Lauri Niemistö

Constructing images of Great Power politics:

A comparative study on the visual representations of British and German political institutions in political cartoons in the early 20th century

List of Contents:

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiivistelmä – Abstract

Tutkielma selvittää Iso-Britannian ja Saksan poliittisten järjestelmien arvioimista ja mielikuvien luomista pilakuvissa 1900 -luvun alun poliittisesti epävakaissa oloissa. Pilakuvien kautta piirtäjät toivat ilmi näkemyksiä ajan puolueista ja poliitikoista, näin vahvistaen olemassa olevia näkemyksiä, luoden uusia mielikuvia ja esittäen kritiikkiä. Tutkimuskohteina ovat valtion monarkkia, hallitusta ja poliittisia puolueita käsittelevät pilakuvat.

Käyttämällä vertailevaa kuva-analyysiä, selvitetään minkälaisia käsityksiä valtioiden porvaristolle esitetään heidän poliittisista järjestelmistään ja järjestelmän sisäisten instituutioiden keskinäisestä toiminnasta. Molemmissa valtioissa monarkia, hallitus ja parlamentti olivat keskeisiä poliittisia toimijoita, mutta mielikuvat näiden välisistä voimasuhteista erosivat merkittävästi.

Eri instituutioita vertailtiin toisiinsa käyttäen taustana molempien valtioiden perustuslakia ja poliittista kulttuuria, kiinnittäen huomiota siihen kuinka pilapiirtäjät kuvasivat kunkin instituution vallan perustan ja sen kuinka ne täyttivät perustuslailliset velvollisuutensa. Iso-Britannian poliittinen järjestelmä kuvattiin parlamenttivetoiseksi ja porvarilliseksi, kuninkaan edustaessa lähinnä arvovaltaa, siinä missä Saksan järjestelmässä parlamentti ja poliittiset puolueet esitettiin ennemminkin haitallisina valtion hallitsemisessa. Saksassa puoluepolitiikan ulkopuoliset valtakunnankansleri ja keisari olivat valtion päämiehiä, siinä missä Britanniassa pääministeri ja muut puolueiden johtajat kuvattiin tärkeimmiksi poliitikoiksi.

Pilakuvat esittävät omien valtioidensa poliittisten järjestelmien heikkouksia ja vahvuuksia käsittelemällä konkreettista päätöksentekoa. Britanniassa äänioikeuden laajentaminen ja ylähuoneen vaikutusvallan rajoittaminen olivat vahvasti esillä. Saksassa merkittäviksi teemoiksi ajanjaksolla nousivat valtion budjetin säätäminen ja Preussin äänioikeusuudistus. Vertailevan näkökulman kautta selväksi käy brittien voimakkaampi luottamus parlamentaariseen hallintomalliin ja saksalaisten arvostus vahvoja valtiomiehiä kohtaan sekä heidän epäluulonsa puoluevetoiseen politiikkaan ennen ensimmäistä maailmansotaa.

1 Introduction

At the beginning of the twentieth century the European political systems became under stress from several sources. This thesis concentrates on comparing elements of two major political systems, the British and the German, which at the time were surrounded by a set of quite similar circumstances. Both systems were well-established constitutional monarchies: the British constitutional agreement could be traced to the Middle Ages and the German one to the unification of the nation in 1871.[1] The British constitution, although it was reformed in several occasions in the 19th century, was again in need of reform, since the Upper Chamber's influence over legislation was perceived disproportionate.[2] At the time of its implementation the German national constitution one, however, was deemed very modern, with universal male suffrage, secret ballots and unrestricted political parties[3]. This modernity suffered (in the today's democratic view of government and constitution) from a weak representative organ and strong administrative ones.[4] This thesis illuminates some views towards the political institutions of said nations.

At the same time the early twentieth century was a time of crises and uncertainty for many people, and a time of peace in serenity as there were no such wars and revolutions as in the nineteenth century.[5] Nationalism was experienced in multiple levels, since these countries had many different nationalities within their borders and strong class structures. It was a tool to bring unity for the people.[6] People were also better educated and the idea of advancing one's interests was spread wider than in the nineteenth century, the lower classes were rising to claim the right to influence national politics. In Germany this is visible in the opposition against the three-class voting franchises, and in Britain in the Votes for Women movement and opposition towards the wealth limited male franchise.[7]

Through comparative cartoon analysis this thesis examines the construction of the image of both nations' political institutions and critique towards them, which the cartoonists wanted to convey to their readers. It is meant to compliment research of the political cultures, by extending the source basis from other (written) newspaper and parliamentary sources to uncover new

---

[1] Congleton 2011, p.299, 450.
[2] Powell 1996, p.48: Congleton 2011 357-358.
[3] For Reichstag, German states had their own voting franchises. Also legislation restricting socialist party's participation in national politics had only recently been repelled (vuosiluku). Koch 1984, p.122-123: Anderson 2000, p.7, 45.
[4] Biefang & Schulz p.68-70, in Ihalainen, Ilie & Palonen 2016.
[5] From the Napoleonic wars to the German wars Europe and its nations experienced violent times, but after the unification of Germany no such conflicts were fought.
[6] Bauer p.74-77, in Woolf 1996: Pakkasvirta & Saukkonen 2005, p.8-9, 15-17: Jeismann p.23-27, in Baycroft & Hewitson 2006.
[7] Pugh 1982, p.113: Powell 1996, p.57-58: Anderson 2000, p.5: Congleton 2011, p.468-469.

information about the ways in which the image of the political institutions were created to the people (most prominently the bourgeoisie) of the chosen nations. The thesis is thus a study of the peoples' views about their governing institutions and national parties, hence it should be taken as history of political action and thought, because the sources, i.e. cartoon magazines Punch and Kladderadatsch, are a way to influence the people's opinion and views about the political institutions, and forums of critique.[8]

1.1 How to analyse representation of political institutions

The focus of this study is to show and explain the images constructed of two European nations' governing institution in the early twentieth century. Comparative cartoon analysis works as the main research method. Political history often concentrates on the thought and actions of statesmen and notable figures, like parliamentarians. Rather than doing so, this study sheds light to the views created for the general public: the readers of the cartoon magazines Punch and Kladderadatsch.[9]

The study concentrates on three main institutions of the political life: the monarch, the government and the political parties. This focus is chosen for three main reasons, firstly: because all three are actors in national politics during the research period. Secondly: the governments in both nations under review have the same three institutions, which works as a framework for the comparative perspective. Thirdly: the sources feature all three institutions in both countries. These three are examined from the perspectives of what kind of image was built of them and what kind of critique is directed at them.

The hypothesis is that the images are created to guide peoples' views to a more nationalistic mind-set. In this way nationalism is a tool to promote the magazine's view of one's own government and form of government, and create a sense of unity. Also the view of one's own political institutions will be constructed to a more positive direction, thus strengthening the people's views of their own nation.

The main research question is: what kind of image the cartoons of Punch and Kladderadatsch were trying to convey and construct of the monarch, the government and the national parties of Great Britain and Germany from 1907 to 1911? This is complemented with: what kind of critique is directed towards these institutions? These are further explicated via comparisons and conclusions to answer: Why is this so? What do the images reflect? The research questions are further expanded for each institution in their respective chapters.

---

[8] Coupe 1969, Kemnitz 1973, Scully & Quartly 2009, ch.1: Ihalainen & Saarinen 2016.
[9] Hiley p.28-30, in Howells & Matson 2009.

The years 1907-1911 are chosen for this thesis, because in both countries under the study there were significant changes in the political milieu around and within this period, e.g. the 1906 change from conservative to liberal administration and 1911 the passing of the Parliamentary Act in Britain, and Reichstag elections of 1907 and Reichstag elections of 1912 in Germany. These political changes do not create a bubble in time, hence a more comprehensive study should be made to perfectly satisfy the research questions. However, to give a satisfactory answer to the question within the limits of a master's thesis the time period has been kept short.[10]

Visual analysis is used here as a means to produce historical information on peoples' views and opinions towards the subject of the images. Most often this is usually used to elaborate people's views of other people, the images of otherness, especially at times of national conflict, when these images of the other are exaggerated.[11] During the era of nationalism there is much to be learned from these images, since much of the creation of one's own idea of nationality is separating it from others. This study attributes to this field of study by showing how the British and the German depicted their national institutions, rather than those of others, and explaining how the institutions were tied to the national identity[12].

The scope of this study does not allow analysing the views of the other nation's political life.[13] The analysis of these would benefit and complement this thesis, but at the same time divert the main focus and force a more superficial analysis, however, it is more important to concentrate on the national ideals the peoples had, and conduct the comparisons without expanding the scope to unreasonable proportions. The views of the government and who it serves are a better focus for this study, since the to find out how the governments were perceived at this time of political unsteadiness in their own nations is a better framework to understand the national political cultures. It is more interesting to see how the image of the governments chance according to their triumphs and failures than to conduct a superficial study on international strife.

For the research questions of this thesis there are other sources, which could be employed, for example the research of parliamentary sources, people's personal letters, magazine articles and letters to the editor, personal journals, and leaflet study. However, political cartoons have been analysed and are analysed to understand people's views, but as a source of historical

---

[10] Powell 1996, p.180: Anderson 2000, p.57.
[11] Kemnitz 1973: Burke 2011, p.123-125: Scully 2011.
[12] Kemnitz 1973: Coupe 1980: Coupe 2001: Scully & Quartly 2009, ch.1.
[13] The sources have both British and Germans visualising the other's political actors (the British mostly the Kaiser, and the German ones the British monarchs). Especially in Kladderadatsch some nuances of the British events, such as the suffragette issue and the Parliament Act, are featured, whereas Punch concentrates more on the blunders of the German emperor. In either magazine the French in particular are seldom seen compared to these. On this subject, see for example: Hugil 2008: Scully 2011: Scully 2017.

knowledge they are underrepresented.[14] In this thesis cartoons are mainly picked for the main source, because they voice a distinctive opinion and convey messages of their subject with a richness of meanings. Of course, the audience of a magazine is never as homogenous as it is intended, but it is safe to assume that the cartoonists had a clear idea of their audience.[15] As mentioned earlier, the journals and newspaper articles would more or less cover the same issue, but cartoons have the quality to try to argue their point by showing what they want to say rather than be factual or actually descriptive.[16] Through this, and the pretext of humour, the cartoonist can voice his opinion (or the opinion he is required) in a much stronger way. The cartoon's expressiveness with their implicit and explicit opinions, and the cartoonists' consciousness about the target audience are thus the reasons why they're chosen as sources for this study.[17]

The interpretation of images is culture and time related (contextual). Pictures hold in them overt symbols and meaning. Cartoons they are always made by a person. They in cartoons are arranged exactly the way the cartoonist wants, thus there is no risk of 'picture manipulation'. Cartoons in addition have the purpose to amuse people. The ways, in which cartoonists ridicule their subjects or otherwise try to amuse their audience, helps us to understand the general attitude towards the subjects.[18] The contextualising of symbols (or icons) helps us understand the meanings in the visuals, and in the comparative perspective can be used as a tool to differentiate different visual languages. Simply put: symbols can be considered as visual concepts.[19] The semiotic field to which the picture is connected via these symbols gives us important information of the intentions of the cartoonist and target groups to whom the cartoon is created. The reader of the cartoon must, of course, be able to understand all the icons and symbols. [20]

---

[14] Written sources are often seen as more reliable and simpler to use by historians, for various reasons such as the perceived reliability of words as a means of communication compared to the images, which are a whole different medium and convey a lot of information, which demand a different type of method of analysis than text. Farmer 2010: Burke 2011, p.9-10.

[15] Through the analysis of the visual language, the general look and layout of the magazines, for example what kind of products are advertised on their pages, and their history. Hiley 2009, p.28-30.

[16] Coupe 1969: Kemnitz 1973: Hiley 2009, p.24-25.

[17] Scully & Quartly 2009, ch.1: Burke 2011, p.178-180.

[18] Kuusamo 1996, p.160: van Leeuwen & Jewitt 2001, p.95-100: Burke 2011, p.30.

[19] This could open possibilities of enriching the method with Reinhart Koselleck's theory of conceptual history. Semiotics in pictures is close to semantics in literature, by combining these a synthesis between the methods could be acquired. This, then, could be used to help when making comparisons. For semiotics, Kress & van Leeuwen 2001, p.18.

[20] For example, the symbol (i.e. concept) of a dragon or *Pickelhaube* (a German army helmet with a pike on top) in British symbol language probably differs from their German counterpart. Whereas dragon, depending on its presentation, may be a symbol for Wales, China or just a general mythical beast in Britain, in Germany it probably only retains the latter two meanings. *Pickelhaube* in Britain will more likely be used just as a symbol of German militarism or old regime, but in Germany the meaning is more loaded with upper class connotations and a Prussian undertone, or it could simply just be a part of the uniform and nothing special. In both countries the essence of the symbols remains the same, but to completely understand the picture and what it represents, these small details must be taken into account. If a British picture of a person wearing a *Pickelhaube* is interpreted in terms of the German symbol language we are left with a puzzling image of a Prussian aristocrat who is representing the whole of Germany, a federal state. An under

The study is conducted individually for British and German cartoons and results are later put together in conclusions. The focus of the study will remain comparative: international rather than transnational. Research material will comprise of cartoons from the British 'Punch' magazine and German Kladderadatsch[21].

All cartoons, which feature a subject matter that is political, or picture politicians involved in the governing of the nation, are collected and analysed in comparison with each other. Some cartoons are later studied further in order to produce more comprehensive analysis. The volume of sources is approximately two hundred pictures and accompanying text.[22] The most expressive or exceptional ones of these are chosen and studied closer to better understand the visuals and what they are trying to achieve and how. A picture has a multitude of different icons and visual meanings, and so the closer analysis is time consuming and cannot be conducted on all of the source images. In addition many of these visual features are recurring in other cartoons and so the analysis would be conducted on them for multiple times. These cartoons, which are chosen for the closer study, usually represent a particular feature of the visual language, usage of icons, or a recurring way of picturing an institution, and therefore are fruitful for the analysis over other images. The cartoons hold many intertextual meanings with other cartoons, which means that they cannot be reliably analysed without a comprehensive context derived from the others.[23]

---

category of symbols are icons. Icons are significant visual or lingual symbols, which have evolved through the ages to have some very strong connotations. The cross, for example, is a very strong symbol, which may signify sacrifice, Christianity, sense of community, betrayal, or many other things depending of the context. The important point is, that when a person, who shares the artist's symbol language, sees such an icon, the icon gives him instructions about how to relate to the image and what to feel and think about the theme in question. Iconographical analysis is one of the main methods used in this study. All significant icons, were they national, religious or romantic, for example, are relevant for the analysis. Kuusamo 1996, p.160: Kress & van Leeuwen 2006, p.157: Seppänen 2010, p.141: Burke 2011, p.34-45.

[21] Weekly publications, Punch was established in 1841 and Kladderadatsch in 1848.

[22] Of the importance of analysing text as a part of the image, Kuusamo 1990, 197: van Leeuwen & Jewitt 2001, 18.

[23] An example of the importance of the contextualisation: It is important to distinguish the parties and persons. Even though, the parties are usually represented through their leaders in the British cartoons, the leaders are also featured as independent characters outside the party connotation. This brings forth some scenarios where it is difficult to see whether the character and the party are the same thing, i.e. the party is represented through the character, or whether the character is acting in his own person. A cartoon featuring Balfour in unfavourable circumstances may either try to generate unfavourable image of the Unionist party or Balfour as a leader, for example. The contextualisation of the cartoon and comparisons to other cartoons and representations are used to understand the difference. Indeed, it may be that both aforementioned meanings are submitted into the same image. The message possibly being: the Unionist party should be viewed unfavourably, because of Balfour's misguided leadership. The same example could also be given from any other party. Kladderadatsch does feature the leading political figures, but the parties are more generally represented through their own characters, rather than their leaders. Due to the governmental system the chancellor may not be analysed as his (possible) party's leader, since the position of the chancellor is not tied to the party affiliation. In the German cartoons the parties are thus rarely portrayed through their members, however, the members are usually tied to their party affiliation. Due to this, the problem of whether the character in the cartoon represents his party or himself in the cartoon is not similar to that of the British one. The British cartoons usually bear both levels of characterisation. They do not wish to say that the leader of the party is synonymous with the party who acts without his own considerations, but rather that they are the ones who carry out the party's policies, or are most representative of them. This tricky dualism will be a point of analysis of the governments and parties, especially of the British cartoons. Scully & Quartly 2009, ch.1.

The comparative perspective is chosen to provide a contrast in the analysis. Through this contrast we begin to see features in the sources, which are similar to each other, or differ from one another. The comparative element is used to offer a point of evaluation to the other nation's images and to uncover similarities and differences between the nations, so that we may evaluate the different political cultures more thoroughly, and perhaps find some unifying features, which help to generalize the results. Both systems were perceived functional and sound at the time and sometimes rivals with each other. The analysis of two popular political systems and the ways in which the images of institutions are build inside them, gives us insight to the political cultures of the time and help us create a better understanding of the world of today.[24]

The main reasons for these nations are the similar governmental systems and that there was a sense of change in both countries. Furthermore, the governments in both countries tried to act towards changing the government, both through the parliamentary system and with intrigue. These kinds of similarities under this period in review create a basis on the comparison. How the magazines wanted to portray their government in these circumstances and what do the portrayals signify, make the comparative perspective an illuminating one.[25] In Britain the governmental structure had not significantly changed since the 'glorious revolution' of 1688, rather it had been reformed to better represent the British political environment, i.e. while the demographics changed the electorate was adjusted accordingly and the power relations of the institutions (such as the king and lower chamber) were also changed with the times.[26] The German form of government, on the other hand, was created in 1871, and had been changed only a little in the years leading to the period under this study, partly due to its quite modern constitution at the time of its creation, and also because of the tradition of powerful statesmen.[27] Both nations had a government led by the monarch, King in Britain, who had only a small, mostly formal, role in the politics, and in Germany the Emperor (*Kaiser*), who had a say in both foreign and domestic policies as an institution on its own and through his ministers. Both countries had a bi-cameral parliament. These similarities are a point of comparison. The governmental forms and the institutions power and relations to one another will be explained more closely later.[28]

The similar set of events and the structural similarity of the governments are important factors behind the comparative perspective. Political culture has been studied by scrutinising sources of political action during significant events, and this thesis follows the same principle. In

---

[24] Ihalainen & Saarinen 2016: Ihalainen *forthcoming*, ch1.2.
[25] Kemnitz 1973: Hiley 2009, p.24-34.
[26] Cord 1991, p.131-140, 376: Congleton 2011, p.343-357.
[27] Koch 1984, p.122-123: Biefang & Schultz 2016, p.68-69.
[28] Craig 1978, p. 173-174: Congleton 2011, p.356-357, 469-475.

both countries there is a major reform under review under this period, the Parliamentary Act of 1911 and the *Wahlreform*, as well as similar voicing of opinions towards change in political systems. Although the roles of the parliament and the need for reform differed between the nations, the elements are similar. Both countries had a strong sense of nationalism presence of socialism.[29] The people in both countries perceived their country (as well as the other country), as a great power. People were aware of their great histories and expected their nations to continue the perceived life of greatness. This put expectations to both the nations governing forces and the people themselves. Great power begets great responsibility, and the premier of a great power is the main bearer of it. These similarities in peoples' thought are an important factor, why Britain and Germany have been chosen for the comparisons.[30]

The threefold research questions concentrate on three different political institutions in the two countries: the monarch, the government and the parties. Under the period in review the monarch's active participation in the politics was possible, the national governments changed and the parties, of course, were active in national politics in both countries. In Britain the possibility of the King creating enough liberal peers to pass the Parliament Act brought the monarch as a possible political actor.[31] In Germany the Kaiser was an active part of the politics due to the form of government.[32] Hence, the monarch's role in both countries is represented in the sources. Chancellor Bernhardt von Bülow left the office of German chancellor in 1908 and the new chancellor Theobald von Bethmann-Holweg faced concerns about his capability to carry out his duties, and in Britain Henry Campbell-Bannerman resigned (due to ill health) the same year as Bülow, and his replacement Herbert Asquith was under similar suspicions as his German counterpart. Hence the government also experienced change under this period.[33]

The research questions are broad and vague at first glance, they will be explained further in later chapters. Since so many different subjects are analysed (two monarchs, four heads of government and eight political parties), the timeframe is quite narrow and there are a lot of different aspects of visual representation. The thesis will create a general examination of the visual images rather than a catalogue-like representation of different visualisations. Through comparative visual analysis these generalisations become possible. Before further examining the sources, we must first look at the magazines themselves to establish some critical factors of source critique.

---

[29] Powell 1996, p.115: Guttsman 1981, p.78.
[30] Powell 1996, p.93, 103-104, 112-119: Baycroft & Hewitson 2006, p.19-20.
[31] Congleton 2011, p.357.
[32] Craig 1978, p.39-40: Biefang & Schultz 2016, p.68-69.
[33] Craig 1978, p.284: Powell 2002, p.126.

1.2 The sources and their backgrounds

The cartoons used as sources were featured between 1907 and 1911 in the British cartoon magazine Punch (est. 1841) and the German magazine Kladderadatsch (est. 1848).[34] Their establishers were bourgeois entrepreneurs. [35] Both magazines' attitude towards political reforms could be characterised as moderately liberal, since they both voiced supportive opinions towards the reforms.[36] Both magazines have had periods, which were more conservative and similarly those that were more liberal, depending on the reader's preferences and editor's choices.[37] They were focused to bring fore the viewpoint of the bourgeois and upper social classes and promote national sentiment. Punch had its largest circulation numbers in the London area and Kladderadatsch in the Berlin area. The general atmosphere of these cities and the fact that they were the countries' capital cities did probably have their effect on the editorial staffs (e.g. the great power status of the countries and the pride that comes with that. The advocating of the great power status is also a way to further appeal to the nationalistic audience.[38]

From a comparative perspective, the magazines are similar in many respects, e.g. they both give their support to the governments, though not without critique, and they are both very bourgeois in their values. Despite this bourgeois base of values, neither magazine is supporting a specific party. Punch often throws its support behind the government and takes the Liberal side in the Parliament Act issue. In Kladderadatsch the parties are portrayed in different ways at different times, but generally the magazine supports the parties with conservative values. More often the conduct of a certain party or a party coalition is covered. By advocating the national good, the magazines support the reforms, but very moderately and often from the perspective, that the person carrying out the reforms should be considered a great statesman.

In Punch the views of the lower classes connote the bourgeois outlook, the poor are people to be pitied, and not a class of people whose position, as such, should be advanced. In Kladderadatsch the lower classes are portrayed more through the socialists, but it must be

---

[34] The cartoons used in this study are readily available, for the most parts, in the internet, well digitized by the universities of Heidelberg and Toronto. The cartoons can be accessed via accompanying hyperlinks, which are created in September 2016. I have noticed that all links do not function from Word document to some internet browsers, but if one copies the link (choose the text, then press cntr + c and click the url field on the browser and press cntr + v) they should work. All attempts within reason have been made to fix them, but some browsers seem impossible to cope with.

[35] Heinrich-Jost 1982: Hiley 2009, p.28-30.

[36] However, in the source cartoons Punch is advocating liberal values more often outside the political subject, whereas Kladderadatsch does not. Their views towards women is completely different. The Punch magazine is supportive of women's active role in household and voices supportive opinions towards the female franchise, but Kladderadatsch is conservative in this matter and advocates masculinity as a virtue.

[37] Heinrich-Jost 1982: Hiley 2009, p.28-30.

[38] Bauer p.74-77, in Woolf 1996: Hiley 2009, p.27-29: Scully 2011.

remembered that Germany had a much more extensive system of social reforms, e.g. pensions, than Britain so the perceived need for the reforms was not as great, thus the reform issues concentrate more on political than social reforms. In both magazines the milieu shown in the images is usually a bourgeois one, e.g. if the magazine presents a home, the home is of the upper middle class style. This can be seen from the furniture, clothing and other such material images (these could be referred as bourgeois icons). The magazines offer a bourgeois and nationalistic view of the world and their country for the nationalistic bourgeoisie. The images also contain references for well-read audiences, e.g. the German ones contain references to Goethe's Faust and the British ones to Shakespeare's plays. It should be noted, that often these references are explicated in the text accompanying the image, so the magazine's assumption of a good education among their readers is not complete.[39]

The bourgeois viewpoint could be seen as a problem in a study that concentrates on explaining the people's views in a time of social unrest, but I argue that the bourgeois viewpoint is better than alternatives when explaining the views of the population, since usually in conservative and socialist papers the issues are presented in a more extreme and biased way. Indeed, not all people belonging to the upper and lower classes share the extremist ideals of politics. The magazines' share this moderate way of thought, although sometimes they voice their opinion quite crudely. This study does not argue that the bourgeois viewpoint is the same as the general opinion, but rather that if one viewpoint should be chosen then the bourgeois viewpoint is better than the alternatives. The cartoons are analysed as middle class biased and the results are handled accordingly.

In this thesis the target audiences of the magazines and the general similarity of the viewpoints, are the two reasons why they are picked as sources. The British magazine 'Fun' and German magazine 'Simplicissimus' are two examples of possible alternative sources, but they both have their pros and cons as sources. Those magazines portray their subjects in a more biased way, Fun in a more conservative and Simplicissimus in a more socialistic. These viewpoints are not as fruitful for comparisons than those of Punch and Kladderadatsch. Also as older papers (established only seven years apart) Punch and Kladderadatsch were better established and had an arguably more stable market, although they both suffered shifts on the numbers sold from time to time.[40]

In Germany the cartoonists were under a looming threat from their own Kaiser, who was notorious of accusing, also prosecuting cartoonists of representing himself in a bad and

---

[39] Heinrich-Jost 1982: Hiley 2009, p.28-30: Burke 2011, p.34-45: Allen 2015, p.31.
[40] Hiley 2009, p.27-29; 31: Allen 2015, p.29-34.

inaccurate way.[41] British cartoonists were in a safer spot in this respect, but the British monarch is featured extremely rarely in their cartoons. One could argue, that the British have a stronger self-censorship than the German, but this applies only to the case of the monarch. However, in both nations the leader of the government, i.e. the British Prime Minister and the German Reichskanzler, are featured often and comparatively quite crudely.

The second chapter examines the milieu in which the cartoons were created. First we take a look at both political systems and constitutions to better understand their main features, and then a short look at the most important political events and reforms, which play a pivotal role in the visualisations of the institutions. Then each institution are examined and compared internationally and between each other to create a complete picture of the construction and ideals behind them.

2 Political systems and cultures

Before diving in the world of early twentieth century cartoons, we must first take a look at the circumstances in which the creation of the cartoons takes place, and the institutions, which are represented in the cartoons. As stated earlier the political systems and atmospheres of Britain and Germany share a number of similarities, while at the same time they are seen as two competing systems. In general, they both had the same institutions, but the relations between the institutions are quite different, as will later be shown. Both nations also had the monarch as the *de jure* leader (the figurehead) of the nation. The lower houses were elected in both countries by national elections, and the seats in the upper houses were mostly hereditary (land aristocratic) or clerical. It is not necessary to know about the exact workings of these institutions, rather the nature of liability of these institutions. In both countries the upper house bore the stigma of aristocracy and the lower house was viewed as the representative institution of the nation.[42]

The political systems and cultures in the nations will be the key points in this chapter. The general image would probably be clearer if both countries were inspected independently, but for the latter comparative nature of the analysis these backgrounds are also represented in a comparative way, since the purpose is to help the reader understand the study and not to offer an overall presentation of the past. The political system and political background are both important viewpoints to understand and explain the thought and views behind the cartoons. These two issues therefore deserve their individual presentations and clarifications. The exact workings of the

[41] Allen 2015, e.g. p.33-34; 36-37; 57.
[42] Congleton 2011, p.357, 474.

political systems are not necessary to know, rather than the most defining features and the most important differences.

2.1 The British political system and culture

The basis for the British constitution was forged in the Glorious Revolution in 1688-9 during a time of rising absolute monarchies in Europe. Of old the British political system had favoured the aristocracy's voice over the monarch's, and the new constitution was a testimony of this, however the monarch still had wide powers under this new constitution. The reforms of the early nineteenth century saw a containment of the powers of the monarch and the upper house with reforms concerning the appointment of ministers and distribution of parliamentary seats (The 1832 Reform Act), which were later reformed again to better account for the new voters (The 1867 Reform Act and The 1884 Reform Act)[43]. Thus it could be said that the British system developed towards a more democratic direction, however the word 'democracy' was not used in this context, instead the people talked about how the parliament reflected the general opinion, or the opinion of the electorate. The idea of universal franchise was not very appealing to the British parliamentarians. Overall, the British system of government was still in many respects an aristocratic one, since both major parties and The House of Lords were remnants of the old aristocratic system. However, the reforms of the 19th century had taken it to a more representative direction.[44]

The Labour Party was viewed as a challenger of these old parties and the old system, and thus was a target of pejorative views and mistrust since the party's relationship with socialism was not definite to many. The thought of a violent revolution was revolting to the British general public, and revolution was very much a thing, which was thought as integral for the socialist movement. There was distrust towards the party and people were not certain of how the party would fit in the parliamentary system.[45] This, however, did not prevent the Liberals from using the new party as a way to wrench some constituencies from the Unionist, as the parties agreed to limit election contest between themselves from 1903 onwards.[46]

In the heart of the British parliamentary system laid a certain sense of pragmatism.[47] The leading party formed a government, which had to create pieces of legislation, which would benefit the country, and reflect the electorate's wishes. At the same time, the government must

---

[43] McCord 1991, p.134-138, 255-256, 375-376.
[44] Powell 1996, p.39-41. Congleton 2011, p.342-362
[45] Powell 1996, p.98, 110, 115.
[46] Ball 1981, p.30, 65: Powell 1996, p.111.
[47] Palonen p.7, in Palonen, Rosales & Turkka 2014.

advance the national good and keep the nation's international position secure. The government was responsible of all of the nation's politics, inner and foreign. In doing so, it must enjoy the trust of the parliament (and the monarch). The government was responsible of taking care of national business as effectively as possible and His Majesty's opposition was there in the parliament to make sure that this was the case in practise, the parties debated over how the policies were best followed so that they may reflect the national good. Of course, both parties had their own goals and forces behind them, which affected the conduct of the policies. Failure to conduct the national business in an effective way would result in the legislation's failure to pass the vote in the House of Commons or Lords, and thus in the possible resignation or change of government.[48]

The House of Lords had the power to amend pieces of legislation and the power of veto (the dismissal of the piece of legislation all together), which was its ultimate option against the House of Commons' legislative initiatives.[49] If the upper house's conduct was perceived as unconstitutional so that it overruled the electorate's express wishes, the monarch had a privilege to create more peers so that the balance of power would be tipped to a more favourable direction, the monarch also had the power to dismiss the parliament if requested by the Prime Minister[50]. In this way, the system was kept in balance by its individual parts. If the system failed to work in a way that served the nation, the possibility to change the system was there.[51]

In the British system the monarch's position was mostly a moral one. The monarch was the symbolical head of state and his views affected the national views.[52] The monarch's signature was in principle needed for a law to be enacted, but the monarch was constitutionally obliged to follow the advice of his Prime Minister. Monarch's powers also included the dissolution of the parliament, however, only in the case that his Prime Minister requested it. The same applied to the dismissal of the government, the monarch could accept resignation, but the independent dissolution of government was not something an Edwardian King could do. The most important power of the monarch, in scope of this study, was the privilege to create more peers so that the balance of the upper house could be turned to reflect better the views of the electorate. King Edward VII was not very keen to use this, but his successor George V saw it as an alternative to resolve the parliamentary crisis, which is further examined in chapter 2.3.[53]

---

[48] Pugh 1982, p.125-126.
[49] Powell 1996, p.42-43.
[50] This privilege was not invoked in the nineteenth century to resolve parliamentary disputes, because the House of Lords submitted under the threat of new peers. Powell 1996, p.56: Congleton 2011, p.344-345.
[51] Powell 1996, p.63: Congleton 2011, p.295-296, 361-362. Ihalainen 2016, p.27: Seaward &Ihalainen 2016, p. 36-45.
[52] Congleton 2011, p.357.
[53] Powell 1996, p.51, 55.

The Conservative and the Liberal parties had dominated the House of Commons in the nineteenth century, the Irish National party was the third largest, but disorganised and less prone to work in a parliamentary manner in national politics before the time of John Redmond.[54] Labour party participated in elections for the first time in 1896, but it did not attain large scale presentation in the Parliament before the Liberal-Labour electoral alliance in which the parties agreed not to pit their candidates against each other. Semi-socialist "lib-lab" MPs made a significant part of the Liberal Party's parliamentary representation. These members of the parliament promoted socialistic values, but still belonged to the Liberal Party.[55]

The Conservative party turned into a Conservative-Unionist alliance and later became to be called just the Unionist Party, this was due to the 1884 division of the Liberal Party in the Gladstone's Irish Home Rule issue, when the anti-Home Rule part of the party formed its own Parliamentary group, which later integrated into the Conservative Party.[56] Therefore, the political field, even though it might seem to be a polarised bi-partisan system, in practise was more diverse. The British governmental system had relied in the Parliamentary majority of either large party.

In the early twentieth century, the Liberal Party needed to rely on one or both of the smaller parties in order to ensure the majority, since neither of the two largest parties were able to attain an independent majority. In general, the Parliament, from 1907 to 1911, was led by the Liberals, who were in power since 1906, but after January 1910 they were dependant of other parties' support for absolute majority, especially the Irish Nationalist's. During the period, the two-party thinking is not removed rather than disrupted by the other parties. The system was still viewed as Liberals versus Unionists with the other parties somewhere in-between, not quite in the opposition and certainly not in the government, as they do not hold any ministerial positions. During the Parliament Act issue the support of the Irish nationalist came with a price and for a reason, which will be more closely explained in the chapter of the political reforms.[57]

House of Lords was a problematic institution in the British constitutional system, since the role of old aristocracy had diminished in the nineteenth century.[58] House of Lords was not an elective organ nor did it reflect the balance of power in the House of Commons in any way[59]. From the Lords' perspective the conduct of national good was its duty just as much as it was the Commons'. The definition of the national good differed and the House of Lords viewed as its

---

[54] Leader of the Irish Nationalist Party 1900 – 1918. The Oxford English dictionary for national bibliograpies 46, p.278-280.
[55] Ball 1981, p.34, 47-49: Powell 1996, p.103-110
[56] Pugh 1982, p.38-43: McCord 1991, p.380-381.
[57] Pugh 1982, p.109-110.
[58] Powell 1996, p.39-41.
[59] Powell 1996, p.42-43, 48: Powell 2002, p.126-8: Congleton 2011, p.357.

responsibility to safeguard the nation from unnecessarily radical, disruptive or expensive reforms, which could be passed in the Commons. The possible tyranny of the Commons was, after all, the reason why the upper house existed. The situation was asymmetrical since on one hand the Liberals had a majority in the Commons after 1906 elections and on the other the Conservatives in the Lords. The opposition could in this way use the upper House to drive its way through in the Parliament and threaten the government to amend its pieces of legislation. In principle the role of the Lords was still sound, but in practise the asymmetry of the balance of power in the Houses of the Parliament hindered national government.[60]

The British governmental system was forged around evolution through political pressure. Due to the working tradition of compromise and gradual reforms, the system had not needed radical changes. A steady growth in the rights of the electorate was enough to uphold the functionality of the government and its legitimacy as time went by. Reforms, as votes for women or Irish Home Rule, would not pass the House of Lords under conservative majority. These issues were nevertheless deemed to be of national importance and if not necessarily vital (the parliamentary opinion concerning women's voting was not particularly supportive even in the House of Commons), the obstruction of other bills as well itself was enough to bring the House of Lords under reform pressure. The nationalistic tendencies of the nation had a role in the issue as well. The good of the nation was the good of its people, and a small number of aristocrats fighting against this good represented by the elected MPs did not gather much sympathy in the ranks of the people.[61]

2.2 The German political system and culture

In the unification of Germany in 1871 the many German nations were joined together under the crown and nominal leadership of the Prussian King, who became the German. Thus, the German constitution was created to satisfy the needs of various German nations, which included three Kingdoms and a multitude of grand duchies, duchies, counties and free cities.[62] There was also a stark contrast between Prussia and the rest of the nation, since Prussia was a generally recognised great power, whereas any other state under the new Emperor was not. The dualist nature between federal and national government did not apply only to Prussia, but to all states. The Prussian prime minister usually was also the chancellor of the nation (*Reichskanzler*). The government consisted of

---

[60] Powell 1996, p.42-43, 52-55, 58. Pugh 1994, p.128.
[61] Powell 1996, p.63: Congleton 2011, p.359-362: Seaward &Ihalainen 2016, p.44-45.
[62] Craig 1981, p.39-41.

an elected lower chamber (*Reichstag*) and a federal upper chamber (*Bundesrat*). Reichstag was created to reflect the people's voice and Bundesrat the federal, i.e. the voice of the states within the Empire, thus its function differs fundamentally from that of the House of Lords. At the time the constitution was created and enacted in 1871 it was in the lead of European constitutions in terms of political rights and reflected the liberal tendencies in Germany in the nineteenth century. Germany had secret ballots and universal voting franchise for men of age (25 years). Parties in Germany also covered a wider spectrum of political ideals than in Britain.[63] In general the system started its life as a relatively liberal and modern constitutional system, but it had not reformed its aristocratic government, hence in the beginning of the twentieth century its institutions and structure became under more severe critique than before.[64]

The Empire's government was divided between the Emperor, or *Kaiser*, and the Reichskanzler, neither of whom was directly tied to the party politics, and in this way not accountable directly to the parliament and the people. In principle both houses of parliament had the power to initiate legislation, but in practise this prerogative was seldom used and instead the Reichskanzler and rest of the government were the executive party in the legislation. In the German system the Kaiser also had wide administrative powers including the powers to independantly appoint and dismiss the Reichskanzler, and dissolve the Reichstag. The constitution was built around powerful statesmen who were responsible to the nation alone, not its representative institution, indeed the Reichstag only could hinder the chancellor's actions, but preventing them completely was difficult.[65]

This reflects the German tradition of non-compromise and party strife, which manifested in parliamentary debate with ideologically coloured arguments, instead of concentrating to the governance of the nation, which might also reflect the limited possibilities to influence the government in general. The parties were keen to advance their own supporters' interests than the general national good. The chancellor modified his policies according to his party coalitions, by promising to advance the partie's agendas. Thus, the balance of parties had an effect on national governing, but this effect was indirect and the chancellor was not obligated to keep his promises, moreover the Kaiser's viewpoint was very significant, the government was under constant pressure from policy tweaks on the Kaiser's part. Unlike his grandfather, Kaiser Wilhelm II took his position as the head of the government with extreme interest and brought forth his current ideas of how the

---

[63] Although, after an assassination attempt directed at the Emperor in 1878 anti-socialist laws were enacted, which limited the rights of socialist people, and the party's possibilities to act in national politics. Craig 1981, p.144-146.
[64] Congleton 2011, p.473-479: Biefang & Schultz 2016, p.67-67.
[65] Koch 1984, p.123-126.

nation should be governed, which were often contradictory to his government's plans.[66] This position of a strong personal rule of the monarch had not been generally criticised, except for the socialists and some liberals, before the twentieth century, but Wilhelm II's way to rule made even the conservatives question the current constitution. A weaker position of the Kaiser and a stronger Reichstag were seen as a possible solution.[67]

Much unlike his British counterpart, the German Emperor was much more than the figurehead of his ship of state. The Kaiser was in charge of foreign politics, in addition he had the powers to dissolve both other political institutions under review and was more ready to use them. The important thing to note is that the Kaiser had more freedoms to act independently, e.g. the Kaiser could conclude international treaties in addition to the powers over national institutions. In theory the British monarch had many of the same powers, but in practise he was not able to independently use them, because he needed the support of his government, which in turn was reliant of its parliamentary support. This direct reliance on the ever-changing attitudes of an elective parliament was just the thing, which Prussian statesmen wanted to avoid when the constitution was drafted under strong influence of Bismarck. Instead, the Kaiser was only answerable to his people (who as his loyal subjects were sure to follow his lead), the chancellor to the Kaiser and Reichstag to the parties' voters. The chancellor needed Reichstag's support for his legislation, but only the Kaiser had the power to dismiss him. This had a profound effect on the relationship between the monarch and his head of state: the chancellor relied on the trust of the Kaiser and found his position uncertain if he lost it, after the loss of trust the chancellor was vulnerable to failures in the Reichstag, for example count von Bülow's career as chancellor ended for this very reason.[68]

The personality of the Kaiser was a significant factor in general in national politics, whereas Wilhelm I had let his chancellor deal with the governing of the nation and took action if he fundamentally disagreed with his chancellor's policies, his grandson Wilhelm II was vividly active in all levels of government, he often presented his own views of national policies and expected his government to heed his advice[69]. Wilhelm also had little respect towards the Reichstag and less towards the parties, especially the socialists, which he considered a threat to him and to Germany.[70] The German constitution was forged around a strong monarch to ensure the functioning of

---

[66] Craig 1981, p.171-173, 258, 260-261, 270: Clark 2000.
[67] Congleton 2011, p.478-480.
[68] Craig 1981 p.283-286.
[69] Fredrick III is left to little consideration due to his dramatically short reign. + viite Wilhelmistä hallitsijana
[70] Wilhelm had had some more lenient views earlier in his reign, but by the twentieth century, his views had changed drastically. Craig 1978, p.173.

government over Reichstag objections, but Kaiser Wilhelm's indecisiveness and interventions in government business on a regular basis did not reflect the fact.[71]

Originally, the power relations of different institutions were created to make sure that no individual organisation, save for perhaps the Kaiser, had too much power within the empire. The chancellor could not pass legislation without the Reichstag's and Bundesrat's approval, the military could not function without the funds, which were regulated by the chancellor and Reichstag through the national budget, and the Reichstag could be dissolved by the emperor.[72] The emperor worked through his government so in theory the government was in a position to influence his actions. In this way all institutions were intertwined under the emperor's guidance, only the powers of the federal and national parliaments could challenge him. However, as long as the chancellor and the Kaiser had a working relationship, the system remained sound. From a modern democratic perspective, this kind of division of power seems odd, but in this multi-party parliamentary system (with tradition of idealism fuelled lack of cooperation) the need for assurances for smooth government is understandable.[73]

The special position of Prussia as the unifier of Germany and generally the significantly largest state in the federation was also problematic. The Reichkanzler was also, two exceptions removed, the Secretary of state of Prussia, thus he was also occupied with Prussian politics and issues. The federal institution, the Bundesrat, was dominated by Prussia, although it did not hold an absolute majority of the votes.[74] Making sure that all member states followed national legislation was the Prussian king's, the Kaiser's, responsibility, thus the new nation could be seen as continuation of Prussian dynasty[75].[76]

In Kladderadatsch, which was a *Berliner* newspaper, the Prussian parliamentary institutions, lower chamber *Abgeordnetenhaus* and upper chamber *Herrenhaus,* are featured in context of national politics, however, the parties in these cartoons can be arguably analysed with the national parties for three distinct reasons. Firstly: the parties are portrayed in the same way as the national parties, they bear the same symbolic language and same division. Secondly: Prussia had the special position within the nation thus its actions created precedents for the other states, thus representation of Prussia's parties in these circumstances are a part of creating the national party images. Thirdly: whether or not the Prussian parties can be distinguished from the national is not

---

[71] Craig 1978, p.39-40: Koch 1984, p.122-125:Kohut 1991, p.131-132.
[72] Koch 1984, p.122-124: Congleton 2011, p.474.
[73] Koch 1984, 171-211: Congleton 2011, p.478-479.
[74] Congleton 2011, p.474.
[75] For example, Kaiser Fredrick III took his regal number after the Prussian succession rather than German in which he would have been Fredrick I.
[76] Craig 1978, p.99: Biefang & Schultz 2016, p.67.

that important, instead the fact that is this distinction made and does it affect the parties' image. If the image, for example, is created to affect the readers' views towards the parties' attitudes, it affects the attitudes of the national parties in addition, and thus can be analysed as one. Some issues in the Prussian parliament are also issues of national importance, for example the three-class voting franchise issue, which was also in effect in other German states, Prussia's views towards the issue was sure to have an effect on the other states.[77]

In conclusion, in the early twentieth century both political systems were under critique, but considering the historical background it is clear that they were at the same time viewed as viable alternatives, a view, which would change only after the War and fall of the European empires. However, it is clear that the critique concentrates in a set of features in the systems, which are best examined through the backgrounds in which they manifested.

2.3 A short look on the political reforms

Both countries share a set of similarities in their political reform campaigns, even though the political systems differed in several levels. There was some unrest and fear of socialism in both countries, franchise systems were under re-evaluation, and the powers of the political institutions, i.e. House of Lords and the Kaiser, were under critique and scrutiny.

In Britain the most prominent issues were the perceived unconstitutional conduct of the House of Lords, the votes for women movements, and the Home Rule of Ireland, whereas in Germany three-class voting franchises in several states (the Prussian in the Kladderadatsch), *Kulturkampf* and the Kaiser's blunders were the most significant.

Upper House had vetoed the Irish Home Rule in the nineteenth century, but at the time the Liberals did not retain parliamentary majority in the ensuing elections.[78] During the Edwardian period the Unionist party dominated the House of Lords and often used it as a weapon against the Liberal government's legislation, e.g. the Peoples' Budget[79]. After the 1910 elections these actions were viewed unconstitutional, as the Liberal Party maintained its majority and strengthened their mandate, which gave the justification for the direct legislative attack against the upper house to remove its power of veto.[80]

---

[77] Retallack 2006, p.9-12: Congleton 2011, p.469.
[78] Pugh 1982, p.126.
[79] The budget was aimed to extend and reform the social benefits, which would have been financed with additional taxes for industries and inheritance (both of which were against the Unionist Party's supporters' interests). see for example Pugh 1982: Pugh 1994, p.122-127.
[80] Powell 1996, 50, 55: Powell 2002, p.126-127.

The issue divided both houses of the Parliament. Two biggest parties tried to find a mutually agreed solution in a national conference during which party strife was minimalized and the parties most eminent persons (e.g. Asquith, Balfour, Lansdowne and Lloyd-George) discussed possible solutions; Irish Nationalist and Labour were not invited. The conference failed to resolve the issue, but its results did impact the Parliament Act in the end. The Lords did not go down without a fight, but after the King's decision to use the royal privilege to create pro-reform peers if necessary was leaked to the Unionist Party, the Conservatives backed down in the face of a no-win situation. The Liberal's electorate victories justified their position in the matter, and the King as a supporter of parliamentary government delivered the final strike. This whole crisis reflects the British culture of gradual reform of their political system.[81]

Whereas the Parliament Act of 1911 was a success for the Liberal Party, the German chancellors faced two notable misgivings under the review period. von Bülow was dismissed after his budget proposal was defeated in the Reichstag and his party coalition disintegrated. He was succeeded by von Bethmann-Hollweg, whose career started with a failed attempt to reform the Prussian three-class franchise.[82]

Even though the three-class voting is a Prussian issue in the scope of this study, we must consider the practise as a whole, since other German states also had similar election laws, Saxony had established a three-class franchise in 1896.[83] The three-class franchise was used in German states as a tool to keep the socialist support contained.[84] Even though the anti-socialist laws had been repelled, the other parties wanted to limit the part's support, as they viewed the socialists with distrust. The reform was one of the Kanzler von Bethmann-Hollweg's first major political endeavours after he succeeded von Bülow in 1909, which also gave a very definite way for how his image developed in the cartoons. In the end he lacked support to pass the reform in the Prussian Herrenhaus, and the reform was dropped. Whereas the British government had had the monarch's support behind their effort, von Bethmann-Hollweg did not, which led to his failure.

In conclusion, these reform initiatives share similarities and demonstrate some important qualities of the nations' political cultures. The British government acted with the people's mandate acquired in national elections (1910), but in Germany the chancellor had the responsibility of creating the reform and to work as an interpreter of the electorates wishes. The British emphasis

---

[81] Powell, 1996, p.58-63: Ihalainen 2016, p.27.

[82] Koch 1984, p.182.

[83] Three-class franchise divided the electorate in sections according to the amount of tax they paid, people who provided the top third tax revenue controlled a third of the votes, the second third was controlled by those who paid the second third of the revenue and so on, resulting in a heavily income weighted electorate and generally a favourable electorate for the conservative and liberal parties at the expense of the socialists. Sheehan 1978, 264-265: Anderson 2000, p.7.

[84] Congleton 2011, p.480.

on the electorate's mandate and the German ideal of a strong chancellor are visible in these examples. The Liberal government obtained their mandate, hence legitimacy for their actions in national elections. Whereas in Germany a capable chancellor, was the ideal statesman and the representative Reichstag often stood in his way. If not for the First World War these crises might have drawn out into long parliamentary processes, although the Parliament Act provided a solution to one major British problem there were still many to solve.[85]

3 The top of the pyramid: the King-Emperors in the cartoons

The British and German monarchs had fundamentally different political roles. Whereas the British monarch had powers in his disposal, which on paper could be seen as comparable to the Kaiser's powers, such as the royal veto, in practise His Majesty's ability to use these powers were limited to his cabinet's discretion.[86] In the matter of the Lord's veto the sovereign decided to use his power to create peers as the only possibility to resolve the crisis cleanly, and expressed his dislike towards the issue beforehand and his relief after the issue was resolved without his intervention, there was talk of the major loss of national prestige, which the mass creation of peers would have caused.[87] Indeed, the King was a sort of an arbiter between the Houses and political parties, not an autonomous actor in the system. The German Kaiser, by contrast, was in some ways a synonym for government in the Reich. The Kaiser was not accountable for anyone *de facto*, even though in principle the German people were his supervisors. In practise his ministers did much to amend his initiatives.[88] There was no area of politics in which His Majesty's interest would not be felt.[89] These were the monarchs' roles the people were accustomed to, and the cartoons should be analysed within this framework.

In the scrutiny of the monarchs' images there are three important factors to consider. Most important one is how does the monarchs' image as a constitution-bound institution correspond with the general perception of the monarchs in the cartoons, that is what kind of image do the cartoons build. Important is how the monarchs are compared to their successors or other national figures, as well as possible breaks in their conduct, and the ensuing critique. The second factor is related to the first, the national icons and historical causalities not only in the constitutional sense,

---

[85] Pugh 1982, p.125-127: Biefang & Schultz 2016, p.67-70.
[86] Powell 1996, p.56.
[87] Powell 1996, p.55.
[88] Craig 1978, p.226-227: Koch 1984, p.125: Kohut 1991, p.135-137.
[89] Craig 1978, p.263: Kohut 1991, p.143-144: Retallack 2006, p.129: Retallack 2008, p.44.

but also in creating the monarchs into national icons in their own right. And third is the general image the cartoons create of the monarchs. These general images also hold visualisations of the monarchs' personality, which is integral to how they fulfil their role, thus affecting their images as political institutions. Important questions in the general image are: Is the monarch a passive or an active character? What attributes are given to him? With whom and in what kind of circumstances does he appear? We can assume that the monarchs should be shown as national icons, whose position helps to strengthen the nations and gives a sense of unity, hence the monarchs should be the vanguard of national good. How the monarchs are tied to the national feeling is thus of special interest.

3.1 The seldom seen Kings: Edward VII and George V

Edward VII succeeded his mother to the throne in 1901 with a rather dubious reputation, but managed to subvert the expectations and quickly create a positive image for himself. Edward's influence was mostly visible in foreign politics and especially the naval armament campaigns. Edward was strongly opposed to creating new peers as a solution to the House of Lords issue in 1909.[90] He is not frequently featured in the Punch, even his son is featured more often even when Edward was still alive. George V succeeded his father in 1910 in the middle of a difficult political situation, and people waited to see what kind of king he would be. He answered this with accustomed negative attitude towards change, however, in the face of the electoral pressure from the two 1910 elections he caved in and gave his support to the government, thus the reform of the House of Lord proceeded with only the aristocracy's, however strong, objection. The sovereign was, in the end, just a national arbiter and his role was received accordingly. The issue in general was fought between the Liberal and Unionist Parties, with Labour and Irish Nationalists playing the second fiddle, and the monarch as an arbiter. The monarch's role was clear at the time of the crises' resolution, but the monarch cannot be said to have been the one to decide the outcome of the issue.[91] Hence the role of the monarch should be seen as a go-between between two very different viewpoints, in a set of nationalistic circumstances. How the monarch's image was created as a part of the national identity is more important than the stance, which he took in the issue.

From beginning the image of George V is stoic and passive. He does not speak or take action and often in the images the King is the target of action, not the actor. This image of the King does not create an idea that he would assert himself, like his German counterpart, as the head of

---

[90] Powell 1996, p.51.
[91] Congleton 2011, p.357.

government, rather the king should be viewed as a guardian who makes sure that everything functions as expected. This ideal of the King is strengthened in an image in which he is depicted surveying the course of the nation as an explorer.[92] He cannot be said to be an active character in the image since he looks passively towards the direction the ship is moving, as if to survey and explore the nation's course. Usually in the western tradition a look to the left signifies a look to the past, but in this context this should rather be analysed as a look towards the way the ship is naturally going, i.e. the course of the nation. Whether or not the King is looking to the future, the most important thing in this image is that he is tied in the British national identity by associating him with a lion statue, which signifies undoubtedly the British Empire and the king is surveying its horizon. In other images different government officials are seen as the crew members guiding the country[93], which connotes with the image in question with the significance that the King is not guiding the state, but rather he surveys and reviews the direction in which the nation sails. This is a prime example of how the King fulfils his role as the constitutional sovereign: he surveys the nation's course rather than is setting it. The King is revered in his quality to survey the parliament and function as a national icon, but no stance is taken on whether or not he would interfere in parliamentary issues. The initiative is always given to the cabinet, moreover the Prime Minister. With his passive attitude he fulfils his constitutional position of inaction in the face of parliamentary disputes, indeed it is noteworthy that the sovereign is not visualised as an active party in the dispute, neither is he pictured in the context of the Parliament Act in any capacity.

The extent of participation in the national politics is limited to George V's time as the Prince of Wales, when he attended the House of Common's debates from the gallery of the Peers.[94] He is pictured in a section of 'essence of the parliament', in which he is a "keen student" of the parliamentary debate. This does not put him into a position of a subject in the field of domestic politics, but rather as a pupil of national politics to help him in his upcoming task as the King. He is learning to ascend to the position in which he may have to take sides and affect the national politics with government nominations. When a government would fail in a legislative initiative, one of two

---

[92] Punch 25.5.1910, volume 138 p.389
(https://ia601407.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/35/items/punchvol138a139lemouoft/punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2/punchvol138a139lemouoft_0433.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).
[93] For example, Punch 1.12.1909, volume 137 p.389
(https://ia601407.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/5/items/punchvol136a137lemouoft/punchvol136a137lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol136a137lemouoft_jp2/punchvol136a137lemouoft_0903.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).
[94] Punch 7.6.1911, volume 140 p.444
(https://ia601406.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/19/items/punchvol140a141lemouoft/punchvol140a141lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol140a141lemouoft_jp2/punchvol140a141lemouoft_0488.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

outcomes would follow: either the king would offer the premiership to the leader of the other major party or new elections would ensue. The choice of offering the premiership would be nominally the King's, but in practice he would first discuss the issue with the party leaders and other advisors.[95] In the case of the Parliament Act Edward VII consulted Balfour whether he would be willing to form a minority government if Asquith would resign, but George V opted to rather follow Asquith's line of thinking and create peers to hasten the resolution of the issue.[96] However, to make this and other such decisions, the King needed to be aware of the national situation, and this cartoon strengthens the King's image as a competent person for his position. What is most important in this cartoon is that the King is in the real world, which does not reoccur under the period under review. The passive image of the Sovereign supports his position within the constitution as the quiet arbiter.

As a passive character the King is mostly the target of the nation's admiration. The passive role of the monarch is an indication that the peoples are conscious of his position in political matters. In principle the monarch has some strong powers in his disposal, but in practice he is only a force of stability and national pride. The posture and bearing of his character are always strong mirroring the strength of the British Empire, albeit completely devoid of personality, and he is much revered, but as a political institution he remains mostly inactive. He is tied to the national identity with surrounding him with national icons. The building of George's image starts even before his ascension to the throne, in a cartoon in 1909 he is pictured surveying debate about naval armament, and is surrounded by historical figures such as Nelson and Drake.[97] The King is on the same level of status with these naval historical figures connoting both the significance of the issue at hand, and the King's position as the overseer of national good (the dreadnought program is definitely of national good in the magazine's view). The King's past in the Royal navy is present in the cartoons as the King is often wearing a navy uniform, naval matters, of course, are of vital importance to the British national good. Perhaps the most exemplary cartoon of his position as a part of traditional national identity, under the review period, is from 1911 after George's coronation. In the cartoon he's dressed in a Germanic early medieval suit of armour, carries a sword and is surveying a fleet of ships.[98] The cartoon is labelled "Heritage". Lady Britannia proudly

---

[95] Powell 1996, p.51, 56, 63: Congleton 2011, p.357: Seaward, Ihalainen 2016, p.44-45.
[96] Powell 1996, 51, 55.
[97] Punch 24.3.1909, volume 136 p.212
(https://ia601407.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/5/items/punchvol136a137lemouoft/punchvol136a137lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol136a137lemouoft_jp2/punchvol136a137lemouoft_0254.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).
[98] Punch 21.6.1911, volume 140 p.481
(https://ia601406.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/19/items/punchvol140a141lemouoft/punchvol140a141lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol140a141lemouoft_jp2/punchvol140a141lemouoft_0525.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

presents George V this heritage, which is the fleet of battleships, the work and interest of Edward VII.[99] The fleet and suit of armour are used to join the roles of protector of his nation and a warden of its interests to the young King's image. The armour also ties the King to a historical past of strength and leadership: for example the helmet of the Sovereign is not a helmet of an ordinary soldier, but rather that of a chieftain. Also rays of light shine from the heavens upon the characters and the fleet, thus further legitimising the new monarch's claim.[100]

Furthermore, in the prior image the character 'Britannia' is worth an additional remark. She is the representation of the United Kingdom, not only the current nation, but also the whole of its history and prestige. Of anthropomorphic characters she is most often the one who acts with the other nations and monarchs (British lion and John Bull being the next frequent ones). The joining of the King and Britannia in these visual means, and often depicting George in a higher position than Britannia, is an important part of creating the readers an image that the monarch is the highest authority of the appearance of the nation and maintaining its prestige. George V also is often portrayed alone and, in addition, in fantastical environments. This is a clear act of giving the reader an impression that the King does not belong to the same world as they, i.e. the King bares symbolic significance outside his person. Other pieces of evidence to support this viewpoint are the characters with which the King is seen, such as lady Britannia, John Bull and the ghosts of historical figures. No real-world characters appear with the King, which is well in line with the separation of the King from the everyday world. As a comparison it may be said, that the Prime Minister often appears in the real world, more often than not actually, and is involved in activities where he gets his hands dirty.[101] The King does not appear with the ministers and other important members of the parliament in the matters of upper house's veto. These forms of symbolism take the king further away from the other political institutions by defining it via traditional, even a bit fantastical and romantic, definitions, and separating it from them, rather than visualising it as a part of modern political processes and powers. The king as an institution is symbolic rather than concrete, such as the cabinet and Houses of the Parliament.

The general image of George V should be analysed in contrast with that of his father's. George V is pictured as a young, keen and energetic ruler. These qualities are often exaggerated to create a stark contrast to his grandmother, who was still very much the ideal of a British monarch, and his father, who was quite old when he took the throne and was, taken the early

---

[99] The Oxford English dictionary for national bibliographies p..

[100] Burke 2011, p.34-45.

[101] For example, Punch 7.8.1907, volume 133 p.155 (https://ia802702.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/15/items/punchvol132a133lemouoft/punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2/punchvol132a133lemouoft_0669.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

20th century context in mind, very obese due his prior way of living. The change of monarch signified a change from old to new.[102] George was a monarch who would bring the United Kingdom to the 20th century. An energetic King was also though as an example for the people to reconsider the Victorian ideals. For example George V takes active part in a cartoon in which he takes the place of St. George and is slaying a dragon labelled "apathy".[103] The image is made to give the reader a sense of what kind of King George is going to be, and what kind of reign that of his will be. The implicit message is that George is ready to heave the country from the claws of apathy and encourage the people to be more active. Depending of the cartoonist the King's age and stature are emphasised differently. Ravenhill puts greater weight on the King's age, emphasising his youth. In his cartoons George V is much younger of his face and posture, which is often less stoic and has more character to it. Partridge has a more formal style to his cartoons, in which the King's masculinity, strength and rigidity, English Victorian virtues, are brought up. In addition his version of the King looks much older than Ravenhill's.[104] Partridge's version of the King is closer to the romantic ideal, which can also be analysed from his more frequent use of national icons, such as the royal coat of arms and the British lion[105]. Together these two cartoonists create an image of an energetic, but at the same time masculine and strong, King, who both has the experience, will and energy to rule over the country, a model British person.

In conclusion the King, both as an institution and a person, is passive, but still bears the potential of affecting the political conceptions of the people. The competence of the King is built in the cartoons to reaffirm the nation that its sovereign is capable to fill his father's shoes. The new monarch is also joined to the national identity as a moral national figure with responsibilities over the maintaining the prestige of the nation. King as an institution is differentiated from the 'governing institutions' both by the implicit function, which is shown, i.e. the role as a moral and national character, and by differentiating him from the real world with fantastical surroundings, characters and actions. The king is prepared for jousting competitions, not parliamentary debates. The King is changed into a mystical character, who guards the best of the nation with Britannia,

---

[102] The Oxford English dictionary for national bibliographies p..

[103] Punch 6.7.1910, volume 139 p.1 (https://ia601407.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/35/items/punchvol138a139lemouoft/punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2/punchvol138a139lemouoft_0535.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[104] For example, Punch 4.1.1911 (for Partridge) and Punch 7.6.1911 (for Ravenhill), volume 140 pp. 20 and 419 (https://ia601406.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/19/items/punchvol140a141lemouoft/punchvol140a141lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol140a141lemouoft_jp2/punchvol140a141lemouoft_0053.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0 and https://ia601406.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/19/items/punchvol140a141lemouoft/punchvol140a141lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol140a141lemouoft_jp2/punchvol140a141lemouoft_0461.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[105] The Oxford English dictionary for national bibliograpies 42, p.953.

rather than a political force. Indeed, the fantasy world may be a way to separate the King from the popular politics. Of course, the popularity of the king is not questioned, but it might be hard to visualise the king as a constitutional institution acting with an institution, whose base of power greatly relied on the electorate, when the king draws his legitimacy from other sources. One of the main issues behind the Kings decision to possibly create more peers were the Liberal's consecutive election victories of 1910, which brought the constitutionality of the Lords' Veto into question. The exclusion of the king in a discourse of the legitimacy and constitutionality of the institutions at a time when another national institution is under accusations of defying the will of the nation does not seem so farfetched. The cartoons do not, however use any forms of critique towards George V, and he is also outside the possibility of ridicule. In Punch the King is handled with cautious care and it seems that the King's image is a sort of a taboo: patriotism dictates that the King's person and the monarch as an institution is beyond the usual style of the cartoons. As a political actor His majesty's image is created into a passive one, albeit keeping his competence unharmed.

3.2 The temperamental Kaiser: Wilhelm II

The only monarch in Germany over 1907 – 1911 was Emperor Wilhelm II, often referred to as simply 'the Kaiser'. The time of Wilhelm I had been overshadowed by Chancellor Otto von Bismarck, who is mostly the reason why Wilhelm I is simply 'a Kaiser'. [106] William II as the Kaiser was a strong and often a quite unpredictable person.[107] The chancellor had to take the Kaiser's viewpoints into consideration, and often the monarch also influenced the initiation of legislation. From 1907 on, the Kaiser is featured ever more frequently in the cartoons, most often in the context of the dreadnought building contest between Britain and Germany. It should be mentioned, that Kladderadatsch often features Wilhelm II and Edward VII in this milieu. It is well known that both monarchs were interested in the naval armament process. Punch on the other hand did not make King Edward the counterpart of Wilhelm, but rather John Bull, the anthropomorphic characterisation of the British people. This point may seem irrelevant, but it is important in the comparison of national traditions of using the monarchs as characters. The monarch had a position in which he could be just as active in national politics as he wished, and other institutions worked as the executors of the Kaiser's will.[108] Wilhelm II was a headstrong and opinionated person, who wanted to see his vision come through in the Empire. At the start of his reign he considered himself

---

[106] The third Kaiser was Wilhelm II's father Friedrich III, who only reigned for 99 days.
[107] Craig 1978, p.224-230: Kohut 1991, p.133-136.
[108] Craig 1978, p.227, 229-230, 264.

as a reform positive monarch, but as time went by he started to favour a stronger idea of status quo. To say that he was reform positive does not mean, however, that he would have been open to constitutional reforms that would undermine his position, but rather that he wanted to be a Kaiser, which the people would love, and give the people what they wanted so that he could overshadow the other political actors, thus strengthening the position of the Kaiser in the people's eyes. His authority driven way of governing was received with mixed feelings, and by the time of the studied period, the Kaiser's way of doing things was known among the German people. Different parts of the population reacted differently to the Kaiser's actions.[109] Some of Wilhelm's actions were seen problematic and it is interesting how the cartoonists change the way they construct his image during 1909 Daily Telegraph interview issue and the dismissal of von Bülow, which will be covered further later in this chapter.

When analysing the image, which the cartoons construct of the Kaiser as a constitution bound political actor, there are two main themes to consider, firstly the Kaiser's relationship with his chancellors, and secondly the Kaiser's actions concerning other targets. In the German constitution the Kaiser's position was a sort of a link between the people and the government, as the Kaiser issued new elections and appointed the Reichskanzler.[110] The Kaiser worked through his ministers and, most importantly, his Kanzler, which brings the relationship between the Kanzler and the monarch to the foreground. The images of all these political figures are greatly influenced by what kind of they were, but more importantly by their successes and failures, which also moulded the relationships between the figures. In one context the Kanzler takes a role of someone aiding, or nearly babysitting, the Kaiser, whereas in other it is the Kaiser who arrives to the Kanzler's aid. How the cartoons show the constitutional relationship, i.e. what they think it is and what they wish it to be, between these two institutions, and how the cartoons show them in other contexts and working alone, is at the core of these institutions' image. Not only do they give their viewer an idea of what issues these people are interested about, but also of the surroundings and political spheres they work in, e.g. the Kanzler is often working with the political parties whereas the Kaiser more often is featured alone or with a specific person[111]. What is clear, though, is that the Kaiser's position as a political actor is clear and separate from other institutions.

Unlike his British counterpart in Punch, the Kaiser appears frequently in Kladderadatsch, although these appearances become even more frequent towards the end of the

---

[109] Koch 1984, p.180-181: Retallack 2008, p.50.
[110] Congleton 2011, p.474: Biefang & Schultz 2016, p.67, 69.
[111] A quick notification that the German political parties are often pictured through anthropomorphic personifications rather than the party leaders as in the British cartoon tradition, thus the differentiation between a party and a person is easier to make.

studied period. Because this study concentrates on the views of political institutions in their own countries, most of the cartoons are about the Kaiser and Kanzler in domestic matters, and the foreign politics are mostly ruled out. As mentioned earlier, Kaiser is a popular character in cartoons concerning foreign politics and especially the relationship with him and his obese British uncle, as the cartoonist has the opportunity to compare perceivedly fit Germany to obese Britain.[112] In conclusion this chapter of the Kaiser's image will mostly be written using the cartoons of domestic affairs as sources, and Wilhelm II's position as a national icon in foreign politics will be left for another study. The ways in which he is tied to the national identity are still analysed, and his image as a national icon in this capacity, but these do not cover the cartoons about foreign policy.

The Kaiser's position in politics and the results of his actions are often difficult to present and explain for the cartoonists. They often show that in the end the Kaiser comes on top, or that the problem in the first place was caused by some kind of a misunderstanding, and that they can be resolved with the Kanzler's assistance. In general, the Kaiser and his Kanzler form a pair, which has a twofold relationship, on one hand the Kanzler is there to help Kaiser keep his appearance and guide him in his actions and on the other the Kanzler needs the sovereign's support and is responsible to him in the political matters, other political institutions are merely affecting the Kanzler's work, furthermore, most often negatively. In the cartoon "*Aus der Borussen-Bude*" the Kaiser, labelled as an older student who has returned home, demands an explanation from the younger student, von Bülow, if has he cleaned up while was away, to which the younger student says that he has not, which leads to the older student ("*Leibbursch*" a sort of a tutor) to wonder whether he should get himself a new tutee. This cartoon came out at a time when von Bülow was losing support in the Reichstag and the relationship between the Kaiser and his Kanzler had become unstable.[113]

The cartoon is a clear indication of the awareness about the relationship between these two, and of the nature of the Kanzler's position; if he does not enjoy the Kaiser's support the Kanzler will be vulnerable to misgivings in the Reichstag.[114] It is interesting that while the Kladderadatsch visualises the Kanzler as a versatile and competent politician while he has the

---

[112] The foreign politics was an important part of the Kaiser's constitutional responsibilities. The character of the Kaiser in cartoons about foreign politics arguably do not have 'the Kaiser' as their subject in the same sense as in cartoons about domestic politics, but rather 'the German Empire' in the form and appearance of the Kaiser, thus these images over-exaggerate the fitness of Kaiser for nationalistic purposes, and are not reliable when analysing the image of the Kaiser as a domestic figure. These cartoons could be used in research comparing German identity with their view towards other nations, notably the British. The Kaiser simply has two different characters, and it would be misleading to compare these two together with the Kanzler. Coupe 1980.

[113] Craig 1978, p.284: Kohut 1991, p.134-135: Retallack 2008, p.49-50.

[114] Kladderadatsch 30.5.1909, volume 62 nr.22 p.380 (the page numbers correspond with the Heidelberg University's digitized volumes) (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1909/0380?sid=0e133a2a5b198f43035d543ffc79e2a5).

support of the Reichstag and also the elegant assistant to the Kaiser, when his position begins to crumble he suddenly becomes a younger student, and in particular junior to the Kaiser, who has had some misgivings in the close past. Of course, the magazine took a very defensive stance towards the issue even then. The main purpose of the use of the student icons is to visualise the power relations of these two statesmen, but the connotation of the older and younger student cannot be overlooked. The very same visualisation continues when von Bethmann-Hollweg becomes the Kanzler. There are a set of images where the Kanzler is shown being responsible to the Kaiser after his attempt to reform the Prussian franchise failed and was a bit unsure whether the Kanzler will continue in his position or not. On the part of the Kanzler helping the Kaiser will be considered more in depth in chapter 4. Kaiser and his Kanzler had a complicated relationship, but it is clear that the Kaiser is the more powerful one and the Kanzler works at His Majesty's discretion.[115]

Outside the Kaiser-Kanzler issue the monarch's conduct is visualised in depth. As a political actor separated from the Kanzler, the Kaiser is a rash, physical and strong character, who takes part in different national issues, however usually only those in which he has personal interests. In other matters the Kaiser tells his Kanzler to advance the issue, for example the magazine gives the image that the Prussian franchise reform is initiated by the Kaiser, which is a dubious statement, since the Kaiser often took the conservative side in issues and the conservatives were very much opposed to the reform.[116] In another image the Kaiser is shown punching a socialist in the face, which is closer to his viewpoint towards them.[117] The active and physical ways to construct the Kaiser's image are well in line with his constitutional opportunities and the style with which he used to conduct his business, Wilhelm II cannot be said to be a tactful monarch. On one hand the Kaiser's strength connotes the wide range of the sovereign's political possibilities and on the other his physicality the way he usually goes about implementing his will.

The icons with which the cartoons refer to the Kaiser when he is not present, are the German royal icons, e.g. the crown of the Holy Roman Empire, and military icons, such as a plated glove, in general the Kaiser is surrounded with strong and militaristic icons, which strengthen his authority as a commander of the nation.[118] Commanders command rather than rule, hence there can be made a strong argument to support the viewpoint that the image, which the magazine sets out to create of the Kaiser as a constitutional institution, is representative of the reality in which his

---

[115] Craig 1978, p.162-163, 274: Colgleton 2011, p.474: Biefang & Schulz 2016, p.68-69.

[116] Kladderadatsch 15.5.1910, volume 63 nr.20 p.371 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1910/0371?sid=0e133a2a5b198f43035d543ffc79e2a5). Congleton 2011, p.480.

[117] Kladderadatsch 6.11.1910, volume 63 nr.45 p.803 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1910/0803?sid=0e133a2a5b198f43035d543ffc79e2a5).

[118] For example, Kladderadatsch 4.6.1911, volume 64 nr.23 p.434 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1911/0434?sid=0e133a2a5b198f43035d543ffc79e2a5).

cabinet would work by his command.[119] In theory the cabinet was the one to carry out the Kaiser's policies, but in practise the chancellor worked as a semi-independent actor, who just relied on his monarch's support. *Ad jure* the image of the Kaiser as a constitutional institution is sound, but it is curious how the Kaiser's position is so strong when most of the successful governing had been conducted by the *Reichskanzler*. We must be satisfied with the assessment that the emperor was a strong character in the political field, and that to gain a better understanding of the Kaiser's position in Wilhelm II time one should compare his image to those of his father's and grandfather's. Nevertheless, as far as the cartoon characters' power relations go, the Kaiser's authority is unchallenged.[120]

The magazine's stance to Kaiser's constitutional position, unlike the British one of their monarch, is not without critique. Even though in these circumstances the Kaiser is often visualised as a victim, not the villain. Kaiser and Reichstag are never compared to each other in the cartoons, they live in different political spheres and the Kanzler works as their go-between. The Kaiser is indirectly in the Reichstag's presence at a cartoon in which von Bülow presents his new party coalition to the monarch, however, in this image the Kaiser faces away from the viewer and von Bülow and the parties are the main objects of the image.[121] The parties are presented as different breeds of horses and thus compared for a humorous effect. To Kaiser, in the magazine's perspective, the Reichstag is only a tool, which works with the Kanzler's guidance, as the nation's workhorses. Hence the Kaiser implicitly works without the consent of Reichstag and the mandate of the people stemming from there. Indeed, the affects of the electorate in German domestic politics are limited to the parties' legitimacy and actions, and the Kaiser is outside this. However, the Kaiser is shown to address the people's (who are visualised as middle and upper class men) concerns, which connotes that the Kaiser is answerable to the people of his actions, however in this particular instance the Kanzler is the one who mitigates the issue and requests that the Kaiser addresses the people. Wilhelm then explains that there has been a misunderstanding and the issue resolves in a general cheer of the Kaiser's magnificence.[122]

---

[119] Craig 1978, p.224-230.

[120] Athough the Kaiser is visualised strong in the Kladderadatsch, the reality was different. Wilhelm was indecisive and often in the way of his government. Simplicissimus portrayed His Majesty in stronger critique, and was subsequently treated more harsly than Kladderadatsch. Koch 1984, p.178-181:Kohut 1991, p.134-136:Berger p.56-60, in Baycroft & Hewitson 2006: Retallack 2008, p.44: Allen 2015, p.48-54: Biefang & Schultz 2016, p.69.

[121] Kladderadatsch 24.2.1907, volume 60 nr.8 p.125 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1907/0125?sid=0e133a2a5b198f43035d543ffc79e2a5).

[122] Kladderadatsch 11.9.1910, volume 63 nr.37 p.655 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1910/0655?sid=0e133a2a5b198f43035d543ffc79e2a5).

The strongest cartoon criticising the sovereign is from 1908 shortly after The Daily Telegraph interview[123]. In this image the Kaiser is visualised as the driver of a train and von Bülow is the stationmaster, who is in charge of the direction cues, which say that the way is clear. However, His Imperial Majesty has collided his train engine with another train causing much distress, not the least to the Kanzler who desperately exclaims followed by his dog.[124] Kaiser is the one who has driven the train, but von Bülow is the one responsible of the traffic control, which mirrors the Kanzler's job to review all Kaiser's interviews before their publication. Wilhelm's character in the picture is puzzled and von Bülow's desperate. At the same time the sovereign's ineptitude at the controls of the nation and von Bülow's mistake and position as the one who should review Kaiser's statements are ridiculed. von Bülow's dog has its tail between its legs possibly connoting the repercussions, which are to come along the Kanzler's way. Wilhelm's carelessness and his Kanzler's mistake are under critique rather than the institutions themselves, the blame is the Kanzler's, but the text under the image tells the viewer that had he been more careful the whole affair would have been avoided. In general the critique towards the Kaiser is directed towards his slight incompetence, and usually explained as mistakes and more often as misunderstandings[125]. The general institutional structure is not under critique, the system is sound, but the people in charge are, because of their silly mistakes.

The refusal of critique towards the institution draws from the Kaiser's special status as a national icon.[126] As his British counterpart, the Kaiser works as a representative of his whole nation both as a masculine and strong example of a man, but also as a carrier of German prestige and regalia in foreign positions. Usually he is visualised wearing a helmet, cuirass or a uniform to join him to the aristocracy and the Prussian and German military traditions. This connotes both the nation's and His Majesty's might. Of course, also the leadership and cultural dimensions are revered, but the aristocratic, militaristic, features are stronger and more often used. The Kaiser is also visualised as a force actively advancing the aristocracy's issues with an argument of the

---

[123] In an interview given to the Daily Telegraph in 1908 Wilhelm expressed his views about the government of Germany, which were not only authoritarian, but also anti-constitutional. This caused immediate and strong reactions among the national parties, the conservatives expressed concerns about the Kaiser's views and position, the Liberals demanded constitutional reforms and greater powers for the Reichstag, and even the Kaiser himself admitted that he had gone too far with his statement. It was the Reichskanzler's (von Bülow at the time) duty to read and revise the Kaiser's statements, but this time the interview got published virtually unchanged. Whether the oversight on von Bülow's part was accidental or a political move to weaken the Kaiser's position, thus strengthening that of his own in national politics, is inconsequential in the scope of this study, what is important is that the crisis damaged the Kaiser's image and hurt His Majesty's relationship with his Kanzler. Koch 1984, p.180-181: Kohut 1991, p.118-119, 133-136: Retallack 2008, p.49-50.

[124] Kladderadatsch 8.11.1908, volume 61 nr.45 p.780 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1908/0780?sid=0e133a2a5b198f43035d543ffc79e2a5).

[125] As a related remark, the images ridiculing His Majesty are often published without artist's signature.

[126] Kohut 1991, p.156-158: Berger 2006, p.59.

aristocracy's popularity as the driving reason[127]. One part of the Kaiser's visualisation is his body; Wilhelm is most often depicted as a fit and masculine person at a time, when the royal way of life had done its part in the sovereign's features. This stays true even when he is ridiculed in the cartoons, which is due to the duality of his icon. On one hand he is a person whose actions may be under ridicule, in the aforementioned way, but on the other he is also a national icon, which must be maintained and strengthened for the sake of the institution. Thus Wilhelm II remains a strong and decisive leader with will to affect national politics, much as the Kaiser could in the eyes of the constitution. It could also be argued that at a time of nationally belittled Kanzlers the Kaiser's image is moulded to fulfil the role of the most influential political institution, which surely is also strengthened by the Kanzlers' misgivings with their legal initiatives and Kaiser's visible role in the national political field.

Other characters wearing the cuirass and the army helmet in the cartoons are romanticised knights, German aristocracy and count von Bismarck (or more accurately his ghost), from which the Kaiser is separated by usually exchanging the spike from his helmet with the German eagle, thus showing Wilhelm II in a separate and special position, rather than just representing the militaristic, Prussian, aristocracy he also represents the nation.[128] It should be remarked that a distinction between Wilhelm II as the king of Prussia and emperor of Germany is not made in the cartoons, even though his appearance bears strong Prussian connotations, the title of King is not used. He is also joined to the naval armaments, i.e. the dreadnought races similarly to his British counterpart, and to the national good, as the surveyor of it.[129] As the model example of a German aristocrat and the warden of national good, Kaiser Wilhelm II is a revered national character, who receives and deserves the admiration of the country.

As a generalisation the Kaiser's personality, headstrongness and unreliability (he is often visualised as a weathervane [130]) are factors that could be called critique towards the person occupying the position, but not towards the institution, since the evidence given by the excuses and belittlements the cartoons make on the Kaiser's part speak strongly on behalf of this viewpoint. Even though the Kaiser's image is laden with a sense of unreliability and headstrongness, in the cartoons depicting his in government issues he is seldom directly accused of oversights, it is rather his Kanzler who has to take the blame. The image of the Kaiser as an institution is quite clear. The

---

[127] Kladderadatsch 10.4.1910, volume 63 nr.15 p.282 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1910/0282?sid=0e133a2a5b198f43035d543ffc79e2a5).
[128] For example, Kladderadatsch 11.9.1910, volume 63 nr.37 p.655 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1910/0655?sid=0e133a2a5b198f43035d543ffc79e2a5).
[129] For example, Kladderadatsch 20.9.1908, volume 61 no.38 p.661 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1908/0661?sid=0e133a2a5b198f43035d543ffc79e2a5).
[130] Kladderadatsch 9.2.1908, volume 61 no.6 p.84 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1908/0084?sid=0e133a2a5b198f43035d543ffc79e2a5).

Kaiser is an institution with a lot of power and it could be raised as the leader of the German politics over the Kanzler. The Kaiser is liable to his people, but usually exercises this as a clarification to the people who have misunderstood his message. Wilhelm II's tenacity to impose his own will in political issues is a thing, which is often ridiculed, but again the Kanzler is the one responsible of the consequences. This all boils down to the institutions as quite correct representations of the constitutional power relations, but with the problematic additional quality of the person's personalities. Indeed, the Kanzler is much celebrated and the Kaiser does not appear very much in 1907, but the Kaiser's character and the connotations to his institution grow stronger and more impactful as von Bülow's Reichstag support dwindled. With a longer research period von Bethmann-Hollweg's image could be further analysed, alas, under the scope of this study his image is plagued by his failures of his early career. The Kladderadatsch creates an image of the Kaiser's character of whom the German people can certainly be proud of, but who happens to stumble when ruling his nation, but with the help of his Kanzler he can maintain the national good.

3.3 The Lion and the Eagle: Comparisons

Cartoons on these two monarchs are as different as the monarchs themselves, both personally and as constitutionally bound institutions. Of course, it must be kept in mind that in 1907 Wilhelm II had been the Kaiser for almost forty years whereas George V was a new acquaintance to the British public, hence it is reasonable to assume that the personality of George does not impact the images in the same way Wilhelm's does, then again the British monarch was calm and restrained by his outwards appearance, hence it can only be said that the images do correspond with the King's personality.[131] Kaiser Wilhelm's personality, however, arguably can be said to have a stronger impact on his general image, since forty years of his reign have made him familiar to the public and the characters personality corresponds that of the Kaiser, albeit not as strongly as it could, since for example his emotional fits and romantic ideals are not used in cartoons, although it is questionable whether the cartoonists would have this kind of information about their monarch, or even willing to use it if they did.[132] Wilhelm had also a weak arm, which had been damaged in birth, which does not show in the cartoons. There is a limit with the cartoonists of the icons and visual means they are willing to use. In both countries the extent of ridicule towards their statesmen is in general characteristics, e.g. von Bülow is ridiculed for obesity and von Bethmann-Hollweg for height in Germany and Churchill for his posture in Britain, anything more could be received badly by the

---

[131] The Oxford English dictionary for national bibliographies.
[132] Craig p.224-230: Kohut 1991, p.104-106, 111-112, 115. Coupe 1980.

magazines' audiences. The cartoonists had to keep in mind the public and its interests for the magazines image and popularity. This and general respect towards the subject matter surely generated self-imposed censorship among the cartoonists. Personality of the monarchs is an important part of their images, but when considering the institutions around them there are more relevant factors to consider.

Both magazines construct an image of their monarch, which resonates that country's constitution well. The British monarch is closer to a painting that is alive than a statesman, whereas the Kaiser is a strong and active character, and he is shown acting in the political fields he generally would. George V does not work with people concerned with the governing of the nation in the images, but rather in fantastical circumstances and incorporeal characters. He is someone who does not belong with the normal people. By distancing the King from the real world, his role as a national icon instead of a political actor is strengthened. Wilhelm is often seen with his ministers and Kanzler, which creates a symmetrically opposite image compared to George. The images created about the monarchs' roles as actors in national politics are close to their constitutional positions, however, when used as historical evidence we must not assume that this was the explicit purpose behind the cartoons, but rather that the cartoons were the manifestations of the cartoonists' perception of the institutions within their political culture whether we think of them as tools to affect the peoples' perceptions or the cartoonists' way to express their personal (or their magazine's) viewpoints without the explicit purpose of changing peoples' views. Whatever is the case, the magazines define the passiveness or activity of their monarch as a part of national good, e.g. George V a warden of the royal fleet and guardian of the realm, and Wilhelm II overseeing his ministers and a part of national identity, thus enforcing the idea of the necessity of monarchy and the soundness of the political system.[133]

National aspects are in the centre of the monarchies' image, in addition to their political positions the monarchs preserve and create national prestige. They are joined to the national iconography, e.g. the British lion and German eagle. George's close relations to sea warfare, i.e. the navy, and exploring new worlds are clear examples of the cartoonists joining the monarch into the world of national values, and the same hold true in Germany, where Wilhelm is a part of the army with his cuirass and sword and army inspections.[134] Also historical figures and national heroes as well as classical ones share the presence of the monarchs. In both magazines the distinction between a character and a flesh and blood person is sometimes made, but both monarchs

---

[133] Craig 224-226: Kohut 1991, p.156-158: Pugh 1994, p.84-86: Powell 1996, p.51-52, 56, 63: Williams 2006, p.277, 281-282: Congleton 2011, p.357, 474.
[134] Craig 1978, p. 99: Kohut 1991, p.156: Biefang & Schultz 2016, p.66-67.

are joined tightly to the national icon systems and they bear many national virtues, thus as monarchs and rulers their image is created into an appealing one and certainly strengthens national sentiment and feeling of togetherness.[135]

The critique towards the monarchs is difficult to compare since George V is not a target of any, neither is the King ridiculed in any fashion. Wilhelm II, however, is a target of critique towards his way of acting in the political field, but even then his Kanzler is usually the one who takes the blame. Often the critique is directly targeted at the Kanzler visually by putting him in the foreground, or referring especially to him in the text accompanying the image. In spite of this belittlement, misdirection and explanation of the Kaiser's critique, his attitude towards power is often underlined: "*sic volo, sic jubeo".*[136] I will, I rule, and similar texts are directly attached to the Kaiser. This is often done in a way of a statement, but the exaggeration of this creates an image of a political actor who is perhaps a bit too authoritative for his position. This, however, is an observation, which should not be exaggerated, since the cartoons may be years apart where this appears, and the knowledge of Wilhelm's personality might affect the result.[137]

In the scope of this study it is clear that the Kaiser is under some critique, however subtle or subdued it is, and George V is not. Kaiser is also a character who is not immune to amusing situations, which is both directed towards him (again subtly). The Punch magazine's characters of the Prime Minister and others, work in the same way as Kladderadatsch's Kaiser, but the British monarch is never ridiculed. In fact, the only time the King is seen even a little bit amused is with Mr Punch, when he smiles slightly, which is the full extent of the situation.[138] Edward VII is featured in only one cartoon in which he sits comfortably in a chair. [139] His personality is visible in the depiction, but as George has just ascended the throne either the magazines want to take time before making suggestions about the King's personality or they want to cement his place as a national icon before visualising him as a person outside its rigid role. The images do not over exaggerate the monarch's capabilities or actions, which is also due to the nature

---

[135] Burke 2011, p.34-45: Kohut 1991, p.156: Williams 2006, 281.

[136] Kladderadatsch 8.5.1910, volume 63 no.19 p.347 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1910/0347?sid=0e133a2a5b198f43035d543ffc79e2a5). Craig 1978, p.173, 264: Retallack 2008, p.44.

[137] Kohut 1991, p.156-158.

[138] Punch 7.6.1911, volume 140 p.419 (https://ia601406.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/19/items/punchvol140a141lemouoft/punchvol140a141lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol140a141lemouoft_jp2/punchvol140a141lemouoft_0461.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[139] Punch 10.6.1908, volume 134 p.425 (https://ia802605.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/27/items/punchvol134a135lemouoft/punchvol134a135lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol134a135lemouoft_jp2/punchvol134a135lemouoft_0467.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

of the cartoons as usually event based media.[140] The comparisons between the two are in line with the political cultures of the nations, and will be further compared to the national administrative institutions in the next chapter. Especially the visualisations of the power relations of the monarchs are important, since the British monarch is excluded from other political actors and the German one so strongly built acting with them.

4 All the king's horses and all the king's men: the Governments in the cartoons

In Britain the parties had mostly differed in their stance towards trade policy and the Irish Home Rule since 1890s, but in the first years of the 20th century the Liberal Party started to take a more reform-oriented stance. As the majority party throughout the period the Liberals were the one to form the government, since unlike in Germany the British political system most often had the majority party in power, and the others as the opposition. Thus the image of the British government around 1910 is almost completely intertwined with the image of the Liberal party. In this thesis the government is analysed by studying the image of those who hold the governmental positions. The British government's legitimacy relied strongly on the electoral majority *vis a vis* the people's mandate, furthermore, this legitimacy was enhanced as the King only formally appointed and accepted the government, whereas in Germany the government was actually appointed and dismissed by the monarch.[141]

Compared to the British model the German government had very little to do with parties' power relations or majorities. The Kanzler had to gather a Reichstag majority behind his policies, but this majority was in no way tied to any particular parties or party alliances. Neither did the Reichstag have any power over the nomination of the Kanzler or his dismissal, which were both prerogatives of the Kaiser. The answer to a failed parliamentary initiative would be the dismissal of the Kanzler, dissolution of the Reichstag and new elections, or simply the continuation of the current power balance, whichever the Kaiser saw as the best course of action.

The Kanzler was not responsible to the Reichstag. He had to operate with the trust and support of his sovereign, otherwise the was very vulnerable for dismissal, as in the case of von Bülow who lost the Kaiser's support in the Daily Telegraph scandal, and after a subsequent failure in Reichstag had to resign, i.e. was dismissed.[142] In the other Kanzler's case under this period,

---

[140] Scully & Quartly 2009, ch.1.
[141] Pugh 1982, p.138-141: Congleton 2011, p.474: Biefang & Schulz 2016, p.69.
[142] Craig 1978, p.284: Congleton 2011, p.479.

however, the position is symmetrically opposite, von Bethmann-Hollweg started his career in a difficult position and suffered a large, if not surprising, failure in Prussian politics, which deepened the doubts about his qualifications for his position (he had already been under some critique because of his inexperience in foreign politics and his liberal party background).[143] Nevertheless, he enjoyed the Kaiser's support and thus continued in his position. In practise the Kanzler must have lost both the ability to govern the nation and the Kaiser's support. In the scope of this study the German government is a synonym for the Kanzler. Even though the Kaiser is visually a part of the government of the nation, it is the Kanzler who is responsible for the victories and failures.[144]

To analyse the images of the national governments we should, as with the monarchs, first concentrate on how they, according to the artists, fulfil their roles in the light of the nations' constitutions. Next the power relations and legitimacy are important issues, i.e. what are their relations to the parties and in the German case the monarch, since unlike the monarch, the national governments are seen as more practical institutions, which makes the views towards their actions more important than the way in which they are tied to the national identity. The governments as national institutions (and perhaps even icons) is therefore analysed with their general images. What should the people find amusing about the government and its actions? What should they be proud about? Which national icons appear with which statesmen? This all is, of course, studied with the general interest towards the critique of the governments. The hypothesis is that the British government is criticised when it does not fulfil the British middle classes, i.e. the Punch magazine's, expectations with its policies. Whereas the German government should fall under critique when it fails as the ideal, Bismarckian '*Eisen Kanzler*', the Iron Cancellor, which in practise means that the chancellor should be one step ahead of the Reichstag and also support his Kaiser, both in practise and in principle. As with the monarchs, it is also interesting to see whether the magazines criticise the institution of government or just the statesmen currently occupying the governmental positions. Most probably the magazines tried to form an image, which would help unifying the people and create national pride towards their form of government, thus the critique and government images are as well analysed from this perspective.

4.1 The liberal premiers: Henry Campbell-Bannerman and Herbert Asquith

---

[143] Koch 1984, p.180-182: Congleton 2011, p.480, also in Kladderadatsch 21.11.1909, volume 62 nr.47 p.817 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1909/0817?sid=0e133a2a5b198f43035d543ffc79e2a5).
[144] Koch 1984, p.122-125, 182: Biefang & Schulz 2016, p.67-70.

In 1906 the Liberal Party made a return as the stronger party, which is sometimes attributed as Henry Campbell-Bannerman's accomplishment. He had succeeded the party leader as a compromise solution between the leading party figures, which was a move against party division and conflict within the party. Campbell-Bannerman's cabinet thereafter sought liberal policies until his resignation due to poor health in 1908 when Herbert Asquith took his place.[145]

Asquith is the main focus of inquiry in this study, since he is the main character in the Lord's veto issue. Other notable characters of the government were David Lloyd-George and Winston Churchill, and of the opposition Alfred Balfour. Even though the Punch magazine first expresses reservations towards Asquith's leadership at the time of his ascendance as Prime Minister, he is thereafter considered a stable statesman.[146]

Individual persons have a larger role in British cartoons that they are in the German, since the parties are visualised through the characters of these persons, i.e. Liberals through Asquith and Unionists through Balfour, rather than some kind of generalisations as in the German cartoons. This creates a difficulty in the analysis, as the researcher must acknowledge the times when the subject of the cartoon is the person and when the person is used as a more general icon, signifying the party for instance. However, it could be said that in the cartoons the characters are such an integral part of the British parties that there is no significance in creating such a differentiation, we should rather focus on how the cartoonists create the image of the parties through their image construction. There are sometimes distinctions between the characters' roles and this, of course, is taken into consideration, e.g. sometimes individual people are given special attention when they achieve knighthood or some other honour. This becomes more important as the parties are discussed, but it is also relevant in the case of the government as the government is led by the Liberal party and the Prime Minister works at the same time in the role of the party leader, his actions affect the party's and the government's images at the same time.

The images of the Prime Ministers are often created in the context of their work, most importantly the reform initiatives and relations to the other parties. The Parliamentary Act of 1911 was the major reform under the review period. The Lords had vetoed the People's Budget after which Asquith requested King George V to call new elections. [147] The budget and the Lords actions were central elections issues, the Lords' veto of the budget was presented as an indication of their

---

[145] Powell 2002, 126: The Oxford English dictionary for national bibliographies 3, p.710-718: Blackwell 1990, p.82-85.
[146] The Oxford English dictionary for national bibliographies 2, p.735-743: Blackwell 1990, p.19-22.
[147] The parties agreed that the social system was in need of reform, but the financing and organisation of them was not agreed upon. The Liberals supported a model, which would impose licensing fees to liquor industry, which was one of the Conservative's support groups, and increase in inheritance taxes, which also would have hurt the Conservative supporters, especially the aristocracy. The Conservatives had suggested increased tariffs as an alternative. Powell 1996, p.20-21.

unconstitutional use of power.[148] During the Parliament Act debates the government and opposition tried to find a common solution in the Constitutional Conference, which failed. Nevertheless, it should be remembered that not all Unionists and Lords were against the reform.[149] The goal of the reform was to limit the Lords' power over the House of Commons so that the Liberal government could better advance their own agendas, which was impossible under the Conservative House of Lords, which did not take the party representation of the lower chamber into consideration in any way. The government derived its legitimacy in the issue from the election victories of 1910, which they argued to demonstrate that they were the executors of the people's will.[150]

However, the government operated under pressure of maintaining the majority in the parliament, after the 1910 January elections the Liberal Party lost absolute majority. After this, the government party had to work with the minor parties to assure its majority. The other parties had their own clear agendas, as the Irish Nationalists wanted Home Rule for Ireland and the socialists further social and franchise reforms. The Liberal Party bargained with them by offering these policies to gain their support for their own purposes. The government as a political actor, its relations to other parties and the electorate, and comparisons with the king as a national icon are the points of interest in this chapter, the king, as argued, is not a political actor so there is no need to compare the government with him in the viewpoint of the governing.[151]

Without doubt we can conclude that its Parliament and thus the Liberal Party led the British nation in the world of cartoons. Liberal legislation and Campbell-Bannerman as its initiator are featured regularly and frequently in the magazine, with the issue about the House of Lords sometimes present. The Lords are visualised bullying the Liberal legislation and the Prime Minister intends to change the situation[152]. Campbell-Bannerman is a witty and amiable character in the cartoons, and is most often actor in the images rather than a passive character, which is also true of the next Prime Minister, Herbert Asquith, thus strengthening the image that the Prime Minister is in charge.

In both countries the legal initiatives are often visualised as a combination of a child and a paper scroll, which symbolises the care, which the ministers put into them.[153] Usually it is the

---

[148] Powell 1996, p.47.
[149] Powell 1996, p.52-55, 58.
[150] Pugh 1982, p.125-126: Pugh 1994, p.126-127: Powell 1996, p.50: Congleton 2011, p.357.
[151] Ball 1981, p.47-49, 83: Pugh 1982, p.139: Powell 2002, p.126.
[152] Punch 27.3.1907, volume 132 p.227
(https://ia802702.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/15/items/punchvol132a133lemouoft/punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2/punchvol132a133lemouoft_0269.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).
[153] For example, Punch 1.5.1907, volume 132 p.317
(https://ia802702.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/15/items/punchvol132a133lemouoft/punch

Prime Minister and the Kanzler who care for the legislation, but in the British case other ministers are also depicted in this way, e.g. Lloyd George who was in charge of the preparation of the budget in 1909 is associated with the legislation in the same way. This sense of care for the legislation builds up the ideal that the government is thorough and takes great consideration in its work.

The same cannot be said of the Lords, whose actions are shown to the viewer as presumptuous and arbitrary. In a cartoon "Boiling over with apathy" the British people in the form of John Bull sleeps on a bench and a triumphant lord character has knocked Prime Minister Asquith's hat out with a "rejected bill"[154]. In the cartoon's text Asquith expresses future actions against such behaviour and hints that the British people will not stand for it. The image has many interesting connotations, but in this context the important one is that the lords are visualised with a light pose, an expression of amused defiance and wears pre-nineteenth century clothing, whereas the Prime Minister is stern and contemporary figure. The electorate as a force behind government is also taken into consideration in other cartoons, e.g. in a cartoon from August 1907 Campbell-Bannerman is driving a bathing carriage with a horse labelled "majority", referring to the parliamentary majority[155].

After the 1910 January elections the majority is not visualised as such a strong force in the government's favour mirroring the election results. Rather the magazine starts to emphasize the cooperation of the parties and explicitly mentions that the support of Irish nationalists is instrumental for the liberals. The liberal majority was not absolute, thus without the smaller parties' assistance the government could not function efficiently, furthermore the government had to take them into consideration and amend its politics to suit them better. Indeed, before 1910 the parties seldom worked together on Punch's pages, but after this becomes a common sight. The magazine does not express its views whether or not this is for the good. The government has to operate through the Parliamentary majority, which is dictated by the people. This is the first part of the government's image as a constitutional institution; the significance of the electorate as an indication of the people's wishes.

vol132a133lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2/punchvol132a133lemouoft_0359.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[154] Punch 16.12.1908, volume 135 p.443
(https://ia902605.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/27/items/punchvol134a135lemouoft/punchvol134a135lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol134a135lemouoft_jp2/punchvol134a135lemouoft_0957.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[155] Punch 7.8.1907, volume 133 p.101
(https://ia802702.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/15/items/punchvol132a133lemouoft/punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2/punchvol132a133lemouoft_0615.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

The second part of the constitutionality is the dialogue between the parties, i.e. His Majesty's government and opposition. Before 1910 the government is shown only in passing with other parties, for instance Campbell-Bannerman converses with Balfour about the last government's accomplishments. The cartoons of the liberals with other parties are about the parties' views towards each other's politics, i.e. the positions that they take in the debate, rather than examples of their cooperation or power relations.[156] After 1910, however, the government's position changes drastically. The magazine represents the endeavours of the liberals and the conservatives to find an acceptable solution to the Lords issue, although later the government would not accept amendments to their reform, which also appears in the paper[157]. Asquith wonders how many knife blows it would take to take down the amendments for the parliament bill[158]. The government is criticised when it chooses to work without taking the Lords' and Unionists' views into consideration, which is visualised with changing the premier's image from the arduous, concentrating and amiable, of the time of conference, to a shifty and malevolent. One suggested reason why the compromise was not acceptable for the government at this time is that the solution would not have resolved the issue completely, but rather just transformed it; the liberal government had a programme with Irish Home rule and other legislation, which the Lords could still have impeded.[159] Thus the conference failed, and another solution had to be found. The failure of a common solution came as a disappointment for the Punch magazine, and the blame was put on Asquith's shoulders.

The Home Rule and the Parliamentary Act are implicitly united as a common issue as John Redmond of the Irish Nationalists and Asquith are often depicted working together. In a cartoon "Quid pro quo" the magazine shows Redmond supporting Asquith's shop and ponders about the possible reciprocity of the situation[160]. Cooperation is viewed as a virtue in the cartoons

---

[156] For example, Punch 29.5.1907, volume 132 p.389 (https://ia802702.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/15/items/punchvol132a133lemouoft/punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2/punchvol132a133lemouoft_0431.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0) and Punch 28.8.1907, volume 133 p.155 (https://ia802702.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/15/items/punchvol132a133lemouoft/punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2/punchvol132a133lemouoft_0669.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[157] For example, Punch 6.7.1910, volume 139 p.11 (https://ia601407.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/35/items/punchvol138a139lemouoft/punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2/punchvol138a139lemouoft_0545.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[158] Punch 26.4.1911, volume 140 p.365 (https://ia601406.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/19/items/punchvol140a141lemouoft/punchvol140a141lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol140a141lemouoft_jp2/punchvol140a141lemouoft_0347.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[159] Powell 1996, p.142-143: Congleton 2011, p.357-358.

[160] Punch 5.4.1911, volume 140 p.245 (https://ia601406.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/19/items/punchvol140a141lemouoft/punchvol140a141lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol140a141lemouoft_jp2/punchvol140a141lemouoft_0287.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

about solving the Lords position, and otherwise as a necessity for the government so that they can enlist the support of the minor parties.

The government's image as a constitutional institution does for the most parts correspond the norm of the British political conduct.[161] Majority is in the centre of political action, and is ascertained from the electorate in national elections. Elections are shown as a tool for the government, which uses them as means to strengthen their position, the waking of John Bull is an example of this.[162] Government's relative majority is visible in the cartoons where the government is kept aloof, i.e. functional, with the help of the other parties. Before the 1910 elections the liberals and other parties appear in relations to their stance in the national debate: the Liberals do not require the support of other parties and so the magazine shows them as an independent actor. Critique towards the government is directed at the way they conduct national politics, as the electorate's mandate is not enough, but the government should not tyrannically discard the amendments. The magazine supports the reform attempts despite the critique, some actions are criticised as harmful for the nation, like tax increases, but in general the image of the Prime Minister and cabinet members is positive. The lords, however, have an image of a force, which impedes the government with means that sometimes are lacking legitimacy, such as arbitrarily damaging legislation[163]. The divide between the lords in the image is visible in the magazine and the debate within the Upper Chamber is visualised as a conflict[164]. The magazine did, however, visualise this as a parliamentary battle and not a real possibility of an internal conflict, which the Lords had offered as a possible outcome of the Liberal Party's actions.[165] The government works through majority and party cooperation with the minor parties, which did not usually impact politics otherwise than offering their viewpoints in parliamentary debate. In view of these perspectives the image of the government

---

[161] Powell 1996, p.63: Palonen 2014, p.7: Ihalainen 2016, p.27: Seaward & Ihalainen 2016, p.33, 41.
[162] Punch 1.5.1907, volume 132 p.317
(https://ia802702.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/15/items/punchvol132a133lemouoft/punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2/punchvol132a133lemouoft_0359.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).
[163] For example, Punch 10.11.1909, volume 137 p.335
(https://ia601407.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/5/items/punchvol136a137lemouoft/punchvol136a137lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol136a137lemouoft_jp2/punchvol136a137lemouoft_0849.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).
[164] For example, Punch 5.4.1911, volume 140 p.237
(https://ia601406.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/19/items/punchvol140a141lemouoft/punchvol140a141lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol140a141lemouoft_jp2/punchvol140a141lemouoft_0279.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0) and 9.8.1911, volume 141 p.99
(https://ia601406.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/19/items/punchvol140a141lemouoft/punchvol140a141lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol140a141lemouoft_jp2/punchvol140a141lemouoft_0731.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).
[165] Ihalainen 2014, p.427-428.

in the Punch magazine does correspond their positions in the national constitution, and the critique is directed towards unusual conduct.[166]

As visual national icon the government is tied to the conduct of national good and the nation's strength, a strong government is an indication of a strong nation. The power of the government is often represented through some historical, occupational or everyday-life roles. Henry Campbell-Bannerman (prime minister 1905 - 1908) is presented as a medieval king, who bears the symbols of a king's legitimate power. The context is that the Prime Minister is choosing a champion to bring the Irish back to the realm. Here the Prime Minister is joined to the honour driven chivalric and romantic tradition as the enabler of the knight's quest. There are no royal regalia in the picture. The Prime Minister is not presented as the King of England, but rather just as a king, i.e. any king.[167] In another picture Campbell-Bannerman is also represented as a strong man who is capable of having a fight with the House of Lords. As earlier mentioned, the magazine made fun of the premier's obesity, and he was well known to be an old and ill man. There were mentions of the Prime Ministers absence from the sessions of the House of Commons, and also speculations of the reasons behind these absences.[168] The cartoonist still decides to create a powerful character out of the Prime Minister by making him capable to fight the Lords. The Prime Minister of the country cannot be a weak character, because he is tied to the national sentiment and making him seem weak in front of problems would diminish the perceived power of the whole nation.[169] The leader of the opposition, Arthur Balfour, and Prime Minister Herbert Asquith are shown together as general during the 17th century civil war. They're talking about a truce in the context of the national conference.[170] Prime Minister Asquith is also visualised as a British general (Duke of Wellington) at the time of the Napoleonic wars with John Redmond (German general Blücher in the cartoon).[171]

---

[166] Powell 2002, p.126-128: Seaward & Ihalainen 2016, p.36-47.

[167] Punch 23.1.1907, volume 132 p.65
(https://ia802702.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/15/items/punchvol132a133lemouoft/punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2/punchvol132a133lemouoft_0107.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[168] The Oxford English dictionary for national bibliographies 3, p.710-718.

[169] Punch 27.3.1907, volume 132 p.227
(https://ia802702.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/15/items/punchvol132a133lemouoft/punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2/punchvol132a133lemouoft_0269.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[170] Punch 19.10.1910, volume 139 p.273
(https://ia601407.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/35/items/punchvol138a139lemouoft/punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2/punchvol138a139lemouoft_0805.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[171] Wellington and Blücher were the leaders of British and Prussian forces in the battle of Waterloo. Punch 1.2.1911, volume 140 p.83
(https://ia601406.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/19/items/punchvol140a141lemouoft/punchvol140a141lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol140a141lemouoft_jp2/punchvol140a141lemouoft_0125.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

The symbol of the general is a reference to the perceived battle, which precedes the passing of the bills, Asquith as a national hero and Redmond as his ally. The symbol is powerful and holds certain implications. To advance to the position of the general one would need considerable leadership and tactical prowess. The leaders of the party are thus leaders of their own armies, they have a great amount of troops under their command. This connotes the power of the whole party.

Through the time period of this study the Liberal Party was in power and a mostly pro-Liberal Party message is written into the images. The most obvious national symbolism used in the cartoons if the Liberal Party is the use of Scottish imagery. Campbell-Bannerman, Asquith and Churchill are portrayed at some point or another wearing a tartan[172]. This is a historical reference to the Scottish battles against the English for their liberty, i.e. the clans' pseudo autonomy, it started as a reference to the pro-reform campaign in Scotland, and takes advantage of Campbell-Bannerman's Scottish background.[173] The Scottish symbolism is usually tied with the Parliamentary Bill, which was designed to limit the power of the House of Lords. The "liberty" of the House of Commons, is a battle. As mentioned above, the leaders of the parties are also generals leading the battle, which is a common metaphor in this issue. Henry Campbell-Bannerman is also portrayed as a historical figure, Guy Fawkes, in the context of the Parliamentary Bill (Guy Fawkes failed in an attempt to blow up the Houses of the Parliament in 1605)[174]. Unlike Guy Fawkes, the Premier is visualised working legitimately, which is represented by showing a policeman salute him. He also has the support of the people, who have formed a crowd to see him pass. The people of Britain support also the Premier Asquith when he took Campbell-Bannerman's place as the leader of the battle against the lords. In a cartoon in the last issue of 1908 the Prime Minister wonders whether he should wake up John Bull to combat the lords, who are presented aggravating Asquith. The context in these images is that the party works with the peoples mandate and the people are ready to support the party in return. The Liberals are visibly represented as a people's party; they are in close relations with the people.

---

[172] For example, Punch 23.11.1910, volume 139 p.363
(https://ia601407.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/35/items/punchvol138a139lemouoft/punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2/punchvol138a139lemouoft_0895.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[173] This may also be a reference to the strong Scottish support for the Liberal Party. Unionist leader Arthur Balfour does not appear visualised in this fashion. The Oxford English dictionary for national bibliographies 3 p.494-507, 710-718: Blackwell 1990, p.34-37, 82-85.

[174] Punch 30.10.1907, volume 133 p.317
(https://ia802702.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/15/items/punchvol132a133lemouoft/punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2/punchvol132a133lemouoft_0831.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

Punch magazine is open in its favour over the parliamentary reform. This can be seen implicitly in the picture of the lords. They are usually not presented as malevolent[175], but rather as old-fashioned and a thing of the past. The lords are made to look detached from national issues. The upper house is an institution that suffers from an illness.[176] Punch magazine's critique consists of showing the peers hinder the functioning of the government. The magazine's support towards the reform is clearly visible in two cartoons from the years of 1908 and 1910. In one of them the cartoonist implies that in case the lords carry on making the government's work impossible, John Bull will be called to help. This is an explicit message that the people of England would not stand for the Lords' behaviour and an implicit message that the Lords should be responsible to the people, because the people won't stand for their behaviour. The other pictures lady Britannia, who has been explained as an icon earlier, putting feathers to a lord's crown, which is a common icon for nobility and the upper house in both Britain and Germany, with a feather labelled "reform". This means that not only the people, but also the essence of Britannia as a whole is ready for the change.[177]

The main force driving the reform, Henry Campbell-Bannerman, is pictured as a strong and capable man, although his physical health deteriorated towards the end of his term. His real physical state has no relevance in the world, which the cartoons create. The cartoonists wanted to give the viewer an image of a strong and capable man, since that was the role of the British Prime Minister. The connotations of the images are of the position of the Prime Minister's institution. The Prime Minister was Britain's leading statesman, de facto. His power based on the majority in the parliament's House of Commons, which was elected by the peoples of Britain. In this sense the Prime Minister had the support of the realm behind him. Campbell-Bannerman in the cartoons is from the very beginning a strong opponent of the current form of the House of Lords. Only critique faced towards him comes from a picture where he and Arthur Balfour discuss their fear of

---

[175] Actually Punch features a cartoon depicting "an average peer" giving a speech to an audience of common people. The people are surprised by the normal appearance of the peer. This is clearly the magazines way to detach itself from some more radical papers. Punch is saying that the peers are not monsters, but the upper house is in need of a reform. Punch 15.12.1909, volume 137 p.424 (https://ia601407.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/5/items/punchvol136a137lemouoft/punchvol136a137lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol136a137lemouoft_jp2/punchvol136a137lemouoft_0939.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[176] Punch 3.7.1907, volume 133 p.11 (https://ia802702.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/15/items/punchvol132a133lemouoft/punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2/punchvol132a133lemouoft_0525.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[177] Punch 1.5.1907, volume 132 p.317 (https://ia802702.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/15/items/punchvol132a133lemouoft/punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2/punchvol132a133lemouoft_0359.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0) and Punch 6.7.1910, volume 139 cover picture (https://ia601407.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/35/items/punchvol138a139lemouoft/punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2/punchvol138a139lemouoft_0533.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

socialism.[178] The cartoons' image of him clearly shows its readers, that the Prime Minister's position is stronger than that of the lords'.[179] Prime minister Asquith takes his predecessor's place directly after his passing. As Campbell-Bannerman, he plays the part of a doctor for the House of Lords.[180] Asquith also quickly assumed the role of champion in the fight against the House of Lords. He shares his predecessor's features, but is criticised by the paper from giving a too one-sided view of the lords. Even though the Prime Minister works with the leader of the opposition to pass the reforms, his image as the leader of the process is unchallenged. Even though Balfour sometimes works with Asquith in the cartoons, Asquith has the leading position. Interesting in during the debate of the reform is that Asquith and the Lords are both featured waging an imagined war. The magazine refrains from showing an inner conflict, even though it has clearly chosen its side, as mentioned above. The two sides come together in a picture, where Asquith plays chess with one of the leading peers, Lansdowne.[181] This is more a representation of their political game of wits and not an attempt to show them as open adversaries. The visual language implies that the sides are prepared to rely on strong measures in the course of the bill, but open conflict within the British governmental system is not possible[182]. This indicates that the British think that the reformation of their society should be conducted parliamentarily. In the cartoons, the reform is initiated and carried out by the government, with the support of the people.

The government is imagined as a strong institution and joined to the national identity, and its position is strengthened through the visualisation of the other parties in the lords' issue. The ridicule of political actors in the cartoons is made by either exaggerating their position, or showing them in a lower social position than what they really possessed. The humour most often is to be enjoyed with the characters, as they make witty remarks or appear victoriously in humorous circumstances. In both perspectives (the constitutional and the nationalistic iconographic) the British government is visualised as a strong and determined institution, which acts legitimately in

---

[178] Punch 31.7.1907, volume 133 p.83
(https://ia802702.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/15/items/punchvol132a133lemouoft/punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2/punchvol132a133lemouoft_0597.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[179] For example, Punch 19.2.1908, volume 134 p.129
(https://ia902605.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/27/items/punchvol134a135lemouoft/punchvol134a135lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol134a135lemouoft_jp2/punchvol134a135lemouoft_0171.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[180] Punch 17.6.1908, volume 134 p.443
(https://ia902605.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/27/items/punchvol134a135lemouoft/punchvol134a135lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol134a135lemouoft_jp2/punchvol134a135lemouoft_0485.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[181] Punch 8.6.1910, volume 138 p.425
(https://ia601407.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/35/items/punchvol138a139lemouoft/punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2/punchvol138a139lemouoft_0469.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[182] Ihalainen 2014, p.427-428.

politics. Critique towards the government's actions is further scrutinised in the chapter 5.2, as it is also critique towards the liberal's party actions. The Prime Minister is a strong character, as he leads the government with the mandate of the people as the parliamentary majority supporting him. Only slight abnormalities in the conduct of political decision-making deserve critique from the paper.

4.2 Between the Reichstag and the Stadtschloss: Bernhardt von Bülow and Theobald von Bethmann-Hollweg

As in Britain, in Germany the head of government changed under the studied period, but for very different reasons. Whereas Campbell-Bannerman had to resign for health reasons, Bernhardt von Bülow resigned due to insufficient support from the Kaiser after a failure in the Reichstag, when his budget was voted down. Before this von Bülow's policies had been successful and he had enjoyed the support of the conservatives and the liberals, since the policies were received positively by the nationalistic circles.[183] These policies, e.g. colonial policies, were under attack from the Socialist and the Centre Parties, but von Bülow was successful in gathering enough support from the other parties. During von Bülow's chancellorship the parties supporting him were called his block, which sort of mirrored a party coalition to form a governmental majority. The parties supported the Kanzler and in return he conducted policies in a way, which worked in the parties' interest.[184] However, the parties in the coalition did not dictate the Kanzler's policies, he often rather sought another party coalition to support him or new elections than amended his policies.

In Kladderadatsch the cartoons visualise little by little during 1909 how the block disintegrates and von Bülow's position becomes more uncertain, until he's forced to resign. Unlike von Bülow, who had been the minister of foreign affairs before his chancellorship, von Bethmann-Hollweg did not have any experience in that field, which was an important part of the Kanzler's duties. His failure in the Prussian franchise reform in 1910 did not help his position, but instead gave a weak foundation for his career.[185] The two Kanzlers have two very different histories in the scope of this study, since von Bülow started off with a good record, but then his failure and loss of support brings an end to his career, whereas von Bethmann-Hollweg started in a weak position and suffers failures and then starts to improve his position.[186] The Kanzler's position in the constitution has already been charted, but it is important to restate that the Kanzler was in the centre of German

---

[183] Craig 1978, p.274, 280-281, 283.
[184] Congleton 2011, p.450, 475-476, 478-479.
[185] Koch 1984, p.178, 182: Congleton 2011, p.480.
[186] Craig 1978, p.289-290.

political life, between the electoral institution and the monarch, indirectly dependant of them both, but yet the most independent political actor in the nation, since the Kaiser acted through his ministers who also reviewed his statements.[187] This has been said to connote Bismarck's influence in the drafting of the constitution, which resulted in a powerful institution of the Kanzler and a complicated balance between the other institutions, he also provided the model of a German Kanzler and the others are compared to him and his way of governing, while at the same time neglecting the change of circumstances in political circles under the forty years period. Hence, their image is visualised both in contrast with the parties and the monarch, this affect his image because the Kaiser is viewed as the most practical political actor and the Reichstag, i.e. the parties, as the most theoretical; the Kanzler has the special position where he must fulfil both: to satisfy the parties and produce results for the Kaiser.[188]

The images of these two Kanzlers provide two different perspectives to the institution. The similarities and differences between the two give us a way to find out about the more general views towards the institution, not only towards the persons acting as them. As with the monarchs, the Kanzler's personalities do not affect the image created of the institution as significantly as the purpose of the image, i.e. to show what kind of a political actor the Kanzler is, or to convey the readers a viewpoint of the undertakings and results the Kanzlers manage to produce. Also the style with which they conduct politics affects their images, for example von Bülow is pictured as an able and elegant political player and von Bethmann-Hollweg as a clumsy and passive[189]. This is explored further when discussed about the general images of the Kanzlers'. Both statesmen work closely with the parties and the Kaiser in the images, however, the Kaiser's participation as a political actor becomes more frequent after von Bülow's popularity starts to sink, which is well in line with their roles in the constitutional sense. Indeed, the parties and the Kaiser do not appear together in the cartoons, instead the Kanzler works as a link between these two. The parties do not work among legislation *per se*, the Kanzler is the one who pushes legislation through, the parties only carry agendas pro and contra, and perhaps influence in the issue via the Kanzler.[190] Indeed, a part of the Kanzler's way of working is to make deals with the parties: a promise of future legislation initiatives in exchange for Reichstag support. Keeping the parties in check is a necessity for Kanzlers' survival and a personal virtue when they succeed in it without the Kaiser's intervention. The chancellor's attitudes towards different parties are also made clear and this often

---

[187] Craig 1978, p.224-226.
[188] Koch 1984, p.125-127, 131-133.
[189] Kladderadatsch 5.6.1910, volume 63 no.23 p.412 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1910/0412?sid=0e133a2a5b198f43035d543ffc79e2a5).
[190] Kladderadatsch 11.6.1911, volume 64 no.24 p.452 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1911/0452?sid=c80d9779942f1223981a4540bf5d61d4).

mirrors the Reichstag relationships between them: von Bülow's distained attitude towards the socialists is in the magazine's pages at the same time when his support group consisted of the liberal and conservative parties.[191] This relationship between the Kanzler and the parties is the first part of the Kanzler's institution in the constitutional perspective.

The relationship and its different perspectives are best explicated with a few exemplary images. In 1907 after elections the Reichstag is visualised as horses in von Bülow's stable; the message is –which comes through via both the image and the text accompanying the image– that the parties in the cartoon are in von Bülow's disposal. The horses' width shows the viewer the parties' relative amount of parliamentary representation. These parties are the so-called Bülow's block, other parties are not in the image. The idea is that the parties work for the Kanzler, they are a source of power rather than cooperative accomplices.[192] In another cartoon von Bülow's attitudes towards all the different parties is visualised, as the Kanzler bows to the aristocratic conservative party, speak politely to the liberals and dismissively to the Socialists.[193] Again the Kanzler's position with his supporters is clear.[194] Those whose viewpoints are not close to the Kanzler's own are dismissed, and the "governing parties' " are treated with respect. This image tells of the Prussian lower house, but the parties and the attitudes remain the same, this particular image is just a fine one to illustrate the issue. von Bülow does not need to take those parties' viewpoints in consideration, which do not work with him, neither do their viewpoints deserve anything but scorn. This constructs an image of powerful statesmanship and overconfident conduct on his part. His distain towards the socialists is shown in an exaggerated fashion, which is put in contrast with the socialists' surprised expressions, also the way he bows to the aristocracy is exaggerated, the pose is a classical court-bow, which gives the viewer an idea that the Kanzler values the conservatives in a special way, even in a bit submissive fashion. When von Bülow loses his support the conservatives and centre "betray" him; the conservatives stab him in the gut and the clerical centre party in the character of the devil triumphantly watches by their side[195]. This is a reference to Faust, who is the Kanzler in the cartoon. His association with the devil comes to haunt him and he pays the price.[196]

This scene of betrayal visualises the fall of von Bülow and puts the parties and the Kanzler in a peculiar position of responsibility of his fall, in one hand the Kanzler has done the deal

[191] Craig 1978, p.283: Retallack 2006, p.192-193.
[192] Kladderadatsch 24.2.1907, volume 60 nr.8 p.125 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1907/0125?sid=0e133a2a5b198f43035d543ffc79e2a5).
[193] Kladderadatsch 12.7.1908, volume 61 no.28 p.476 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1908/0476?sid=c80d9779942f1223981a4540bf5d61d4).
[194] Craig 1978, p.279, 283: Congleton 2011, p.479.
[195] Kladderadatsch 11.7.1909, volume 62 no.28 p.492 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1909/0492?sid=c80d9779942f1223981a4540bf5d61d4).
[196] Craig 1978, p.284: Congleton 2011, p.479.

with the devil, thus bringing forth his demise, and on the other the parties are clearly the actors in the cartoon, not the Kanzler, so his downfall is their doing. One way or the other, the cartoon is a clear depiction of the power relations between the parliament and the Kanzler. This same imagery is used also with von Bethmann-Hollweg, who as Faust makes a deal with the socialists; he gathers their support in a political issue and the cartoon, but it is implicated that this comes with a price, since the devil is holding a deal for himself, which concerns the Prussian electoral reform[197]. Kanzler's actions and party associations come with a price, which may be significant, since the cartoon is after von Bethmann-Hollweg's failure in the very issue: another such failure is implicated fatal for him. The last example is also after the *Wahlrecht* issue in which the conservative and centre parties keep the Kanzler upright[198]. These cartoons are also significant for the analysis of the Kladderadatsch's image towards these parties, which will be examined deeper later, but the Kanzler is often passive in the images, which contain these two parties, giving them a strong image. The cartoon implicates that the Kanzler needs the parties to stay upright, i.e. carry out his work, and that the parties are the ones, who make this possible. These examples should be sufficient to illustrate the image, which is created of the Kanzler's reliance of the parties, and on the other hand how he deals with them to keep their support, however, the parties are not reliable of the Kanzler, they are independent actors and only make gains through him, perhaps with him in a few cases, but nevertheless remain unaffected by his success or failure. Furthermore, it should not be overlooked that the resignation of von Bülow is partly blamed on the national parties, since this removes blame from the Kanzler and supports the prevalent notion that the parties are unreliable.[199]

Relationship between the Kaiser and his Kanzler show a similar reliance as the previous examples do, although the Kaiser is visualised as also needing the Kanzler's support, unlike the parties, whose lives continue on regardless of the Kanzler. After the Daily Telegraph interview von Bülow removes a thorn from the Kaiser in a cartoon titled "der neue Androniklus", which references the Greek tale of a man (Androcles) who removed a thorn of a lion's paw and befriends the creature for life[200]. The repercussions are the thorn and von Bülow deals with them. This does not completely correspond with the events, since von Bülow admitted that the situation was partly caused by him, and he needed to issue an apology.[201] Nevertheless, the image, which is created, does not put blame on the Kanzler, but rather to uncontrollable outside forces. The Kaiser

---

[197] Kladderadatsch 4.6.1911, volume 64 nr.23 p.434 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1911/0434?sid=0e133a2a5b198f43035d543ffc79e2a5).
[198] Kladderadatsch 25.12.1910, volume 63 no.52 p.948 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1910/0948?sid=c80d9779942f1223981a4540bf5d61d4).
[199] Retallack 2008, p.50: Congleton 2011, p.477, 478-479: Biefang & Schultz 2016, p.67-69.
[200] Kladderadatsch 29.12.1908, volume 61 no.48 p.833 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1908/0833?sid=c80d9779942f1223981a4540bf5d61d4).
[201] Craig 1978, p.284.

might have evaded the thorn if he was more careful, but the damage was not directly due to his actions, he is merely a victim. The cartoon celebrates the Kanzler's competence in dealing with such issues by calling him delicate, and at the same time makes a remark of how the situation is familiar to him. This may be a stab at the Kaiser's carelessness as he makes such remarks, but taking the visual relations (the Kaiser's awe filled expression and the Kanzler's concentrated appearance) into consideration it is more likely that the remark is made to enhance the image of the Kanzler's competence, and is a reference to his prior experience with foreign politics, since the Daily Telegraph interview is visualised as an attack on the Kaiser from a foreign newspaper. In the cartoon the Kaiser-lion watches with an awe-filled expression as von Bülow removes the thorn. One of the Kanzler's duties was to review his Kaiser's statements and help him keep his appearance, hence the Kanzler fulfils this part of his duties and is revered for it. A similar cartoon appears in von Bethmann-Hollweg's time, where he clarifies the Kaiser's statement for the people, thus clearing out the misunderstanding[202].[203]

The other side of the relationship is the Kanzler's reliance of the Kaiser, i.e. in case of a failure in Reichstag the Kaiser is in position to decide upon the Kanzler's future.[204] This relationship is seldom brought forth in the cartoons, since the only times this is visible are when von Bülow loses support and it is implied in the magazine that the Kaiser might consider dismissing him, and after von Bethmann-Hollweg's failed electoral reform initiative.[205] In these situations the monarch functions in accordance with the constitutional purpose, as a counterforce for the Kanzler, since the original purpose arguably was to not make the Kanzler responsible to the Reichstag, but at the same time also not independent. At these times of doubt towards the Kanzler's capability and competence, the Kaiser is more active so that he might find out whether a change of Kanzlers is in order. In von Bülow's case Kaiser was an older student in the cartoon, thus his legitimacy to dismiss the Kanzler was strengthened, whereas in von Bethmann-Hollweg's the Kaiser sees him in his palace and the setting is very formal[206]. Arguably this is a result of the earlier constructing of von Bülows image and in turn the lack of status on von Bethmann-Hollweg's part; the magazine has made a strong case of von Bülow's competence and then starts to deconstruct it when his

---

[202] Kladderadatsch 11.9.1910, volume 63 nr.37 p.655 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1910/0655?sid=0e133a2a5b198f43035d543ffc79e2a5).

[203] Craig 1978, p.283: Kohut 1991, p.133-135: Retallack 2008, p.49-50: Allen 2015, p.59.

[204] Congleton 2011, p.479, 482

[205] Congleton 2011, p.479-480: Neue Deutsche Biographie 2 1971, p.188-193, 729-732. Kladderadatsch 17.7.1910, volume 63 no.29 p.527 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1910/0527?sid=c80d9779942f1223981a4540bf5d61d4).

[206] Kladderadatsch 11.4.1909, volume 62 no.15 p.253 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1909/0253?sid=c80d9779942f1223981a4540bf5d61d4), and Kladderadatsch 15.5.1910, volume 63 nr.20 p.371 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1910/0371?sid=0e133a2a5b198f43035d543ffc79e2a5).

dismissal seems a possibility, thus giving support for His Majesty's decision. The power relations between these two statesmen are important and a bit problematic, since the Kanzler is visualised as a skilful and elegant political player, and the Kaiser as an unreliable and prone to make overstatements. The magazine does not take the side of the person, which it visualises as more competent in the political field, but rather the Kaiser's, whose position and prestige elevate him over the Kanzler.[207] The implicit suggestion is that even though von Bülow has the stronger image as a statesman, the Kaiser is a more important institution, and thus more deserving the support.

In von Bethmann-Hollweg's case the magazine and Kanzler have not been able to construct a strong image of him as a statesman, so the Kaiser may question his competence without difficulty. In both images the Kaiser is put into a much stronger visual or conceptual position, first as an older student with the Kanzler as a sort of a servant or valet, and in the second the Kaiser sits, while the Kanzler has to stand, and has come to a palace, which is clearly the Kaiser's area of influence, whereas in the first image the two characters meet in "the Prussian House" (signifying the royal palace or the non-physical substitute), which is a clear reference to Wilhelm's position as a Prussian monarch; Wilhelm has a more powerful position in the Prussian sphere of politics than his Kanzler. Hence the images do construct a strong image of the mutual reliance of the two political institutions, but mostly in case of a some sort of a crisis on the other's part. However, constitution-wise this is the exact situation in which these two institutions would most likely and strongly be in contact with each other. The Kaiser in a more powerful institution, but is very reliant on the Kanzler's support, whereas the whole functionality of the Kanzler as a political actor relies on his good relations with the monarch.[208]

In conclusion the twofold position in which the Kanzler is in between the national parties and the monarch in the German constitution is visualised through specific political events and situations. His possibilities in acting in the national politics are strong, but possibly due to the weaker position as a national icon or the Kaiser's power to dismiss him he cannot be shown stronger than the Kaiser. The party support in Reichstag is seen as a personal virtue of the Kanzler and losing it his personal failure, where the deals he makes are in the centre of the issue.[209] The Kanzler tries to outwit the parties in the political field. As a constitutional institution the Kanzler's position mirror's the chancellor centrality in the German constitution, which results to his positions weakness, and is directly attributed as his personal failure instead of, for instance, the party strengths in the Reichstag. The heritage of Bismarck and the constitution, which was supposedly the

---

[207] Kohut 1991, p.156-158: Biefang & Schulz 2016, p.67-69.
[208] Craig 1978, p.284, 289-290: Koch 1984, p. 122-126, 178-182: Biefang & Schultz 2016, p.69.
[209] Congleton 2011, p.479-480: Biefang & Schulz 2016, p.67-70.

first Kanzler's own creation, and to suit his own needs, is present in this way.[210] Indeed, Kanzler von Bethmann-Hollweg is compared to the old *Eisen Kanzler* at a time when the paper's editors were generally pro-Bismarck. The Kanzler's image is thus strong, but vulnerable and gives significant weight to his personal achievements; he is the one most significant political actor to create and push through legislation, and responsible for the Kaiser's actions, as argued in previous chapter, thus the Kanzler is in between two institutions, which are difficult to deal with.

In addition to the Kanzler's image as a competent government official his performance is evaluated with how he manages to keep the parties in check, i.e. how well he plays the "*Reichstags-Schach*" against the Centre Party (Zentrum)[211]. Clear virtues are attached to the Kanzler's institution and he is tied to the national identity by joining him to national icons, e.g. in Reichstags-Schach the Kanzler is the second most important piece of the nation. Other examples are Tannhauser and other Wagner characters, the German crown (although used as an icon of the Kaiser), German eagle, Deutscher Michel (the anthropomorphic personification of the German people), the mother stork of the nation and Bismarck[212]. They are just ways to promote that the Kanzler is German and works for the German national good. The main way the Kanzler's role in national semantics is constructed is through the results of his actions, mostly in the Reichstag, but also in the Kaiser's service. Unlike the Kaiser, Kanzlers have a wider variety of poses and usually stronger expressions. Strong expressions are often the gateway to humour and ridicule in the cartoons. For example, in 1910 the two Kanzlers are compared to each other, especially their political suavity. von Bethmann-Hollweg is a crude, thin and bony figure with a suffering expression, whereas von Bülow is enjoying himself and swims with little difficulty [213]. The cartoonist wants to critique von Bethmann-Hollweg's performance in national politics by comparing him to von Bülow, whose image as discussed the magazine does advocate. The

---

[210] Craig 1978, p. 162-163: Koch 1983, p.122.

[211] "Reichstag chess": a cartoon of the Kulturkampf, which is represented as a game of chess. The game is a draw by perpetual check. The Kaiser (white king) is under check from a centrum party politician (black queen) and the only way to prevent this is either move to safety, which would result in another check by the same piece, or by sacrificing von Bülow (white queen), hence the game is a draw. (Deeper analysis would be interesting and viable if this study was concentrated on the Kulturkamph). Kladderadatsch 27.1.1907, volume 60 no.4 p.53 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1907/0053?sid=c80d9779942f1223981a4540bf5d61d4).

[212] For example, Kladderadatsch 27.1.1907, volume 60 no.4 p.52 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1907/0052?sid=c80d9779942f1223981a4540bf5d61d4), Kladderadatsch 12.4.1908, volume 61 no.15 p.244 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1908/0244?sid=c80d9779942f1223981a4540bf5d61d4), Kladderadatsch 13.2.1910, volume 63 no.7 p.125 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1910/0125?sid=c80d9779942f1223981a4540bf5d61d4) and Kladderadatsch 22.1.1911, volume 64 no.4 p.65 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1911/0065?sid=c80d9779942f1223981a4540bf5d61d4).

[213] Kladderadatsch 5.6.1910, volume 63 no.23 p.412 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1910/0412?sid=0e133a2a5b198f43035d543ffc79e2a5).

difference is between the long and quite successful career of von Bülow against von Bethmann-Hollweg's early misgivings[214]. The Kanzlers are ranked through their success in politics.

After a cartoon of how von Bethmann-Hollweg reorganises his ministerial staff in a show of force, his image starts to improve, thus again with the personal action and a show of power the statesman redeems himself[215]. He is German and works in the interest of the nation, but he is not someone, who will be joined to the national canon with Bismarck and Kaisers. Arguably the person can be made into a national hero after his time as a Kanzler, as in the example of revering von Bülow after his resignation. Whereas the Kaiser is usually stiff and masculine, the Kanzler can be witty, expressive and even have silly poses. In addition, under the studied period there are several cartoons, which depict the Kanzler scantily clothed or even nude. This is usually used to ridicule the Kanzler and make fun of some extreme characteristic he possesses. The livelier visualisation of the Kanzler strengthens the image of an active position he has in national politics, and shows that he is not as important as the Kaiser. However, the he is seldom put into danger and usually he is the actor in the images. There are suspicions towards the Kanzlers, but critique is mostly targeting the person occupying the position. If anything, the institution is criticised for being too prone to party influence and its weakness in enacting legislation. Its institutional weaknesses are in governing and the possibility of the Reichstag weakening the statesman. Other critique is directed at the persons occupying the position, not the institution itself. Kanzler is a national institution with a lot of power and possibilities, but the constitutional position between the parties and the Kaiser requires that a person of considerable skill occupy the position, furthermore, unlike the Kaiser, the Kanzler is more an administrator than a national hero worthy of being made an icon, which also gives the cartoonists more possibilities to visualise the character.

As an institution and a statesman the ideal Kanzler should be the Bismarckian Iron Chancellor in the Kladderadatsch's definition, who would make the nation proud with his actions in governing and the general prowess of the person. If he does not succeed in keeping this up, he is ridiculed. In between the parties and the monarch, the Kanzler is in a difficult position, but at the same time the most active political actor in Kladderadatsch's pages. His importance in national politics is made clear both implicitly and explicitly, and he works with all other political forces, hence the Kanzler is in the centre of the government. He is also more directly responsible for his own misgivings, unlike the Kaiser, who has the Kanzler looking after him. Of the three different institutions under analysis Kanzler's is visualised as the most stable one. In conclusion, the

---

[214] Craig 1978, p.273: Koch 1984, p.178-182: Congleton 2011, p.480.
[215] Kladderadatsch 10.7.1910, volume 63 no.28 p.511 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1910/0511?sid=c80d9779942f1223981a4540bf5d61d4).

Kanzler's image is well in line with the constitutional position as the link between other political actors and the main influence in national legislation, his possibilities to affect the governance are vast, but he should be capable enough to carry out his duties, and is answerable for his misgivings, furthermore he is not on par with the Kaiser as a national icon, as he is an easier target of ridicule and weakly tied to national icons.[216] In short the Kanzler is a more concrete and practical political actor than the two other institutions (the Kaiser, who is there to make suggestions and decide the Kanzler's fate and make certain that he is up for his job, and the Reichstag, which is unreliable and most often impedes national governance rather than acting as a helpful force), is undoubtedly German and works for the best of his nation, and the de facto leader of national administration.

4.3 Servant of the Majority or the Monarch: Comparisons

Even though Britain and Germany had fundamental differences in their constitution, the general images of their leaders are very similar. Whereas the British Prime Minister is deliberative and careful, the German Kanzler is physical and expressive. This is due to the differences in national visual traditions, but also because the political systems. The British political life revolved in this period mostly around the reform of the upper house and liberal legislation, which was to many too extreme to consider, and so resulted in the deadlock position between the Houses of Parliament, as liberal initiatives were refused by the conservative House of Lords.[217]

In Germany the dominant theme was the relations between the Kaiser and other institutions, as the Reichstag's position in particular was difficult. On one hand it was a representation of the German electorate, but on the other it was an institution, which impeded the Kanzler's work and thus the practicing of the national good. The German system did not weigh the electorate's mandate as strongly as the British[218]. The Kanzler found Reichstag support with his own work, and the parties' support, in turn was due to their success in the parliament; even though the parties worked through the Kanzler their success was not tied to him, but rather to the parties' own ability to appeal to the people.[219]

In both countries the competence of the leader of the government was put under suspicion, but in Britain only briefly: these suspicions were lifted after Asquith's legislative

---

[216] Kohut 1991, p.156: Berger 2006, p.46-47.
[217] Pugh 1982, 115-117, 119, 125-126: Powell 126-129
[218] Ihalainen 2016, p.26: Biefang & Schulz 2016, p.69.
[219] Craig 1978, p.285.

initiative was successfully enacted in the House of Commons.[220] The British Prime Minister similarly to his German counterpart had to achieve the majority for his legislation by working and bargaining with other parties, the Kanzler had to find a stable source of support, which under the review period came from the conservative and centre parties, von Bülow's conservative and liberal block had not been reliable without the centre party. The differences in the constitution, the parties, and parliamentary system in general also affect the head statesmen's position, but political traditions also have a significant effect in how the magazines create the governments' images, i.e. in Britain the ability to compromise and understanding of financial matters were revered, and in Germany the strong and resourceful Kanzler who could lead the country in accordance with the Kaiser's wishes.[221]

Both magazines construct a supportive image of the institutions, and also explain the government's failures. In the British case it is plain to see that the failures of the Prime Minister are attributed as the Lords' fault and a sort of a political *casus belli* for the Prime Minister. Reichstag and the parties are the reason behind the Kanzler's failure, and he is responsible for it, because he has not succeeded in keeping the parties in line and falls vulnerable to their betrayal. The practising of politics in British system revolved around debate in the House of Commons and amendments in the House of Lords, in cartoons the debate in the Commons is hardly visualised, but the Lords' amendment are, furthermore the national conference, which was the sort of a final large-scale attempt at a compromise, is featured. The conference is a good example of the idea of two major parties as the main policy-makers, since the smaller parties are not included, instead of major political players they are only enablers of majority in the Parliament, the discussions and debate is between the two major parties.[222] The Kanzlers act with the parties, but also show their views towards the parties quite clearly, since von Bülow, for instance, is shown in a cartoon not taking the socialists' and centre's opinions into consideration[223]. Unlike his British counterpart he acts through making the parties follow him and making deals, which might prove dangerous or even fatal. British parties are the ones who dictate the politics, not individual statesmen, but then again, only the two major parties, which have the old aristocratic roots, are taken into consideration in the context of debate, and the two lesser parties are there just to help the government maintain the

---

[220] Punch 4.3.1908, volume 134 p.165 (https://ia802605.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/27/items/punchvol134a135lemouoft/punchvol134a135lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol134a135lemouoft_jp2/punchvol134a135lemouoft_0207.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0) and Kladderadatsch 25.7.1909, volume 62 no.30 p.524 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1909/0524?sid=c80d9779942f1223981a4540bf5d61d4).
[221] Craig 1978, p.284: Powell 1996, p.63: Palonen 2014, p.7: Biefang & Schulz 2016, p.69.
[222] Powell 1996, p.98.
[223] For example, Kladderadatsch 2.2.1908, volume 61 no.5 p.69 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1908/0069?sid=c80d9779942f1223981a4540bf5d61d4).

majority in exchange for concessions.[224] Indeed, it could be argued that the lesser parties in the British parliament have an image similar to that of the German Reichstag, in relations with the statesmen. The images of individual parties are the point of inquiry in the next chapter, but in relation to the Prime Minister and the Kanzler, these appear similar.

If further similarities were sought for in the British opposition to a German institution, it would be hard to find. The other institutions are completely dissimilar between the nations. The German opposition is presented as a force in open action against the government, the residue of Reichstag against the Kanzler and his quest for the national good, whereas the British opposition, as argued before, is almost an integral part of the political process. As a governmental institution the British cabinet and Prime Minister are the highest, and the King just a national icon. The German Kanzler, however, is between the political parties and the Kaiser; he must consider both institutions in drafting the legislation, otherwise it could be difficult to sustain the support of both. On the one hand, the image of the British Prime Minister is weaker as a statesman, since he does not work alone, but nevertheless the British cabinet is accountable to the electorate, on the other hand the Kanzler is a stronger statesman with a lot of power, but is in a difficult position between the national parties and the Kaiser, to whom in particular he is responsible. The magazines forge images of the governments, which well mirror the constitution, but also the political culture of the nations, since the ideal Prime Minister works through compromise and Kanzler with his own prowess.[225]

As the governments are visualised as more practical institutions in both nations, they are also weaker as national icons. In both magazines it is the monarch's job to keep national prestige, although in rare occasions also the government officials appear with some national icons or historical heroes. The Prime Minister's and the Kanzler's position is practical, and they do not have the status of bringing particular continuity for the nation in the way the sovereigns do. There will always be a head of state, but the monarch comes from a seemingly certain line of ancestors, whose deeds are the pride of the nation.[226] Both statesmen are, however, visited by the memory of their predecessors, as Asquith is seen wondering what William Evart Gladstone would do in his position, and von Bethmann-Hollweg gets a visitation from Otto von Bismarck's ghost.[227] In both

---

[224] Pugh 1994, p.122-127: Powell 2002, p.128

[225] Craig 252, 280-284, 289-290: Powell 2002, p.127: Ihalainen 2016, p.27: Seaward & Ihalainen 2016, p.36-37, 41-42, 44-45: Biefang & Schulz 2016, p.67-69.

[226] Kohut 1991, p.156-158: Pugh 1994, 84-86.

[227] The reference to Bismarck doubtfully does not require an explanation. However, Gladstone's career and legislation has similarities to Asquith's: he was a minister in the cabinet during the constitutional reform of 1867 and the premier in 1884-5 when the Third Electoral Reform was enacted, and later in his career worked to pass the Irish Home Rule, but lacked sufficient support from the electorate at that time. Pugh 1982, p.36-44.

cases the statesmen's competence is compared to that of their predecessors', which creates a sort of continuity and a reverence towards the person, because both points of comparison are established national heroes.

Rather than strengthening the Kanzler's image in the same way that Punch does the Prime Minister's, Kladderadatsch concentrates to picture how the Kanzler acts in politics, and in what kind of a position he is in. Both magazines support their national institutions, but whereas the British cartoonists try to strengthen their statesmen's image, the German cartoonists ridicule theirs more, and do not beautify their position. When the Kanzler is in peril or fails, it is shown, but also when he succeeds or acts in a way, which the cartoonists consider proper for him, e.g. von Bethmann-Hollweg's actions after the Wahlrecht failure. Asquith's Parliament Act created an atmosphere of crises in the nation and the King's prestige was also at stake, if the monarch were dragged into the issue to create sufficient peers to enact the reform, his position would also become endangered.[228] Punch magazine does its best to legitimise the government's actions. The British Prime Minister's and government's image is strengthened with ties to national sentiment occasionally, but the general image is nigh always strong, witty and positive, his German counterpart has to build his own image through action: the closer to the ideal "Eisen" chancellor he is, the better his image in Kladderadatsch.

The magazines have a similar vision towards the direction of their nations' political and constitutional development. Similar in the perspective that both magazines would like the institutions, which are seen as the best working and strongest in their countries, to be even more central and more important. These institutions are in charge of the practical politics and the nation's success, thus they should be able to carry out their work more freely. In Britain this institution is the House of Commons and the cabinet, which mostly relies in the majority in the commons, and in Germany it is the Kanzler. The image of an ideal political system in the Punch is a representative government and parliamentarism, which creates new policies through debate with the other parties, the electorate, however, is not that of a universal franchise, but rather as the voice of John Bull, a middleclass man.[229] Likewise the idea of equal universal vote is visualised as repulsive in Prussia,

Punch 20.10.1909, volume 137 p.273
(https://ia801407.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/5/items/punchvol136a137lemouoft/punchvol136a137lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol136a137lemouoft_jp2/punchvol136a137lemouoft_0787.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0) and Kladderadatsch 22.1.1911, volume 64 no.4 p.65 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1911/0065?sid=c80d9779942f1223981a4540bf5d61d4).
[228] Pugh 1994, p.124-126: Powell 1996, p.55, 63.
[229] Punch 15.11.1911, volume 141 p.349
(https://ia801406.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/19/items/punchvol140a141lemouoft/punchvol140a141lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol140a141lemouoft_jp2/punchvol140a141lemouoft_0981.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

only socialists are visualised as its supporters. Kladderadatsch is a magazine that advocates the middle class' opinions, which are usually liberal or conservative.[230] A strong Kanzler and the Kaiser are the most positive political characters in Kadderadatsch. They are also joined to the national semantics by associating them with national heroes, icons and the national animals, although in this perspective they are second to their monarchs. The governments are practical actors, whereas the monarchs' roles are more ceremonial. The monarchs are the wardens of national good and the nations' prestige, the governments are the practical political actors. Thus, as political and national institutions the governments have the magazines' loyal support.

5 Res Publica: the parliamentary parties in the cartoons

The British parliamentary system was arguably a two-party system, whereas the German system had four major parties. The British also had the Irish Nationalist Party and (nominally) a socialist party (Labour), which are featured in Punch, and other smaller parties, which are not featured and therefore are left outside this study. In Germany there were two conservative parties, a centre party (which could also be considered conservative due to its values), three different parties with liberal agendas and a socialist party[231]. In addition, there were some small parties, which are never featured in the cartoons, such as the Danish Party. This meant that the German parliament was more prone to alliances, whereas the British system made such alliances negligible. Here it should be mentioned, that both magazines have a lot of pictures of the said political alliances, mostly on the German part, but also on the British, because the British parliamentary system required majority to pass legal bills, e.g. the 1911 Parliamentary Act.[232]

In Britain the Prime Minister was the leader of the largest party, the Liberal Party, and thus tied party-politically directly to it. The German Reichskanzler was appointed by the Kaiser and did not hold any direct party loyalties, however, he might have had a party membership loyalty as in the case of Theobald Bethmann-Hollweg, who was Reichskanzler from 1909 to 1917 and belonged to the Progressive People's Party.[233]

The British Prime Minister usually had a parliamentary majority, as long as he enjoyed the support of his own party, thus he only needed to keep the party discipline. The

---

[230] Retallack 2006, p.137, 192-193.
[231] Conservative: the German Conservatives, the Free Conservatives, the Centre Party, liberal: the National Liberal Party, the Progressive People's Party, the German Freethinkers League, socialist: the Social Democratic Party: Koch 1984, 140-147.
[232] Powell 1996, p.50: Ihalainen 2016, p.26: Seaward & Ihalainen 2016, p.44-45: Biefang & Schulz 2016, p.67-70.
[233] Koch 1984, p.226-228: Neue Deutsche Biographie 2 1971, p.188-193.

Reichskanzler, on the other hand, had to make alliances with Reichstag parties in order to advance his agenda. This made it necessary for the Chancellor to change his primary supporter parties whenever necessary, often through promises and concessions to the parties. [234] In Britain the debates were more focussed into finding a solution, which would be acceptable to most. This culture gave the people the impression that the parliament was inefficient in Britain and took too much time to think things through, and in Germany the Reichstag was seen as a place of argument more than debate.[235]

In Britain both major parties were involved in the reform to limit the power of the House of Lords, although they had very different views about it[236]. In the question of extending the franchise, both parties opposed it, but the Liberals in particular since they did not want to let women and lower class men vote, because they believed that the new voters would support the Labour Party or the Conservatives.[237] On other issues the parties had their own, quite different goals. The greatest difference between the British parties was their economic policies. The conservative Unionist Party advocated protectionist tariff policies, which would protect the nation's trade and markets from foreign products, whereas the Liberals supported free trade policies by removing the tariffs. Both parties supported the Anglican Church. The socialist Labour Party's agenda held hopes for social reforms and creating a more equal society. They tried to advance their moderate socialist agenda via political reforms and differentiate themselves from the radical (and less politically legitimate) communist movements, which were a threat in the minds of other British politicians.[238] The Labour politicians are featured scarcely in Punch, however, the Irish Nationalists Party, is featured more frequently, because of their cooperation with the Liberals, and their active participation in the Irish Home Rule question.[239] In Britain the level of activity and the perceived strength of the party in question vary according to the subject and context, e.g. the Irish nationalists were represented as stronger actors in the context of Irish independence.[240]

The German parties did also work together via the chancellor to achieve their own goals. These goals differed due to two very distinctive reasons. The parties' agendas varied both pragmatically and ideologically, which will be examined a bit later in comparison to the British, and some parties had strong support in some regions and very little at others. When Germany was united in 1871 many of the parties unified with other German countries' parties, e.g. the National

[234] Craig 1978, p.283: Congleton 2011, p.357, 479-480.
[235] Brooks 1995, 127: Koch 1984, 139: Biefang & Schulz 2016, p.67-70.
[236] Powell 2002, p.126-127.
[237] Brooks 1995, p.13.
[238] Powell 1996, p.115.
[239] Powell 2002, p.128.
[240] Ball 1981, p.48.49: Powell 1996, p.116, 142-143 164.

Liberal Party was created when Liberal parties with similar agendas all over the country unified.[241] This meant that some parties still had very strong local support bases. The socialist, for example, enjoyed large support in Saxony. The parties also were not only national parties, but local as well, since the former countries still remained semi-autonomous states. In Kladderadatsch the difference between a national and local party are seldom made. The images in the paper represent the parties in a simplifying manner through their ideology, modus operandi and their supporters. Thus the parties cannot only be analysed as Reichstag parties, but rather in a larger national context. These dimensions, however, are rarely explicated in the cartoons, so it should not be overemphasised in the study of the parties' power relations.[242]

The German parties are best examined through the same division, which is made in the images in Kladderadatsch, with the bloc's internal problems explained, of course. The Conservative Partiy's agenda was to strengthen the local regimes and oppose the socialists in the Reichstag. The Centre Party opposed the *Kulturkampf*, which was aimed to limit the power of the Roman Catholic Church in German politics. [243] Political reforms were a significant part of the liberal agenda, although amongst the Liberals there were those, who supported the militaristic, Prussian, way of leading the country and those who did not.[244] The German socialists wanted to enact further social reforms, though unlike their British counterpart, the German socialists had stronger radical elements amongst them. It should be mentioned that the number of seats for the Socialists Party went from 81 to 43 in the 1907 elections and they recovered only in 1912.[245]

When analysing the parties images there are several key-questions to consider, firstly which social class are the parties visualised to represent in the magazine? Here the differences are subtle and mostly visible intertextually, in relation with other images. Secondly, what kind of political agendas do the parties have and how well do they manage to advance their agendas? This is also closely linked to the question about the parties' social status, since the agendas usually advance their class' issues. And thirdly, what kind of a general image is given of the parties? Do they seem as protagonists or antagonists, what kinds of symbols are attached to them, how do they work as political actors, and are they seen as nationalistic?[246] In addition to these questions the general attitude towards the parliament and how the parliament works is a point of inquiry,[247] i.e. what kind of political actors the parties are shown as. Because of the British parliamentary

---

[241] Koch 1984, p.140-146.
[242] Congleton 2011, p.480.
[243] Koch 1984, p.149-151: Retallack 2006, p.58, 192-193.
[244] Sheehan 1978, p.264-265: Koch 1984, p.144.
[245] Koch 1984, p. 136 - 147.
[246] Berger 2006, p.49, on the pejorative attitude towards parliamentry parties.
[247] Biefang & Schulz 2016, p.69, on the German attitudes towards parliamentarism.

traditions, it is assumed that in Britain there is a clear distinction between the old parties (Unionist and Liberal) and the new (Labour and Irish Nationalist), which is visible in both the practical level of the parties' agendas, but also in their general image. The visualisations of the German parties are assumed to be more ideology driven than their British counterparts, since the German debate had stronger ideological flavour than pragmatic.[248]

5.1 Four agendas in motion: the British parties

The British middle class had a certain admiration towards the higher classes. As earlier argued for, the Punch magazine is mainly focused on the bourgeois audiences, thus it creates in its images a world, which pleases the middle class. Hence, an upper class symbol, e.g. owning a car, cannot be interpreted solely as an upper class symbol, because the middle class would like to believe that it was possibly also a symbol associated with them. This doesn't apply to all upper class symbols and in this study the line is drawn in extravagance. Thus upper class symbols are to an extent considered also middle class symbols. This applies to the Unionist and Liberal Parties. [249]

The parties in Britain, or in the Punch magazine, are represented via their leader or another strongly visible member of the party. The Liberal party was in power for the whole scope of this study, so inevitably they have a wider array of characters, which appear in the cartoons. This is due to those persons holding governmental positions. The Prime Minister, the leader of the opposition and the Chancellor of the Exchequer are the most common to appear, however, in some cases the whole cabinet is present in the cartoons. In Germany the governmental representatives are not as numerous in their appearances, not taking the Reichskanzler into account, and their party affiliation, if any, is much more subdued. This tradition of representing the party using their leader as a symbol unavoidably means that the image created is bourgeois or upper class in appearance. All party leaders and significant members in the cartoons were members of the parliament, thus they were represented wearing a suit, vest or a tuxedo, which all bear a strong upper or middle class connotation. Not only this, but also these characters are most often very neat in appearance and politely mannered (with a few exceptions from the Labour Party's part), which also is a way to promote class in the cartoons. The persons' physical appearances are also made fun of. Campbell-Bannerman's obesity, Balfour's length and Churchill's bad posture, for example, are all ridiculed in

---

[248] Powell 2002, p.125-127: Berger 2006, p.49: Palonen 2014, p.7: Ihalainen 2016, p.26: Biefang & Schulz 2016, p.69-70.
[249] Powell 1996, p.116.

the Punch, but the persons themselves maintain their dignity. What differentiates the parties' social standings are all the other symbols and icons by which they are portrayed.

Both the Liberal and the Unionist Parties are represented through bourgeois icons such as golf clubs, top hats, riding horses, wearing furs, lavish dinners, etc. There are also references to the character's education, which was, by definition, private, furthermore, the leaders also are associated with universities[250]. Also the characters are clearly separated from the lower class in pictures where they are depicted next to each other, this is mostly done with the aforementioned means, but also the language plays a significant part in these images. The characters do, on occasion, use coarser language, but in these pictures the characters do not appear in the "real world", it is only used as a tool for humour. The parties hardly ever differ in their representation, when it comes to social class. The analyser must use contextualisation to find out the party affiliation of the member of the parliament in question, when he is unknown to him. However, in the German cartoons the conservative and liberal parties are clearly separated. The similarities in representation are probably due to several factors. The parties did not explicitly represent a certain faction, rather both of them were national parties with national agendas. Also the leaders of the parties were both active in the practice of politics, i.e. the Prime Minister, and the national leader of the opposition. The Liberal party appears more often with the members of the lower class than the conservatives, however, it should not be seen as a clear indication of the conservative's possible role as an upper class party, without analysing images from the time when the Unionists were in power. On the other hand the socialist and Irish Nationalist Parties' agendas allowed for a clearer distinction.[251]

The Labour Party and the Irish Nationalist Party both were drawn in the cartoons with clearer working class, i.e. lower class, sympathies. This is hardly surprising taking into account the parties' supporter bases and agendas. These two are represented more as ideologically driven. In the sense that the peoples, whose position they are trying to better, function as motivators for the parties' actions. The Labour thrives to better the workers' and the poor people's position and the Irish Nationalists the position of Ireland. [252]

The appearance of the Labour Party differs from the Liberals and Unionists. The members of the party do not wear top hats, neither do they ever use finer suits than a plain regular suit. There is no cartoon under the analysed time period where a member of the socialist party

---

[250] Oxford dictionary of national biographies 3, p.494-507. Punch 17.11.1909, volume 137 p.345 (https://ia601407.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/5/items/punchvol136a137lemouoft/punchvol136a137lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol136a137lemouoft_jp2/punchvol136a137lemouoft_0859.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[251] Ball 1981, p.53-57, 79-81: Pugh 1984, p.106-121.

[252] Ball 1981, p.47-49, 83: Powell 2002, p.128.

would have a tuxedo on him. In the place of top hat, the parties' representations have a bowler hat, which is associated with bourgeois contexts, but also with the lower classes. The Labour is often presented in a lower position spatially, which creates a sense of its weakness in relation to other actors in the cartoons. An important thing also is, that whereas all other three parties are represented mostly through their leader, the Labour Party is often also represented by its name. The other parties are also presented by their name on occasion, but in the case of Labour this is proportionately more common[253]. In a particular cartoon a peer is a target of thrown daggers, which are all but one labelled with the names of other parties' members, the last simply says Labour.[254] Here Labour is separated from the other parties as a political force and an actor. Either the cartoonist has wanted to emphasize the party's low impact in politics, or to belittle the party's influence and relevance in the issue. The cartoonist in question (Bernard Partridge) often drew cartoons with anti-socialist sentiment and opposes social reforms in the Punch magazine, so could be making either of the aforementioned points. As a socialist party, the Labour party thus clearly is a working and lower classes' party[255].

The most interesting thing about the Labour Party in the Punch magazines cartoons is the way it is pictured in relation to socialism.[256] As argued earlier the German cartoons show the ideologies, which drive the parties much more clearly than the British ones. This does apply also to the Labour Party, which was closer to the trade unions than revolutionary socialism. There is a clear

---

[253] The Liberal Party appears twice by name under the review period, and the Labour at least three times. In addition to this, the Liberal Party is much more frequent in appearance. For example, Punch 9.3.1910, volumes 138 p.172 (https://ia601407.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/35/items/punchvol138a139lemouoft/punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2/punchvol138a139lemouoft_0215.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[254] Punch 6.4.1910, volumes 138 p.245 (https://ia601407.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/35/items/punchvol138a139lemouoft/punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2/punchvol138a139lemouoft_0287.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[255] Here there is a need to explain the division to working and lower classes: in the magazines there is a working class, which differes from the other lower class persons by doing something useful. The poor, homeless and old do have certain sympathies from the magazine, but are still differentiated from the workers. They are to be pitied, not rewarded, here the intention behind the social reform's enactment differs. The workers are dominantly males. Other lower class people can be women, but the workers, and in particular in the association with the Labour party, are always men. Ball 1981, p. 47-48: Powell 1996, p.116 For example, Punch 13.10.1909, volume 137 p.263 (https://ia601407.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/5/items/punchvol136a137lemouoft/punchvol136a137lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol136a137lemouoft_jp2/punchvol136a137lemouoft_0777.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0) and Punch 14.9.1910, volume 139 p.191 (https://ia601407.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/35/items/punchvol138a139lemouoft/punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2/punchvol138a139lemouoft_0725.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[256] In 1907 it was not yet clear how the Labour party would fit in the parliamentary system, thus the attitudes towards the party were still uncertain. There was a lot of distrust and fear directed at the socialists, which was mostly fuelled by lack of knowledge. Through participation in the parliamentary process the Labour helped to strengthen its position and image. Important is that there was a very real fear about the socialists, but the revolution was mostly an imagined one. The "rise of the socialists" was mostly a fear of the Liberal party, which contended for the same votes as Labour. Ball 1981, p.47-49: Powell 1996, p.110-115.

distinction between "the socialists" and the Labour. It is clear that the Labour's agenda is to advance the lower classes issues (most prominently in the cartoons, the pensions for old age), but socialism is not directly tied to the party.[257] The cartoons imply that the Labour party is a socialist party, but the connection is not directly made. Socialism is shown as a radical and destructive ideal, which threatens the British bourgeois way of life. The most common representations of socialism are ghost, seductress or a lower class hooligan. In a cartoon lady Britannia (a mythical character, who represents the British nation) has a little flirt with a socialist, and in another cartoon John Bull, who is the anthropomorphic personification of the British people, tries on the socialist cap (it has a label "socialism" so that the target audience is sure to understand what's going on. The sight of British people associated with socialism was too strange and thus required additional explanation). These appear at a time when the government sought out a solution to some domestic problems via social reforms. Most often socialism is seen as a threat and in one occasion it is featured as a strong and menacing lower class person carrying a club (ruffian or hooligan), who would like to associate himself with the "old liberalism".[258] The Labour is presented as the force, which keeps the socialists in check.[259] Socialism by itself is seen as a threat, because it is not clear, which means it would use to achieve its goals, furthermore, the socialists are shown as non-respective of the authority.

The Irish National Party is presented through their leader, just as the two largest parties, John Redmond (leader of the party 1900-1918) his appearance varies according to the situation he's in and other characters with whom he is in these situations.[260] Redmond does wear a suit and a vest, but is also left without the top hat. The absence of the top hat and shagginess of his suit brings him lower in terms of the class he represents. Irish people in general, it should be mentioned, are presented as lower class people. In the cartoons the Irish common people are pictured as farmers, furthermore, the Irish could be called right out as pig farmers since the majority of the cartoons features a pig alongside the Irish (in one occasion as an Irish person[261]). Redmond is presented as a rural middle class person. He does wear lower class clothing on occasion, but in

---

[257] Ball 1981, p.83.

[258] Punch 27.10.1909, volume 137 p.291
(https://ia601407.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/5/items/punchvol136a137lemouoft/punchvol136a137lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol136a137lemouoft_jp2/punchvol136a137lemouoft_0805.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[259] Punch 29.1.1908, volume 134 p.75
(https://ia802605.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/27/items/punchvol134a135lemouoft/punchvol134a135lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol134a135lemouoft_jp2/punchvol134a135lemouoft_0117.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[260] Powell 2002, p.128: Oxford dictionary of national biographies 46, p.278-280.

[261] Punch 3.3.1909, volume 136 p.167
(https://ia601407.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/5/items/punchvol136a137lemouoft/punchvol136a137lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol136a137lemouoft_jp2/punchvol136a137lemouoft_0189.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

general he is differentiated from the lower class. He's spatially apart from them, not belonging to the lower class, and the context in which he is pictured through the symbols (clothing) of the lower class is usually him trying to convince them or to get them to work with him. Irish icons such as the shamrock are used to tie the party leader and thus the party to Ireland. If a person would see a cartoon with Redmond not knowing his political agenda, the person would soon understand it from the way he is presented. Redmond is seldom featured in the cartoons so that he is not advancing the Irish issues, although on a few occasions he is shown as a political player, and once or twice trying to unify his party.[262] In this cartoon are also a few other members of the party and two of them have a top hat, the third has a very shaggy rural outlook. This strengthens the party's position in the Punch as representing the lower classes, because now we know that there would be a way to represent the party through these other MPs as a middle class or upper class party, but in Punch the conscious decision has been made to use Redmond, and furthermore, use him in an image that connotes lower class. The class and agenda represent accurately the party's position in the early twentieth century, Ireland was for the English a comparatively backward place.[263]

The general image of the Liberal Party is difficult to differentiate from the general image of the government, since these are in many respects the same thing. However, the party is criticised for not fulfilling the expectations of the British middle class, i.e. the Punch's magazine's perception of the national good. Asquith is taking young Johnny Bulls "buns away".[264] This image is in opposition to the old age pension plans, which Asquith had in 1908. The nation is featured as the helpless creature here and the Prime Minister is the antagonist. Nation asks whether the elephant (old age pensions) requires all his goodies (the revenue), and the Premier answers that that is the case and the elephant will also require all the nation is going to get in the future. This is a clear antagonisation. The Prime Minister wants to make the taxes higher in order to pay for the old age pensions and the magazine opposes. The elephant is a large and intimidating creature and presented in the left, the past, and Johnny Bull is innocent, defiant and perturbed in his appearance. The Prime Minister stands in between them and issues the child to help the elephant. He has an expression, which signifies that he does not care much for the Johnny Bull or his benefit. The party does not deliver what was expected. Here the understanding of the national good is put under scrutiny, and

---

[262] Punch 26.10.1910, volume 139 p.299 (https://ia601407.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/35/items/punchvol138a139lemouoft/punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2/punchvol138a139lemouoft_0831.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[263] Pugh 1994, p.136-138: Williams 2006, p.288-289.

[264] Punch 13.5.1908, volume 134 p.253 (https://ia802605.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/27/items/punchvol134a135lemouoft/punchvol134a135lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol134a135lemouoft_jp2/punchvol134a135lemouoft_0395.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

the party's perception does not correspond with that of the nation. This perspective is, however a rarity compared to the more common visualisation of the party. The Liberal MPs are often presented in a positive light, e.g. as knights storming a castle, which is the representation of the reactionary House of Lords.[265] The Lords are not distinguishable by face in the picture, unlike the MPs, who also have the Union Flag with them and their postures are straight. The Prime Minister points a sword at the castle and leads his people. This is also a further example of the metaphor of battle in the issue of the Parliamentary Bill. This is the more common viewpoint of the party; they address the issue of the House of Lords, which is seen endangering the national good. In general the Liberal party's image as a political actor is a very positive (the critique towards their uncooperativeness in the Parliament Act has been discussed in the previous chapter).

Working as a counter-balance to the Liberal administration, the Unionists are represented as clever political players, who keep a firm eye on the liberals[266]. The party is mostly represented in relation with the Liberal Party.[267] The reader is also reminded of their term in office, not so long ago (Arthur Balfour was the Prime Minister before Campbell-Bannerman). Witty, clever and beneficial to the country, the conservatives watch that the national good is served. The conservatives are not presented in the same position as the other, but rather as a counter force to the government. The conservatives are in two images campaigning for the people's interest with an undesirable effect on their part.[268] The general public does not show much interest in the party in the cartoons. In both the public (or the electorate of bovine nature as in the other) is turned away from the party, which is represented by Arthur Balfour.[269] The conservative character is, however, optimistic in both images. In one he retorts to pessimistic statements with making the stakes higher and in the other he laments the lack of practise on his part, giving the impression that things will be different when he has had his time to better himself. The party's actions are tied to politics more than the people, however, the magazine gives its readers the impression that the people should take more interest in the party. Both the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition are represented

---

[265] Punch 30.3.1910, volume 138 p.227
(https://ia601407.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/35/items/punchvol138a139lemouoft/punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2/punchvol138a139lemouoft_0269.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).
[266] Powell 1996, p.98.
[267] Pugh 1982, p.109-112, 125-126, Pugh 1994, p.122-131.
[268] Punch 5.7.1907, volume 132 p.309
(https://ia902702.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/15/items/punchvol132a133lemouoft/punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol132a133lemouoft_jp2/punchvol132a133lemouoft_0441.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0) and 14.12.1910 volume 139 p.425
(https://ia601407.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/35/items/punchvol138a139lemouoft/punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2/punchvol138a139lemouoft_0957.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).
[269] Pugh 1982, p.106-112: Pugh 1997, p.127-129.

as fathers of the country, at one point or another. In this respect they are both needed to ensure the consistency and functionality of the British system. The party may not be as much a people's party in the eyes of the Punch magazine, but they are still a necessary one.

The Labour party's image is represented mostly via its capability to advance the position of the lower classes peacefully (also working with the liberals). We're given hints about what the lower class would be like without the Labour. The worst enemy of the Labour party is a "bottle throwing hooligan".[270] The party's strong connection, or dependence, to the trade unions is also featured in a cartoon. In which the leader of the party is represented as a "paid piper". John Bull (the national character) offers to pay the party, this is a reference to the suggestion about paying the MPs salary, in exchange the piper would be free to play whatever tune he would like, i.e. be independent from the trade unions in making their policies.[271] The trade union is against the idea in the image. Significant factors here are that the leader of the party seems unaware of the conversation. He is also pictured on the foreground marching forwards, the direction, however, is on the left, which in western tradition means usually the past, or the "bad direction". In the background we see the Big Ben, i.e. the Westminster where the Houses of the Parliament are located, to keep the image's audience's mind focused on what is important in the matter. John Bull eyes the trade unions suspiciously and the trade unions glare back with a belligerent stare. The most powerful actor in the image is the character of the trade unions. John Bull is passive and the Labour has no part in the conversation. He is there just to be associated with the unions and further show, that the situation could be improved.[272] The tie to the trade unions is explicit and definite.[273] They are the ones calling the tune. The party is not attached to national symbols in the way the other parties are, apart from the general appearance. The Labour is not seen working with the working class. The party's loyalties remain unclear. On one hand the Labour works by the rules on the other it is unable to function independently and is dependent on the trade unions, which are not synonymous with the working class. The magazine does not support the party as it does the Liberals and the Unionists. The independence of the Labour MPs was an important issue in the beginning of the century, but the party managed to subvert suspicions about their socialistic intentions and

---

[270] Punch 23.8.1911, volume 141 p.135
(https://ia801406.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/19/items/punchvol140a141lemouoft/punchvol140a141lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol140a141lemouoft_jp2/punchvol140a141lemouoft_0767.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).
[271] Pugh 1994, p.131.
[272] Punch 5.10.1910, volume 139 p.245
(https://ia601407.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/35/items/punchvol138a139lemouoft/punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2/punchvol138a139lemouoft_0777.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).
[273] Ball 1981, p.47-48: Powell 1996, p.110.

transform into a legitimate Parliamentary party, which was also largely because of their association with the Liberal Party.[274]

   With the other parties the use of national symbols, and the national symbols clashing with other symbols, is more common and has more dimensions than with the Labour Party. The Irish Nationalist Party is represented using power through Westminster, rather than Ireland, in the cartoon "The Irony of Circumstance".[275] Redmond holds the usual icons of monarchy, i.e. the sceptre, the orb and the crown, which are clashed with the English ones. The crown has shamrocks all over and a peasant's hat in the middle, the sceptre is an Irish club and the orb is huge and labelled "British Constitution". The British icons are exaggerated and in a more dominant position than the Irish ones. Redmond is represented as the king, who owes his position to the British constitution.[276] In the picture the character acknowledges this, because he looks benevolently at the orb. The text in the image is a reference to Redmond's goal of getting home rule passed for Ireland. The image lets the viewer have the notion that Redmond wants to be the ruler of Ireland, and ridicules him for this. Ireland was a part of the British Empire and thus ruled over by His Majesty and His Majesty's Government. In addition to this, however, the cartoon does give Redmond credit for his work, at least in the sense that he is portrayed as a person who is closely associated with the parliament, since the throne he is sitting on has two Westminster clock towers on its corners. The Irish Nationalist Party's worth is put at their actions in Westminster. The party's power is tied to Ireland and the Irish. The image portrays the image that the Irish should be ruled from London, that their party is satisfied doing so. In another cartoon, however, there is a slight hint that the English position as the cultural hegemony over other British peoples might be changing.[277] "The new John Bull" wears a kilt and has a Welsh hat, he has shamrocks in his vest and carries an Irish club. The image is a warning against giving excessive amounts of autonomic power to the other British nationalities, since not much is left of the original patriotic John Bull (who does not look happy at the transformation). The cartoons are created mainly for the English audiences and should be

---

[274] Ball 1981, p.30, 34, 71-73: Pugh 1982, p.101, 122, 125-126, 130: Powell 1996, p.101-102

[275] The Irish Nationalist party's main agenda was the Irish Home Rule. The Lord's Veto was the main obstacle for the passing of the Home Rule, which gave the Liberals and Irish a common goal, furthermore the Irish Nationals fared well in both of the 1910 elections, thus enabling their bargaining position with the Liberals who did not anymore posses a sole majority. After the Parliament Act of 1911 the question of Home Rule came once more to the fore. The Home Rule question played a large part in the Lord's Veto issue. Powell 1996, p.52-54: Powell 2002, p.126-128: Punch 2.2.1910, volume 138 p.83
(https://ia601407.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/35/items/punchvol138a139lemouoft/punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2/punchvol138a139lemouoft_0125.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

[276] Powell 2002, p.128.

[277] Punch 26.10.1910, volume 139 p.291
(https://ia601407.us.archive.org/BookReader/BookReaderImages.php?zip=/35/items/punchvol138a139lemouoft/punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2.zip&file=punchvol138a139lemouoft_jp2/punchvol138a139lemouoft_0823.jp2&scale=4&rotate=0).

analysed in that context. Hence, the image of John Redmond ruling from London is an informative representation of the way the English public would like to keep the relationship between the Irish Nationalist Party and Westminster.[278]

In general, the Irish Nationalists' image corresponds their position in the Parliament, since Redmond was very keen in achieving the Irish Home Rule through parliamentary action, whereas the English would have preferred the status quo, and many of the Irish were advocating more direct actions. The position is difficult, but John Redmond works according to the rules of the Parliamentary conduct, and is rewarded with a generally positive image of him and his party.[279]

British parties are first and foremost visualised as middle class parties, with the exception of the Irish Nationals. The Labour Party is clearly supported by the lower classes and its intentions are to advance the lower classes' issues, but the image of the party, i.e. as a parliamentary actor, is closer to the middle class than it is the lower classes. The parties have their own problems and agendas, which the Punch accurately portrays. Critique is usually directed towards the lack of cooperation and hindrance of practical politics. Parliamentarism is seen as a virtue, and obstacles for its completion, as in the case of the Labour Party and the trade unions, are shown in a bad light.[280] The magazine has clear reservations towards the two more recent parties, the Labour and the Irish Nationals, but mostly visualises them positively, as they work with the government party towards a common goal. The same witty attitudes, which are attributed for the major parties, are not extended to the others in the same extent, thus their image is left as a cruder one. It is clear that the two largest parties are the basis of the British parliamentary system, but the two others are also welcomed to join them, as long as they follow the rules and behave properly.

5.2 Kanzler's workhorses and the Devil: the German parties

The distinctions between the German parties are easier to make than the British parties, mostly due to the fact that the parties are most often visualised through their own characters rather than the party leaders or other significant party members. There are five parties, which are frequently featured in the Kladderadatsch: the Conservative Party, the Centre Party, two Liberal Parties (National Liberals and Left Liberals) and the Socialist Party. Very seldom some other parties appear, but only in individual cartoons, thus their image is difficult to analyse and not very

---

[278] Pugh 1994, p.136-138: Williams 2006, p.279, 288-292.
[279] Pugh 1982, p.109.
[280] Powell 1996, p.175-176: Ihalainen 2016, p.26-27.

comparable under the scope of this study.[281] The power relations of the parties, or the amount of representatives they have, is sometimes the subject of the cartoons.[282] Usually cartoons of the parties, however, are about their relations to each other or to the Kanzler. The parties are very distinctive from one another, and bear icons, which make them easily recognisable. This connotes the stark differences of opinion and ideology between the parties.

The conservatives and the centre were the most common supporters of the Kanzlers, with one or both of the liberal parties backing him up.[283] Hence it is not surprising that these two parties are often seen together, in 1907 the centre and the socialists were together against the Kanzler's colonial policy until the 1907 elections, but this remains the only instance where the Socialists are visualised working closely with another party. They are, however, making deals with the Kanzler and a major part of the national politics. Unlike the British Labour Party, the German Socialists are usually on the same level (as political actors) with the other parties when the power relations are compared. After the 1907 elections the Socialist Party is shown as a much weaker and famished figure in relations to the well fed Centre Party[284]. In these elections the socialist's support sapped, while the centre remained quite strong, important is that the Socialist Party is still a strong and present political actor even after their loss of support.[285]

Conservative Party is visualised as a militaristic, upper class (aristocracy) character wearing a monocle and moustache, which sometimes have the same shape as the Kaiser's, depending of the cartoonist. They are usually either fit as a soldier would be, or nigh obese, to connote the well-fed upper class, as well as the moustache and monocle, which are also clear visual icons of the upper class. The Conservative Party is usually dressed in a good suit, hunting clothes or a uniform and he wears boots, although sometimes he is clad in a suit of armour, which connotes their militarism and to the cartoonist's mind out dated values[286]. The upper class image connotes their party agenda, as militarism is connected to the royal houses and the old regime, the conservative party was the Kaiser's strong supporter. This image tells us more about the policies of the party than of its supporters, since the conservatives were popular also amongst the middle and lower classes, although mostly in rural areas. The militaristic outlook of the party might also hint to the fact that the conservative's strongest support areas were in Prussia, although the usual Prussian

---

[281] The Polish party once and Antisemites in the background of another, the Danish are not featured.
[282] For example, Kladderadatsch 17.2.1907, volume 60 no.7 p.109 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1907/0105?sid=4e200932b962d4dd5f2cd4f14676a67e).
[283] Craig 1978, p.280, 283.
[284] Kladderadatsch 17.2.1907, volume 60 no.7 p.105 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1907/0105?sid=c80d9779942f1223981a4540bf5d61d4).
[285] Anderson 2000, p.343.
[286] The cartoonist who uses this the most (Johnson) usually critiques the institutions more than the others (for example see footnote 233).

icons of *Pickelhaube* and Prussian eagle are not visualised with them. This leads us to the conclusion that the icons surrounding the party are meant to visualise their support for the military and the conservative values. They were the foremost party voting for the increase of military spending, colonial policies, and against political reforms, e.g. the Prussian electoral reform. The party's image corresponds its policies better than its supporter base, but as the German parties were more ideology driven this is not surprising. Thus the image of the Conservative Party is that of the upper class, although not strictly aristocratic, since they lack the usual icons of the aristocracy.[287]

The main issue of the Centre Party before the First World War was the *Kulturkampf*, i.e. the struggle between the papal and national governments, or from another perspective, the protection of the catholic values in the Reich.[288] Therefore, the Centre Party, whose supporter base was mostly the South-German Catholics, is usually visualised as a member of the clergy, most often a priest. He also usually has a devout expression on his face and carries a bishop's staff or a cross. The bishop's staff connotes the administrational perspective of the party's agenda, whereas the cross the values. The centre's social class is a bit tricky since the party represents several social classes, but from the image created in the magazine one cannot say that the party would support any other class than the clergy. The magazine takes no interest in the primacy of the South-German people in the party's support base, either because it is so obvious or it makes no difference, since the party is a national actor. Just like in the Conservative Party's case, the icons are used without further context of the support or locality. Of course, both parties also had support in other areas, but in general their main support areas were quite clear. In addition to the general connection between the party and catholic values, the party is also connected with the pope and thus this sort of an international administrative system, which is also problematized in the Reichstag-Schach, in which the Kaiser and the pope are the king pieces, i.e. in the same level of power, thus competing against each other. In Kladderadatsch the party's values are generally conservative, but not tied to the perceived national good, since the Zentrum was a part of what the Conservatives called the "*Vaterlandsfeinde Politik*", which was directed against colonial expansion and conservative

---

[287] Koch 1984, p.141-142 : Retallack 2006, p.147.

[288] The Kulturkamph in short was a power struggle between the catholic Centrum and the Reichskanzler, which had begun when Bismarck was holding the Kanzler's office. It started when the pope reserved the powers to appoint and dismiss church officials, however, these officials were at the same time state clerks and in this position under the nation's jurisdiction. This clash of authorities resulted in a long struggle between the state and the church, which was lead by the Centrum party on the church's behalf and the Kanzler on the government's. The whole issue resulted in a result, which satisfied neither side, in addition, the issue left the relationship between the church and the state ambiguous and the Kulturkamph continued through other issues. After this catholic perspectives dominated the Centrum party's image. Sheehan 1978, p. 135-137: Koch 1984, p.149-151: Anderson 2000, p.106-107.

politics. As in the Conservative Party's case, the Centre Party's agenda goes before the support base in its image[289].[290]

Both liberal parties are visualised in a very similar fashion. They are sometimes both older intellectual men, with top hats and spectacles, however, a distinction between the two is sometimes made.[291] The National Liberals are more often the aforementioned top hatted intellectual and the Left Liberals a bowler hat wearing lower middle class character. Indeed, the Left Liberals' party represented the lower middle class and had somewhat more leftist values than the National Liberals.[292] These two parties often voted differently in armament and social legislation issues, but both were advocates of political reform.[293] The Prussian vote franchise initiative was mostly the socialists' issue, but the liberal parties did also support it. The liberal parties are usually visualised with each other and sometimes even as the same character, depending on the issue, i.e. if the cartoon's subject is the government the parties are separated, but if the subject is a more general political topic, the parties are often united. Usually the distinction between the two is written out, not just shown in visual terms. The parties' images correspond well to the difference in their support groups, the National Liberals were the intellectual elite's and the wealthier businessmen's party, whereas the Left Liberals' support base was in the lower middle class. After the unification of the nation the National liberals enjoyed the support of nationalistic Germans, but by the twentieth century the nationalistic sentiment had become more or less the value of every party, resulting in loss of support for the party. The nationalistic attribute is not exaggerated in the cartoons. Both liberal parties had also been strong supporters of the Kanzler in the past and this continues under the review period, as they are both seen in most images, with the Kanzler's support parties as subject. In general, the image of the parties is dictated by their values and party programmes than their voters. The liberal parties are clearly both middle class parties, with some variation in the party agendas, nevertheless the parties are close enough to each other that the cartoonists from time to time unite them as one.[294]

Unlike the British Labour, in Germany the Social Democratic Party is closely tied together with socialism. The character of the socialists is a visibly lower class person. This person usually wears a poor and mismatched suit and a worker's cap, which is the most recurring socialist icon. Unlike the other parties, the socialists' face hair is also unkempt and shaggy. There is little

---

[289] Kladderadatsch 13.1.1907, volume 60 no.2 p.25 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1907/0025?sid=4e200932b962d4dd5f2cd4f14676a67e).
[290] Koch 1984, p.142-143: Anderson 2000, p.77-78.
[291] For example, Kladderadatsch 24.2.1907, volume 60 no.8 p.120 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1907/0120?sid=4e200932b962d4dd5f2cd4f14676a67e).
[292] Sheehan 1978, p.239-242, 246: Koch 1984, p.143-145.
[293] Sheehan 1978, p.268-269: Koch 1984, p.144-145.
[294] Sheehan 1978, p.221-223: Koch 1984, p.144-145: Anderson 2000, p.201-202.

question about the Social Democrats' class affiliation. The lower class connotations are very strong, although they usually visualise the socialists as workers and do not use the other lower classes icons. Indeed, only item the socialists carry is a wooden club, similar to the British cartoons' Irishman's or socialists club (the icon may very well be borrowed), no hammers or other tools are seen in the socialists' hand. The hat, clothes and the lack of grooming are the usual socialist icons. They are also associated closely to the Kanzler with their "*Vaterlandsfeinde Politik*" and the Prussian voting franchise issue, thus their position as a lower class party and their agenda are clear.[295] The socialists were usually the opposition party in the Reichstag, e.g. they voted against military spending increases, therefore the Kanzlers found little support from their direction. As a lower class party the Social Democrats are often put in a conflict situation with the government or upper class characters, in which their image is a belligerent and bullying one, they are seldom visualised as a victim or a pitiful character[296]. In Kladderadatsch the Socialists are the party who are most visibly seen advancing their agenda, which probably is due to the strong opposition position of the party. The only time they are visualised working with another party is before 1907 elections, as they and Centre Party opposed the Kanzler's colonial policies.[297]

The conservatives' general image and their way of working in the national politics are nationalistic and strong. They are shown in dominant and self-confident positions and situations, their posture is good, and their character is stout, fit and militaristic. Their wealth and influence is visualised in their clothing and accessories, and association with the aristocracy with the militaristic outfits and moustache. As a Reichstag party they are visualised as a strong actor, which is also in line with their representation, since the Conservative Party was the second largest in the Reichstag, next only to the centre. Those two parties are often working together in the cartoons, first with and then against von Bülow, and thereafter against von Bethmann-Hollweg, and last supporting him[298]. The magazine constructs an image for its viewers that the parties have common interests.[299] In general the conservatives have a changing attitude towards the Kanzler, in 1907 they are a part of von Bülow's support, but later they are the ones who are shown responsible of betraying him[300].

---

[295] Craig 1978, p.279: Koch 1984, p.145-147.

[296] For example, Kladderadatsch 21.2.1909, volume 62 no.8 p.122 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1909/0122?sid=4e200932b962d4dd5f2cd4f14676a67e).

[297] Guttsman 1981, p.271-275: Anderson 2000, p.424.

[298] For example, Kladderadatsch 11.7.1909, volume 62 no.28 p.497 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1909/0497?sid=c80d9779942f1223981a4540bf5d61d4), Kladderadatsch 24.4.1910, volume 63 no.17 p.314 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1910/0314?sid=c80d9779942f1223981a4540bf5d61d4) and Kladderadatsch 25.12.1910, volume 63 no.52 p.948 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1910/0948?sid=c80d9779942f1223981a4540bf5d61d4).

[299] Craig 1978, p.290: Congleton 2011, p.480.

[300] Kladderadatsch 11.7.1909, volume 62 no.28 p.492 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1909/0492?sid=4e200932b962d4dd5f2cd4f14676a67e).

They are commonly visualised with another party, and seldom alone. Their expressions are usually strong, but arrogant. The conservatives are a counterforce to both the liberals and the socialists. Even though the conservatives supported von Bülow at the time, they are shown opposing the liberals in a cartoon. In the cartoon the Centre and Socialist Parties benefit from the infighting of von Bülow's block, i.e. the Conservative and Liberal Parties[301]. The conflict between the socialists and the conservatives is deeper, the parties are never visualised working together, which also is well in line with the parties' relations, e.g. in 1910 the socialists are depicted amused and discussed of a socialist's Reichstag speech[302]. The main reason given for von Bethmann-Hollweg's improved image in the magazine is that he is successful in enlisting the support of the conservatives and the centre.[303]

Likewise, the centre party is a strong political actor. After the elections there are cartoons, which clearly visualise the centre as the largest party[304], and the strongest force behind von Bülow's Reichstag support. After the change of the Kanzler, the centre party is shown as the best friend of the conservatives until the end of the review period. Unlike the conservatives, the centre has no similar enemies in the political field. The party is visualised in passive means compared to the conservatives, their most active times are in the early 1907 before the elections, when they conduct the politics against colonial policy with the socialists, and at the time of von Bülow's fall. Otherwise they are sometimes visualised with the conservatives and other parties, but in a passive role. Somewhat similarly to the conservatives, whose image is often arrogant and malicious, the centre party shares the same kind of expressions and in addition is sometimes exaggeratedly devout. The party is a strong party, which works actively in the politics when needed, but whenever it was not working against the Kanzler its image is that of a harmless giant.

Liberal's combined Reichstag strength was less than the conservatives or the Centre Party's, which is also visualised in the parties' image. Both parties are weak, old and thin compared to the larger parties. When they are visualised in action, they seem disorganised and clumsy[305]. They do not work with the centre or the socialists, and their relation with the conservatives ends up

---

[301] Kladderadatsch 1.12.1907, volume 60 no.48 p.815 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1907/0815?sid=4e200932b962d4dd5f2cd4f14676a67e).
[302] Kladderadatsch 30.1.1910, volume 63 no.5 p.81 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1910/0081?sid=4e200932b962d4dd5f2cd4f14676a67e).
[303] Kladderadatsch 25.12.1910, volume 63 no.52 p.948 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1910/0948?sid=c80d9779942f1223981a4540bf5d61d4).
[304] For example, Kladderadatsch 17.2.1907, volume 60 no.7 p.109 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1907/0109?sid=4e200932b962d4dd5f2cd4f14676a67e).
[305] Kladderadatsch 23.2.1908, volume 61 no.8 p.125 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1908/0125?sid=4e200932b962d4dd5f2cd4f14676a67e).

with results that help no-one[306]. In fact their relationship with the conservatives is as natural as that of a hare and a fish[307]. The parties seem weak, passive and harmless. The liberal character's expressions and facial features tell the viewer of a lot of their intellectual capabilities, but the practical actions of the party are weak. The liberals are the least featured in the cartoons, much because they are not as relevant in the Kanzler's successes in the Reichstag as the larger parties, and not as radical as the socialists. They are also rarely the actor in the cartoons, which both strengthens their passive image and others' active image. There is little to say about them as political actors, since they are weak and passive, furthermore they keep to themselves and do not act with the other parties unless as a part of the Kanzler's support.[308]

Compared to the other parties, which at some time or another supported the Kanzler, the socialists are in a position of opposition. Only in the end of the period, there are some cartoons of the Kanzler working with the socialists, of which the cartoon where von Bethmann-Hollweg is making a deal with the party has already been mentioned[309]. The socialists are the devil and the Kanzler should be careful when dealing with them. Social democrats' image in general as a political actor is a violent and unflattering. They generally seem angry and uncompromising, even compared to the other parties. Often a threat of violence is present when the socialist party is visualised. Their opposition of the Kanzler's politics is also plain[310]. Nevertheless, the Social Democratic Party's image is an active one, even though the other parties and authorities do not relate to them positively, they carry on as an actor[311]. This should not be considered praise towards the party. The Social Democrat's image is the most uncooperative of the parties, however, Kladderadatsch keeps them as an integral part of the German political system. They are a party among all others, and a strong influence in the Reichstag, even though their strength almost halved in the 1907 elections. Compared to the conservatives and the centre the socialists are not a force that could harm the Kanzler, and thus the national politics, but their activity and devotion to their cause cannot be refuted. As the liberals were visualised as intelligent and considering, albeit weak, the socialists seem irrational, advocating action over reason, to become a socialist, one should remove ones

---

[306] Kladderadatsch 1.12.1907, volume 60 no.48 p.815 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1907/0815?sid=4e200932b962d4dd5f2cd4f14676a67e).

[307] Kladderadatsch 11.4.1909, volume 62 no.15 p.253 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1909/0253?sid=4e200932b962d4dd5f2cd4f14676a67e).

[308] Sheehan 1978, p.221-231.

[309] Kladderadatsch 11.6.1911, volume 64 no.24 p.452 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1911/0452?sid=4e200932b962d4dd5f2cd4f14676a67e).

[310] Kladderadatsch 2.2.1908, volume 61 no.5 p.69 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1908/0069?sid=4e200932b962d4dd5f2cd4f14676a67e).

[311] Kladderadatsch 22.5.1910, volume 63 no.21 p.379 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1910/0379?sid=4e200932b962d4dd5f2cd4f14676a67e).

brains[312]. All in all, the socialists are a strong actor, although an irrational and violent one. Their strength in the images is even somewhat contradictory, as they suffered a significant electoral loss. The party's image is not positive, but then again, all parties have their flaws in the representations in Kladderadatsch. Social Democrats are, however, a significant part of the party system, and the possibility of them working with the Kanzler is present. Their policies are opposed to those of Kladderadatsch, which clearly defines national good in quite Prussian terms: wealth and power bring a stable Great Power status, and the socialist policies of armament spending reduction and colonial inaction do not support this.[313]

In conclusion the images of the German parties correspond to their agendas and actions in national politics. They are blamed for betraying their Kanzler and shown as uncooperative and stubborn. All of the parties are presented in weak, antagonistic or hurtful for the national politics, not the images of cooperative and healthy political actors the British parties are. The conservatives are arrogant, the centre is only interested in the catholic matters, the liberals are weak and the socialists irrational. All four major parties are visualised smirking at the Kanzler's failure in 1910[314]. Humour comes from the power position and the Kanzler's exaggerated expression, because the parties are stronger than the Kanzler, which is a contradictory situation. The parties seem to enjoy of the Kanzler's weak position. This image is exemplary in the visualisation of the parties' relationship with the Kanzler. The relationship is a constant power struggle between the parties and the Kanzler, and it is up to the Kanzler to keep the parties in control, and govern the nation.[315]

The general image of the parties as political actors is that they are interested in their own agendas and are not concerned of the national issues, of course, some parties are visualised more patriotic than the others, but the general behaviour of the parties is not constructive. Another exemplary image of the parties together is from 1909, where the parties are surveyed by other nationalities[316]. The cartoon shows five parties (the liberals are divided in this instance) fighting with each other, the conservatives and the socialists are at each other's throats, the centre hits one of the liberal parties in the stomach, who in turn sits on top of the other liberal party. Chaos and discord are the general messages of the cartoon. The same use of violent images is also used in other cartoons; this is just an exemplary one. The parties' images do correspond their agendas and

---

[312] Kladderadatsch 21.2.1909, volume 62 no.8 p.131 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1909/0131?sid=4e200932b962d4dd5f2cd4f14676a67e).
[313] Retallack 2006, p.147, 192-193.
[314] Kladderadatsch 12.6.1910, volume 63 no.24 p.445 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1910/0445?sid=4e200932b962d4dd5f2cd4f14676a67e).
[315] Craig 1978, p.264:Anderson 2000, p.425, 436-437: Congleton 2011, p.479: Biefang & Schultz 2016, p.69.
[316] Kladderadatsch 26.9.1909, volume 62 no.39 p.664 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1909/0664?sid=4e200932b962d4dd5f2cd4f14676a67e).

values, as well as their political activity and power, but the image of the party system and Reichstag as a whole is either a chaotic fight between the parties, or the well organised stable of the Kanzler.

5.3 Parties in change: Comparisons

Even though the representations of the parties differ a lot, as the British parties are visualised by using their leaders and the German usually through the special characters, there are a lot of similarities between the parties. The German and British conservatives share the use of better suits and upper class icons, however, the Liberals are also visualised through these icons in both countries. The Centre party and the Irish Nationalists are in a strange in-between position compared to the other parties, since they are tied so closely to just one political feature, as the Centre Party is visualised in catholic icons and the Irish Nationalists through the Irish. Their actions in the parliaments are visualised as somewhat similar, since both parties work visibly with other parties to achieve their goals.

The greatest difference between the nations is in their left-wing parties, the Social Democrats are also referred as the socialists, while there is a visible difference in both the visualisation and association of the Labour party and the socialists. The Social Democrats share the same icons in the German cartoons, whereas the British idealists are divided from the Labour, as the party is never joined to the same icons. Labour is a lower middle class person, whose appearance suggests moderate income and he is well kempt and clean, whereas the British socialist is scruffy and untidy, similar to the German social democrats. In similar fashion the presence of the British socialist carries with him a possibility of violence, and the Labour party is the force that can keep him in check. In both magazines the socialists have the air of irrationality and flawed deduction, from which the Labour party is differentiated as a parliamentary actor. The party is criticised of its viewpoints, but the way they work in practise are legitimate. Indeed, the difference in general is found from the relationship between the parties and the practical politics, and the behaviour of the parties in their parliaments. The parliaments' images are created through the parties' images and their actions with each other and the national statesmen.[317]

Comparison of the nation's parties uncovers a clear, but hardly surprising image towards the conceptions the two nations' peoples' had towards their Parliaments. The German Reichstag had very little possibilities to impact the national politics directly, hence it is visualised as a brake rather than the throttle in the national politics.[318] The parties are uncooperative and fight

---

[317] Craig 1978, p.146-150, 155-156: Ball 1981, p.47-48: Powell 1996, p.105-106.
[318] Craig 1978, 162, 263-264: Retallack 2008, p.50: Congleton 2011, p.479-480: Biefang & Schultz 2016, p.67-69.

amongst themselves, unable to compromise, whereas the British parties, who are seen as adversaries of sorts, are ready to go far in order to resolve the issues in a gentlemanlike spirit. This idea of pragmatism is not visible in the German parties, since they are groups, which guard their own interests, leaving the national governance to the Kanzler.[319] The difference between the political traditions is clear. The German parties have their own, strong and dissimilar agendas, and they follow them. Their way of action is though the Kanzler and the deals they can make with him in exchange for support in the Reichstag. The British system and its idea of the majority dictated politics, on the other hand, forces the parliament into practical solutions and forced cooperation. Both magazines put the emphasis in politics on the concrete end results and construct the image of the parties and the parliaments according to this.[320]

The German parties are visualised as more abstract than the British, as the British parties' images contain clear assumptions towards the parties' support base and the class, whose agenda the parties advance, whereas the German parties are visualised through the ideal, which they support, manifest spirits of the ideology. In the Punch the parties' supporter bases are clear, and the magazine takes a stance towards the Labour's possibilities to advance the lower class issues if the trade unions control the party, the representativeness of the party is endangered, if the unions have too much power. From this viewpoint the German parties are visualised more as political pressure groups, which guard the benefits of the people they are representing, rather than their supporter's in general. Indeed, the image of the parties corresponds well with their main financial supporters, thus the parties seem like their financier's interest group than national, representative parties. Although the parties work with the people's mandate, this visualisation weakens the Reichstag's and the parties' images as representative actors[321]. The British parties and their voters are shown in strong correlation to each other, which then the parties' agendas moulded slightly, i.e. the small nuances like the different views about fiscal politics, or support bases, thus the image is symmetrically opposite compared to the German one. Compared to the German parties, all British parties seem bourgeois, the difference is between lower and upper middle class. The connotation is that the Parliament is advancing the bourgeois' ideal of national good.

The cartoonists put worth on the practical results in politics, it is hard to see value in ideological debate. Thus the German party system's image (and the image of the parliament in general) is created into a much weaker one. The division in the British parties is, of course, tied to the party in power, which through their stronger and more frequent actions is the more prominent or

---

[319] Craig 1978, p.285: Ihalainen forthcoming, ch.2.2.
[320] Palonen 2014, p.7: Biefang & Schulz 2016, p.69.
[321] For example, Kladderadatsch 20.1.1907, volume 60 no.3 p.36 (http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla1907/0036?sid=4e200932b962d4dd5f2cd4f14676a67e).

the major parties. Difference between the old parties and the new is also visible, since the Irish Nationals and the Labour both face stronger suspicions towards their actions and are visualised more strongly through their specific goals. This division, as argued earlier, is both visual and topical. The German parties are visualised ideology driven rather than following practical reasoning, both in their appearance and the ways in which they act. In both magazines the images created of the parties follow the magazines' bourgeois values.[322]

In the cartoons the parliament is in the very centre of the British political system and an obstacle and burden for the Kanzler in the German. In Britain it is the institution, which is in charge of the national good, as the government is tied to the Parliament directly and indirectly needs its approval in the form of the majority, and the legislation is often the collective result of debate and upper chamber's amendments, whereas in Germany the legislation is drafted by the Kanzler and his ministers who are affected more by the Kaiser's views than those of the parliament, the Kanzler enlists the Reichstag's support, but cooperation is not as direct as in Britain. The parliaments in both countries are related to the national icons of John Bull and Deutscher Michel, but the British attach the parties and the parliament closer with national icons than the Germans. In conclusion the position of British Parliament is viewed as a better and stronger institution than the Reichstag, which is rather imagined as a place of competing ideologies and an obstruction to efficiency.

6 Strength in numbers or statesmen: Conclusions

The main purpose of this thesis is to illuminate how the chosen institutions were visualised and what kind of image the cartoonists tried to create around their subjects. What were the images of these institutions, which they wanted to create or consciously (and unconsciously) reimagine? Why these images were created the way they were, is answered through the examination of the cartoonists' backgrounds and papers' target audiences, i.e. the bourgeois milieu. These cartoons are humorous political entertainment for the bourgeoisie, but they at the same time hold significance in the use of icons. At the same time the cartoons wished to reinforce the values of their audience and create for them a world to which they could relate, but at the same time mould the existing ideas and views towards the subject matter. In the British case we can make an argument for the

---

[322] The British government through Parliament (Ihalainen 2016, p.26: Seeward & Ihalainen 2016, p.36-38) versus the German system of the Kanzler as leader of the government (Congleton 2011, p.474-475: Biefang & Schulz 2016, p.67-70).

magazine's liberal values, but on the other hand, the Punch magazine advocates traditional family values and gender roles (which are problematized in the cartoons about women's suffrage), which means that the magazine can only be called liberal in the political context. Kladderadatsch with its anti-socialist attitude and traditional gender and social values, is a more clear example of a conservative paper. As argued earlier, the bourgeois target audience is obvious from the magazine's uses of symbols, icons and references, in addition to this the magazines' editorial staffs had bourgeois backgrounds.[323]

The building and undermining of legitimacy for the political actors and the national institutions, and the strengthening of national unity through historical continuity and the pride in one's own political system and statesmen, were the main purposes of the cartoons. Thus the initial research question "what kind of image the cartoons try to convey?" was answered by comparisons of the cartoons with the countries' constitutions and examination of how the institutions were joined to national identity. Through international comparisons the similarities and differences of the nations' political systems become more transparent, than if they were studied individually, since the contrast and differences draw focus on the important aspects, for instance without the comparative perspective of another monarch, the German Kaiser's role in administration might become underrepresented, since it is overshadowed by the role of the Kanzler. Rather than stating historical facts about the personality or deeds of the statesmen, this kind of comparative visual analysis gives insight to which kind of conceptions the cartoons worked towards to create for the people of early twentieth century, and of the means they employed. [324]

Monarchy in both countries was clearly perceived as a part of the constitutional system, since in Britain it was mechanically central in the Parliament Act as a threat to enforce the House of Lord's compliance in the face of a perceivably continuous electoral support, and the German monarch was an active part in both domestic and foreign politics. However, in the cartoons the British monarch was not present with his ministers, and in the cartoons, which hinted at the mass-creation of new peers, the monarch was not present. Indeed, the creation of peers was visualised as more of a force of nature than an act of a political institution. If the creation of new peers should be seen as some political actor's work, it was rather the Prime Minister's than the monarch's. The constitutional position of the monarch has been examined earlier, nevertheless, his image corresponds this position well, as a more passive character. Indeed, earlier research gives credit of the Parliament Act to Asquith's administration, however, unnecessary significance is given to the young King's role by stating that the monarch was mislead by Asquith to consent to creating

---

[323] Hiley 2009, p.28-30.
[324] Ihalainen & Saarinen 2016.

more peers, when in truth the issue was weighed by the monarch, and he chose to abide with the popular opinion and the (at the time current) notion of electorate.[325] The monarch's image in the Punch corresponds with this view, as it is created both through his own competence in his role, and as a national icon: a figurehead for the nation and an icon of historical continuity. Asquith's decision to let the press know about the King's decision was criticised and it is not farfetched that the magazine's editors made the choice to distance the monarch from the issue.[326] The magazine created this through showing John Bull as the significant factor in the issue, i.e. the electorate would decide the outcome of the Parliament Act. The King is in this way trivialised, as he will implicitly follow the will of the people. In the Punch the monarchy's legitimacy was unquestioned, and his role was to create national unity through providing historical continuity, and maintain nation's prestige.

As the British monarch remains passive, his German counterpart enjoys a much more active role. Even though Wilhelm's actions and person have been criticised (perhaps due to vilification in propaganda during the First World War [327]), his image for the readers of Kladderadatsch was quite different. Just like George, Wilhelm's image is that of a benevolent ruler, who has the good of his people in mind. Wilhelm is a much more active character, as he works with his ministers and Kanzler in the administration, but he is also a strong national icon. The magazine is conscious of the Kaiser's misgivings and rather than criticising the structures or his political position, makes excuses and sheds blame on the Kanzler and ministers. Here a similarity to George's position is visible: both characters, as national icons, are implicitly beyond critique. In George's case this is done by excluding him from the cartoons, and in Wilhelm's, by shifting the blame. Wilhelm's activity in national politics was visualised as a generally positive thing, and his misgivings belittled. From earlier research we know that Wilhelm's unbalanced personality and changing ideas of how the nation should be ran were a vexing quality on the administration.[328] Often he is put in a position, where he is leading or guiding the nation, and the real critique falls on the Kanzler, who cannot keep up with the Kaiser's ideological, even dream-like, actions. Indeed, Wilhelm's personality is a factor, but he rarely takes the blame. Also, by showing the Kaiser with middle and upper class people (men), with whom the magazine's audience could certainly relate, this legitimacy is grounded to the support of the people, i.e. the right kind of people. The Kaiser is also joined to the past and national identity similarly to the British sovereign, but as an active

---

[325] Pugh 1994, p.126: Powell 1996, p.55: Congleton 2011, p.357. Oxford dictionary of national biographies p.735-743.
[326] Powell 1996, p.60.
[327] Scully 2011B.
[328] Craig 1978, p.224-226: Kohut 1991, p.134-136.

political actor he is better grounded to the real world, as he also works with other political institutions.

The most significant factors in the inquiry of the institutions' image are the governments, since they are the most obvious and influential political actors, and thus most closely tied to the national good. In both nations the governments are also the most visible representations of the political cultures, since they are the actors who work with other institutions. In both nations the governments have the basis of their legitimacy grounded in efficiency of the national administration and politics within the limits of their constitutional frameworks.

In Britain the legitimacy of the government relies in how well does it correspond with the will of the electorate, which is most often represented as politically liberal and bourgeois.[329] The Liberal Party was in power over the whole review period, and although it lost much of its support in the 1910 elections, it remained the largest party. Although the Punch was politically a liberal magazine in the early twentieth century context (and even quite liberal in its other values as well), other researchers have called it conservative, which I think is a slight anachronism.[330] Nevertheless, during the period under study the Punch upheld arguably liberal political values (not to be confused with party-bias), which is in particular visible in the magazine's coverage of the Parliament Act issue. The Party's elections victories of 1910, i.e. the mandate of the people, are the basis of the governmental legitimacy.[331]

German government, on the other hand, had the basis of its legitimacy in its capacity to fulfil the ideas of the Bismarckian constitution, which was perceived as the foremost model of continental constitutional monarchy. This model required a strong head of government capable of creating legislation by maintaining support of both the monarch and the parliament. There was no direct element of popular will in the model of government, and the Reichstag support was often achieved by alliances with the parties and favourable policies.[332] When the Kanzlers started to lose the support of either the Reichstag or their Kaiser (Kaiser's support is visualised more important than the Reichstag's, which is true as the Kaiser was the one with the power to dismiss him), his image started to become weaker in Kladderadatsch. The institution and constitution were visualised as sound; the Kanzler was the one, who manages to produce results, i.e. advance the national good. What is clear is that the Kladderadatsch created a strong ideal of the constitutional model, and through the uses of national icons, also gave it nationalistic connotation, which arguably was also

---

[329] Which was also true though 1907 - 1911. Pugh 1994, p.123.
[330] Hiley 2009, p.28-30: Scully 2011.
[331] Powell 2002, p.126-127.
[332] Craig 1978, p.290: Retallack 2008, p.50: Congleton 2011, p.479-480: Ihalainen 2016, p.26: Biefang & Schulz 2016, p.69.

tied to its position as a constitution of a great power and a model of continental constitutional monarchy, thus a rival to the British constitutional model.[333]

The parties and their functioning are tied to the national parliaments, both magazine's do carry certain party biases, the Kladderadatsch often shows the socialists as disruptive or antagonised, and the Punch casts suspicions over the Labour and the Irish Nationalists. The parties, which work closely with the administration of the country and in general support the government are thus shown in a more positive light than others. Indeed, the functionality of the government is a key point in how the parliaments themselves are represented. The British parliament and the parties are given support apart from the House of Lords, which is mostly visualised as an alien and dysfunctional part of the government, hence in need of a reform, or 'physically ill', whereas the Reichstag in general is visualised as a collection of uncooperative support organisations, which hinder the government, and fight amongst each other.

In conclusion both nations visualise the legitimacy of their parliaments in relation to their perceived impact on the administration of the national good, with the parties as instruments in this. Of course, the parties, through their visualisation and the visualisations of their actions, are tied to certain agendas and bases of support, which also builds their legitimacy as parliamentary, representational institutions. In Britain the parties, which are visualised as the main actors in the national government, i.e. the Liberals and the Unionists, are viewed in a generally more benevolent fashion than the parties, which are perceived as having a stronger and more particular agenda. The German parties in turn are visualised through their support factions and the classes they represent, as well as their ideologies. However, the images of the parties and parliaments differ drastically as the British Parliament is visualised as a central organ of national administration, and the German Reichstag is visualised as a disruptive institution filled with uncooperative parties, which is why the Kanzler is the natural and correct institution in charge of practical politics.

It is hardly surprising that both visual traditions uphold their own forms of government, and criticise the parts of them, which are seen disruptive for their functioning. Both nations join their old institutions closer with the national identity than the more recent ones. In Britain the dynamics between the major parties had been closer to national pride, as the revered statesmen were members of either of the parties. Similarly in Germany the Kanzlers, who were in the same position as the British Prime Ministers as statesmen and national icons, were the ones who enjoyed the support.

---

[333] Ihalainen 2016.

In this thesis I have analysed the visualisation of two of the most prominent political systems in pre-World War Europe, with the main institutions in the focus, one with a limited franchise, but a parliament driven government, and another with universal male suffrage, but a suspicious attitude towards the parliamentary process and a tradition of strong, independent, statesmen. Both systems had similarities and differences, as the political tradition, visualisation of the institutions and joining them to the national identity differed dramatically between different institutions, but at the same time the images of said institutions corresponded well with what is the understanding of their constitutional positions. Legitimacy and trust is built towards the systems, even though critique emerges sometimes. In the light of this evidence the initial hypothesis of the cartoons as means to build national pride and unity through the visualisation of the institutions proved sound. These results can be generalised in the context of the target audiences, and by no means meant to represent the attitudes of the whole of the people, indeed there is still a lot of research to be done to more closely analyse the views towards the national institutions. Studies with wider source bases or longer time periods would better our understanding of the features of these political cultures, some of which prevailed through the First World War and maybe even to present times.

Sources:

Archive of Kladderadatsch volumes digitized: http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/kla

Humoristisch-satyrisches Wochenblatt. Kladderadatsch volumes 60-64 (1907-1911). Berlin.

Punch magazine volumes online: https://sites.google.com/site/punchvolumes/
Last used 24.5.2016.

Punch, the London Charivari volumes 132-141 (1907 - 1911). London, Punch publications Ltd.

University of Toronto Internet Archives: http://www.archive.org/details/robarts

Research Literature:

Allen, Ann Taylor (2015), Satire and Society in Wilhelmine Germany: Kladderadatsch and Simplicissimus, 1890-1914. The University Press of Kentucky, Lexinton 2015.

Anderson, M. L. (2000), Practicing Democracy: Elections and Political culture in Imperial Germany. Princeton University Press, Princeton 2000.

Ball, A. R. (1981), British Political Parties: the emergence of a Modern Party system. MacMillan Press Ltd, London and Basingstoke 1981.

Bauer, O. (1996), The Nation, in Woolf, S. (ed), Nationalism in Europe 1815 to the Present. Routledge, London 1996, pp. 61-84.

Berger, S. (2006), Germany, in Baycroft, T. & Hewitson, M. (eds), What is a Nation? Europe 1789-1914. Oxford University Press, Oxford 2006 pp.42-62.

Biefang, A. & Schulz, A. (2016), From Monarchical Constitutionalism to a Parliamentary Republic: Concepts of Parliamentarism in Germany since 1818, in Ihalainen, P., Ilie, C. & Palonen, K. (eds), Parliament and Parliamentarism: a Comparative History of a European Concept. Berghahn Books, New York 2016, pp.62-80.

The Blackwell biographical dictionary of British political life in the twentieth century. Ed.Keith Robbins. Blackwell, Oxford 1990.

Brooks, David (1995), The Age of Upheaval. Manchester University Press, Manchester 1995.

Burke, Peter (2011), Eyewitnessing: The Uses of Images As Historical Evidence. Reaktion Books Ltd, London 2011.

Clark, Christopher (2000), Kaiser Wilhelm II: A Life in Power. Longman Publishing Group, Harlow 2000.

Congleton, R. D. (2011), Perfecting Parliament: Constitutional Reform, Liberalism and the Rise of Western Democracy. Cambridge University Press, New York 2011.

McCord, N. (1991), British History 1815-1906. Oxford University Press, New York 1991.

Coupe, W. A. (1969), Observations on a Theary of Political Caricature. Comparative Studies in Society and History, Vol.11, No.1 (Jan.1969), pp.79-95. Cambridge University Press.

Coupe, W. A. (1980), Kaiser Wilhelm II and the Cartoonists. History Today, Vol.30, No.11 (November 1980), pp.16-22.

Coupe, W. A. (2001), Bismarck and the Cartoonists. History Today, Vol.51, No.10 (October 2001), p.42-48.

Craig, G. A. (1978), Germany 1866-1945. Oxford University Press, New York 2004.

Farmer, Sarah (2010), Going Visual: Holocaust Representation and Historical Method. The American History Review, Vol.115, No.1 (February 2010), pp.115-122.

Guttsman, W. L. (1981), The German Social Democratic Party 1875-1933. George Allen & Unwin Ltd, London 1981.

Heinrich-Jost, Ingrid (1982), die Geschichte eines Berliner Witzblattes von 1848 bis ins Dritte Reich. Informationspresse Leske, Köln 1982.

Hiley, N. (2009), Showing politics to the people: cartoons, comics and satirical prints, in Howells, R. & Matson R. S. (eds), Using Visual Evidence. McGraw-Hill Education, Berkshire 2009, pp.24-43.

Hugil, Peter J. (2008), German Great-Power Relations in the Pages of ”Simplicissimus”, 1896-1914. Geographical Review, Vil.98, No.1 (January 2008), pp.1-23.

Ihalainen, P. (2014), Prospects for Parliamentary Government in an Era of War and Revolution: Britain and Germany in Spring 1917, in Palonen, K., Rosales, J. M. & Turkka, T. (eds), The Politics of Dissensus: Parliament in Debate. Cantabria University Press, Santander 2014, pp.423-448. Ihalainen 2016

Ihalainen, P. (2016), European Parliamentary Experiences from a Conceptual Historical Perspective, in Ihalainen, P., Ilie, C. & Palonen, K. (eds), Parliament and Parliamentarism: a Comparative History of a European Concept. Berghahn Books, New York 2016, pp.19-31.

Ihalainen, P. (2016), The First World War, the Russian Revolution and Verieties of Democracy in Northwest European Debates.

Ihalainen, P. & Saarinen, T. (2016), Bringing language research, intellectual history and political history together in the analysis of parliamentary debates as a discursive nexus.

Ihalainen *forthcoming,* The Springs of Democracy 1917, 1918 and 1919: National and Transnational Debates on Constitutional Reform in the British , German, Swedish and Finnish Parliaments in an Age of War and Revolution.

Jeismann, M. (2006), Nation, Identity and Emnity, in Baycroft, T. & Hewitson, M. (eds), What is a Nation? Europe 1789-1914. Oxford University Press, Oxford 2006 pp.17-27.

Kemnitz, Thomas Milton (1973), The Cartoon as a Historical Source. The Journal of Interdisciplinary History, Vol.4, No.1, The Historian and the Arts (Summer, 1973), pp.81-93.

Koch, H. W. (1984), A Constitutional History of Germany: in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Longman Group Ltd, New York 1984.

Kohut, Thomas A. (1991), Wilhelm II and the Germans: A Study in Leadership. Oxford University Press. New York 1991.

Kress, Gunther & van Leeuwen, Theo (2006), Reading images: The Grammar of Visual Design. Routledge, New York 2006.

Kuusamo, Altti (1990), Kuvien edessä: esseitä kuvan semiotiikasta. Gaudeamus, Helsinki 1990.

Kuusamo, Altti (1996), Tyylistä tapaan: Semiotiikka, tyyli, ikonografia. Gaudeamus, Tampere 1996.

van Leeuwen, Theo & Jewitt, Carey (2001), Handbook of visual analysis. Sage publications Ltd, New York 2001.

Neue Deutsche Biographie. 1971.

The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Oxford University Press 2004.

Pakkasvirta, J. & Saukkonen, P. (2005), Nationalismit.WSOY, Porvoo 2005.

Palonen, K. (2014), Introduction, in Palonen, K., Rosales, J. M. & Turkka, T. (eds), The Politics of Dissensus: Parliament in Debate. Cantabria University Press, Santander 2014, pp.1-22.

Powell, D. (1996), The Edwardian Crisis: Britain, 1901-1914. MacMillan Press Ltd, Basingstoke 1996.

Powell, D. (2002), Nationhood and Identity: The British State since 1800. I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd, New York 2002.

Pugh, M. (1982), The Making of Modern British Politics 1867-1939. Blackwell Publishers Ltd, Oxford 1996.

Pugh, M. (1994), State and Society, British Political and Social History 1870-1992. St Martin's Press Inc, New York 1994.

Retallack, J. (2006), The German right, 1869-1920: political limits of the authoritarian imagination. University of Toronto Press, Toronto 2006.

Retallack, J. (2008), Imperial Germany 1871-1918. Oxford University Press, New York 2008.

Seaward, P. & Ihalainen, P. (2016), Key Concepts for Parliament in Britain (1640-1800), in Ihalainen, P., Ilie, C. & Palonen, K. (eds), Parliament and Parliamentarism: a Comparative History of a European Concept. Berghahn Books, New York 2016, pp.32-48.

Sheehan, J. J. (1978), German Liberalism in the nineteenth century. University of Chicago Press, Cambridge 1978.

Scully, R. (2011A), The Other Kaiser: Wilhelm I and British Cartoonists, 1861-1914. Victorian Periodicals Review, Vol.44, No.1 (2011), pp.69-98.

Scully, R. (2011B), Mr Punch versus the Kaiser, 1892-1898: Flashpoints of a Complex Relationship. International Journal of Comic Art, Vol.13, No.2 (Fall 2011), pp.553-578.

Scully, R. (2012), Mr Punch versus the Kaiser, 1892-1898: Flashpoints of a Complex Relationship – Part II: Photographing "Wilful Wilhelm"'. International Journal of Comic Art, Vol.14, No.2 (Fall 2012), pp.460-463.

Scully, R. (2017), Kaiser Cartoons, 1914-1918: A Transnational Comic Art Genre, in Michael Walsh & Andrekos Varnava (eds), The Great War and the British Empire: Culture and Society, London New York: Routledge, 2017, pp.41-62.

Scully, R. & Quartly, M. (2009), Drawing the Line: Using Cartoons as Historical Evidence. Monash University Publishing, Clayton 2009.
Last read online 26.5.2017:
(http://books.publishing.monash.edu/apps/bookworm/view/Drawing+the+Line/77/xhtml/frontmatter01.html).

Sepänen, J. (2010), Katseen voima: Kohti visuaalista lukutaitoa. Vastapaino, Tampere 2010.

Williams, C. (2006), The United Kingdom, in Baycroft, T. & Hewitson, M. (eds), What is a Nation? Europe 1789-1914. Oxford University Press, Oxford 2006 pp.272-311.