agreements between the United States and other nations for citizens to renounce their citizenship in one country and be nationalized in the other.
limiting the role the Irish could play in Atlantic affairs, the Anglo-Americans replaced British immutability with Anglo-Saxon immutability. This effectively shut the Irish out of the conversation, adding a legal component to the notion of a distinct, non-Anglo-Saxon Irish race that *Punch* and *Harper’s* had established in the previous decade.

In spite of these developments, the *Alabama* claims were still far from settled by the end of the summer of 1870. Over the course of the next year, with little disturbance from the Irish, the two governments came together to settle their grievances through the ratification of the Treaty of Washington in May 1871. Though it did not settle the *Alabama* claims directly, the treaty settled many other disputes between Great Britain and the United States, including the establishment of stricter neutrality laws that would prevent another *Alabama* dispute from distancing the two Anglo-Saxon nations in the future. As for the actual claims, treaty negotiators agreed to have them undergo review by an international tribunal of five arbitrators chosen from the United States, Great Britain, Italy, Switzerland, and Brazil.

The signing of the Treaty of Washington and the tribunal it guaranteed thrilled Americans. For *Harper’s*, the idea of the joint commission was all that mattered. One cartoon from a few weeks after the treaty’s ratification shows an image of John Bull and Jonathan hugging warmly, with an Irishman scowling in the background and a caption that says “Felicitations over the great Anglo-Saxon Victory” (Figure 20). The message is readily apparent: Great Britain and the United States have come together as proud Anglo-Saxon nations and have consciously shut out the Irish from this group. At the same time, however, the Anglo-Saxons still need to keep him around, as a large part of the
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121 Sexton, “The Funded Loan and the *Alabama* Claims,” 464-68, argues that American statesmen agreed to leave the *Alabama* claims out of the treaty because they believed the issue would resolve in their favor in arbitration.
establishment of their identity is in opposition to his. The cartoon is similar to a *Punch* image from June 1870, which shows a British border guard kicking a Fenian back into the United States for President Grant to deal with, addressing both the recent Fenian raid on Canada and the neutrality treaty that both nations were finishing (Figure 19).

The arbitration process began in December 1871.\textsuperscript{122} Tension plagued negotiations as American officials insisted on keeping indirect claims on the table, but the arbitrators eventually eliminated these from the conversation.\textsuperscript{123} The rest of the negotiations went smoothly, and in September 1872 the arbitrators announced that Great Britain owed the United States $15.5 million for claims related to the *Alabama* and other British-built ships used over the course of the American Civil War. The British government paid off the claims by the end of the year.\textsuperscript{124} The decision garnered mixed reviews among the British public, but politicians received it well. Gladstone, though he thought the payment was too much, said it was “‘dust in the balance compared with the moral example set’ of two proud nations going ‘in peace and concord before a judicial tribunal rather than ‘resorting to the arbitrament of the sword.’”\textsuperscript{125} Though it did not come out precisely the way they wanted, British officials were satisfied that the solution came through a peaceful and diplomatic process, one that properly reflected their Anglo-Saxon bond with the United States.

**Solidifying the Future of the Fenian Image**

By 1872, the Anglo-American cartooning family had experienced a complete paradigm shift from a decade before. Beginning in 1861, Erin was single and Pat was fading into

\textsuperscript{122} Bingham, “The *Alabama* Claims Arbitration,” 19.
\textsuperscript{123} Ibid., 19-20.
\textsuperscript{124} Ibid., 1.
obscurity, while Jonathan and Columbia harbored intense grudges against their counterparts John Bull and Britannia. By 1872, Erin had married the Fenian, and John Bull, Columbia, Britannia, and Jonathan all got along. By crafting racially charged and exaggerated cartoons, artists at *Punch* and *Harper’s* played the dual role of reflecting changes in Anglo-Saxon racial perceptions while advancing these same perceptions through mass-produced, highly accessible visuals.

The change in these visuals over the course of the decade exposes the dramatic shift in Atlantic politics in these years and provides documentation of the extent to which Anglo-Saxons saw their world differently in 1872 from how they saw it in 1861. The Fenian Irishman, thick-lipped African American, tall and confident depictions of Jonathan or John Bull – these were the new lenses through which Anglo-Americans saw their larger political world. By personifying these races and nations and engaging them in familial and interpersonal relationships, cartoonists created a new and highly effective method of spreading this worldview to the entirety of the Anglo-American community.

The most significant figure in these relationships is the Fenian Irishman, through whom both nations created a new understanding of an Irish race. This very specific rendering of Irishness includes a long jacket, pinstripe pants, and high socks, with a tall hat and gun or shillelagh at the ready. He has an ape-like jaw with ragged teeth and a perpetual scowl. In the earlier part of the 1860s, both countries had anti-Irish images, but they were not thematically coordinated, and they did not include as many specific accouterments or physical characteristics. In *Punch*, the Fenian started out as a representative of a minority group who gave other loyal Irishmen a bad name. In *Harper’s*, the Fenian figure always signified all of the Irish, rather than a specific group.
As the decade went on and both publications added additional details to his figure, *Punch* came to agree with the *Harper's* on the Fenian as a larger, pan-Irish image. By 1871, the two nations had come much closer in their own relations, using the Irish caricature as a source of common ground.

As important as it is to explain how the anti-Fenian image helped bring the countries together, it is as important to note how this image retained its distinct features over the remainder of the nineteenth century and arguably up to the present. American, British, and Irish historians have argued that Fenianism had almost completely died out after the Treaty of Washington, in a process that, according to some historians, had begun in 1866, at least in the United States. As James Adams writes in “The Negotiated Hibernian,” by 1872:

> The public image of Fenianism in the British mind was revealed to be an illusion, an artificial construct that vanished when confronted by real people and events within the temporal sphere. Conversely, though the discursive rhetoric continued in the United States for a few years after, without a rhetorical counter-stream to stand against the temporal existence of the [Fenian Brotherhood] began to wither. Quinlivan and Rose note that “by 1872 the heat had largely gone out of the movement,” and that the cause of the Fenians was handed down to subsequent generations as inspiration.

Adams is undoubtedly correct in arguing that the Fenian movement lost its way at this point, and that specifically *Fenian* rhetoric died out. However, I do not believe the public image of Fenianism completely disappeared. While the movement died, the feelings and stereotypes that it provoked remained embedded in Anglo-American discourse, most notably in cartoons, the medium that helped cultivate those sentiments.

One of the most basic associations with Fenianism that lingered was the notion that the Irish were incapable of conforming to an Anglo-Saxon model of government.

---

126 DeRosier, “Importance in Failure,” 192.
Many Anglo-Saxons believed strongly in the 1860s and early 1870s that the Irish lacked self-governing capacities, suffered from a condition of such constant anger that they could never vote for themselves, and lacked the intelligence to choose a proper representative government. These ideas live on in one Harper’s cartoon from March 1874 (Figure 21). The cartoon shows Columbia stuck between two men angrily gesturing at her, with the caption “between two evils.” The man on the left represents communism, while the Irishman on the right represents an ultramontane: a Catholic who puts the Pope’s word over his government’s. Affiliation with either of these groups was perceived as a challenge to the supremacy of one’s government. The Irishman looks extremely similar to the incarnations of a few years prior: short pants, long jacket, tall hat, wide ape-like jaw, snout-like nose, and shillelagh in hand.

Another cartoon from August 1881 plays on very similar themes (Figure 22). The cartoon, titled “Two Rivals,” shows Prime Minister Gladstone giving Erin a bouquet of flowers that says “Land Bill.” The Irishman, on the other hand, has his Land League basket. The Land League was an organization that sought to end the dominance of landlords over peasants in Ireland, as Gladstone’s Landlord and Tenant Act of 1870 had since failed. The organization was known for its violence, and thus the basket is full of dynamite and guns. This cartoon plays nicely into the idea of Erin and the Fenian as a married couple. Gladstone, a proper gentlemen, tries to court her with flowers, while her disheveled husband brings her dynamite and guns, providing a nice contrast between what the cartoonist wants to say makes a proper man or husband in Great Britain versus Ireland. Clearly, according to the cartoonist, the two groups have very different cultural norms and expectations, which further ostracizes the Irish as a non-Anglo-Saxon other

---

and reinforces the message that the Irish are fundamentally different from the British and do not properly fit in to their society. The cartoons do not explicitly reference any actual Fenian activities or efforts, but they very implicitly represent the anti-Fenian prejudices that grew in response to the movement.

This anti-Fenianism is the thread by which the Fenian image was drawn out of the 1860s and into later decades. Both publications continued in the same direction they had begun in the 60s, maintaining their similarities in terms of the Irish physicality, personality traits, and non-Anglo-Saxon status. Into the 70s and beyond, then, cartoonists used the Fenian image, with all its negative associations, to connote the Irish as a whole. They superimposed the Fenian fear to other, newer social or political movements that suggested Irish involvement and branded them with the same sins and negative associations that had been used to differentiate their revolutionary brothers years earlier. Instead of an Irishman protesting at a rally, getting drunk, or even just walking to work, it was a Fenian. Both British and American cartoonists used this image to prevent future generations from forgetting what Fenianism was and how it affected them, setting up a unified, coherent, and sustainable anti-Irish signifier for years to come. Its smaller details and associations were subject to change, but its inherent castigation of the Irish as violent, dangerous, and drunk, became embedded in Anglo-Saxon politics and culture.
Bibliography

Primary

Books

Government Documents
*Congressional Globe*
*Foreign Relations of the United States*

Magazines
*Harper’s Weekly (A Journal of Civilization)*
*Punch, Or the London Charivari*

Newspapers
*Congressional Globe*
*Daily Eastern Argus*
*London Times*
*New York Times*
*Richmond Whig*

Secondary


Rafferty, Oliver P. The Church, the State and the Fenian Threat, 1861-75. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999.


5. Josiah Wedgewood, “Am I Not a Man And a Brother?” 1787.
MR. G-O’RILLA, THE YOUNG IRELAND PARTY, EXULTING OVER THE INSULT TO THE BRITISH FLAG. SHOULDN’T HE BE EXTINGUISHED AT ONCE!

7. Untitled [“Mr. G-O’Rilla”], *Punch*, December 14, 1861.
ERIN’S LITTLE DIFFICULTY.

BRITANNIA. “YES, MY DEAR! THAT’S THE SORT OF DRILLING TO DO HIM MOST GOOD!”

THE FENIAN-PEST.

Hibernia. "O my dear sister, what are we to do with these troublesome people?"

Britain. "Try isolation first, my dear, and then——"

THE YANKEE FIREMAN KEEPS HIS WORD.

Yankee. "You see I'm ready when wanted, Miss Canada."

(See No. 1991)
A Hint to the Loyal Irish.

"Ah, thin, Mister Bull! Give us the oath an' some o' thim sticks. Sure, there's hundreds o' the boys as is ready to help ye, sor."

THE IRISH "TEMPEST."

CALIBAN (SOLY OF THE HILLS). "THIS ISLAND'S MINE, BY SUCORAX MY MOTHER, WHICH THOU TAKEST FROM ME."—Shakespeare.