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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Rhetoricians are known for the wide variety of phenomena they study. Criticism ranging from a neo-Aristotelian investigation of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address\(^1\) to a Burkean analysis of a mass murder and suicide\(^2\) have appeared in communication journals and anthologies. The province of rhetoric has by consensus been expanded in recent years beyond classically based examinations of political or homiletic discourse. At the present, the scope of what rhetoricians are pleased to consider public address has broadened considerably. This expansion, however, has resulted in few systematic analyses of nonverbal rhetorical acts. A few studies focusing on film\(^3\) and on music\(^4\) have appeared, but these studies have in common a focus on the verbal aspects of their subjects. With the exception of Hendrix and Wood's 1973 study and Benson's 1975 study on films,\(^5\) rhetoricians have developed no specific methodology for dealing with nonverbal rhetoric.

Several problems arise when the venture is considered. Rhetoricians are trained to deal with either written or spoken discourse. To undertake an examination of, say, a painting, would require skills beyond the reach of most
rhetorical critics. Matthew Mackay has attempted such a task with his 1978 master's thesis on modern art, but Mackay did so from a vantage point of a practitioner's familiarity with the medium. The iconic mode, while not entirely unfamiliar to the rhetorician, has been thought of as primarily the province of artists and art critics. Rhetoricians have, in the main, given in to these stumbling blocks, avoiding a genre of rhetoric that could prove interesting and fruitful.

The initial problem concerning rhetorical criticism of nonverbal acts is twofold: First, what kinds of acts should be examined, and second, how should a rhetorician examine them? The first question could be answered by resorting to mixed modes, i.e., looking at a medium that combines visual and verbal elements. The critic could use the verbal portion as a touchstone for the investigation of the visual as in Frentz and Farrell's study of The Exorcist; yet with minimal verbal elements the critic would not be tempted to focus too heavily on word data for his analysis. A medium that seems ideal in meeting these requirements is the editorial cartoon. Many reasons support its suitability for rhetorical examination. First, visual and verbal elements are commonly combined in a way ideal for the rhetorician. While verbal messages are frequently visible in editorial cartoons, they are a small part of the overall message elements. Indeed, many cartoons have no verbal
content at all. Editorial cartoons, then, are a combination of iconic and discursive modes, with emphasis on the former. In addition, the editorial cartoon has politics as its subject matter, a topic long considered suitable for the rhetorician. Additionally, there is not, to the knowledge of this writer, a body of scholars or popular critics whose raison d'etre is the analysis of editorial cartoons.

Gombrich maintains that "the professional art historian has had little occasion to busy himself with the vast mass of ephemeral propaganda prints, broadsheets, and cartoons which were produced in ever-increasing volume from the sixteenth century onward." 7

Secondly, if editorial cartoons are worth the attention of the rhetorician, how should the critic-theorist go about his investigation? For the rhetorical critic, cartoons belong to an unfamiliar medium and an initial inquiry should, for obvious reasons, be more generally based than a case study. It should be an analysis of the nature of the genre, and questions should be directed toward that goal. Specific cases should be used as exemplars of the medium so that outcomes of such a study would be information about cartoons rather than information about politics, history, or other related fields. Attention to the cartoon itself rather than to its environment would help ensure focus on the medium. A rhetorical critic-theorist should, then, address the process of argument as manifested in the
object of study; however, when critics who commonly find arguments in words are confronted with pictures, by what method should they begin to explicate the new medium?

One way is to focus on its capabilities. Pictures, the stock in trade of the cartoonist, are representations of tangible objects. On the other hand, English words, not based on ideographic principle, have no visual connections with referents; they are apparently arbitrarily devised to name whatever needs naming. Therefore, coining a word to refer to an abstract idea is not a singular problem.

Referring to abstract notions is not beyond the everyday workings of the verbal medium. Pictures, however, (and here I am speaking of the fairly representational drawings found in cartoons) refer to tangible objects; they look like what they represent. Thus, devising a pictorial representation of an abstract idea could be a troublesome departure from the ordinary functions of that mode. With a few exceptions, pictures lack the capability of expressing abstract notions directly; except for certain visual commonplaces, such as the blindfolded woman or the Red Cross nurse, words such as justice, mercy, faith, and evil call to mind no pictorial referent.

How, then, do cartoonists commenting on the world political scene express their subject matter, abstract ideas? The problem for the cartoonist is to draw a picture of something that has no concrete visual referent. It is
a problem similar to that when we want to talk about something for which we have no name. Rather than coining a new word we often use an existing symbol that names the referent metaphorically. Cartoonists employ a similar device, using a juxtaposition/combination of visual symbols to present abstract ideas. Consider the example of Don Wright's 1972 cartoon in the Miami News. The illustration presents a stage with lavish scenery, including scrolls that say "good works" and "harmony" and doves flying overhead. In the foreground is an orchestra with Henry Kissinger as the conductor. In the center of the stage are Nixon and Brezhnev, arms linked, each releasing a dove into the air. The caption reads "Turn Up the Cloud Machine, Angels Enter From the Left---" Wright argues for scepticism regarding the Nixon-Brezhnev summit of 1972 by portraying the two as actors on stage, and his details reinforce the argument. Wright presents two metaphors in his cartoon which could be stated thus: (1) detente is merely a political show, and (2) Kissinger is the conductor of Nixon's foreign policy.

As in the example above, political cartoonists make arguments that contribute, at least to some extent, to politicians' images. Support for this view can be found in public figures' own concern with how they are represented in this medium. William Tweed is said to have placed his worries regarding Nast's visual criticism over what was
written about him. Rhetoricians' neglect of this genre should cause some concern since virtually every other aspect of the political world has been explored by these critics. A host of phenomena awaits the critic willing to venture out of the familiar realm of words. The study of rhetorical processes in public communication is incomplete if we ignore visual acts because of their novelty to scholars who have focused primarily on words. Mackay's work points the way for rhetorical critics by providing an example of rhetorical principles applied to the criticism of art. Morrison also suggests that basic critical methodologies could be applied to iconic rhetorical acts.10

Following Morrison's advice to apply rhetorical theory to nonverbal media, two perspectives have been chosen to function in this study as bases for the rhetorical criticism of political cartoons. This writer has selected Lloyd Bitzer's view of enthymematic argument and Chaim Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca's notion of metaphorical fusion. Application of these perspectives in a following section of the dissertation should demonstrate both the extent of their heuristic qualities in the rhetorical explanation of political cartoons and certain gaps in these theories which can be filled in by their unorthodox use. Both perspectives will be applied to representative editorial cartoons by Pulitzer winners to study their use of metaphor to create arguments and gain adherence.
A Review of Relevant Literature

Since the basic focus of this study is an examination of the argumentative function of metaphor in editorial cartoons, a review of literature relevant to this endeavor should include three major areas. The first and most obvious task is to examine any research available on cartoons. The second area of review will encompass studies by rhetoricians of other nondiscursive media such as art and music, and the third will be an investigation of discussions of the function of metaphor and enthymeme in argument.

Cartoons

An examination of journals in the field of communication (see Index to Journals in Communication Studies Through 1974, and subsequent journals mentioned in the index), reveals only two studies dealing with rhetoric and graphic arts of any kind. In Morrison's study "The Role of the Political Cartoonist in Image Making," the author contends that the political cartoonist uses "graphic counterparts of effective oral style" to present a condensed image of abstract political concepts. The author feels that many aspects of rhetorical style can be applied to the visual messages of cartoonists and uses Langer, Nichols, and Berlo to support the contention that political cartoons are effective persuasion. The method of the cartoonist, according to Morrison, is "a purposeful
condensation of sometimes complex meanings into a single striking image." Morrison contends that among the things that set the cartoonist apart from his colleague, the editorial writer, is the impact on the reader of perceiving the cartoonist's message immediately rather than having to go through the comparatively slow business of deciphering a discursive political argument. As Morrison argues, "By providing a momentary focus he [the cartoonist] telescopes a whole chain of ideas into one clear image." 

Kathleen Turner investigated another area of graphic art in her study of comic strips. The first part of her essay presents a case for the rhetorical criticism of popular art, citing studies of non-traditional rhetorical forms as support for this view. The two subsequent sections are devoted to a rhetorical analysis of comic strips in general and a case study of the image of women in comic strips in particular. Turner's contribution most relevant to this study is her contention that comic strips are enthymematic. This, Turner contends, is a contributing factor to the popularity of comic strips. "The comic strip asks for ideas already possessed by the audience on topics known to them, requiring their participation in order to be completed." 

In the field of communication, then, only two studies of rhetoric and cartoons have appeared, and only one of those deals with the editorial cartoon. Two aspects of the essays reviewed above are useful to this endeavor.
First, both Morrison and Turner present an argument warranting the rhetorical study of nontraditional forms. Second, Morrison supports the contention necessary to this work that critics can find, in existing rhetorical theories, a methodology to apply to nonverbal forms of rhetoric. Furthermore, Turner employs the concept of the enthymeme to be used in this study and supports this author's contention that audiences participate with artists in the creation of visual messages. Further, their work helps to raise questions pursued in this essay: What makes a single image "striking?" What is the nature of the premises supplied to produce a visually-based enthymeme?

While few studies of cartoons have been done by rhetoricians, a somewhat larger body of research can be found within the discipline of journalism. A survey of Journalism Quarterly yielded four articles dealing with cartoons. The first of these, "Chicago Tribune Cartoons During and After the McCormick Era," by Rothman and Olmsted, is a content analysis of eight categories during two four-year periods of the front page Chicago Tribune cartoons. The cartoons were analyzed for frequency of appearance on the front page, scope (local, national, or international topics), topicality (current or "perennial" issues), mode of characterization (identifiable persons, symbolic figures, or both), polarity (positive, negative, or neutral in intent), recurrent terms: words, labels, or phrases, and
dominant themes.15 The only category used by the authors that is directly relevant to this study was "mode of characterization." Within that category, Rothman and Olmsted classified all cartoons as containing either specific individuals in public life or "symbolic figures," explained by the authors as "Uncle Sam, the Democratic donkey, etc.--"16 The authors identified the individuals portrayed in the cartoons and reported the frequency of their appearance and whether they were shown in a positive, negative, or neutral light. Cartoons in their sample containing "symbolic figures" appeared more frequently (64.1%) than those containing actual people (13.8%) or cartoons using both modes (22.1%). Although the "symbolic" category clearly relevant to the concerns of this study was more frequent, it was not analyzed beyond determining the occurrence percentage reported above.17

Two other empirical studies of cartoons have appeared in Journalism Quarterly, both investigating the effectiveness of editorial cartoons as persuasion. Del Brinkman studied the effectiveness of editorials and editorial cartoons together in achieving opinion change. Brinkman presented cartoons and editorials to 230 Indiana University students in 23 different conditions. His general findings were that cartoons and editorials presenting the same opinion using the same arguments were the most effective in achieving opinion change.18 LeRoy M. Carl conducted a
study for his doctoral dissertation on the interpretation of cartoons by readers in three communities. Carl measured readers' interpretations against intended messages of their work submitted by 18 cartoonists. Significantly for this study, the author proposes that, among other variables, the "ability to see analogies" is important in understanding cartoons.19

The four studies discussed above are mainly relevant to the argument that little research has been done on editorial cartoons. All the authors mention the scarcity of cartoon studies and the need for further research. In particular, Rothman and Olmsted's content analysis of the Chicago Tribune inadvertently points out a need for a theoretical analysis of cartoon messages. In their analysis of "mode of characterization" the authors imply by omission that the only mode in cartoons other than representations of actual public figures are cartoon cliches like Uncle Sam and the Democratic donkey. Rothman and Olmsted did not attempt further analysis of cartoon technique, which leaves a substantial gap in present knowledge of the medium. Brinkman's study of the effectiveness of editorial and cartoon combinations also fails to deal with modes of communication particular to cartoons. He says that cartoons using the same arguments as accompanying editorials are more effective than cartoons using other topics or espousing another point of view, but he does not hypothesize the cause
of this finding, nor does he address the question of how cartoons present arguments. LeRoy Carl deals more directly with cartoon content in his comparison of readers' interpretations with cartoonists' intended meanings. Carl found a substantially low correlation between the two, and his speculation that a cause may be readers' poor understanding of analogy encourages a study of cartoonists' formulation of analogy or its condensed version, metaphor.

A further glance at articles in journalism reveals little else relevant to this study. Jack Bender in "The Outlook for Editorial Cartooning" has gathered practitioners' testimony as to the present and future of the art, but their statements do not address the question of style or form. Everette and Melvin Dennis are more useful. In "100 Years of Political Cartooning" they discuss the evolution of style in cartoons, and maintain that cartoonists of the 'Seventies were reverting back to the techniques of Nast and his contemporaries, who "invented the use of extended metaphor in caricaturing a person or group." The authors do not go beyond the above statement in discussing the use of metaphor in cartoons, except to characterize it as Nast's innovation. An article published at about the same time by Everette Dennis alone discusses artistic techniques of contemporary cartoonists such as Mauldin and Herblock but does not mention metaphor or analogy.
More closely related to this study are the works of Roy Paul Nelson, a professor of journalism at the University of Oregon and himself a practicing cartoonist. In *Comic Art and Caricature* he reinforces the contention that cartoonists do not express their ideas directly. "An editorial cartoon ordinarily would not depict an event literally; it would instead offer an analogy." Nelson does not spend time theorizing on the nature of metaphor in cartoons; he seems to take it for granted that metaphor is a common and effective technique. The value of Nelson's work to this study lies in his numerous well-chosen examples of the visual metaphors in cartoons. For instance, in his book *Cartooning*, Nelson devotes a section in his discussion of caricature to the metaphorical technique of showing people as animals. His illustrations include Theodore Roosevelt as a frog and William Jennings Bryan as a woodpecker. Nelson uses the terms metaphor, simile, and analogy interchangeably under the general rubric of "figures of speech." He mentions the cartoonist's transformation from verbal to visual images and affirms their value in the cartoon: "For an editorial cartoonist, a figure of speech (visually portrayed) can make a mere illustration on the editorial page into a genuine editorial cartoon." Nelson's books provide background for the researcher as well as insights on cartoons, and are full of cartoon lore and an insider's view of the cartoonist's working environment.
In relation to this essay, the most useful work on cartoons is found, not in the disciplines of communication or journalism but in the field of art criticism. E. H. Gombrich discusses techniques of cartoonists in his metaphorically titled "The Cartoonist's Armory," published in The South Atlantic Quarterly. Here is found, to the knowledge of this writer, the only thorough discussion of the cartoonist's use of metaphor. Visual metaphors, both those that illustrate existing verbal metaphors and those invented by the cartoonist, are "the weapons in his armory." Gombrich supports my contention that little serious work has been produced which investigates the nature of political cartoons. Gombrich mentions illustrated histories which are a primary source of political cartoons but suggests that "it is in the nature of these books that they take the cartoon for granted, as we all do when we open our newspapers." Instead, he urges, scholars should investigate cartoons, "not so much for what they can tell about historical events as for what they may reveal about our own minds."

The remainder of Gombrich's article is devoted to showing, through illustrations, the strategies employed by the cartoonists, "the weapons in his armory." Gombrich mentions metaphor as such a strategy in his first example, a 1787 cartoon showing North Carolina's ratification of the
Constitution as the erection of another pillar of "the Great National Dome." He comments on the forgettable nature of the metaphor when articulated orally or in print, but suggests that "something clearly happens to us when the image is lifted out of the flux of speech....The metaphor takes on a greater measure of reality. For clearly the 'edifice of state' is a metaphor and even the state itself is an abstract entity, a shorthand formula...." Importantly to Gombrich, the most faded or commonplace of metaphors is "embodied before the eyes." The cartoonist takes the complex and confused matter of politics and makes it clear for us. Gombrich argues that people want to see social realities concretely, and "the cartoonist...appeals to this tendency and makes it easier for us to treat abstractions as if they were tangible realities." The cartoonist achieves this effect, according to Gombrich, through "the process of condensation and fusion which has always been the major aim of the cartoonist." Gombrich suggests that because of the unique verbal and visual capabilities of cartoons, metaphors supply assertions of different strengths. The cartoon metaphor was far more effective than the verbal metaphor, because of the "possibility of extending the equation into a virtual fusion." The critic supports this with the example of a cartoon showing Pitt as a toadstool: "Many an orator must have called many a minister a 'parasite,' but to make the identity visible
is another matter." Gombrich implies that the visual presence of the cartoon is both a more interesting representation of political ideas and a more persuasive one as well:

...the cartoonist can mythologize the world of politics by physiognomizing it. By linking the mythical with the real he creates that fusion, that amalgam, that seems so convincing to the emotional mind.

Gombrich, however, does not articulate an explanation of the persuasiveness of such metaphorically achieved physiognomy except in Freudian terms. He is content to discuss the similarity Freud points out between the action of humor and the unconscious activity of dreams. "In both cases the fusion of disparate elements results in an unfamiliar and weird configuration which may still hide a lot of sense."

Gombrich's explanations and examples constitute the most intensive study in this review of the processes involved in the perception of cartoons. Gombrich seeks to persuade his readers that cartoons are worth studying and that they are more complex than generally presumed; in this endeavor, the author relies mainly on the cumulative effect of examples rather than depth of analysis. Gombrich raises some interesting issues: that faded verbal metaphors come to life when presented pictorially and that fusion in visual metaphor results in heightened persuasiveness, but he fails to explore them fully, a task that will be attempted in this study.
Rhetorical Studies of Nondiscursive Media

As Turner suggested in the introduction to her study of comic strips, a trend exists among rhetoricians toward the study of non-traditional topics. The purpose of this part of the review is to provide some relevant examples. A proper focus would be to review rhetorical studies of non-discursive modes of address. This would include both visual and aural modes, the study of art and music as persuasion. Studies dealing with music reveal a strong tendency to focus on lyrics. Seward's 1974 dissertation, a rhetorical analysis of four protest songs, is a partial exception. He discusses, for example, the different sound-reproducing capabilities of home stereos and AM radio and the effect of recording techniques on musical enhancement of lyric. Most other rhetorical critics of music exhibit equal-or-less focus on the non-verbal aspects of their subject. Finally, Kosokoff and Carmichael, Thomas, and Mohrmann and Scott, all concentrate on lyrics.

Studies of visual art as rhetoric are sparse, the most commonly attempted genre being rhetorical evaluations of films. Perry's study of Antonioni's film L'Eclisse and Berquist and Greenwood's study of Birth of a Nation are two such examples. Like the research regarding music cited above, both tend to focus on areas other than the films' visual communication. Hendrix and Wood offered some methodological considerations for rhetoricians studying
films, and many empirical studies regarding visual aspects of films are available. Mackay's master's thesis is the most comprehensive examination of visual art as rhetoric. The thesis applies Perelman's concepts of choice, presence, and communion in argument to selected works of modern art and formulates the hypothesis that "an artist's style is either an analogy, allegory, or metaphor of his world view." In relation to these investigations, this essay will focus on non-discursive elements of the cartoon and will analyze instrumental means rather than instrumental ends of choice, presence, and communion.

Three major schools of thought consider the cognitive function of metaphor. The first emphasizes that metaphor serves the purpose of naming; that is, metaphors are invented instead of coining a new word to fill some linguistic need. Suzanne Langer holds that we use metaphor as a way of naming and hence ordering and understanding the world around us. Metaphor, she maintains, is "a natural process, born of practical exigencies." When we need to express that for which we have no name, we use an existing symbol that names the referent metaphorically through emphasis on commonalities in the literal meaning of the name used and the thing to which the name is applied. William Brown cites an example of the word "hood" used metaphorically to refer to the engine cover of an automobile that illustrates the naming concept in metaphor. "For the
everyday use of language the disparities between things compared (steel coverings for engines and cloth coverings for heads) 'cancel one another' with only the 'relevant feature in common' (coverings) surviving."

The second view is a traditional one, that metaphor serves to enhance messages; this view emphasizes that metaphor functions as embellishment or illustration. This notion goes back at least to the classical rhetoric of Aristotle, who felt that metaphor had two basic functions: entertainment and explanation. Aristotle maintained that metaphor could elicit attention from audiences because of its novelty. In discussing the function of metaphor in argument he said that "we should give our language a 'foreign air;' for men admire what is remote, and that which excites admiration is pleasant." Aristotle felt that metaphor was an addition to an argument rather than a substantial part of the argument itself. The other function that seems pervasive in Aristotle and, at first glance, seems in conflict with the previous view, is metaphor's use in explanation: "Use metaphors...by way of illustration, taking care, however, to avoid the poetical." Evidently, Aristotle felt that a comparison between referents of vastly different spheres was too fantastic for the practical business of rhetoric. But since he considered metaphor's novelty an asset, he apparently saw an appropriate middle ground in metaphor between the fantastic and the banal.
The notion of metaphor as embellishment or illustration remained popular through the British neoclassical period and is still preserved by composition textbooks and rhetorics, which commonly present metaphor as a speaker's or writer's tool to enliven or clarify a topic. Macrimmon and Schor and Fishman both discuss metaphor in this fashion.

The third approach to metaphor function is the most relevant to this study. It subsumes a number of other categories and is the most far-reaching of the three in this review. A number of contemporary thinkers from diverse fields view metaphor comprehensively as a way of knowing. Many writers who explore the value of metaphor in science include poetry as a second example of metaphor's epistemological function.

One such author is Douglas Berggren, in "The Use and Abuse of Metaphor, I." Berggren's piece is a thorough discussion of the conditions of metaphor as epistemic. In this first article on the subject, poetry provides his major examples. Berggren first dispenses with three traditional views of metaphor. The first two he dismisses as not worth refutation: the view of metaphor as embellishment and Aristotle's notion that it is also an illustrative comparison, which views, Berggren asserts, were responsible for metaphor being "traditionally considered a hindrance rather than a help to any serious cognitive pursuit; and
hence the study of metaphor was banished to the domains of rhetoric and biblical exegesis." Refuted also is a later view of Vico, Croce, and Collingwood that metaphor is a pre-cognitive expression of the experienced world. To Berggren, these men had contended that metaphor precedes analysis or conceptualization as a way to order or make sense of experience. This view, Berggren contends, is interesting for its assertion that metaphor contributes specific knowledge about experience, but ultimately Berggren rejects it as having the same shortcoming as the traditional view; first, in that "the traditional dichotomy between metaphor and all intellectual pursuits was made even more pronounced," and finally in that such pre-cognitive theory does not differentiate between poetic metaphor and other kinds of couplings of referents.

Berggren argues instead for a "theory of metaphorical tension," the conditions of which he sets out in a cogent manner. The first condition is that the second term of a metaphor, what Richards calls the "vehicle," and what Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca call the "theme," have two referents. (He contends that this point is consistent not only for verbal, but for iconic metaphor as well). The second condition is that referents of the metaphor must be from sufficiently different spheres "that a literal...reading of the sign combination in question would result in either logical or empirical absurdity." Berggren's third
condition is that in spite of the divergence between referents, there must be a meaningful link, some commonality between them, so that the metaphor has "the outreach and extension of meaning through comparison." Berggren further divides this overall comparison view of metaphor into three categories: pictorial, structural (used by science and philosophy), and textural (used by poetry).

Berggren moves the notion of metaphor beyond comparison in his fourth condition that metaphor "introduces new meaning by construing the one referent in terms of the other." It is here that he stresses the importance of the metaphor preserving the differences in the referents so that meanings interact and a tensional state is maintained.

Berggren's final point is a warning against the transformation of metaphor into myth. Myth, Berggren contends, "is a believed absurdity, believed because the absurdity goes unrecognized." When fusion of metaphorical components occurs, the tension between the two disappears, the disparities are lost, and metaphor becomes myth. This, in Berggren's view, is the abuse of metaphor rather than its rightful and appropriate use. We shall see an example of a metaphor whose "absurdity goes unrecognized" in Max Black's discussion of theoretical models when he describes the hydraulic theory of electricity. Berggren's views will be further analyzed in Chapter II and later chapters of this study.
Max Black, whose interaction view of metaphor Berggren quotes admiringly, is another advocate of metaphor as a way of knowing. In the opening paragraph of his section on metaphor, philosopher Black maintains that his colleagues "assume that metaphor is incompatible with serious thought." He, like Berggren, feels that traditional views of metaphor are inadequate for all cases and offers an addition to the substitution (naming) and comparison (illustration or embellishment) views whose weakness, Black says, is that they are readily reducible to literal terms. Black's "interaction" view of metaphor attempts to account for metaphor's intellectual and creative properties. The terms of the metaphor interact so that "the focal word...obtains a new meaning, which is not quite its meaning in literal uses, nor quite the meaning which any literal substitute would have." Of the three views of metaphor, only the interaction view is important in philosophy or science. "Their $\square$ mode of operation requires the reader to use a system of implications (a system of 'common-places'--or a special system designed for the use in hand) as a means for selecting, emphasizing, and organizing relations is a different field."63

Black discusses the relationship of metaphor to science in a subsequent chapter of his book, "Models and Archetypes." As with metaphor, Black formulates three types of models, the last of which is the most active. To Black,
the scale model and the analogue model both have substantial limitations as creative forces in scientific thought. The purpose of the scale model is to produce a "relatively manipulable embodiment" of some original to show in some way, how it works. Its limitation is that one cannot depend on its accuracy since there is always some distortion involved in a change of dimension and materials. The analogue model differs from the scale model in that, instead of reproducing the entirety of the original, it attempts to reproduce merely the structure of the original in some other medium. The analogue model is isomorphic; that is, it imitates "not a set of features or an identical proportionality of magnitudes but, more abstractly, the same structure of pattern of relationships." Analogue models share some of the shortcomings of scale models, and Black contends that they are grave; "the risks of fallacious inference from inevitable irrelevancies and distortions in the model are now present in an aggravated measure." Nonetheless, as with scale models, analogue models require independent checks.

The difference between an analogue model and Black's last type, the theoretical model, begins as a linguistic one that ultimately changes the model's capabilities and the ontological commitment made to it. Analogical models are "heuristic fictions" and lack explanatory power. Theoretical models are "existential statements" whose use
"consists in introducing a new language of dialect, suggested by a familiar theory but extended to a new domain of application." Consider a social scientist trying to determine how rumor spreads. The referent he finds most useful in theorizing about how rumor spreads is disease. If our scientist uses that referent in an analogue model, he will be making a comparison: rumor spreads like disease spreads. If he uses a theoretical model, however, disease will become more than a way to describe rumor; the two will be united indivisibly, as in "rumor is a disease"—the phenomenon and the model will become one, "existential." Speaking of something as if it belonged to another domain is substantially different from speaking of something as being in that domain. Black contends that the former is a comparison similar to simile or analogy; he maintains that the latter "requires an identification typical to metaphor." The danger of theoretical models is the same danger Berggren describes as myth, or the abuse of metaphor. When the scientist believes in his model as the literal truth, then the model constitutes the original, and the model, as Berggren's metaphor, becomes myth. But Black feels that the benefits of theoretical models are sufficient to outweigh this danger, for models enable the scientist to "see new connections." Black likens the detractors of scientific models to those who believe that metaphor is an embellishment and describes the benefits of theoretical
models by describing those of metaphors:

A memorable metaphor has the power to bring two separate domains /spheres/ into cognitive and emotional relation by using language directly appropriate to one as a lens for seeing the other; the implications, suggestions, and supporting values entwined with the literal use of the metaphorical expression enable us to see a new subject matter in a new way. The extended meanings that result, the relations between initially disparate realms created, can neither be antecedently predicted nor subsequently paraphrased in prose. We can comment upon the metaphor, but the metaphor itself neither needs nor invites explanation and paraphrase. Metaphorical thought is a distinctive mode of achieving insight, not to be construed as an ornamental substitute for plain thought.74

I. A. Richards, like Berggren and Black, takes issue with the trivialization of metaphor, which Richards says has its roots in Aristotle's emphasis on similarities and continued with the British rhetoricians of the 18th century. But Richards feels that, far from being a special case of ornament to prose, "metaphor is an omnipresent principle of language." That Richards views metaphor as a way of knowing is evident in his contention that it is "a borrowing between and intercourse of thoughts, a transaction between contexts." Like Black and Berggren, Richards asserts the creative function of metaphor. He maintains that "the co-presence of the vehicle and tenor results in a meaning (to be clearly distinguished from the tenor) which is not attainable without their interaction." Richards' primary examples of metaphorical creation are poetic rather than scientific, but his theory is similar to
Black's and Berggren's in certain key ways. Like Berggren, he feels that the power derived from metaphor lies not in fusion of, but in tension between tenor and vehicle. Richards contends that "talk about the identification or fusion that a metaphor effects is nearly always misleading and pernicious." Richards feels that "true" metaphor does not effect fusion between its terms, and with Black, contends that the comparison notion of metaphor is only part of a complete view. "Once we begin to examine attentively interactions which do not work through resemblance between tenor and vehicle, but depend on other relations between them, including disparities, some of our prevalent, over-simple, ruling assumptions about metaphor as comparisons are soon exposed." Of the three views of metaphor presented in this review, that of metaphor as a way of knowing is both the most complex and the most relevant to this study. The three authors examined with respect to this view are fairly representative of the general trend of thought in this area. Berggren, Black, and Richards dispense with the two schools of thought preceding this section and contend that an accurate theory of metaphor rightfully includes it in the mainstream of intellectual endeavors. To regard metaphor solely as a response to linguistic exigency, as in naming, or as a decorative addendum to "real" ideas, as in
embellishment, is a simplistic and dangerous view. The authors contend, rather, that metaphor has a creative function in philosophy, science, and poetry, providing insights in those areas that are irreproduceable. Metaphor is not a comparison but an interaction of its terms which produces knowledge not originally contained in those terms. Richards and Berggren emphasize the importance of retention of differences among entities "compared" to preserve metaphorical tension.

Black adapts the fusion principle of metaphor to his discussion of theoretical models. To Black, fusion is a way that the scientist can exploit his model more fully; the scientist thinks and speaks of his model as being one with the original. Berggren warns us, however, that a fused metaphor misleads us into myth. For Richards, fusion is pedestrian; a tensive metaphor which takes some meaning from disparities is much more frequent and interesting. In general, these views are not incompatible with each other, as they seem to be with Perelman's theory, to be discussed in the next chapter. In chapter two, moving from the literature review to conceptualizing the study, I shall explore the concepts of tension in relation to metaphorical fusion more fully and relate the concept of the enthymeme to metaphor.
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CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL FORMULATIONS

The Enthymeme

The enthymeme has been a concern of students of rhetoric ever since Aristotle called them "the substance of rhetorical persuasion."¹ In the last century, particularly with the emergence of speech communication as a separate discipline, the precise nature of the enthymeme has been a matter of much investigation.² Of the many discussions of enthymemes, only Bitzer,³ Cronkhite,⁴ and Delia⁵ emphasize as their most important feature the notion that enthymemes grow out of propositions supplied by the audience. These authors present convincing arguments for that idea, but with the exception of Lloyd Bitzer, largely neglect the process by which the speaker uses the audience's belief system to make a claim. Further, as we shall see, Bitzer leaves gaps in his explanation.

Bitzer, in "Aristotle's Enthymeme Revisited," contends that enthymemes, "the strongest possible proofs," are constructed jointly by speaker and audience and are therefore "self-persuasive."⁶ Audiences, in Bitzer's view, supply the premises for enthymemes by associating the speakers'
messages with propositions already known or believed. Persuasion takes place because "the audience views a conclusion as required by the premises it subscribes to." 7

Bitzer summarizes his theory thus:

The speaker draws the premises for his proofs from propositions which members of his audience would supply if he were to proceed by question and answer, and the syllogisms produced in this way are enthymemes.

The point to be emphasized, then, is that enthymemes occur only when speaker and audience jointly produce them. Because they are jointly produced, enthymemes intimately unite speaker and audience and provide the strongest possible proofs...Since rhetorical arguments, or enthymemes, are formed out of premises supplied by the audience, they have the virtue of being self-persuasive...the audience itself helps construct the proofs by which it is persuaded. 8

Bitzer discusses the circumstances around which enthymemes occur but leaves a crucial gap in the theory. He refers to a tacit exercise in dialectic between speaker and audience which, if we were to verbalize it, might go something like this:

Speaker: You all know that A is true, am I right?

Audience: Yes, we know that.

Speaker: You know also that B is true, is that not so?

Audience: Yes, we know that as well.

Speaker: Well, if A is true and B is true, then C, my claim, is also true, don't you agree?

Audience: Why, we never thought of it that way before.

Of course, you are right.

Bitzer assumes that supplying premises for enthymemes will
persuade audiences of the final claim. But what if the audience response to the last question is "Absolutely not. A and B have nothing to do with C." Must the audience accept the speaker's claim "as required by the premises it subscribes to?" Not necessarily. The key to the success or failure of an enthymeme lies in the connection the speaker creates between premises supplied by the audience and his claim. It is this connection that has not been fully explained.

A more thorough understanding of this relationship can be gained through an application of Bitzer's theory of the enthymeme to the editorial cartoon. For an example, we can look at David Levine's famous caricature of Lyndon Johnson. Levine uses enthymatic argument in his pictorial reference to an incident in 1966 when Johnson, after a gall bladder operation, lifted his shirt to show the scar to reporters. The press made much of this act; Johnson had disgraced himself and his office by revealing the presidential person to reporters and, through them, to the world. Through his reference to the incident, Levine's readers supply the generally known proposition that Johnson's behavior was inappropriate in that instance. Levine depicts the act of revealing the scar; the readers associate it with the criticism of the act that they have read or heard. Levine's central assertion is not, however, that Johnson's behavior was crude or undignified; as Moynahan contends, Levine makes
a statement about the Vietnam war. He refers to the war by replacing the scar on Johnson's stomach with a map of Vietnam, and it is through this strategy that Levine constructs his enthymeme. When the reader looks at the drawing of Johnson, he sees at once a scar and an outline of Vietnam. The scar evokes associations of undignified behavior, crudeness, embarrassment, etc., in the reader, which associations, because of the map's presence, are also connected in the reader's mind with Vietnam. But Levine's argument is more substantial than association or suggestion. Levine, by making one image refer to a scar (what Richards would call the "vehicle" of the metaphor) and to Vietnam (what Richards would call the "tenor") has bound the two referents indivisibly. He invites scar-associations from the reader which, because of the double referents inherent in the single image, become Vietnam-associations. The function of an enthymeme is to connect so securely the arguer's claim to a proposition supplied and adhered to by the audience that a belief in the former necessitates a belief in the latter. What Bitzer fails to explain is how the connection may be accomplished. One way, of course, is by association. Proximity of audience's propositions to arguer's claims may be sufficient, and so may similarities in proposition and claim. But far stronger than these strategies is the complete unification of the two, and it is this tactic that Levine uses. By presenting his proposition
(disgrace-scar-associations supplied by the readers) and his claim (Vietnam-associations-as-disgrace to which he wants adherence) as one image, Levine successfully constructs a visual enthymematic proof.

Metaphor

This study focuses on argumentative strategies used by editorial cartoonists to communicate political messages. In examining how metaphor functions in such a circumstance, we must take a more penetrating look at this phenomenon. The simpler notions of metaphor discussed in the review will be omitted from this examination. Metaphor as embellishment, as nomenclature, and as illustrative comparison are perhaps adequate for the study of metaphor in argument, but not for a study of metaphor as argument. In editorial cartoons, a single metaphor may constitute the entire message. In that case, we may no longer speak of metaphor as an aid to argument; the metaphor is the argument, and these basic views of metaphor will not suffice for the explanation of that argument.

Thus, we must return to the third view of metaphor discussed in the previous chapter: metaphor as a way of knowing. In the last chapter this examination was organized by authors. In this chapter, two important aspects that emerge from the works of these authors will be discussed: metaphorical tension and metaphorical fusion.
The Theory of Metaphorical Tension

When certain scholars began to branch out from various traditional views of metaphor, one of their first steps was to venture beyond the notion that the meaning in metaphor lies in similarities between the things compared.

I. A. Richards was among the first to posit that differences are an important component in metaphorical meaning. He felt that for a fuller understanding of metaphor, one should examine not just the similarities of the terms, but "other relations between them, including disparities." Richards contends that "comparison, as a stressing of likeness, is not the whole mode of...metaphor, though it commonly is in 18th century writing." Berggren, too, feels that metaphor is more than emphasis on similarities. He argues that the terms of a metaphor "are transformed and yet preserved," implying that among the qualities preserved are differences. Explicitly, in Berggren's view, retention of differences is crucial to metaphorical meaning: "If the initial differences between the two referents were not simultaneously preserved, even while the referents were being transformed into closer alignment, the metaphorical character of the construing process would be lost." The role of disparities in metaphor is further explained by William Brown as he examines the action of metaphor in poetry. The "metaphorical character" that Berggren contends would be missing without retaining a sense of
differences between the terms is discussed by Brown when he talks about the differences between metaphor in its everyday and its poetic use. According to Brown, the preservation of differences in a metaphor keeps it from fading. He illustrates the fading process with the examples of a "dry" martini and a "cold" personality. Brown contends that such metaphors serve an everyday naming function and that, as such, "disparities between things compared must be 'cancelled out' in order that a liquid can be 'dry' and a non-physical personality can be 'cold.'" When differences are de-emphasized and fall away, the metaphor becomes literal, and loses, as Berggren says, its "metaphorical character." Brown argues that it is precisely this that the poet wants to avoid. For the poet, "the metaphor must not fade into the literalness that follows from dissociation of differences." Instead, Brown contends that differences in poetic metaphor "appear as paradoxical similarities with an accompanying experience of mystical transport."

It is clear then, that retaining differences, in the view of these authors, is crucial to the function of what we might call "more important" metaphors. But how do these differences work in metaphor? It is in consideration of this question that the tension theory arises. As with differences, Richards is again the first theorist to discuss tension between the terms in a metaphor as an important
contribution to their working. The notion of tension arises when Richards discusses what he considers to be the "excessive reaction" from traditional views of metaphor, that one can create metaphors merely by juxtaposing things from vastly different spheres. While Richards views this notion as crude, he acknowledges the value of the force a poet creates when he invites his reader to assimilate ideas in this manner. "In all interpretation we are filling in connections, and for poetry, of course, our freedom to fill in--the absence of explicitly stated intermediate steps--is a main source of its powers....As the things put together are more remote, the tension created is, of course, greater." Richards qualifies this statement by maintaining that force or power is not the only criterion for a metaphor but also argues that "what seems an impracticable connection...can at once turn into an easy or powerful adjustment." The notion of tension is explored further in Berggren's work. He calls "the theory of metaphorical tension" a much-needed development and a "different and far more adequate account of metaphor." Berggren's elaboration of the tension theory is a further explanation of Brown's description of paradox. "On the one hand, a logical or empirical absurdity stands in apparent conflict with the possible truth. On the other hand, this possible truth may itself depend upon a creative interaction between diverse perspectives which cannot be literalized or disentangled
Tension, it would appear, results from the action of opposing forces in a metaphor. The metaphor's literal absurdity, which arises from significant differences between the referents, tends to push those referents apart, while the aptness of the metaphor on some other level tends to pull them together. The metaphor which incorporates differences in concepts compared and which retains them as a part of the expression tends to preserve the metaphor's original tension between similarities and disparities and thus, because of this dynamism, remains what has commonly been called, "live." The key ingredient in metaphorical tension, then, is the differences in the comparison which serve to remind us that the metaphor, in fact, is a metaphor, and if obscured, literalize, or kill the metaphorical quality of the expression.

The Theory of Metaphorical Fusion

Another direction that scholars took in exploring metaphor's epistemological qualities is an examination of the effect of fusion in metaphor. Fundamentally, fusion is the unification of the referents, the tenor and vehicle, in a metaphor, but there are marked differences in opinion regarding how this occurs and with what result. I. A. Richards mentions fusion in metaphor briefly and disparagingly:
We must not, with the 18th Century, suppose that the interactions of tenor and vehicle are to be confined to their resemblances. There is disparity action too... Thus, talk about the identification or fusion that a metaphor effects is nearly always misleading and pernicious. In general, there are very few metaphors in which disparities between tenor and vehicle are not as much operative as the similarities. Some similarity will commonly be the ostensive ground of the shift, but the peculiar modification of the tenor which the vehicle brings about is even more the work of their unlikelihoods than their likenesses.28

As Richards indicates above, he believes fusion to be a result of emphasis on similarities and the consequent neglect or suppression of differences in the terms of a metaphor. Since Richards views tension as a dependence on differences and fusion as a dependence on similarities, it is clear that for him, tension and fusion are opposites. Richards further suggests that fusion is rarely present in metaphor at all, or at least that fusion is not what metaphor is really about.

Berggren discusses fusion in metaphor at more length and, unlike Richards, deals with the effect metaphorical fusion has on understanding and knowledge. Fusion, according to Berggren, occurs when the terms of a metaphor are "univocally conjoined,"29 that is, forming a single unit of meaning. He supports Richards' assertion that fusion results from suppression of differences, and suggests that this suppression transforms metaphor into myth, "the most serious and interesting danger"30 of metaphorical expression. Myth, deplored by Berggren as the "abuse of
metaphor," is a "believed absurdity: a belief which is distanced or exalted, so that its supposed profundity or momentary persuasiveness offsets or masks the mere absurdity involved." By "absurdity" we can assume that Berggren means differences. He feels that, given a prior clear awareness of the distinctions between A and B, if one then as a result of metaphorical construing, genuinely believes that A is B, the original metaphor is transformed into myth. Berggren summarized his theory with a diagram that explains the transformation. "Sign focus" is used by Berggren to refer to what Richards calls the "vehicle" of a metaphor. In the sentence "The student plunged into her work," the sign focus is "plunged." What Berggren calls the subsidiary subject is the literal connotation of "plunged," as in someone having plunged into water, and what he calls the "principal subject" is the student's action regarding her work. The "transformed assimilation" of Berggren's model is the result of "the process of metaphorical construing," a vision of one referent as seen in terms of the other, which changes the meaning of both.
With $F$ standing for the sign focus of the metaphor, $S$ for the subsidiary subject, $P$ for the principal subject, and $T$ for the transformed assimilation of $S$ and $P$, the use and abuse of metaphor can be fairly clearly distinguished by two rather simple assertions. The legitimate and vital use of metaphor, while transforming $S$ and $P$ in the direction of $T$, by means of some principle of assimilative construing, simultaneously retains their initial separation. Myth, on the other hand, momentarily ignores the perspective defined by the triangle FSP, and thus retains only the transformed fusion of $S$ and $P$ in the perspective defined by the triangle SPT.

It is useful to read Berggren's diagram from top to bottom to see what he means by myth. If we move from $F$, the sign focus (vehicle) of the metaphor, to the subsidiary and principal subjects, we retain an awareness of their differences and the distance between them; if we move in the direction of fusion from the points $S$ and $P$, at the end we have only $T$, the transformed assimilation of $S$ and $P$, and our original awareness of their individual status has been left behind.

Berggren seems to have impaired the thoroughness of his discussion of fusion in metaphor by his aversion to it. In his view, fusion of metaphorical referents results in falsehood. By positing oneness of metaphorical terms, we neglect or assimilate real differences between them, and to Berggren no insight or creation results that can compensate for such literal inaccuracy. Only by tension, perpetual awareness of disparities, can we avoid fusion, metaphor's deterioration into myth.

Black's explanation of the conditions of metaphorical fusion are not incompatible with Berggren's, but the two
are clearly at odds when discussing effects of fusion. As was mentioned in Chapter I, Black evaluates fusion from the perspective of its use as an aid to scientific thought. Fusion is described by Black in his discussion of the scientist's theoretical model. The theoretical model arises from the fusion of a model and the phenomenon it describes. Black distinguishes it from mathematical and analogue models with the example of the development of Maxwell's theory of electrical fields as ether.

There is certainly a vast difference between treating the ether as a mere heuristic convenience, as Maxwell's first remarks require, and treating it in Kelvin's fashion as 'real matter' having definite—though to be sure, paradoxical—properties independent of our imagination. The difference is between thinking of the electrical field as if it were filled with a material medium, and thinking of it as being such a medium.38

As with Berggren, the difference between the two modes of expression described is an awareness of the disparities. Black compares this distinction to the difference between analogy and metaphor, a statement that, as we shall see later, Chaim Perelman would agree with. Black elaborates on the movement from non-fusion to fusion of thought:

In as if thinking there is a willing suspension of ontological unbelief, and the price paid... is absence of explanatory power. Here we might speak of the use of models as heuristic fictions. In risking existential statements, however, we reap the advantages of an explanation but are exposed to the dangers of self-deception by myths (as the subsequent history of the ether sufficiently illustrates).39
Black's notion of fusion is substantially similar to Berggren's. The "existential statements" Black talks about occur when the model and the phenomenon, Berggren's "principal" and "subsidiary" subjects are fused, or seen as one. Indeed, we could chart the ontological changes in thought that Black describes on Berggren's diagram. "As if" thinking is defined by the upper triangle FSP, where a sign focus, referring to two referents, maintains the tension or awareness of differences between them; the change from "as if" to "as being" is defined by the lower triangle SPT, where differences between S and P are lost, and only the "transformed assimilation" of S and P remains. Where Black sees beyond Berggren is that fusion, the "transformed assimilation" is valuable to the scientist.

The existential use of models seems to me characteristic of the practice of the great theorists in physics. Whether we consider Kelvin's 'rude mechanical models,' Rutherford's solar system, or Bohr's model of the atom, we can hardly avoid concluding that these physicists conceived themselves to be describing the atom as it is, and not merely offering mathematical formulas in fancy dress. In using theoretical models, they were not comparing two domains from a position neutral to both. They used language appropriate to the model in thinking about the domain of application; they worked not by analogy, but through and by means of an underlying analogy. Their models were conceived to be more than expository or heuristic devices.

Precisely what benefit does the fusion in Black's theoretical model give the scientist? Black posits that the use of theoretical models "permits assertions about the secondary
domain /the subsidiary subject or the literal implications of the model/ to yield insight into the original field. To Black, the benefits of fusion in models is similar to the benefits of fusion in metaphor. "They, too, bring about a wedding of disparate subjects by a distinctive operation of transfer of the implications of relatively well-organized cognitive fields." Black maintains that these models, like metaphors, "help us to notice what otherwise would be overlooked, to shift the relative emphasis attached to details—in short, to see new connections." At this level, both poetry and science require the fusion of concepts in order to make "new connections" between the two in the former and from one to the other in the latter.

In further discussion of fusion, Chaim Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca shift ground from its use in poetry and science to its use in argument. For students of argument, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca cover new ground. In general, metaphor has been discussed in argument, rather than as argument. In their introduction to metaphor, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca mention this tendency, maintaining that "though everyone recognizes it as an essential factor in imaginative thinking, it had been viewed with distrust when used as a means of proof." Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca do not share that distrust and feel that, because of fusion, metaphor is superior to analogy as evidence. Unlike Berggren, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca do not relate
unawareness of differences to fusion. They explain their perspective of metaphor thus:

In the context of argumentation, at least, we cannot better describe a metaphor than by conceiving it as a condensed analogy, resulting from the fusion of an element from the phoros /tenor/ with an element from the theme /vehicle/ ...Through this fusion, the analogy is presented not as a suggestion but as a datum. In other words, metaphor can be used to improve the standing of the analogy.

It is accordingly not surprising to find in arguments by analogy that the author not infrequently employs metaphors derived from the proposed analogy, so as to accustom the reader to see things as he depicts them. It is only quite rarely that phoros and theme will be stated independently of each other.52

The authors neglect to explain fully what they mean by "fusion" and how, as they assert, fusion enables metaphor to function more effectively as proof than analogy. We can more readily understand Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's view if we recall our early lessons in analogy, characterized in our early English lessons as simile. The traditional view is that a simile, as in "She was like a mother to me," is a stated comparison, and metaphor, as in "She was a mother to me," is an implied comparison. When one learns this distinction in seventh-grade English class, the inference is that simile, being stated, is the stronger assertion. But what Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca contend is that analogy (simile) being a stated comparison, is a suggestion of likeness, whereas metaphor is the stronger statement, a bold assertion rather than a suggestion or implication. In analogy, the terms are juxtaposed; in metaphor, they are joined.
Metaphor functions as a datum not by asserting likeness, but oneness. Nowhere is this seen more clearly than in David Levine's cartoon of Lyndon Johnson.

Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca suggest that metaphors are data which arise from a fusion of their terms. A cursory glance at Levine's cartoon reveals an exemplar of their theory. The elements, Johnson's scar and a representation of Vietnam, are visually fused; one image refers to both. Instead of the analogy, "Vietnam is like a scar," we have the more direct assertion, "Vietnam is a scar." The authors contend that the metaphor is therefore a datum rather than a suggestion. To me, it appears that the arguer using such a visual metaphor has some inherent potentiality of persuasion. In analogy the terms of the metaphor are separated and can be driven further apart in rebuttal so that the comparison an arguer makes is weakened. One could, for example, state that Vietnam is somewhat, in some instances, at some levels, etc., like a scar. The fact that the elements of comparison are separated enables a refuter to drive a wedge of rhetoric between them and seriously undermine the argument. On the other hand, elements in a metaphor are fused; since they cannot so easily be separated, the metaphor is less easily refuted. Further, in a picture using one visual construction to refer to two elements, those elements cannot be divided; in removing one of them, a would-be refuter removes the other. His only recourse is
to deny the image entirely, a difficult process if he is working with a visual medium. Moreover, if a critic wishes to refute an arguer's claim, he must first articulate it and then offer an alternative. The difficulty lies in replacing a visual construction. Developed this way, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's proposition that metaphors function more strongly as proof is supported and more fully explained by an examination of Levine's cartoon.

Richards, Black, and Berggren all suggest in various ways that for fusion to occur in metaphor, the differences between its terms must fall away. This is a view that required further exploration, and the question of retention of differences in a metaphor will be addressed later in the chapter. Additionally, these authors view metaphor from the perspective of its use in poetry or science, and do not speak directly to its use in persuasion. Of the three only Black discusses some other process that may be causing fusion when he says that scientists use language to work "through" an analogy which makes their models "more than expository or heuristic devices." To Black, the terms of a metaphor achieve oneness through this process; the scientist effects ontological change and asserts in his way of speaking not that A is like B, but that A is B. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca maintain that such an assertion makes what would be a mere suggestion (comparable in my view, to Black's "heuristic devices") a "datum" which, among
other benefits discussed by Black, means a considerable increase in persuasive force. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, interestingly enough, offer the political cartoon as an exemplar of what they mean by fusion.56

We have seen this idea work in David Levine's cartoon, but it needs further exploration. If a cartoonist compares Jimmy Carter to an ape, he arranges the two side by side so that the reader may see and judge the comparison. The tension between the two entities, supported by awareness of their differences as well as similarities, is much in evidence. The reader has the opportunity to determine whether the comparison is apt or not; if he decides that the comparison does not make sense, that the "tone" of the two clashes unbearably with no redeeming insights resulting from their juxtaposition, he can separate one from the other because the artist has already done so before him. If, on the other hand, the artist asserts, through his unification of the two images, that Jimmy Carter is an ape, the reader is less able to judge whether the comparison is apt, because there is no longer a comparison, there is only, as Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca say, a "datum."57

The main question that remains is precisely what our image of Jimmy Carter-as-ape is. First, has fusion occurred in the image? This would be hard to deny, even from Berggren's or Black's perspective. It is obvious that neither author has thought of visual metaphor except as a
way to talk about the cognitive processing of words, but the fact that both referents, Carter and ape, are "univocally conjoined,"\(^{58}\) that they cannot be separated, seems evidence enough to support the argument that fusion is present. Second, is this image a real, "vital" (as Berggren would say), or important metaphor? Richards and Berggren would deny this, if it is fused. According to Berggren, fusion creates myth, the "abuse"\(^{59}\) of metaphor, and Richards argues that "talk about the identification or fusion that a metaphor effects is nearly always misleading or pernicious."\(^{60}\) Third, is the image a myth? Berggren, of course, and possibly Black would say yes. Before we agree, however, let us look again at the Carter-as-ape image. There is one image only; the artist has combined Carter-characteristics and ape-characteristics into a single, indivisible unit—fusion has been effected. But, as Berggren says he must, does the reader literally believe that Carter is an ape? Hardly. Here we are faced with the dilemma in which the fusion-tension dichotomy proposed by Berggren and others places us. What maintains the reader's disbelief? And if he does not believe literally that Carter is an ape, then what is the purpose of the cartoon; what does he believe?

It is possible that fusion and tension in metaphor are not discrete categories. It seems to me that in our Carter-ape example, both tension and fusion are involved.
That there is fusion has been demonstrated by the unification of images, so that Carter and ape are united indivisibly. Is there also tension? There must be; otherwise the literal meaning of the image would be taken seriously by the reader, a prospect that is absurd to consider. A re-examination of Brown's notion of paradoxical similarities seems appropriate here, and the word "absurd" is a key to understanding the image. Tension in the metaphor is present not because of separation of its terms, but because, to the sensible reader, the statement cannot be true. The result is an image with a dynamic quality. The main argument or assertion is stronger because of the fusion that has taken place; this fusion has drawn the terms into a unit. Since they are joined, they form what Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca call a "datum,"61 in the picture; the two terms are absolutely the same. But because of the absurdity of the combination, there is tension. The image is impossible, but apt; ridiculous, but true. The dynamism of the image comes, as Berggren and Richards maintain, because of the differences, inherent in the absurdity of the image, pulling away from each other, while the fusion of the image keeps the terms united.

In this chapter, we have seen the several versions of metaphor which inform this study. The theoretical issues involving metaphors and enthymeme that have been the focus of this chapter will be further explored in Chapter III
when methodology is discussed. Three different categories of fusion will be developed from the discussions in this chapter; these categories will form the basis for the rhetorical criticism in Chapter IV of the study's sample of cartoons.
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CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

The basic questions that are addressed in this study deal with the constitution of argument in political cartoons and the utility of rhetorical critics' paradigms to evaluate this medium. In order to investigate these questions, a combination of methodologies will be employed.

Rhetorical Criticism

The basic investigation both of argument in the cartoon and of the applicability of established critical methodology to this configurational medium begins appropriately with rhetorical criticism of political cartoons. The tasks attempted in this study with regard to rhetorical criticism are similar to those confronting the model (or touchstone) critic as described by Swanson:

The model critic...must argue for (1) the appropriateness and defensibility of the theory used to generate his model discourse, for (2) the model itself as the logical and best consequent of the theory, for (3) the accuracy of his representation (description/understanding) of the object of criticism, for (4) the reasonableness of his comparison of that object to the model generated by his theory, and for (5) his conclusion as warranted by his analysis.¹

While all of the tasks articulated by Swanson are addressed to some extent in this study, its foci are particularly the
second and fourth tasks and to a lesser degree the third and fifth.

This study began with the perusal of cartoons as a form of public address. It was assumed that political cartoonists make some form of argument, as rhetoricians understand the term, or that at the least, advance claims to which they want adherence. The initial question of this study was "How do cartoonists use pictures to make arguments?" This question was first approached by an examination of the capabilities of the cartoon medium. The political cartoonist does not have the luxury of extended linear arguments which are available to the speaker or writer; rather, he has a single frame to make his appeal to the public. The rhetorical devices cartoonists use must be compact or condensed; a cartoon cannot present several lines of argument or extensive use of detail. Rather, support for cartoonists' arguments must be included with their claims, to be perceived at the same time. Another constraint which the cartoonist faces was discussed in detail in Chapter I. The cartoon, by its nature, is representational; the cartoonist's pictures bear some visual relation to the "real" objects and people to which they refer. Thus, unlike the wordsmith, the cartoonist has no way to express directly his subject matter, abstract ideas. He must somehow arrange his iconic representations so that in juxtaposition or combination they refer to that which
cannot literally be pictured.

These two constraints bear directly on the rhetorical strategies available to the cartoonist and lead the critic to elimination of those strategies beyond the capabilities of the cartoon. We are left with two established argumentative strategies which can operate in the cartoonist's medium: the enthymeme and the metaphor.

The enthymeme is commonly regarded as a truncated or abbreviated syllogism; it is a linear argument that has been so condensed that it can be stated merely as a claim with a supporting premise understood by the audience. In Chapter II I summarized current thought regarding the enthymeme and argued that a major gap in other discussions was that they overlooked the process by which the arguer connected his claim to a proposition accepted by the audience. We have seen an example of enthymematic argument in David Levine's portrayal of Lyndon Johnson. An examination of this cartoon from the perspective supplied by the enthymeme provided the insight that in Levine's cartoon, at least, the arguer connected his claim to a proposition supplied by the audience by referring both to claim and proposition with one image. From this example, a view of enthymemes appeared in Chapter II which asserts that uniting a premise from the audience with an arguer's claim is a crucial factor in the operation of an enthymeme. As we have seen from the Levine example, rhetorical criticism of
cartoons from this perspective should yield some insight into both the nature of argument in political cartoons and into the nature of the enthymeme as argument.

The second general approach by which political cartoons may be examined is the cartoonist's use of metaphor to make arguments. Like the enthymeme, the metaphor circumvents the constraints on the medium of political cartoons. As Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca maintain, the metaphor is a form of shorthand reasoning. If metaphor is used as an argument, the claim and its support may be presented at once, obviating the need for linear argument. The investigation of metaphor in Chapters I and II indicates that few theorists have treated metaphor alone as capable of constituting the substance of argument; among those who do, there is no consensus regarding how metaphor functions and with what results. From the perspectives developed by those theorists who treat metaphor as a way of knowing (and, hence, arguing), and from other formulations developed in Chapter II, three categories of metaphor have been devised for the criticism of political cartoons. As they all have something to do with the notion of fusion, they have been titled fusion_1, fusion_2, and fusion_3.

Fusion_1 has been formulated from Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's concept that metaphor is a "condensed analogy." In this version, the basic analogy according to Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, has four terms: "A is to B
as C is to D, \(^4\) and the condensed metaphorical form is "the C of B"\(^5\) to designate "A." The analogy, according to Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, is fused, and the resultant metaphor has increased persuasive force; instead of being a suggestion, like analogy, it is a "datum."\(^6\) Because of this condensation or fusion, metaphor can take a stronger role in argument than it is ordinarily thought to have.

Fusion\(_2\) reflects the view that, through the use of paradox, as described by William Brown, fusion and tension can appear in the same metaphor. Fusion occurs because the two referents of the metaphor are unified: presented as a single image. When a cartoonist presents a politician as a circus ringmaster, in the image he literally is a ringmaster. But because it is fantastic or absurd to think of a politician as "really" being a ringmaster, tension is present in the metaphor as well. The absurdity of the comparison pulls the referents apart, but because the image is fused, because it is a visual "fact," the referents are pulled toward each other as well. The comparison is between different or even opposing spheres and is therefore absurd or impossible, but the cartoonist argues through his unification of those referents that it is nonetheless true.

Fusion\(_3\) is derived from Berggren's notion of myth. Characteristics of one referent are attributed to the other because, as in fusion\(_2\), the cartoonist presents them as one. But unlike fusion\(_2\), tension does not contribute to the
image. In fusion, the spheres of comparison are far enough apart to warrant calling the image a metaphor, but they are not ridiculously different. The juncture of referents is apt, but not absurd.

These three explanations of metaphor's function in cartoons and the explanation of enthymeme's function in cartoons will be used as a basis for the rhetorical criticism in the next chapter. It is hoped that this application will provide insights regarding their relative merits in explanation as well as contributing to the understanding of political cartoons as a medium of persuasion.

Selection of Data

We have seen the rhetorical paradigms to be used in the criticism of cartoons in this study; however, before such an examination can occur, criteria had to be established for selecting examples for analysis. Since part of the methodology for this study consists of interviews with cartoonists, (to be discussed later in this chapter) it was decided that samples of their work would be analyzed prior to the interviews and would be the subject for the critical section of this study.

Three criteria led to the selection of cartoonists for this study. Since the aim was to discover how cartoonists make arguments, it seemed desirable to choose those who could do so effectively. Therefore, the first criterion for selection of cartoonists whose work would be used was
that they be nationally known among their colleagues and, further, that they be recognized in some way as "good" cartoonists. Therefore, possible subjects were selected from those who appeared with regularity in anthologies of political cartoons, guaranteeing to some extent that the artists were nationally known. The most consistent way to fulfill the second part of the first criterion was to limit the selection of cartoonists to those who had won a Pulitzer Prize. The second criterion was to choose from among those cartoonists who had at least one anthology of their work published. Further, it was proposed that the anthologized cartoons, presumably their "best" work, would be compared to a selection of cartoons from their everyday pieces for the newspapers, presumably not always as "good" as the work that appeared in anthologies. The third and most limiting criterion for selection of cartoonists for this study was that they be willing to devote at least one hour to a taped interview with the author. The three cartoonists who fulfilled the first two criteria and who were the first cartoonists to agree to an interview were Tony Auth of the Philadelphia Inquirer, Jeff MacNelly of the Richmond Newsleader, and Don Wright of the Miami News.¹

Ten cartoons by each artist were selected from two sources for examination in this study: five from newspapers published in 1978 and five from the anthologized work of each. The year 1978 was chosen for this selection because
it assured availability of cartoons throughout a 12-month period. Specifically, the cartoons were selected by choosing five numbers from a table of random numbers for each sample. The number chosen from the table was used to indicate a specific cartoon appearing in numerical order. For instance, if the number forty-five appeared when MacNelly's newspaper cartoons were being sampled, then the forty-fifth cartoon that appeared in the Richmond Newsleader in 1978 was drawn. If the number eighteen was chosen from the table of random numbers when selecting cartoons from Auth's anthology, then the eighteenth cartoon in the pool was drawn for the study. If a number was drawn from the table that was too high to refer to a cartoon, that number was discarded and another number was drawn. For the unanthologized cartoons, I tried to use the same dates drawn from the sample for all the cartoonists. The dates drawn were September 25, November 21, May 12, July 5, and February 10. Cartoonists, of course, take vacations as we all do, and if one cartoonist did not do a cartoon on the date selected for the sample, another date was chosen from the table of random numbers until a day was found on which he did publish a cartoon.

Interviews

Although critical evaluations such as those proposed earlier in this chapter advance understanding of phenomena, rhetorical critics have often been questioned for failing
to seek validation of their findings; consensual validation had been a part of other researchers' work for some time. In an attempt to corroborate personal judgements as critic and social actor via rhetorical criticism of cartoons, I gathered and analyzed interviews with Pulitzer Prize-winning cartoonists about their art. The interviews were conducted to gather cartoonists' statements about what they do and how their cartoons work. In addition to this information, the cartoonists were questioned to see if rhetorical evaluations of specific cartoons completed previous to their interviews made sense to them.

A focused interview technique was used with the cartoonists, which consisted of open-ended, general questions at the beginning of the interview, giving them the opportunity to respond with as little direction as possible. This was done to enable the artists to speak freely, without being led by the interviewer. The possibility was anticipated that they might have little or no information to give when questioned generally about their work, so a flexible format was designed. The questions, general in the beginning, gradually became more and more specific, so that if information was not forthcoming at first, the more directive, leading questions might lead to more response later in the interview. Some examples of questions used in the interviews are: What do you feel your job is as a political cartoonist? How do you use pictures to communicate your
political views? What are some criteria that contribute to the creation of a good cartoon? How do you evaluate your work or the work of your peers? What are some characteristics usually seen in a "bad" cartoon? What are some techniques that cartoonists use that you think are detrimental to the cartoon's communication? What particular strategies do you like to use to persuade your readers of a particular view? Can you show me some examples in your own work?

A pilot interview was conducted with a local cartoonist, Scott Willis, then of the Ohio State University Lantern, to refine interview techniques and to get his reaction to the interview situation. As I had considered a possibility, Mr. Willis was unable to explain in terms applicable to this study, exactly what he did to communicate to his readers. His responses dealt mainly with matters of artistic style or the source of his ideas rather than with how his style and ideas worked to communicate his messages. It was decided that a more flexible format was needed so that adjustments could be made to the individual interview situations. Additionally, if one of the open-ended questions achieved little or no response, it was decided on the basis of the pilot interview that a more specific probe would follow the general question.

The open-ended questioning period varied, of course, with each interview. If a cartoonist began, for instance, to answer subsequent questions in the interview as a
response to an earlier question, then of course those ques-
tions were not asked. If a cartoonist seemed so impatient
with a particular line of questioning that he was not
responding, then that line was abandoned. For the MacNelly
interview, two interpretations of every cartoon were
devised; that is, two different statements describing his
major argument or claim in the cartoon. These two inter-
pretations of the cartoon message were shown to MacNelly
with explanations from each rhetorical perspective (fusion_1,
fusion_2, etc.) used in the study. Because of MacNelly's
adverse reactions to having his cartoons' messages inter-
preted two ways (he felt that there was only one correct
interpretation--what he meant by the cartoon) this strategy
was eliminated from the interviews with Wright and Auth.

In order to compare how the artist would explain a
cartoon following categories that resulted from his own
analysis derived from the general questions, each artist
was shown five of the ten examples sampled from his work,
from both the anthologized and newspaper sources, and asked
to talk about them. Following that, the cartoonists were
shown the remaining five cartoons with explanations of each
provided by the critical application of the theoretical per-
spectives used in this study. Each cartoon was explained
briefly in terms of the use of enthymemes, and fusion_1,
fusion_2, and fusion_3, the perspectives outlined earlier in
this chapter. These explanations were couched as much as
possible in layman's terms; the criticisms were condensed so that there would be time to cover all five cartoons in the interview. The object of this final inquiry was to determine if such explanations made sense to the cartoonists in terms of how they argue by using visual images. They were asked which explanations, if any, seemed reasonably accurate in describing how their cartoons work, in order to choose which explanation seemed to best reflect what a cartoonist does with images. The cartoons shown with explanations were the remaining five of the ten sampled from their work, both from anthologized and newspaper sources.

Treatment of Data

This section of Chapter III is concerned only with methods for analyzing the three interviews with cartoonists. Rubrics for critical analysis of the cartoons themselves have been discussed earlier in the chapter. The discussion of the interview analysis begins with a statement of precisely what information was sought from the interviews: the main reason for conducting the interviews was to look for corroboration from practicing cartoonists regarding the appropriateness of the theoretical assumptions and critical findings of this study.

Rhetoricians have frequently been under attack for being a law unto themselves regarding their research. The rhetorical critic has considered that his status as a
competent social actor and his ability to act as an expert commentator were enough support for his critical judgements, provided that they were internally consistent and demonstrated a conscientious application of what Swanson calls "a specialized representational system" from rhetorical theory. Swanson has argued that rhetorical critics commit the same error for which logical empiricists are castigated by philosophers of science: namely, our stance in the natural attitude. Along with logical empiricists, Swanson claims, rhetorical critics labor under the assumption that experience is "objective and free from interpretation." Critics view their task as one of description, interpretation, and evaluation. The problem here, according to Swanson, is that it is assumed that description is a direct translation of reality, whereas a more defensible notion is that it is an interpretation of reality; "the view of observations and observation language as theory-free is indefensible." Swanson argues instead that while the task of rhetorical criticism must be conducted from the natural attitude, critics "should admit the subjective nature of critical knowledge." One way of admitting and compensating for the subjectivity is to seek consensual validation of our findings. If we agree that our observations are interpretations, then they no longer constitute a factual check of our findings. Instead of looking for factual validity, perhaps critics should consider consensual
validity an appropriate goal.

It was with this objective that the interviews were conducted. The general aim was to see if cartoonists' interpretations of what they do were congruent with the interpretations generated in this study. The basic feature for which the interviews are to be examined, then, will be points of agreement with the views posited earlier and developed later in the dissertation. The responses to the open-ended questions may have another yield. Since little prompting was inherent in that part of the interview, features of cartooning that have been overlooked by the writer may surface as important in the cartoonists' view of what they do.

The interviews should provide answers to several basic questions important to this study. A fundamental assumption of this work is that cartoonists' messages are arguments and/or they are advocates. The interview material may tell whether their explanations provide evidence that cartoonists assume this as well.

The first question regarding the interviews goes beyond the assumption of the study to its fundamental research question: how do cartoonists use pictures to make arguments? An inference of this work is that the use of metaphors as enthymemetic process is the means by which cartoonists adapt to constraints of their medium, which would otherwise inhibit their argumentative capabilities.
The interviews should be a source of information regarding the extent to which cartoonists' own accounts support this view. It is important in looking for this information to be aware whether support for this study's inferences comes spontaneously from the open-ended questions at the beginning of the interview, or if corroboration is merely the cartoonists' agreement with statements made by the interviewer. In the beginning section of the interview, the artists' responses to the general questions will be examined for any direct or indirect references to metaphor which support the inferences of this study. It is possible that the artists may refer to metaphor without using that term, so use of terms like exaggeration, comparison, ridiculous, absurdity, or distortion will be viewed in context as the possible support.

If examination of the interviews is limited to the two questions discussed above, a valuable part of the information that the interviews should offer may be lost. In addition to answers to questions inherent in the conception of the study, the interviews need to be examined for other questions regarding the medium that have not arisen in the design. For instance, are there any other ways that cartoonists feel their drawings "work"? What criteria seem important to them when assessing the merits of their creations? The open-ended questions were developed particularly to encourage opportunity for a variety of responses,
so that the artists had the opportunity to respond congruently with the original inferences of the study or in other ways that might create new ones.

The methodology for this study, then, arises from two major sources: Rhetorical criticism of cartoons and self-descriptions of cartoons from their creators. It is hoped that a combination of methodologies will provide greater insights into the subject than either one conducted alone. These sources of information were not meant to be viewed separately, but analyzed together in the conclusion of this work. The ultimate aim is that the investigation of rhetorical forms' applicability to the iconic medium inform us not only about the nature of the medium being investigated but about the capabilities of the rhetorical forms as well.
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CHAPTER IV
RHETORICAL CRITICISM OF CARTOONS

Much of the foundation for the rhetorical criticism in this chapter has been addressed previously in the dissertation. Some of this material will simply be reviewed here, but some must be elaborated on in order to form a solid basis for the criticism that follows.

Rationales

In order to defend the activity proposed in this study, the rhetorical criticism of political cartoons, two rationales had to be established. The first was for the use of rhetorical paradigms originally intended for verbal rhetoric as a basis for the criticism of an iconic medium such as political cartoons. Chapter I provided support for this activity in two ways. Recent research providing a precedent for such criticism was cited, along with Morrison's recommendation that rhetoricians try to apply their methodologies to non-verbal acts. The second rationale needed was a justification for the choice of metaphors and enthymemes as the rhetorical basis for criticism. This rationale was addressed in Chapters I and III. In both chapters metaphors and enthymemes were suggested as a
reasonable solution to inherent problems cartoonists have with making arguments. The rationale can be summarized thus: arguments in cartoons have severe limitations on time and form. Cartoonists are allowed one frame, typically, in which to state and support a claim. This limitation rules out lengthy, linear argumentation; the cartoonist needs some form of shorthand communication. Additionally, the pictorial medium of cartoons is not suited to express abstract ideas directly since pictures of the type that appear in cartoons are representational in nature. The vocabulary of the cartoonist is concrete, and his subject matter, politics, is abstract. Thus, combinations of images to achieve new meaning, as in metaphor, or the tacit communication of propositions supporting a claim, as in the enthymeme, seem to be reasonable assumptions about how cartoonists circumvent the constraints of their medium, and have been adopted in this study as appropriate for use in rhetorical criticism of cartoons.

Enthymemes

A review of literature regarding the enthymeme was presented and theoretical formulations for its role in this study were developed in Chapter II. Following is a review of these findings and elaboration of the relation between enthymemes and metaphor.

Highly regarded works on enthymemes emphasize the notion that enthymemes grow out of propositions supplied by
the audience. Bitzer, who addresses this view in the most detail, argues that because audiences assist in their construction, enthymemes are "self-persuasive." But Bitzer fails to describe the actual connection the speaker creates between premises supplied by the audience and his claim. Clearly, this connection is crucial to the enthymeme's effectiveness; without it, audience members' belief in a proposition the speaker raises will have no effect on their acceptance of his claim. It was argued in Chapter II that enthymemes work by so securely joining the arguer's claim to a proposition supplied and adhered to by the audience that belief in the latter helps to establish belief in the former.

But how does the arguer accomplish the crucial connection between data and claim? One way may be that the arguer, having supplied data and claim, asks the audience to supply the connection between them, relying on shared norms of reasoning. This seems to be Bitzer's view, and it probably subsumes a large number of enthymemes. But the connection may be accomplished in other ways as well. Proximity of premise and claim may be sufficient in some cases, and so may similarities of style between premise and claim. Another way that the connection may be established is, as Bitzer mentions, through speaker-audience identification. Still another way, and perhaps the strongest of the methods that does not rely on shared systems of reasoning, is the
complete unification, the metaphorical connection of proposition and claim.

In Chapter II appeared a discussion of the function of fusion in metaphor, and in Chapter III was a summary of three views of fusion reflecting the different orientations of theorists whose work was particularly relevant to this study. The fundamental criterion for fusion in metaphor is that the comparison between referents is asserted most strongly by the unification of those referents into a single image. I have urged that the reason enthymemes are, as Bitzer says, "self-persuasive,"\textsuperscript{3} is that an indivisible connection between audience propositions and arguer's claims is established; audience members lead themselves to accept the claim on self-supplied premises. Fusion in metaphor works in a similar way. The arguer turns a comparison that may be denied into a "datum"\textsuperscript{4} by uniting the things compared. The audience members cannot separate the two referents; they must, looking at the unified image, see the two in terms of each other, and are thus led, as with enthymemes, to accept the arguer's claim. Metaphor and enthymemes, then, can work in the same way. By uniting the proposition and claim of an enthymeme, and the tenor and vehicle of a metaphor, arguers present their perspective, inviting the audience into adherence through its participation in the claim-building. The audience provides an idea which the arguer fuses with his claim; if the audience
wants to hang on to its premise, it must accept the claim, for the two are now indivisibly joined.

Metaphor

Theories of metaphor were reviewed extensively in Chapter I and some works particularly relevant to this study were discussed more fully in Chapter II. The most important theorists to this work are Berggren, Black, and Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca. From their work and from Brown's notion of paradox came the three formulations of fusion introduced in Chapter III. Each theorist has a somewhat different perspective on metaphor which it is important to review here.

Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca see metaphor as a "condensed analogy" which results from fusion. Their aim is for metaphor to take what they consider to be its rightful place in argument, as a form of proof. Fusion in metaphor is what they feel elevates it from its traditional role as illustration or embellishment to a more substantial place in argument. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca contend that whereas analogy presents a "suggestion," metaphor presents a "datum." The authors have left an interesting gap in their discussion. They fail to explain why fusion turns suggestions into data: why, as they contend, metaphor functions more effectively than analogy as proof. After the review of Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's theory in Chapter II, I suggested a reason. Stated briefly, it is that
metaphor functions as a datum not by asserting likeness (as in analogy) but by asserting oneness. It has appeared in the discussion of the congruence of metaphor and enthy-meme how the assertion of oneness through fusion or unification of images is persuasive. In metaphor and enthy-memes, if tenor and vehicle or proposition and claim are united indivisibly, then to accept one part involves acceptance of the other.

Berggren takes a seemingly opposite view in presenting his tension theory of metaphor. Inherent in this theory is the notion that "good" or "true" metaphor maintains tension between its terms. To Berggren, the opposite of tension is fusion, the unification of the terms of a metaphor. Berggren calls fusion "the abuse of metaphor" because when terms of a metaphor are viewed as literally the same, inaccuracy, or what Berggren calls "myth" results.

Although Berggren quotes Max Black's discussion of metaphor admiringly, Black's perspective is incompatible with Berggren's in some important ways. A thorough study of Black's view requires an examination of his discussion of models in science; perhaps Berggren is unaware of this. In his chapter on theoretical models, while Black sees the danger of fusion as possibly leading users of metaphor to the literal inaccuracy of myth, he nonetheless maintains that without fusion, theoretical modeling cannot occur. To Black, the ontological change in status from the "as if"
statement of analogy to the "as being" statement of metaphor is crucial to the epistemological function of a theoretical model. To Berggren, then, fusion equals myth; to Black, fusion equals insight. Although Black never directly states the advantages of fusion to the scientist, he implies that scientists' continued awareness of their analogies as analogies inhibits the creative application of a model to a phenomenon. Only after the scientist changes his thinking about the model from the "as if" to the "as being" can the model function to explain the phenomenon. For Berggren, tension (awareness of the analogies we are using and the literal inaccuracy of our comparisons) is not an inhibitor of creative thought but a necessary preventative measure against fallacy.

How do we resolve this dichotomy, and what are its implications for the study of political cartoons? First, let us look at Berggren's concept of myth. He feels that when we lose tension, the conscious awareness that a metaphor is a metaphor, when we forget the literal falsehood of the expression, then metaphor has been abused, transformed into myth. But what is tension except the retention of our conscious awareness that the referents are from different spheres? The process that Berggren feels changes metaphor into myth is the reduction of tension, the loss of awareness of the metaphorical quality of the expression, and the movement toward literal belief. Black, too, feels that fusion
is a gradual process, a movement toward literal belief through metaphorical construing. For Berggren and Black, the process of fusion is the same, and is remarkably congruent with discussions of what is commonly called "faded" metaphor. Brown's discussion of this phenomenon, which he calls "the naming function of metaphor in its everyday use," describes the fading process as "the survival of similarities in isolation from differences." Brown's example of such an expression is the "hood" of a car. Similarly, Black, in describing the process of fusion, uses the example of the hydraulic model of electrical flow as having evolved from an analogue model to the point where scientists speak of electrical "current" literally, with no awareness that the expression came from a comparison of electricity with water. In short, Black's and Berggren's view of fusion is another way of talking of a faded metaphor, and the two disagree chiefly in their attitude toward what is essentially the same process.

**Fusion**

Clearly, acceptance of Black's and Berggren's view that fusion is a literally believed metaphorical expression poses a problem if one insists that political cartoons argue through metaphorical fusion. It seems unlikely that readers literally believe that Ronald Reagan is a wolf, just because a cartoonist shows the two as one image. A solution to this dilemma is the argument proposed in Chapter II,
that fusion and tension are not discrete categories and can therefore occur simultaneously in a metaphor.

To discuss the notion thoroughly, I need to clarify further the discrepancies in the theory of fusion. To Berggren and Black, fusion results in a loss of awareness that differences exist between the terms of comparison. From this perspective, fusion and tension are opposites. There is, however, another view of fusion, hinted at by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, which suggests that fusion is the "condensation" of comparison. Does condensation necessarily mean a loss of awareness of differences; does fusion bring about literal belief? My claim is that it does not. It is the ridiculous, the absurdity, that preserves tension in a metaphor and creates a dynamic image. Brown views the dynamism in a metaphor which effects fusion while preserving tension as consisting of differences which "appear as paradoxical similarities." Brown further believes that this process is "largely what Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca call 'fusion.'"

Out of the theoretical positions regarding enthymeme and metaphor elaborated in this chapter grow categories for rhetorical criticism that will be applied to the cartoons in this study. The version of enthymeme that will be used in the criticism has been sufficiently formulated in the beginning of this chapter and in Chapter III. The three categories of fusion, however, bear some final discussion
before they are applied to the cartoons.

I said of fusion₁ in Chapter III that it was developed from Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's notion of metaphor as a condensation of analogy. Fusion₁ reflects their views at face value, not more complexly as Brown or as I interpret their discussion. Fusion₁ then, is a shorthand form of a four-term analogy; it evolves from A is to B as C is to D, to the metaphor A is the C of B. In translation, this type of fusion becomes clearer. If one recalls the example of Levine's cartoon of Lyndon Johnson in Chapter II, one will remember that, stated analogically, the message was "Vietnam is to Johnson's Presidency as the scar is to his body." Stated metaphorically, the message is "Vietnam is a scar on the Presidency." The interesting difference between fusion₁ and other varieties of fusion lies in the third term of the metaphor. The assertion is not simply that Vietnam is a scar on the Presidency. The reservation inherent in the third term weakens the assertion, implying that Vietnam is only a scar in some cases. Fusion₁ then, is a less forceful version of the effect of unifying terms in a metaphor.

Fusion₂ grows out of a more complex interpretation of Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's discussion of metaphor, and out of Brown's position on the function of paradoxical similarities in metaphor.¹⁷ These two sources are combined with the notion of tension and fusion in simultaneous
operation proposed earlier in the study. Fusion, in this interpretation, requires the unification of two referents from significantly different spheres into one image. The unification of the referents functions as an assertion that they are literally the same. But fusion is only one component of the total image. Tension, caused by the sheer absurdity of the image (arising from a significant difference in spheres) acts on the image as a polarizing influence to pull it apart. Explained in terms of paradox, the image is at once true and false: true, because of an indivisible visual unity and an aptness of metaphorical construing but false, because of the literal absurdity of the claim. Fusion₂ is the more effective because of its tensive component—its dynamic quality—and what Brown calls "differences which paradoxically become similarities."¹⁸

Fusion₃ comes in part from the work of Black and Berggren. Their version is that the differences in the referents compared in a metaphor become suppressed, with only the similarities remaining a part of the expression. It was pointed out earlier in this chapter that these authors view fusion as faded metaphor, and it is important here to distinguish faded metaphor from fusion₃. The two have in common that tension does not exist as a part of the expression because differences in the referents of the metaphor are not important to its meaning. In faded metaphor,
however, the suppression of differences leads to literal belief; the expression, through frequent use, becomes so commonplace that its metaphorical quality is lost. The type of metaphor described by fusion$^3$ is distinctly different. In fusion$^3$, even though the referents are different, the absurdity is not an important part of the expression as it is in fusion$^2$; the reader does not think "how funny," but "how true." Tension is not present because the referents, while apart, are not "ridiculously" apart. The absence of absurdity does not mean that the expression is faded, however. Fusion$^3$, particularly in its visual form, is by no means a commonplace. Indeed, even when the metaphor's verbal translation constitutes a faded metaphor its visual version does not. A good example is Gillray's portrayal of Pitt as a toadstool attached to the crown. Gombrich comments on the difference between a faded verbal metaphor and a fresh visual one: "Many an orator must have called many a minister a 'parasite,' but to make the identity visible is another matter."$^{19}$ Thus, another capability of the iconic medium is usually to revive metaphors that are dead or faded verbally, as in some examples of fusion$^3$.

These are three perspectives on metaphor from which to undertake the rhetorical criticism of our sample of editorial cartoons. As stated in Chapter III, thirty cartoons will be analyzed: ten from each of the three artists interviewed for the study. In attempting to account for
each of the thirty works in this study, four major categories were devised for a preliminary sort by the writer: fusion₁, fusion₂, fusion₃, and those cartoons which did not use metaphor. When the sorting began it became evident that more than one category additional to fusion was needed: the cartoons which did not reflect any of the types of fusion conceptualized for this study exhibited marked differences from one another. A number of cartoons contained what could be construed as metaphor, except that the spheres of comparison were similar enough to cast the finding in doubt. These were put into a category characterized by the use of hyperbole or reductio ad absurdum. In addition, two drawings did not seem to fit into either the three categories of fusion or into the category just described. One, by Auth, united three referents instead of two; and one by Wright deliberately avoided fusion to contrast the two referents, tension between the two images being paramount in the work. Finally, the group remaining was reserved for cartoons that were literal.

The first category to be described in detail consists of those cartoons which, although interpretable as metaphor, can also, and perhaps more appropriately, be viewed as exaggerations of literal messages; as with fusion₃, such cartoons lack the inherent absurdity of comparison emphasized as a characteristic of other kinds of metaphor in the theoretical formulations of this study.
The major difference between these cartoons, which could be construed as hyperbole or reductio ad absurdum, and the various types of metaphorical cartoons is that the spheres of comparison, the sources of the two referents, are not particularly far apart in the former, whereas in cartoons using metaphor as we have described it in this study, the referents are far enough apart to preclude literal belief in the image. In the cartoons in this first category, however, the referents are from sufficiently similar spheres that a literal belief in the comparison is an option for a reasonable audience.

The first two in this series are by MacNelly, and both deal in some way with the situation in the Mideast. One shows a ramshackle building characteristic of many in the South, with a pickup truck by its side and a lazy hound dog in front. The building is labeled "Jimmy's Gun Shop," and a further sign advertises a "Mideast Shotgun Special." MacNelly is referring to the United States' supplying weapons to warring countries in the explosive Mideast and is characterizing Carter as the proprietor of this gun shop. But casting Carter as a purveyor of weapons to the irritated and irresponsible is not fantastic or absurd, since Carter, acting for the United States, does sell weapons in the Mideast. What MacNelly has done in this cartoon is exaggerate a reasonable view of the situation to make his point.
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MacNelly's second offering in this category concerns NATO's military power. He communicates his position on this issue by drawing a decrepit, broken-down tank labeled "NATO" with a white flag coming out of the gun muzzle that says "Bang!" A tank is too close an image for military power to be considered a metaphor in this case. This, again, is therefore not metaphor but hyperbole, the use of exaggeration to make a point. MacNelly has taken an example of what he feels to be the genuine state of NATO's military forces, and exaggerated it to make his statement, that NATO's military strength has greatly deteriorated.

Another drawing, this one by Tony Auth, fits into the first category and is entitled "Detente." This work depicts two tanks, one from the United States and one from the Soviet Union, facing each other. The picture is an ordinary representation except that the two gun barrels of the tanks are joined, forming a single barrel. Auth's message here is that while detente may present a facade of proximity, it does not create greater security and that the danger of war with the Soviet Union continues, despite Nixon's efforts. In Auth's cartoon, the tanks are a microcosm of the military relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union. That Auth has the gun barrels joined is his exaggeration of what he believes to be the truth: detente--closer relations with the Soviets--does not necessarily mean more peaceful or more secure relations with the Soviets.
The next two cartoons, one by MacNelly and one by Don Wright, use the same image to refer to the same situation. Both cartoons were prompted by Cyrus Vance's trip to the Mideast to promote the Israeli-Egyptian peace plan to other Arab countries. Both Wright and MacNelly use the image of a salesman to refer to Vance's diplomatic mission in the Mideast. MacNelly portrays Vance as an auctioneer, and Wright portrays him as a traveling salesman. The reason that these cartoons are more hyperbolic, relying on exaggeration rather than metaphor, is that the idea of persuader-as salesman is so commonplace as to have become literal. Both MacNelly and Wright have employed what Brown would call "metaphor in its everyday use" to communicate their message. In both cartoons, the artists contend that Vance will have a difficult task persuading the Arab nations to accept the Israeli-Egyptian peace plan, and they both use the commonplace visual and verbal image of an unsuccessful salesman to make their point.

The last members in this mode are both by Don Wright. The first is a drawing of John and Martha Mitchell, showing John with his foot shoved in Martha's mouth. The cartoon refers to the incident when Martha Mitchell made public statements embarrassing to the Nixon administration, claiming that her views were congruent with her husband's. John Mitchell promptly denied this, causing even more of an uproar than Martha's remarks had. As with the cartoons
discussed above, Wright has used a common verbal metaphor that has become literalized through frequent use and which is not revived by visual representation. The metaphorical quality of "putting a foot in one's mouth" has long since been lost in favor of a literalized use of that expression. Another of Wright's works exhibits a message which constitutes exaggeration of an actual situation. This cartoon was prompted by Nixon's renunciation of biological warfare and his order to destroy disease-causing germ stockpiles. The drawing shows Nixon entering a darkened laboratory with a sign labeling it "Chemical & Germ Warfare Bacteriological Research" saying, "Okay, the fun's over." In the laboratory are men in military uniforms clearly depicted by Wright as the archetypal "mad scientists" of the horror films. Again, it is not entirely unreasonable to believe, as Wright apparently does, that it literally is madness to contemplate using such an insidious and indiscriminate weapon in war. Thus, the cartoon is not metaphorical; it is a visual exaggeration of what Wright perceives as reality.

Before we begin the discussion of those cartoons that exhibit various forms of metaphorical fusion there is another category to be examined, a group of cartoons that use metaphor in a way different from all three categories of fusion formulated in this study. Only two of the cartoons which rely on metaphor use it in a way differing from my original formulation. One such example is Don Wright's
cartoon entitled "Reverend Jones." Wright uses metaphor in this cartoon but does not fuse the images he presents. Instead, he divides the referents of his metaphor to make the claim that Jones was a madman whose wholesale destruction was as random and insane as the attack of a mad dog. Initially, Wright shows Jones, the leader of the People's Temple, as the upright and holy man he pretended to be. But Wright draws Jones' shadow as the mad dog he believes Jones was. The image of Jones as he presented himself to the world is drawn with wispy, broken lines, giving the picture an ethereal, insubstantial quality, but the image of the mad dog is clearly pointed out as Wright's idea of the real Jones by his use of a stark, black silhouette that virtually leaps off the page away from Jones' holy public image. Wright has separated the referents of this metaphor in order to contrast the idea of Jones as he pretended to be and Jones as Wright believes he really was.

Tony Auth has also done something different with the use of metaphor in his cartoon of Philadelphia's former Mayor Rizzo. Auth's extended cartoon campaign against Rizzo focuses in part on what he perceives as Rizzo's racism. When Rizzo was fighting for an extra term as mayor, Auth began characterizing him as a character from an old comic strip, "The Little King." Later, after his readers
were used to seeing Rizzo so portrayed, Auth added to the metaphor by clothing the Rizzo-as-king figure in a robe and hood reminiscent of the Ku Klux Klan. In this image we not only have fusion, but a three-way metaphor; Auth fuses three referents in one drawing, not relying on a single metaphor, but using two.

The last category outside the three primary views of fusion consists of those cartoons that do not use any form of metaphor as their primary message element. These visual editorials illustrate real or hypothetical situations. Cartoons with more than one frame, for instance, are included in this category; their story is told mostly through their verbal component. Others in this category have visual representations of literal situations that illustrate a primarily verbal message.

Three members in this category are drawn by Don Wright. The first illustrates two Black men in a slum neighborhood being beaten by policemen. One policeman standing to the side of the scene points to a dilapidated, run-down tenement and says "Go back to your homes and act like civilized human beings." Wright's message is, of course, that the "homes" in question are not fit for "civilized human beings" to live in. This cartoon creates its ironic message by a combination of visual and verbal elements; the drawing serves only as an illustration of the verbal content. The next two cartoons in this category by Wright both consist of
more than one frame. One portrays an imaginary journey of Carter's plan to revamp Civil Service, indicating that by the time the Washington bureaucracy gets around to doing anything about the proposal, Carter will be out of office. The other cartoon in this vein shows a sad wispy spectre making its way through four frames. The creature is observed by two men, and their dialogue is "What was that?" "The spirit of Camp David." Wright uses a discursive, linear mode to tell us that not as much was accomplished at Camp David as we were led to believe. Wright's fourth drawing in this category is a one-frame picture of an Indian Chief reading a newspaper which says "Carter attacks Doctors, Lawyers..." This is Wright's view of Carter's search for a scapegoat for inflation, and the poor Indian Chief knows that he is the next candidate for blame.

The next two cartoons in this category are by MacNelly. Both of them portray a hypothetical situation literally. The first refers to the incident of Queen Elizabeth II's receiving a bomb threat. MacNelly portrays two people on the deck of a ship. One of them is preparing to detonate a bomb, while the other says "I usually fly, but with all those skyjackers running around..." In this drawing, MacNelly has simply chosen to illustrate a hypothetical situation, as he does in the next cartoon. This one shows a signpainter revising a billboard in China, preparing for a visit from the United States. The sign reads "People of
the World Unite! Defeat the Imperialist U.S. Aggressors and all their Running Dog Lackeys!" In the cartoon, the word "defeat" has been crossed out by the sign painter and is being replaced with the words "negotiate with." This is also a literal portrayal of an imaginary situation that reflects MacNelly's view that, in spite of detente, little has changed in China.

The last cartoon in this group is a four-frame by Auth explaining his version of how a memo came to be placed in the F.B.I. files which said that a Black helped discredit Martin Luther King. In the cartoon, J. Edgar Hoover orders an agent to find a Black to take King's place. When the agent asks Mr. Wilkins to do it, he refuses; but the agent tells Hoover that Wilkins agreed--hence the memo saying that Wilkins cooperated with the F.B.I. In this cartoon Auth has simply told a story and become what he calls Gerry Trudeau, a good writer.26

Metaphorical Cartoons

The remaining cartoons in the sample seemed to be using metaphorical fusion in one of the three forms outlined previously in this chapter and in Chapter III. These categories also include cartoons which fit the enthymematic mode because, as discussed earlier, metaphors provide the connective component in some enthymemes. Thus, a cartoon using metaphorical fusion also displays the connection between premise and claim that makes enthymemes persuasive.
The criticisms of cartoons using metaphor will be organized by the three categories of fusion. The decision regarding into which category of fusion a cartoon belongs will be based on which set of criteria the cartoon fulfills most extensively.

**Fusion**

Fusion, as described earlier, is a condensed four-term analogy and occurs when the third term seems to be an important part of the message. In fusion, the third term qualifies the comparison; it states the context in which the comparison (or unification of referents) is apt. The artist may use fusion when he wants to make it clear that his claim applies only to a particular situation. Of the thirty cartoons, only two had messages that required a third term as a qualifier. In "What's Keeping Mr. Poff?" MacNelly refers to the Senate rejection of Nixon's southern Supreme Court nominees. They had already rejected Haynsworth and Carswell; suddenly Nixon's next southern candidate for the Supreme Court, Poff, withdrew his name from consideration. The cartoon shows two hangmen on a scaffold, looking off into the distance, saying "What's keeping Mr. Poff?" Stated in analogical form, MacNelly's message is that the Senate is to Nixon's southern Supreme Court nominees as executioners are to condemned men. The condensed form of this analogy is that the Senate members are executioners with regard to Nixon's nominees. The comparison (or, in the cartoon, the
unification of referents), is between the Senate members and executioners; the underlined portion is the third term of the analogy—the context in which the comparison is true or apt. Clearly, MacNelly did not intend a blanket indictment of the Senate, but rather wanted to criticize its behavior in a particular circumstance. One could easily say, for instance, that "Nixon is a pig" or "Carter is a child" without qualifying the remark; however, this is not possible with "The Senators are executioners." Thus, the third term is essential. MacNelly's argument cannot be boiled down into two terms without distorting the message and saying more about the Senate than he intended.

Another cartoon in the sample clearly exhibits fusion: Tony Auth's "The Horn of Africa." It was inspired by Soviet intervention in Africa in the form of sending Cuban troops. The cartoon shows Brezhnev holding a large cornucopia, or horn of plenty, which spills Cuban troops into Africa. As with MacNelly's cartoon, stating this metaphor in only two terms would distort the message. The metaphor is that the Cuban soldiers are a gift, which Auth illustrates by placing them in the context of the cornucopia. But to state Auth's message as "Cuban soldiers are a gift," is misleading. Clearly Auth does not intend to imply that the presence of these soldiers is a good thing. Rather, he means that Soviet intervention is not a good thing for Africa. The third term is thus necessary to
clarify the analogy; "Cuban soldiers are the gift Africa gets from Brezhnev" is a more accurate description of Auth's message. The addition of the third term is essential in this case because Auth's attitude toward the situation he describes inheres in it.

Situations in which the third term is an important part of the metaphorical message are infrequent in the sample. Far commoner is a more complex form of metaphor, named in this study as fusion.\textsubscript{2}.

Fusion\textsubscript{2}

This second variation of fusion was described earlier in this chapter as a dynamic entity because of the tensive fusion, caused on the one hand by visual unity of images and aptness of metaphorical labelling, and on the other hand by differences between the concepts compared and the literal impossibility of the claim presented by the fused images. Eight cartoons from the sample fall into this category.

The first is a cartoon from MacNelly which depicts Sadat, Begin, and Carter as two signpainters and their foreman, respectively. Sadat and Begin, as the painters, are quarreling over the colors for the billboard they are painting, while Carter, as the foreman, sits helplessly with his head in his hands, obviously having despaired of finishing the sign, which is supposed to say "Peace."\textsuperscript{29} The message here is that Sadat and Begin are undermining a potentially great accomplishment with their disagreements over
trivial matters. MacNelly communicates this message by portraying the two as signpainters who ostensibly have the same objective in mind but who cannot complete their picture because of their petty squabbles over color. At first glance, the comparison is absurd, which provides tension in the metaphor; it is literally impossible that one would find Sadat and Begin painting a billboard together. But MacNelly's absurd trivialization of the two men becomes a truth through metaphorical fusion. What was seen as differences are now similarities; Sadat's and Begin's petty disagreements are keeping the peace agreement from being made as surely as the painters' arguments over what color it should be will prevent them from finishing their sign.

The next drawing in this group is also MacNelly's; the cartoon shows Carter as a circus ringmaster trying to get an overgrown hippopotamus to jump through a tiny hoop he is holding. Again, it is obvious that to compare a hippopotamus to the Civil Service is absurd; the two are completely different entities. But MacNelly makes his statement, that the Civil Service has grown too large and unmanageable for Carter or anyone to handle, through the fusion of these two vastly different concepts; the differences between them become similarities as we understand that the characteristics of this beast (gargantuan, unmanageable), are characteristics of the Civil Service that will prevent its reform by even the best intentioned.
We find another example of fusion in Auth's cartoon, "The Absolutely Incredible Nixon." Auth's message in this situation is that, like many people, he did not believe Nixon's account of how those crucial eighteen minutes were erased from the Watergate tapes. To illustrate his scepticism, he portrays Nixon as a magician, holding up a tape with gaps in it. A sign announcing this performer, says "The Absolutely Incredible Nixon." Auth uses an absurd comparison to produce some slapstick humor and make his point. Of all recent Presidents, the stuffy, ultra-proper Nixon was the least likely to engage in any razzmatazz, political or otherwise. For Auth to unite Nixon's ordinarily arch-conservative image with that of a flashy, flamboyant magician is tantamount to a Disney portrayal of a hippopotamus dressed as a ballerina. The image is literally impossible. But because of the visual fusion that Auth has effected, the two are one, and ultimately we see the aptness of the image that makes Auth's message acceptable in spite of its impossibility. Differences are transformed into similarities as we realize that actually, both Nixon and the magician are, as Auth argues, "incredible."

Another MacNelly cartoon is the next example of fusion. In this cartoon, Dole is pictured atop a stagecoach with a shotgun. Although Dole is in the driver's seat, the reins lead into the interior of the stagecoach, the door of which
is emblazoned "President Jerry." Again, on the surface, there is nothing common between Dole and a shotgun guard for a stagecoach. Dole was a vice-Presidential candidate; one would be unlikely to find him in a cowboy hat guarding a stagecoach. But MacNelly uses this comparison to make the statement that Dole did most of the campaigning for Ford, taking responsibility for policies that were not really his, and it is here that we see the similarities in the situation; Dole was riding shotgun for Ford. He "drew the fire" for Ford's unpopular actions.

MacNelly made another comment on vice-Presidential power when he referred to the debates between Dole and Mondale with a cartoon showing the two in the rumble seats of two cars labeled "Ford" and "Carter." Mondale is shown in the cartoon saying to Dole "Wanna Drag?" Characteristic of cartoons employing this version of fusion is that the situation is literally impossible. One could safely conjecture that vice-Presidential candidates Dole and Mondale would never challenge each other to a race from the rumble seats of two model A Fords. At first glance, the two referents are different on any level of comparison; their combination as one is impossible. But in those differences lie similarities. Like the children MacNelly compares them to, Dole and Mondale are powerless, but choose to ignore that fact and instead go on pretending, and thus MacNelly makes his statement that the vice-Presidential debates are a moot exercise since vice presidents do not make policy.
Another Auth cartoon showing this version of fusion is "His Master's Voice." 32 This cartoon is a parody of the old RCA advertisement showing a dog listening to an old fashioned victrola. In Auth's cartoon, the initials RCA are replaced by LBJ, and the dog has Nixon's face. Out of the victrola come three phrases that sound familiar: "We will not be defeated..." "We will never surrender..." "The bombing will continue..." Auth, it is clear, intends for us to recognize the phrases from the Johnson policy on the Vietnam war, and he portrays Nixon as the faithful dog in the RCA advertisements to make his claim that Nixon is continuing Johnson's war policies. But to portray Nixon as Johnson's faithful dog is ridiculous; the philosophies and policies of Nixon the conservative Republican are diametrically opposed to those of Johnson the liberal Democrat. Yet the tension created by those differences is balanced by the visual fusion which tells us that, with respect to policy regarding Vietnam, Nixon is faithful to the precedent set by Johnson.

The next-to-last cartoon in our sample of fusion is also by Auth. The first shows Carter, Young, Vance, and Brzezinski lost in an African veldt. Carter's three advisors want to go off in several different directions, while Carter is hopelessly studying a map labeled "African Policy." 33
truth. The President is not a big game hunter; his foreign policy advisors are not bearers. But the situations that seem so different—Carter, Young, Vance, and Brzezinski lost in the veldt and Carter, et. al. trying to devise a policy toward Africa, in fact become similar when Auth, through metaphorical fusion, points out that Carter and his advisors are truly "lost" regarding African policy.

The final cartoon in the sample of fusion 2 is an Auth drawing of President Ford on skis, with each ski pointing in a different direction. Auth has portrayed Ford as a bumbler on skis, and the comparison is absurd in this case because Ford, although reputed to be clumsy on land is, in fact, an athletic man and is known to be a very good skier. The points of the skis in Auth's cartoon, however, are labeled "Tax Increase," and "Tax Cut," which provides the fusion and the ultimate truth of the message. Just prior to that particular trip to Vail, Ford announced two conflicting tax policies, clearly indicating that, like the skier in Auth's image, he cannot decide which way to go.

Fusion 3

Fusion 3 is characterized by its seeming simplicity. As with other types of fusion, the artist unites referents from different spheres, but unlike fusion 1, the image is not qualified in any way, and unlike fusion 2, the difference in the components of the image do not produce tension. In this type of metaphor differences between the referents of the
metaphor do not turn into paradoxical similarities. And unlike faded metaphor, the image is not commonplace even though the referents are not ridiculously different.

I have found four examples of fusion in the sample of cartoons: two by Auth and two by Wright. The first Auth cartoon shows a woman, smiling and smoking a cigarette, lying in a bed labeled "Judith Campbell Exner." In Auth's picture, the mattress of the bed is lying in the money drawer of a cash register. Auth uses fusion in this cartoon to communicate his message that Exner is no better than a prostitute to have made money on her alleged affair with John Kennedy. He makes this statement through the unification of images, saying that since a cash register is where one gets money, and since Exner's bed is a cash register (as Auth's drawing shows), then Exner's bed is where she gets her money, and she is tantamount to being a prostitute. For Exner, Auth claims, a bed and a cash register are the same.

The second cartoon by Auth that serves as an example of fusion shows a church, labeled "People's Temple," with the cross on its steeple formed of smoking guns. To further indicate the significance of the role of the guns in the cartoon, surrounding the church are hundreds of graves, marked with crosses. Auth's metaphor in this cartoon is focused on the unification of the cross and the guns into a single image. In this context the guns
represent violence and death; the cross, rather than symbolizing Christianity, or religion in general, refers specifically to the People's Temple, as indicated by the label on the church. Thus Auth's message through the unification of the guns and the cross is that the People's Temple is an instrument of death. Differences between the two referents are extraneous to Auth's argument here, and so he has asserted that they are one.

The other two drawings that fall into the category of fusion are by Don Wright of the Miami News. The first shows Governor Claude Kirk of Florida entering a cave wherein reside Governors Wallace and Maddox. The caption reads "We got company." Here Wright is criticizing Governor Kirk's stand on school desegregation; his assertions are made through complete unification of images, and his message depends only on similarities between the referents of his metaphor. His argument is simply that Kirk, with Wallace and Maddox, is a caveman, and absurdity, or tension between the spheres of comparison does not play a role in the message. In this cartoon, as with the others, the differences are suppressed in favor of the similarities, which are the focus of the message.

The second cartoon by Wright reflects his attitude toward the right-wingers who were opposing the Warren Supreme Court because of its stand on minority rights. Wright shows these people, labeled "Anti-Supreme Court
Fanatics," charging out of a sewer. Again, although the spheres of comparison, people and sewer rats are dissimilar, the differences are not important in the message. Indeed, it is normal usage to speak of one's enemies as coming out of a sewer, and in its verbal expression, one could speak of this metaphor as being faded. Characteristic of fusion_3, however, is that, although differences do not contribute absurdity to the expression, a metaphor that is faded in verbal use is revitalized in the visual mode.

Having presented a category-sort and criticism of the sample of cartoons in this study, the final portion of the chapter will be devoted to a summary of preliminary findings. This summary will be simply a statement of how many cartoons from our random sample were sorted into each category. An analysis of those findings, and subsequent discussion will be presented in Chapter V.

Summary of Preliminary Findings

In the first category, fusion_1, there were two cartoons: one by Auth, from the newspaper source, and one by MacNelly, from one of his books. There were eight cartoons in fusion_2, all by MacNelly and Auth. There were three from Auth's book and one from his newspaper, and two each from MacNelly's books and his newspaper. In fusion_3, there were four cartoons, one from Auth's book and one from his paper, and two from Wright's book. In the group of cartoons that used images from similar spheres there were
seven cartoons. One cartoon was from Auth's book, three from MacNelly's newspaper cartoons, and two from Wright's book and one from his newspaper. There were also seven cartoons in the literal category: one from Auth's newspaper, two from MacNelly's books, one from Wright's book and three from his newspaper. As we mentioned, two cartoons used metaphor in a way different from the ways described by our categories of fusion: one was from Auth's newspaper and one was from Wright's newspaper.

Of the fourteen cartoons that used some kind of metaphorical fusion, nine were from the cartoonists' anthologies and five were from their newspaper cartoons randomly selected from the year 1978. If we include the first category, (metaphors with referents from similar spheres), then twenty-three cartoons of the thirty used some kind of metaphor. If that group is not included, then fourteen used metaphor in some form.

I inferred at the beginning of this study that anthologized cartoons, since they were selected by the artists from a larger body of work, would be their better efforts, and that if the use of metaphor was in any way a criterion for a "good" cartoon, then the three categories of metaphor would contain more works from the artists' anthologies than from the newspaper sample. This inference is supported to some extent in the self-category sort since nine of the drawings using one of the three forms of fusion came from
the artists' anthologies and only four came from newspapers. A cursory glance at the results of the self-category sort tells us that there is some support for the inference that metaphorical fusion is an important way in which good cartoonists make arguments. In Chapter V I will further discuss these findings and examine to what extent the interviews with the three artists corroborated them.
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CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEWS AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

In this chapter, the three interviews with the cartoonists selected for this study will be analyzed in the following ways.

First, the interviews will be examined to determine how much, if at all, the cartoonists' responses to the open-ended questions in the beginning section of the interview support the inferences formulated in this study. With this question in mind, voluntary references by the cartoonists to the use of comparison, absurdity, metaphor, distortion, and like terms, will be seen as indications of possible support. This first section of the interviews will be further examined for references by the artists to other features of cartooning which may be important as techniques to the artists, but which have not arisen as major considerations.

The second section of the interviews consists of discussions with the cartoonists of selected works. Each artist was asked to discuss five drawings from the sample, then to listen to my explanations of five others, and,
finally, give his reaction to the analyses of their cartoons. This section of the interviews will be examined to see if, during the cartoonists' explanations of their work, any reference to metaphor was made in any of the forms listed above, and to see to what extent, if at all, they agreed with the author's critical views of their cartoons.

In the conclusions section of this chapter, the extent to which the inferences of this study were supported by the author's critical findings and by the interviews with cartoonists will be discussed. This section will evaluate the merits of the methods of validation used in this study, and will present new formulations of the original inferences of the study with recommendations for further research.

**Jeff MacNelly**

MacNelly, the first cartoonist to be interviewed for this study, is one of the nation's most important young cartoonists. In 1972 MacNelly become one of the youngest cartoonists to have won the Pulitzer Prize, and his work is syndicated through the Chicago Tribune--New York news Syndicate.

During the first part of the interview, when general, open-ended questions about the nature of cartooning were asked, MacNelly was articulate, eliminating the necessity for extensive probing by the interviewer. One of the main objectives of that section was to determine if the cartoonists, independent of leading suggestions from the
interviewer, would talk about anything that could be construed as metaphor used as a strategy of argument or a component of the cartoon message. The intent of the opening questions was to see, first, if the cartoonist was willing to think of his work as argument and then to see how he thought the pictures he drew functioned as argument. MacNelly mentioned a feature that could be viewed as metaphor early in the interview, in response to this question: "What do you feel your job is...as a cartoonist?" Instead of talking about a purpose such as persuasion or communication as was expected, MacNelly responded immediately with a reference to techniques. His first mention of a non-literal device was "distortion," and when he was asked to explain what he meant by that term he replied:

If you're talking about...a SALT debate or something, you're not going to have two guys sitting at a table for very long--that's kind of dull. You'd have fighter planes, or you'd have cowboys shooting it out or something. You'd get to it a different way. You would compare the existing reality to a totally fantastic situation. Sort of a Science Fiction translation.

Here one may safely interpret what MacNelly says as a description of metaphor. In our earlier formulations, metaphor was characterized in one of its forms as an absurd or ridiculous comparison, a statement remarkably similar to MacNelly's explanation that he "would compare the existing reality to a totally fantastic situation." In particular, MacNelly seems to have described fusion, which was characterized in this study as an absurd or ludicrous comparison,
exhibiting tension because of its absurdity, and fusion because of the unity of images and the aptness of metaphorical construing: an image that is absurd, yet true. Indeed, when MacNelly later responded to a question regarding his criteria for a "good" cartoon, he said that the drawing must have "a little whimsical humor in it, a little fantastic voyage in some way or another /that has/ that ring of truth in it."\(^6\) It is not unreasonable to contend that the "ring of truth" in an absurd comparison could be another way of talking about the "aptness of metaphorical construing." And if there is any doubt regarding what MacNelly meant when he talked about a "science fiction translation," he elaborated:

> They say that science fiction is a legitimate art form because we take a basic problem or a basic conflict that you find in man's life or existence and you stick it on some ridiculous planet with giant caterpillars crawling on it. You get a different perspective, and that's what the cartoon is doing. It's taking something completely out of context and putting it in a fantastic setting and that way you're...stripping all the usual boring trappings and paraphernalia from the arguments or from the personality, and you're looking at them in a completely different light. It's a constant challenge, you must admit, trying to come up with new situations and to make yourself do something fantastic.\(^7\)

This passage reinforces the contention that MacNelly has described what has been formulated in this study as fusion.\(^2\) "Taking something completely out of context and putting it in a fantastic setting" includes the comparison of two referents from vastly different spheres; "looking at
Arguments, personalities in a completely different light" implies the freshness and dynamism which characterize tension in a metaphor. The comparison MacNelly describes as resulting in a "different perspective" on a political situation cannot but be a result of tension in the metaphor; probably this is what he means when he says that a cartoon must have a little "whimsical humor." For MacNelly, absurdity creates humor; for readers-as-arguers, it creates tension. These are not altogether opposing views if we remember that tension describes metaphor as the tension-fusion interaction which preserves the metaphor as a dynamic entity.

In response to the open-ended question session in the first part of the interview, MacNelly mentions only one other general feature of cartooning, and that is his contention that cartoons do not constitute "logical argument." In cartoons, MacNelly claims, "you're just kind of saying that this guy is a total jerk and you don't give any reasons..." MacNelly draws a distinction between communication and argument and sees the work he does as clearly the former: "...it's an effective way of communicating, I think; I'm not so sure it's an effective way of arguing or debating. Debate and argument need a verbal ammunition, and the photo effect basically is a debate where a kid would be able to debate by standing up and sticking his tongue out." Here MacNelly articulates a major constraint of
his medium that was discussed earlier in this study. The "photo effect," of course, refers to the cartoonist's limitation to one frame. Within that one frame, MacNelly seems to feel, is no room for evidence.

In the second section of the interview, MacNelly's responses were not as fruitful in relation to the major concerns of this study. The first part of the second section consisted of his open-ended explanations of five of the ten cartoons from his anthologized and newspaper work as selected by random sampling techniques. His explanations of those cartoons were limited mainly to a description of the political situation that prompted the cartoon and to comments on the amount of verbal component in the message. MacNelly's opinion, expressed both in this section and in the previous one, is that the best cartoons communicate their messages or a major component of their messages with a minimum of verbal content. In addition, MacNelly's evaluation of the relative merits of the cartoons in his two books and those selected from the newspaper dispelled the expectation that he might consider the anthologized cartoons his better work. When shown a cartoon from his earlier book, he said: "I haven't looked at that book in five years. This is very embarrassing."12

As already indicated, the structured part of the interview consisted of MacNelly's responses to the critical evaluations of the other five cartoons in the sample 25 provided
by the interviewer. It was a strategy in this first inter-
view to present two interpretations of each cartoon with
four approaches to each interpretation. This presented a
problem in the interview because, in order to come up with
two different interpretations, the cartoons had almost to
be split into sections, with different interpretations
depending on which half of the cartoon was emphasized.
In fact, sometimes neither interpretation was congruent
with MacNelly's intent; he was then uninterested in the
various criticisms regarding those interpretations. In
other words, if he perceived that his intent was misunder-
stood, the applications of the paradigms in the study, the
enthymeme and the three kinds of fusion, were irrelevant.
An additional problem was that MacNelly was reluctant to
talk about specific cartoons at all, saying that it was
hard for him to translate his pictorial messages into words.
"People call me up on the phone sometimes and say 'Could
you explain tonight's cartoon to me?' I say 'No.'"\textsuperscript{13}
MacNelly seemingly couldn't express the relationships in
words that he sees and portrays so well pictorially. At the
end of the interview, however, after listening to the modes
of criticism used in the study several times applied to
several cartoons, MacNelly was asked if any one explanation
seemed in general to be more accurate than the others so
far as discussing what goes on in cartoons. Here MacNelly
stated the conclusion that, for him, fusion, explains
JB: What I want to know now is if there's any one of those explanations that seems more accurate to you in terms of what happens in the cartoon.

JM: You mean in all the cartoons that you've...

JB: Of the kinds of explanations—the ludicrous comparison and the straightforward comparison, or the sort of formal argument where the audience supply a claim and you supply a claim...What's more important? Is it that there's one image, or that the comparison is ridiculous, or that...

JM: No, I think it's the image; it's the one image. The comparison is almost always ridiculous. It almost has to be, because if it's not, then you're talking about a documentary—a couple of lawyers discussing the law in an office—and it is not an image at all...I think that's sort of a given.

JB: And the one image is then referring to both the setting and the same thing you talked about.

JM: Yeah, the reality.

JB: And what I've said basically was that this image almost in a way forces the audience to buy your argument because they can't separate them out; they can't separate the setting from—

JM: Yeah, that's right; they can't. And they can't say—the great thing about cartooning is that they can't say that Sadat and Begin are not painters. Of course they are—right there they are.

JB: Right there in front of you.

JM: And so by looking at the cartoon you're accepting the whole bunch of premises you couldn't possibly accept, really. If MacNelly accepts the idea of a cartoon's making an absurd comparison as a "given," then he clearly has chosen fusion² as his explanation of how a cartoon communicates. Additionally, his last statement in this passage lends some support
to the argument, discussed briefly in the last chapter and
to be dealt with more thoroughly in this one, that meta-
phor—at least in the editorial cartoon—can profitably be
viewed as a form of enthymeme.

Tony Auth

Tony Auth, the second cartoonist to be interviewed for
this study, began his career in art as a medical illustrator.
His interest in political cartooning arose out of a concern
with the Vietnam War; his first work was done for a college
newspaper. After four years drawing for campus publications
and for a Los Angeles underground weekly paper, Auth moved
to The Philadelphia Inquirer, where his work appears daily.
Auth's art is syndicated by The Washington Post Writer's
Group; he has won both the Overseas Press Award and the
Pulitzer Prize. Auth says he is a good friend of Jeff
MacNelly in spite of their political differences (MacNelly
is a conservative).

Auth's responses to the first part of the interview,
the open-ended questions about the nature of cartooning,
were less overtly supportive of this study's inferences
than were MacNelly's. However, Auth did support the infer-
ences more definitely in the probing questions. When Auth
was asked what he considered to be the job of the political
cartoonist, he said that it was "analysis of events that
somehow cuts through all the fog and the oratory and the
rhetoric and...gets to the point." The editorial cartoon,
he continued, is a "very good medium for making one point at a time,"\textsuperscript{18} and when asked what strategies he uses to make that point, Auth responded with a statement he later explained: "One of my favorite questions is 'What's really happening?' And in some of the best cartoons, well, what's really happening is something that's just crazy. So you illustrate that, and it's a funny cartoon."\textsuperscript{19} When Auth was asked if he used absurdity, he said that he tried to "show something that's really true by carrying it to such an extreme that it's crazy."\textsuperscript{20} Here, in response to probing, Auth begins to describe a technique that could be interpreted as metaphor. When Auth argues that "what's really happening" (the artist's view of the political situation) is "something that's just crazy," and "some of the best cartoons...illustrate that," he seems to enumerate the main features of fusion.\textsubscript{2} That is, the artist presents a "datum" as he "shows" what is "really true" (fusion) by "carrying it to such an extreme that it's crazy" (tension).

The above remarks are Auth's most detailed description of metaphor in cartoons. In them, he does refer to the concept in the first part of the interview, somewhat at the prompting of the interviewer. He mentioned a cartoon, "The Sorcerer's Apprentice," as an example of a good cartoon that nobody understood. Of the drawing which has been anthologized, he said, "I used a metaphor, 'The Sorcerer's Apprentice' in a cartoon about nuclear waste and proliferation,
which many people did not recognize." When asked to respond regarding that work, he called it a "parody" of the Disney movie; further he mentioned, as another example of metaphor, his making Frank Rizzo a malevolent Robin Hood but gave no more time to the concept until later in the interview when asked to evaluate criticisms of his cartoons.

In the more structured, second part of the interview, Auth discussed five of his visual editorials from the random sample. For some of these cartoons, Auth's remarks were simply an explanation of what they meant: a translation of the drawing into a verbal message. He mentioned metaphor, though, while talking about a picture he drew of Gerald Ford, showing him on skis, each pointing in opposite directions, one labeled "Tax Increase," one labeled "Tax Cut." The picture was drawn, according to Auth, in response to Ford's contradictory statements regarding his tax policy just before he left for a ski trip to Vail. Auth felt that it was generally unfair to portray Ford as being excessively clumsy but said that "it was a good metaphor in this case because he obviously couldn't make up his mind." By name, this was the only other mention of metaphor by Auth until the concept was introduced again by the interviewer. However, in his explanation of a cartoon, Auth again dealt with how his messages are communicated in a non-literal way. The drawing shows a church, labeled "People's Temple," whose cross, on top of a steeple, is
composed of smoking guns. Auth touches on paradox (a characteristic of fusion) when he describes how the cartoon works: "...here you've got the cross becoming a symbol of violence instead of a symbol of peace." The convergence of Auth's notions about cartoons with the conclusions of this study appeared to a greater extent in the final part of the interview, when he was asked to respond to the interviewer's critical explanations of the remaining five drawings in the sample.

In this part of the session, Auth was asked to respond to individual explanations of each frame from the four perspectives developed to analyze the cartoons, and then to evaluate the perspectives in general. Auth seemed to be reasonably happy with all the perspectives used in the study; his answer when asked to choose the explanation he preferred was, "I think they're all valid. And I think that whichever one seems most appropriate is going to be determined by the particular cartoon you're looking at." Auth generally agreed with the analyses in this study but showed a general reluctance to explain his cartoons in depth or commit himself to one general explanation of how they work.

...don't forget, when I'm—I really don't have rules. And I really, I experiment, I play, I, consciously, the only rule is trying to have no rules when you're thinking of these things. You're very good at after-the-fact figuring out what went on, and sometimes I can do that too... And so those /the interviewer's inferences/ all
seem real valid to me. In fact, they're in some ways very similar, they're sort of like the, the other side of those questions that I have to help me get going on my chain: 'How would this look to children?' 'What's really going on here?'

Don Wright

Don Wright, of the Miami News, started as a news photographer. In the mid-fifties, during his military service, he began characterizing Army life in cartoons; in 1963 Wright became a regular political cartoonist, winning the Pulitzer Prize just three years later.

Wright was eager to share his cartoonist's perspective with the writer. Although much of the initial recorded portion of Wright's interview turned out to be inaudible through a malfunction of the cassette recorder's microphone, the audible parts yielded some helpful information. The initial inquiries sought Wright's view of inventional strategies used in cartooning. In the audible portion of the discussion, Wright named a device he uses: "The chief ingredient is distortion, which is what I think separates it from your written editorial. It is the only real weapon I have." When Wright was asked to elaborate on what he meant by "distortion," he gave examples from the situation in Iran as it was in June, 1979. He referred to his piece showing Khomeini cutting off the hands of a robot labeled "Western Technology."

I'm trying to think of a specific example of what I've done, but I think you've probably seen it all. Everyone's done pretty much the same thing.
with the cutting off of the hands, bathing in blood, all of those carry the situation, probably to extremes if you understand Iran and you understand the revolution.30

The figure to which Wright refers is clearly a visual metaphor as conceptualized in this study. The one referent, a robot, refers also to the technology of the west, and Khomeini's action, cutting off its hands, refers both to Khomeini's rejection of western influences and to what Wright clearly considers to be the backward customs of the Islam world in general--the traditional Islamic punishment for stealing being the severing of one of the thief's hands. So in this instance, what Wright calls "distortion," I would call metaphor, particularly if one remembers Brown's view of metaphor as paradoxical similarities, or an absurd comparison in relation to what Wright says about the strategy he uses--that "distortions...carry the situation to extremes."31 Wright was asked what he felt the relationship was between distortion, exaggeration (another strategy he mentioned), and comparison as reflected in the political cartoon; it is here that his support of the idea of metaphor in cartoons becomes explicit.

I can't separate the two because the comparison is built into the exaggeration, and the reason it's a difficult question to answer is because I really don't see a finely defined point at which one turns off and the other comes on.32

Wright apparently sees comparison as being an integral part of several devices he uses in the cartoon. He agrees that comparison is present in cartoons, but since to him
hyperbole is part of comparison,\(^{33}\) he sees no reason to distinguish them.

At the end of the conversation, when asked to respond to the writer's explanations of his cartoons and cartooning in general, Wright further explained the relationship between comparison and exaggeration or distortion. He elaborated on my description of a particular cartoon as using exaggeration:

"There is some comparison in this, too...I think that's what I meant earlier when I said it's really hard to find the line. Comparison I think you will find probably in every single cartoon in one form or another. Comparison seems to me to be the whole...I think the one element that everyone would have to have in order to understand the cartoon--to compare it with something they already know or something that is visible in the cartoon itself."\(^{34}\)

As examination of the Appendix will show, Wright agreed to my explanation in general, occasionally disagreeing with what he considered to be the thesis of a particular cartoon. By "comparison" Wright seemed to include what is described as metaphor elsewhere in this study; the former term, however, was more comfortable for him to use.

**Summary of Interviews**

In different ways and with varying degrees of emphasis, all three artists agreed with the critical analyses of this study. On their own in response to open-ended questions, each made mention of using other than literal communicative devices in his work. Of the three, MacNelly came
closest to my critical concept when he described his works as utilizing an absurd comparison. Auth had mentioned use of metaphor in his book and offered little elaboration in the open-ended portion of the interview. Wright said that "distortion" is his major strategy, offering as an example a cartoon which is clearly metaphorical.

In the second part of the interview, the artists were presented with interpretations of their cartoons based on metaphorical and enthymematic models and were asked whether they agreed with those explanations. As can be seen in the appendices, all three cartoonists felt for the most part that the explanations of their work made good sense. Occasionally all three disagreed with my interpretation of the message or the claim that the work was making, but they never took issue with the explanation of the mode for presenting the message. Jeff MacNelly was the only cartoonist who seemed to prefer one version of fusion (fusion) over the others; Auth and Wright both contended that all versions were valid at one point or another, depending on the cartoon. When the artists were asked what they thought of the general inferences in the study, the four ways in which cartoons were said to communicate, they agreed that those statements indeed described the way that cartoons worked. Such support, of course, is subject to the qualifications necessary when the "demand characteristics" of the structured interview are involved.
Conclusions

The original purpose of this study was to investigate three phenomena—the political cartoon, the enthymeme, and the metaphor—with regard to their interrelation in argument. The latter two were examined to see how they worked as argument in political drawings with the hope that the results of such investigation would shed some light not only on their dynamics of political influence but also on how enthymemes and metaphors serve as argument in general. The study, therefore, yields three types of information.

As I examine how political cartoons use metaphor to make arguments, this essay necessarily addresses the process of invention. Typically, rhetoricians have looked at invention from either of two perspectives: as discovery or as the ordering of experience for the purpose of persuasion. More recently, Bitzer views invention as speaker-audience co-creation of argument. In this study, I have looked at cartoonists' use of metaphor as argument from each of these perspectives.

When invention is seen as discovery, we realize that the cartoonist "discovers" his arguments by taking the phenomenon (specifically, the political situation, personality, or idea) that is his subject and asking, as Auth does, "What's really happening?" The answer to that question is the discovery of a referent which, when visually connected to the cartoonist's subject, "explains" his view of it.
Stephenson's theory of mass communication is relevant to invention-as-discovery in his description of "play." My interviews with the cartoonists support the inference that they feel free to some extent, from some of the constraints of proof and evidence that limit the claims that editorial writers may make. Wright and MacNelly call the cartoonist's work "distortion," and MacNelly contends that cartoonists "don't give any reasons" to support their arguments. Auth says that he gets ideas for cartoons by asking himself questions like "How would this look to children?" In each case, the cartoonists have a certain freedom from responsibility that Stephenson proposes as a characteristic of "play:" "Play is pretending, a stepping outside the world of duty and responsibility... It is not ordinary or real." Stephenson connects play with fantasy and myth, and distinguishes play from work as he distinguishes fantasy from reality. In Stephenson's view, then, the editorial cartoon is a bridge between play and work. The cartoonist uses fantasy to achieve reality, to provide what Auth calls "the ring of truth." In this sense of invention, one sees that metaphor as argument is epistemic. An issue is seen and known in a new or novel perspective. Metaphor emerges as epistemic in this view also, because of what Black refers to as its capacity to make one "see new connections." The connection, of course, being the fusion of the artist's original topic and his new referent.
When one looks at invention as the organization of experience for the purpose of persuasion, another aspect of metaphor's role in argument emerges. Applying this perspective to political cartoons focuses one's attention to the view of thinking as sorting. Here one sees the evolution of metaphor as epistemic beginning with the analoging process. The artist must select from a large store of information a referent that, while it may seem radically different from the phenomenon he wants to compare it with, actually fits with the phenomenon into some one superordinate category. The single category which subsumes both referent and phenomenon, even though they are vastly different, contributes what we have discussed as "aptness" of a metaphor. Thus, in one metaphor we have tension produced by the differences in the referents, but at the same time we have fusion since those very differences may, in their opposition, produce that category that subsumes both referents. The act of arranging the members compared entails argument. That such arranging occurs in partnership with readers leads into the next sense of invention.

A third perspective is the view Bitzer represents that invention may take the form of rhetor-audience co-creation of argument. This occurs when one looks at metaphor operating as a connection between a premise supplied by the audience and a claim to which a rhetor wants adherence. In a visual metaphor, the rhetor connects his claim and a premise from
the audience through fusion of the two. It has been shown how visual metaphors operate similarly to verbal enthymemes; an examination of Stephen Toulmin's model of argument applied to the editorial cartoon reveals the ways in which visual metaphor operates differently. In editorial cartoons, what is visible, the stated message, is the middle premise of the enthymeme, what Toulmin calls the "warrant." In verbal argument, whether one looks at it from the perspective of the enthymeme, or whether it is seen from the vantage point of the Toulmin model, the first premise, or in Toulmin's case the assertion of data, is commonly an overt part of the message, as is the concluding premise, or the claim. In both perspectives, the middle premise, the warrant, goes unstated, a tacit part of the message, filled in by the audience. In editorial cartoons, the situation is exactly the opposite. Only the middle premise or the warrant is present before the reader's eye, and left to the audience to provide from their imaginations are the data (the first premise of the enthymeme) and the claim (the concluding premise). The visual metaphor constitutes the warrant in the argument with the data and claim implicit in the image. Since the implied portions of the argument in a visual metaphor are provided by the audience, the argument is a joint action of rhetor and audience. An example of this operation of invention appears earlier in this chapter. In this view of invention, as with the others, metaphor operates as epistemic with the audience.
participating in the creation of knowledge.

Political cartoons interest me not only because of what their study contributes to the knowledge of argumentation but because they also offer a unique genre of rhetoric to the scholar. No other visual art form so clearly mirrors the argumentative claims and subject matter of a written form of rhetoric while presenting these claims in an entirely different mode. The political cartoon and its companion on the editorial page, the prose editorial, make similar arguments. Don Wright said in his interview that generally, "your cartoonist is acting well within the philosophy represented by the editorial page..." and that "if the reader tends to scan all the other material around the cartoon then the chances are that he's going to get filled in on all the background and understand why we've arrived at that position." But, as I stated in Chapter I, it was problematic that political cartoons make standard political claims that are abstract. At first glance, the mode has no inherent capacity to express abstract ideas; cartoonists must represent them concretely. Their drawings, I said, are representational; they look like the objects they represent. Since visual representations of concrete objects are all the cartoonist has at his disposal, how is it that he is able to make the abstract political claims that comprise his message? It was inferred that the cartoonist transcends the limitations of his medium by using metaphorical fusion of concrete images.
To explore this notion in depth, three versions of fusion with different emphases were developed. Fusion$_1$ was the term used to mean metaphor simply as a condensed version of the four-term analogy, or A is to B as C is to D, condensed to the C of B. Fusion$_2$ denoted metaphor as paradoxical similarities, or metaphor in which difference in the two references were crucial to its meaning. Fusion$_3$ referred to metaphor as the visual unification of two referents, so that what might have been thought of as a comparison became a visual fact. These three perspectives were applied to a sample of political cartoons to see which one, if any of them, seemed to explain the argumentative process in the cartoon.

In addition, to explore further the rhetorical process in cartoons, the enthymeme was also used as a perspective since it is classic in argumentation theory and seemed to have some features in common with metaphor. The persuasive component in enthymemes is the connection between a proposition or premise understood, believed, or adhered to by the audience, and the claim to which the arguer desires adherence. If the arguer can establish such a connection strongly, then belief in the proposition implies belief in the claim, and the enthymeme is, as Bitzer argues, "self-persuasive."$^{50}$

An examination of the interface between metaphor and enthymeme and an investigation of how enthymemes operate in political cartoons reveals that the connection between pre-
mise and claim crucial to an enthymeme's effectiveness is provided by the metaphors operating in those cartoons. In other words, cartoons found to contain metaphor as an argumentative strategy contained, by their nature, enthymemetic argument. Metaphorical fusion in any of the versions derived for this study forms an indivisible link between premises and claims in political cartoons. Later appears the operation of enthymeme with metaphor as the connection among premises. Insofar as this essay specifies the nature of audience-supplied premising, it adds to the work of Bitzer.

The three perspectives of fusion described earlier were applied to a sample of thirty political cartoons, one from each of the three cartoonists interviewed for this study. The cartoons were subjected to a self-category sort, beginning with four divisions: fusion\(_1\), fusion\(_2\), fusion\(_3\), and literal cartoons. To these categories, as a result of the sorting procedure, were added a "hyperbole" category and an "other metaphor" category, the latter established to contain two cartoons that did not seem to fit into the established category of metaphor, and yet were not literal. Cartoons found to be using any of the forms of fusion were considered as being enthymemetic.

As reported in chapter four, if the seven cartoons in the "hyperbole" group are counted, twenty-three of the randomly sampled cartoons used metaphor to communicate their claims. The fact that I found only seven cartoons that were
a completely literal presentation of their message supports
the idea proposed at the inception of this study, that the
cartoon form is suited to metaphorical argument.

Among the various types of metaphor, fusion₂, that is,
metaphor of paradoxical similarities, and the "hyperbole"
group, were the most common, with eight and seven cartoons
respectively falling into these two categories. Fusion₂ was
also preferred among the explanations by Jeff MacNelly, with
Auth and Wright expressing little preference.

The other two versions of fusion failed to emerge
strongly, either in the sort or in the interviews. Fusion₁,
a condensed four-term analogy, was gleaned from Perelman's
discussion of metaphor. This concept was difficult to work
with because while the comparisons in cartoons were visually
understandable, they could not always be translated into a
four-term analogy that made sense verbally. Fusion₃, which
emphasized another aspect of Perelman's theory, that metaphor
is a "datum" because of a unification of referents, did not,
in this study, include differences between the referents as
being important in the metaphor. The notion from fusion₃
that a metaphor's status as data is achieved by unification
of referents could easily be incorporated into fusion₂; dif-
ferences as being paradoxical similarities though literally
impossible, become true through unification of referents.
The unification, or fusion, has effected the ontological
change in status discussed by Black, making the metaphor in
one sense, a fact. But instead of the metaphor becoming myth, as Berggren apparently holds, the figure retains its dynamism and remains alive because of the simultaneous retention of differences in the figure, the literal impossibility of the statement. Fusion_2, then, amended with elements from fusion_3, is within the limits of this exploratory study the best account of metaphor. Indeed, support for this conclusion can be found in the interviews with both Wright and Auth, who urge that value inheres in all of the versions of fusion, and contend that the appropriateness of any particular version depends on the individual cartoon.\textsuperscript{51}

Metaphor was chosen as a perspective for the study because this concept seemed to solve the political cartoon's inherent inability to express abstract ideas directly; enthymemes were chosen as a perspective because they constitute a form of argument basic to the field of rhetoric. If political cartoons can be characterized as visual arguments, it is necessary to determine whether they are capable of arguing enthymematically. As demonstrated in Chapter Two with Levine's cartoon of Lyndon Johnson, it is possible to describe arguments in political cartoons in enthymematic terms (with the first premise and the claim supplied by the audience).

In cartoons, the rhetor presents one referent from which the audience derives an intended premise; this referent is combined with another into a single image. The premise which the audience supplies from the first referent is then neces-
sarily applied to the second, since, through metaphorical fusion, the two have become one, and it is the effect of application of the first referent's premise to the second referent that suggests the artist's claim. For instance, a visual editorial may want to argue that Jimmy Carter is stupid. The artist makes the claim by portraying Carter as an ape, intending the audience to supply the premise that apes are stupid. Since this ape is united indivisibly with Carter, the audience sees (at least in this image) that not only is the ape stupid, but, since Carter is the ape, he must be stupid, too. The enthymeme, if we were to articulate it verbally, might read thus:

Premise$_1$: (supplied by the audience) Apes are stupid.

Premise$_2$: (supplied by the artist) This particular ape is actually Jimmy Carter.

Premise$_3$: (jointly constructed by audience and artist) Jimmy Carter is stupid.

What readers see in the cartoon is premise$_2$, the connection the artist creates between something believed by the audience and something he wishes the audience to believe. This connection is effected by the artist's use of metaphorical fusion. Here one sees not only how cartoons work enthymematically but also how enthymemes may work successfully. Bitzer argues that enthymemes are "self-persuasive" but fails to articulate precisely how supplying the premise for an argument convinces audiences of an arguer's claim. An application of enthymematic argument to the political cartoon
reveals that one specific key to success in an enthymeme lies in metaphorical connections the arguer makes between premises supplied by the audience and his claims. Any metaphor, then, can be viewed as enthymematically although, as I stated earlier, the reverse is not true. Metaphor is one among several ways in which the persuasive connection in enthymemes can be effected. With metaphorical fusion of a premise believed by the audience and a claim to which the arguer wants adherence comes an example of the unique "self-persuasive capability" of enthymemes that Bitzer proposes. In the visual mode of the editorial cartoon, we find an exemplar of such fusion.

Justification and Recommendations

There were several inferences about the various topics of this study which were either assumed from its inception or emerged with its development, and those inferences that were supported are the justification for this essay. First, it was assumed that the political cartoon is an iconic rhetorical form, and suitable material for the rhetorical critic. Even the more traditional rhetoricians must agree that cartoonists make claims to which they want adherence, and it was a finding of this study that they do so in a way that is at once unique to the mode and surprisingly similar to some ways in which verbal rhetors make their arguments. Another, related inference was that existing rhetorical paradigms
would prove to be workable when used in the rhetorical criticism of editorial cartoons, and that such an application would produce some insights into the nature of the paradigms themselves. The two that were chosen for this study, the metaphor and the enthymeme, provided explanations of cartoons that made sense to both the critic and the practitioners. In addition, their use in this study resulted in two major findings. First, that metaphor can act as argument, tension and fusion can be present in the same metaphor, and that its visual translation can redeem a faded metaphor. Second, that crucial to the success of an enthymeme is the connection that the speaker establishes between premise and claim, and that this connection may take the form of metaphor.

The discussion above is a brief summary of what I believe we have learned from this investigation. However, a number of related questions remain unanswered, and several areas addressed in this essay need further research. For example, the relationship between visual and verbal modes needs continued exploration. I mentioned earlier in this chapter that Jeff MacNelly had difficulty in expressing verbally the kind of relationships that he sees and portrays so well pictorially. A question that arises here and needs further exploration regards the nature of the translating process from the discursive to the iconic mode. I refer here not to those cartoons that are visual embodiments of commonplace or faded metaphors, but to those which, as Black says, "see new con-
Do these metaphors reflect some capability in iconic mode that is untranslatable? Or, as my own experience suggests, can one learn visual and verbal "interliteracy?"

Another perspective for investigating the relationship between visual and verbal modes is suggested by the system of constraints and freedoms that affect the editorial cartoonist in his daily work. This proposal is not simply for a study of gatekeeping but for exploring the relative constraints placed on cartoonists and writers with an eye to what such information could tell us about the perceived differences in modes. Are cartoonists allowed to get away with "saying" in pictures what an editorial writer would be prohibited from stating in print? Are cartoonists perceived as "saying" things at all in the same way that speakers and writers are? Tony Auth mentioned a libel suit against a cartoonist in California. A detailed examination of such litigation might inform the researcher about the seriousness given pictorial statements.

One final suggestion for further research is a testable hypothesis that emerges as a result of this study: That "good" cartoons use metaphor to make their arguments and that fusion, the fusion of paradoxical similarities, exemplifies excellence in political cartooning. One way to test this hypothesis would be to do a content analysis of the work of cartoonists who have won the Pulitzer. Another way would be to have practicing cartoonists rank order in terms of quality
a sample of cartoons which employ a variety of message strategies, fusion among them, to see which ones the artists judged to be the best. A shortened form of this test was intended as a part of this study, but one of the cartoonists that were interviewed was reluctant to do the task, and the interviewer did not remember to ask one of the other artists, so that part of the project was abandoned, and would be a potentially fruitful subject for further research.

The above suggestions for further research are only a few of many directions that studies of iconic genres may take. Chapter I established that few rhetorical investigations have been conducted which focus on nonverbal modes, and I hope that results of this study encourage further exploration of this relatively untapped genre by scholars of argument. Such an endeavor should contribute to our knowledge, not only of the visual medium, but of the explanatory capabilities of accepted rhetorical constructs.
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I would like to tell you a little bit about what I am doing. Basically I study argument and persuasion and so forth which is a very big field, but usually people study it in its verbal form and I am doing something a little bit different and since I am trained in dealing with words and so forth and for any number of reasons I haven't felt all that extremely comfortable in my own judgment of these drawings since it's like stepping into another mode for me. I am trying to fit some kind of theories that I have, that I have derived from sort of classical theories of argument about how pictures work in somewhat the same way as words do and that is why I am doing this. That is why I wanted to talk to you.

That's interesting.

What I am saying is that I hope you don't find all this too tedious.

Okay. What do you feel is your job basically as a cartoonist?

I don't know. I think you want to comment on what's going on. I guess be a commentator and a professional skeptic. But I think there's an element of education in there somewhere. We make them think a little and cartoons I think can do that because you can distort a situation totally and you can entertain somebody if you're lucky and you can get them, maybe get them to laugh about a situation or at least look at it in a strange sort of way. A lot of times you can get closer to the truth I think by violating all the laws of journalism and everything else.

You talk about distorting situations. Could you explain that a little bit?
M Just as you have to distort when you're doing a caricature of a person a lot of times that caricature looks more like the guy than a photograph would.

J Um huh, in some ways.

M Yeah, and I think that's the same way. I think you're distorting a situation too. If you're talking about, I don't know, a SALT debate or something, you're not going to have two guys sitting at a table for very long—that's kind of dull.

J So what might you do?

M You'd have fighter planes or you'd have, you know, cowboys shooting it out or something. You know, you'd get to it a different way. You would compare the existing reality to a totally fantastic situation. Sort of science fiction translation.

J So you're making some sort of—then a comparison that's fantastic or seemingly absurd.

M Right.

J And then, so you make this absurd comparison, then how does your message work through that?

M Sometimes it doesn't quite work it's way all the way through that. Sometimes it just looks like a cheap shot or a comic sort of gag on the news, but I usually start out to try . . . I always have something to say, an opinion on something. And it might not necessarily be something on the front page or something that is . . . it may just be something to read that's on everybody's mind like the energy thing or something. So you, um . . . So that's the way I approach it first. Usually there is a message in there somewhere but sometimes it does, let's say, get obscured by the other elements of the drawing but hopefully not. I don't know how . . . it's an effective way of communicating I think. I'm not so sure it's an effective way of arguing or debating. I don't know. Debate and argument need a verbal ammunition and the photo effect basically is a debate where a kid would be able to debate by standing up and sticking his tongue out.

J Do you feel that people don't take cartoons seriously?

M Oh yeah, I think they take them seriously. I think they oftentimes they take them much too seriously I find. I have people, even in my comics, especially
in my comics. I just do a silly whimsical comic strip and I get people reading all kinds of things into it. They say, I've got it, this character is Henry Kissinger and the tree is western world and they've got it all worked out. It sounds like one of my term papers. They read a little too much into it I think. But I think it is being taken very seriously, not only as an art form but I think as a legitimate commentary. Because I think basically cartoons have improved in the last ten or twenty years. They're not the same old ________.

J I've noticed that there's a change in your cartoons. I have your book from 1972 and this one from '76 and then your cartoons from '78 and I seem to be noticing a difference but I don't want to put words in your mouth. Do you think your cartooning has evolved?

M Oh yeah, sure.

J In what way? How are your drawings now different from your drawings then?

M Oh, I'm a lot more confident at doing it than I am technically. I think my philosophy has evolved. I'm a lot better informed person than I was when I started this and in many ways I'm a lot more interested in different things than I was then. When I started out I had some definite political thoughts and leaned into them but they weren't very well formulated and still aren't. I think it's a constant . . . if you're in any kind of creative situation I think your work really has to evolve or you get totally stale. I hope that I continue to be disappointed with the work I did two months ago. That's the way it should continue.

J I see. You mention comparison as a technique, absurd, or you said science fiction-like comparisons or fantastical comparisons. Is that your major technique for your items?

M Yeah, I think it's more contrast I think. The science fiction thing I think is the argument of science fiction freaks, of which I am not one. They say that science fiction is a legitimate art form because we take a basic problem or a basic conflict that you find in man's life or existence and you stick it on some ridiculous planet with giant caterpillars crawling on it. You get a different perspective and that's sort of what the cartoon is doing. It's taking something completely out of context and putting it in a fantastic setting and that way you're sort of stripping all the usual boring trappings and paraphernalia from the
arguments or from the personality and you're looking at them in a completely different light hopefully. It's a constant challenge, you've got to admit, trying to come up with new situations and to make yourself do something fantastic.

J Do characteristics from a new setting, the fantastical setting, do they rub off on, I mean are they attributed to whatever phenomenon you're talking about. Say if you're talking about the SALT talks and you said you put them in the context of shoot-them-up cowboys, so do some aspects of shoot them up cowboys sort of rub off on the SALT talks and is that maybe . . . I feel like I'm putting words in your mouth, but I'm wondering if that's part of how it works.

M Yes, usually an impression I've gotten reading the news or reading up on it. I suppose in my own mind it does take on __ and a lot of times just by definition they're exaggerated but it's not the whole picture. That's where you get away from debate and argument there.

J Okay, because you're stripping down . . .

M Yeah, you're just kind of saying this guy is a total jerk and you don't give any reasons you just say look at this nerd, what he's doing here. It's really stupid.

J No evidence.

M Yeah, if you're writing an editorial about it you'd say "so and so just did this." His reason for doing it was "thus and such." There might be a good reason why he did this. Probably a good idea. However, we think that it's a dumb idea, and then you say why it's a dumb idea. And then if they really want to come in and say not only is it a dumb idea but the guy is really a jerk and they come in with some more evidence about why he's a jerk, sort of giving both sides. In a classical debate situation you really aren't thrown the fish, you really nail him, but with cartoons, you know, there are a lot of people who don't understand the medium and they say, "Why don't you guys ever do anything positive?" It's impossible, absolutely impossible. It's satirical and by definition you avoid endorsement in cartoons of your favorite politician. It's ridiculous.

J Sure. So if you were awarding the Pulitzer, what criteria would you use to evaluate the work of your peers? What are some characteristics you think are essential to a good cartoon?
M I have always been partial. The reason I got into this in the first place was not any political activism. It was basically that I loved to draw. That is really primary with me. It's the drawing I really enjoy. I'll look at it and if it's an interesting, enjoyable presenta-
tion then I'll look at it and think there has to be something obviously beyond that. I think it has to say something, it has to definitely make a point. But it should make it responsibly. You know, there are a hell of a lot of guys who sit down almost like gag writers from the front page. They see what's happening and they make a funny joke. I think you've got to avoid that. A lot of that will creep in. I fall into that trap myself but I try to avoid it. I think you've got to have . . . I always sit down and say what do I want to say today, not what's a big yuck today because that's not really, you know none of it's funny if you follow it day in and day out like I do. So I think with me it's got to be the drawing, it's got to have a little whimsical humor in it, a little fantastic voyage in some way or another and it has to have that ring of truth to it. Tony rings the bell an awful lot. His drawing, you know it's not a complicated drawing. He really strips things down to the basic and really gets to the meat of the thing. I'm liable to sit down and draw a squadron of planes and spend four hours on it just for the hell of it and it may be a stupid cartoon idea but I get wrapped up in the drawing.

J So, you're saying sometimes maybe you can let the drawing get in the way of your message?

M I think you can. Malden has a great quote on that. He said it's divided into ideas and execution. He says, basically, this: A good idea doesn't have to be well drawn but a bad idea can't be saved by a good drawing, it really can't. You can have a really great concept and draw it in about six lines and if it's a recogn-
nizable concept it's a great cartoon.

J So the bad ideas may be one of the kind of things that go into making a bad cartoon. Are there any other things, characteristics of the cartoon message that you think are bad characteristics or make a poor cartoon. What are some other things . . . What I'm saying is what are some of the things you see in poor cartoons that you don't like?

M We all have to use labels from time to time but you can go overboard with it. The ideal cartoon doesn't have any labels, it's got everybody perfectly identifiable
and you understand what's going on. I think you've really got to avoid that kind of stuff. And by labels I don't just mean . . . The other day I drew something on the Rhodesian election and I had a ballot box and it was marked Rhodesian election so you'd know what the hell it was, what I was talking about. And that's all right. But when people have a barrel full of junk and label the junk "Problems of the 20th Century," or they'll label a skunk "Guerilla Warfare," it's just ridiculous. If you're translating some person or some thought or group or something into a cartoon character, usually you're trying to keep it at least recognizable so you don't have to go out of your way explaining why the hell you picked this particular image to represent this particular person or thing or idea.

J  Right.

M  If you were going to make a bunch of animals and stuff and the Russian bear would be the obvious one or something. I don't know. Maybe that's not it.

J  Well, you're talking about using images to represent things, ideas or people. And you said sometimes that wasn't appropriate; sometimes the images just sort of came out of left field like using a skunk to represent guerilla warfare.

M  Well, I'm thinking of bad cartoons. Ones that I see that I don't think work.

J  Well, what makes images appropriate to represent. I mean, how do you . . .

M  It's all individual. There's no great convention or anything. It's just individual judgment and the guy that doesn't have very good judgment doesn't draw good cartoons.

J  So that's sort of an intuitive process--picking the right images.

M  It's trial and error too.

J  Sure, and what seems to work and what doesn't? How do some images work and how do some not work, and how do the ones that work work and what are the characteristics?

M  Well, it's all communication problems. I mean you can have a fantastic image and it doesn't make any sense
on its face but when it's drawn if the reader looks at it and understands it immediately, if you get something out of that, then that's successful. Sometimes you really go out on a limb by taking a chance and the reader doesn't get it—and a hell of a lot of the time the reader doesn't get it.

J I was wondering. Do you ever have what you consider to be really great ideas that you don't do because you don't think the reader will get it?

M No, because by definition I don't think it's a really great idea. You do run into maybe a sophistication problem. You don't want to do ideas all the time that are going to be . . . that everybody will recognize or everybody will understand because they just . . . If you wanted to reach every reader with your cartoon that would be a pretty moronic exercise. I do get ideas that I reject totally, I mean I get kind of tickled by them but they wouldn't mean anything to anybody else.

J Okay.

M There's no use doing them unless you're communicating to somebody. I mean it's not a question of "I've done it -- if they don't understand my great artistic ability," and they should, you don't want to force it on them. So, I avoid ideas or reject it as a bad idea if it's one you don't think will work. Okay, I have one more general question. I really eliminated a lot of them because I didn't need to . . . you kind of answered them without my asking them -- and that is: Do you think what goes on in your head, and I think maybe you addressed this a little bit already, do you think what goes on in your head when you're kind of putting together elements to make a cartoon or to make an idea or a drawing, is the same kind of process as what goes on in my head when I see and interpret the cartoon, my head or anyone's head? In other words, do you think the process of the kind of thinking you do . . .

M The reader and the drawer -- the guy that does the work -- is the same? Not . . . well, sometimes maybe. I don't know. See, I've done it so often and I really, I never sit down and analyze why the hell I'm coming up with it, a particular idea, why am I going in this direction and not that direction. I just don't
I want to think about it. I would hate it if somebody actually could come up with an answer. Terrible. I've had people come here to interview me who used psychology approaches and psychology of humor, terribly serious, complex people telling me why things are funny. It's something you want to avoid is overanalysis. I think what happens a lot of times is you're doing something like I'm doing, you want to communicate it and you want to make it as simple as possible -- this happens to me sometimes -- you start out with a hell of an idea, what the hell I say, an image. I start working on it and I say, "Wow, it would be a little funnier if I had this guy over here saying this and maybe he shouldn't have a suitcase, but maybe he should be a pirate or something." And, I have gone through five or six evolutionary steps in my idea and I have lost the reader in the dust because they haven't seen steps one through four. He only sees the finished product. So, you have to guard against that. You have to say, "Is what I'm coming up with what I really wanted to say?" Or, just open the paper and look at it and say, "Talk to me."

J So you try and say . . . so you draw a little bit and you're MacNelly and then, you know, you sit back and look at it and be a reader for a little while to see if you can go where . . .

M You have to do that I think. But, at the same time I still draw for myself. It has to entertain me. It has to be . . . If it doesn't then it's no good. Now, I have kind of a weird sense of humor. So, a lot of times what I think is going to be good, and you never can tell, and Tony will probably tell you this, the reader, you can never predict what's going to be a good cartoon. I mean, what's going to be a . . . I guess. I always, I think that they'll be wondering about me, boy isn't that great and I won't hear anything and another time I'll come in and I'll draw one in about 20 minutes because I'm late or I'm kind of annoyed and want to get it out of the way and the phone will ring off the hook with people saying it's great, it's the best thing you've done in two years.

J Right. Auth has this great cartoon in his book when he's talking about himself as a cartoonist and he has some kid in there saying, "Well, when I told my parents I wanted to cartoon for a living they said it would be a tragic waste of my intelligence," and I thought that was just great.
M Oh yeah. He's great. He does a slide show that's fantastic. He did one, one time we were doing a join appearance somewhere and he was discussing the various ways people work and he had . . . he showed me coming to work at 5:00 in the morning, not another soul out and the moon out.

J I'm hoping that sometime I'll be able to catch that show of his. Now, I'd like to . . . time's kind of getting away from us and I have a lot of stuff to do. At least for me this is exactly . . . I really liked hearing you talk about it in general but right now I'd like to show you some of your own work. What I'm trying to get is some corroboration from you about my ideas to make them sort of valid and so, before I show you I'm going to show you some of my evaluations of your work from various angles and see what you think. But, then that's awfully . . . if you were trying to be nice or something like that you might say, "Oh year, right on the mark, so what I'd like to do . . .

M Okay, I'll be very honest.

J I appreciate that. I really do. I'd like to show you some of your own cartoons and have you sort of talk to me about them a little bit.

M I haven't looked at that book in five years. This is very embarrassing.

J I like your later work much better myself, but this is one . . . These were randomly selected if you want to know how I chose them. I picked them out of a table of random numbers. Okay. Maybe you could just tell me, what is this cartoon and how is it working? How would you explain it?

M Well, first of all I'm going to have to really think here. What the hell is going on.

J You put a handy little explanation here, that's how I knew.

M Yeah, this was a big deal around here for . . . there were two possums being considered for the uh . . . let's see . . . they turned it down, didn't they? Yeah. Let's see . . . his name was a consideration and, well, actually this was one of the more successful ones that I did on local traffic. I think it's a kind of a classic cartoon situation because the dialogue here, you're not really mentioning the hang man's noose and
so it's kind of understated what's going on in a way because you're not saying, "Why isn't Mr. Poff going to be hung by the neck until he dies." So, it's a little subtlety in there in the dialogue. That's what I try to do. I never use, I try not to use titles. Now, a lot of people would say, the old style cartoonists, they wouldn't have any dialogue here, they'd have a hang man's noose and they wouldn't have these two guys. Underneath they'd say... there'd be a tower in the background with a bonging bell or something and they'd say, "Where's the victim?" Whenever I use something underneath or whenever I put any kind of words in; very rarely will I use a title. I'll just use dialogue then. But, I didn't know, I thought that was one of the more successful ones because it all worked.

J Could you, let's see, I had to do this for my dissertation. I found it incredibly difficult sometimes because you're translating from pictures into words. Could you say the message for me in a sentence for me do you think? You know, what you were trying to say.

M Probably not. I don't know, it's really hard. That's the thing. People call me up on the phone sometimes and say, "What? Could you explain tonight's cartoon to me?" I say, "No."

M Yes, I read about that lady...

M What it's like is, you tell a joke... you know, or it doesn't have to be just a Polish joke... you told a joke and no matter what it was, nobody laughed at it. It doesn't make it funny by explaining it. I think it's the same way with a political cartoon. If it's not immediately evident what's going on then they say it's terrible and you shouldn't draw it. But, I think this thing conveys the, you know, what Poth would have gone through had he been nominated and, of course, these are the three guys that had just been crucified in the hearings. So, it's very self-explanatory.

J Sure, yeah, I'm not asking you because I don't understand you know.

M Oh, no, no, I know that.

J Okay, let's see. Here's one.
M  We've got another one here.

J  Sure, sure, we can go to that one. That's "People of the World Unite." That's for the tape's benefit. I know which one we're talking about. You've got a little note on it.

M  Yeah, I was just showing that really things really hadn't changed all that much. Just in the semantics of it. It's sort of a continuing theme that I get on.

J  That's the last one.

M  Oh yeah. There's nothing funny about skyjacking. This was probably in bad taste. But, that's a punch-like drawing I guess. That one, see, these cartoons you can read and you can go on and on about cartoons. I think when I did this I was just trying to be funny.

J  Okay, I have two more. These are from '78 that I'd like to show you. And, this is one of them, "Jimmy's Gunshop."

M  Oh yeah. I think that was right after the jet deal to Saudi Arabia or something. I'm not sure. Our aid to Israel and stuff. And it was kind of a common debating point whether we should be feeding guns to both sides. This is one that I did in about 20 minutes that I didn't think much of and I got a whole bunch of calls and requests for it that said it was great. That one I sort of liked the idea and it always gets a good reaction from audiences and stuff when I show it because I think it really shows what goes on in negotiations, especially when you have two parties who basically want the same thing except they have different methods of going about handling it.

J  So, then you said about this cartoon, the peace cartoon, that they really want the same thing and have different ways of going about it and the message seems to be here at least to me . . .

M  Yeah, there never . . . It never gets completely done to either's satisfaction. The other thing that makes it successful is the graphics. It's pretty self-evident what's going on.

J  This is where I've taken some of your cartoons and I guess you would pretty much say analyzed them to death.
and I'm going to show you some of my explanations and see if perhaps they make sense. Here's the first one. Now, what I did basically was come up with whatever I could. I came up with two kinds of topic sentences for the cartoon. Probably, perhaps your intended message may be somewhere in between or maybe one or the other -- It's not that I thought these two are equally, you know, could equally be. But, I just did that sort of as an exercise for myself to see if I could do it. The topic sentence, what I mean topic sentence is your cartoon in a sentence is here, "Carter's plans are inadequate to manage an operation the size of the Civil Service." Okay. And then these are sort of, I have various kinds of explanations of how the elements in the cartoon worked to present a message like that. Okay. They may add on to each other. You may think one explains the cartoon better than the others do or they may cumulatively or all together work, you know. All that kind of thing is true, or this is really off the ball and you are really forcing explanations. The first one is that what you have done is sort of condensed an analogy, a comparison, into a single image in metaphor so that you are saying basically in this interpretation, "The size of the Civil Service is to Carter's ability to handle the Civil Service and streamline the bureaucracy and so forth. And, the size of this great big over-grown beast is to this little flimsy, miserable inadequate kind of hoop. The metaphor doesn't translate very well into words as well as it does in the picture.

M Yeah, Well I . . . What I think. . . I think you've been putting the emphasis too much on the Carter figure here and not on the thing. You know, it's not preposterous to hold up a ring and have an animal jump through it. What is preposterous is expecting this particular animal to jump through this particular hoop. That's really what you're getting at is that the Civil Service . . . I mean, if your first sentence were true you would have like a great huge lion. Of course, I don't want to label the Civil Service huge, and that would show that the hoop was too small, and have the hoop around his nose or something. But, the problem really is with this side of the picture.

J My next one focuses more on this. That's how I got two out of it instead of one was focusing first on this and then on that. There's one thing that I think maybe you talked about earlier; and that is the idea of a comparison in that to compare the Civil Service
bureaucracy to a hippopotamus and compare Carter's intentions for the Civil Service to this little, flimsy hoop is preposterous, is ludicrous, yet is it? The two things have one characteristic in common and in this interpretation the hoop, since I'm focusing on the hoop, the hoop and Carter's plans both are inadequate for the job so a comparison that's once yet apt. Okay, I have another. It goes on and on. I'm terribly sorry. I go on in this view how the message works is that this hoop represents not only this thing that the animal can't squeeze into but also Carter's plans so that you use one image to report two things and so the characteristics of the hoop are attributed by the reader.

M That's true; what he's trying to do.

J Okay, and then finally I broke it down into more of a debate style formal argument to see if that would work and in this the first premise is supplied by the reader in looking at your cartoon and the second one is supplied by you. Then, you put the two together and out comes your claim. The first premise would be this animal is too big to go through here. Okay, the readers get that. Then the premise that you supply is that this animal is the Civil Service and it's too big to get through this hoop which is Carter's plans and so the claim is Carter's plans presenting these two as one, putting the premise from you and the premise from the audience together you get Carter's plans can't handle the Civil Service. Okay, are inadequate to handle the Civil Service. Now, on the second one, the second topic sentence focuses here because of its enormous size and inefficiency. Carter's ambitions to control the Civil Service are commendable but naive. And then it's very much the same thing. The big size . . . the overgrownness and inefficiency of the Civil Service is to Carter's efforts to control it as this huge beast is to this little hoop. Then you can answer the Civil Service is this large overgrown thing that is too much for anybody to deal with and again you have this ludicrous comparison here between this huge, clumsy, dim-witted, overgrown hippo and the Civil Service and these are from absurdly different spheres. Okay, so the comparison seems ridiculous or impossible. Yet, it's apt because both of these would be impossible to really control or do anything with. And then the formal argument that the audience looks at this and says this animal's the Civil Service and then they say, they, you know, you and they together have built their
claim the Civil Service is too big to control. So, that's my first one. I guess I'd like to know if those make sense to you.

M Oh yeah, no, I think they do. I think it actually makes me stop and think about the point. I think what, if you really wanted to make Carter look inept as a circus man, I mean it's not really an indictment of what he's trying to do except that like all politicians he's trying to put on a little show and this whole thing about . . .

J Oh, then there's a third image there. Right.

M So, he's trying to put on a show, but if it were totally inept exercise, you'd probably have him. . . . If you were trying to exercise what he's doing wrong then you'd have something like a flaming hoop that he's holding on to, you know, it's burning.

J Um hum, smoke coming from his coattails and so forth.

M Right, something like that.

J In a way a little David and Goliath aspect.

M Yeah, that's right. That's really how else you could illustrate that cartoon.

J There are so many things and as I said, I was really stretching my brain to come up with these on purpose, not that I thought either one was particularly, absolutely apt. Here's one, this I've taken whatever words I could find on the cartoon and titled the cartoon by that. So, this one's called "NATO-BANG." The first interpretation I could come up with, and I had to sort of push these interpretations kind of farther apart so I could come up with two when I could, and this one is sort of, although NATO persists in presenting itself as an effective defense organization it's real military strength is more rhetorical than genuine. And, then the analogy of the comparison: the straightforward comparison would be NATO is to real military strength or substantial military strength as the word BANG is to a real bullet. So, then you say that NATO is among military defense or among real defense NATO is a toy gun or something like that. And then, comparing on this level of looking at the cartoon, the similarities are still paradoxical. You are . . . NATO is the defense organization of the North
Atlantic and so, it is absurd to compare the whole fire power of NATO to this one decrepit old tank. But, it's absurd, yet at once apt because NATO's fire power has been diminishing more and more. And, you're using here, again, a visual metaphor. This tank is a metaphor of the whole: both the tank, both this decrepit old thing and all of NATO's fire power. So, the audience thinks this is one image, you can't divide it up and say, "Oh, no." They have to say, "Well, since this stands for two things," they attribute the characteristics of one with its oldness and decrepitness to the other, which is NATO. You say the audience supplies this. Well, the power of this tank is more rhetorical than real and then what you supply them is this tank is NATO and then they put those together and say NATO's power is more rhetorical than real.

M  I can see . . . I'll buy that.

J  You'll buy that?

M  Yeah, I don't know. That . . . of course you're . . .

J  I know I'm really discussing them to death.

M  Well, it's kind of interesting. I guess that's about it. I mean that's a pretty simple cartoon to deal in any time. It's not really the reacting kind on any particular event. I don't assign any great importance to that one.

J  Now my second . . . I picked this one to ask you about because my second interpretation leaves out those elements of image and so forth and said, well, the topic sentence is only somewhat different, which is "NATO has neglected its military equipment so much that it's no longer defense power in the North Atlantic." This becomes an example rather than an image or a metaphor or something fantastical. In other words, here's an example of NATO's military power. Now, to be sure an exaggerated example.

M  It's hard to get into examples in a cartoon because it's not a documentary type medium. In other words, if I wanted to make an example out of what the hardware was in NATO I'd have a photograph.

J  So, the other interpretation would be more accurate.

M  Yeah, I think. I think you don't want to say . . .
you wouldn't do a cartoon saying this is an example of how dumb Carter is and if you had to use an example you could not twist the truth; this is clearly a twist of the truth. So, you are dealing all the time with figurative language and images and so forth. I think the example root is probably enough direction to grow in.

J That's true probably in my own ideas. Okay, now this is, "Thank you, Sir, Now Do I Hear Two Buckets of Camel Spit." What, okay, and the first one, and again, see, I sort of slipped in maybe a composite message and split them up so I could come up with two. The first one is "Vance and Carter are stupid to think that any of the other Arab countries are going to buy this peace agreement." Okay, so then you say, "Well, the promotion of a shaky peace treaty is to the Arab countries, who are obviously unfriendly to the ideas, as it would be the same as trying to sell a painting of questionable authenticity to a bunch of confirmed art haters." So, then you put them together and you say the Arab countries are never going to buy this sort of forgery of peace that Carter's come up with.

M You know, the, I'm not really saying anything in there about the peace treaty. I'm saying more, I'm saying something about the selling of the peace treaty, maybe. But, I'm not really indicting it. I'm not saying that the peace treaty is a bunch of junk.

J Sure, I kind of added it in there.

M Yeah, but I think that's important because that's... in fact, probably subtracts from the cartoon a little if I definitely were sitting down and saying it's a piece of junk. But you don't have time to do that in a cartoon. You can't really do two or three things at the same time, I don't think. Back to your...

J What I've sort of said is that the long awaited agreement, and this is a ludicrous comparison, the long awaited agreement, tenuous as it is, is a great step forward to peace; and it couldn't possibly have anything to do with a sort of indifferent or questionable painting sold by a Nazi. Yet, it does because in neither case, you know, these art haters aren't going to buy the painting and the Arab countries are not going to buy the peace treaty. And then, when I'm talking about the fusing, putting two images in one, I think that the metaphor here is more verbal
rather than visual because here are Arabs and it's kind of hard in the mind to kind of Arabs are Arabs are Arabs, you know, and it's hard. I think it's probably hard for a Westerner to think of them in terms of art buyers.

M Yeah, although my experience with Arabs is only at goat auctions and things so it's sort of an image of, you know, camel traders or rug dealers or something. You could make the argument, they are incredibly shrewd traders and they know a crumby buy when they see one. You might be able to argue that side of it too.

J That was, yes, and I got that too, although my knowledge of mid-East is pretty slim.

M That's the thing. You can't read much -- in a cartoon you can't read much into the history of the Arab culture. I mean you can't rely on that . . .

J As a communicative measure. So, hence, I think maybe you relied on -- you had this and the buckets of camel spit which I thought was great. And, so, basically then the argument is Vance is trying to sell these Arabs, okay, sell these folks a painting. Okay, and the painting represents the peace agreement. Okay, a painting of the peace agreement, say. And the audience is going to get all of that. Then what you're saying is, "Well, the Arabs aren't buying this." And then the claim is . . .

M They sort of are. I mean, they didn't . . . This was I think in particular he took a trip to Saudi Arabia as I recall. Saudi Arabia was not, you know, they weren't saying, "Go to hell and break off diplomatic relations." They were very cool to the whole idea obviously. They weren't as bad as Syrians maybe, but this shows you the level of the great enthusiasm for them.

J Okay, then, I maybe extended it more than intended. Now, this is a totally contrasting interpretation, and that is that these Arab countries should follow Sadat's example and support the peace agreement. That's your new topic sentence. And, so that this instead of becoming a painting of questionable authenticity, it's a masterpiece and you're saying basically these people are ignorant not to buy this masterpiece. So, the Arab countries are to the peace agreement as some confirmed art hater.
M Well, I think there again you're reading something into this. You're kind of saying, and there's nothing in this picture, there's nothing in this image here to say that it's either bad or good. It's just kind of there. You can't really get into that. If you wanted to do that you would do a separate cartoon entirely with a picture and showing how it's faked or something. I don't know. You'd do something like that. So, I think that's going a little too far.

J Okay. I'd like to go on to a couple of more cartoons and these are the most recent. No, not these are the most recent -- these are from your most recent book that was very hard to get ahold of. A . . . shop in Richmond air mailed it to me.

M Is that right?

J They were very nice about it. Okay, the first sort of sentence I have for your cartoon would be "Since Dole is doing most of the campaigning, he's taking all the flak for Ford's policies." More important to me is not these sentences I've come up with (they're just framework from which to work), but to find out what in the cartoon is going on. Okay, and this is . . . So, you say Dole takes the criticism for Ford's policies just as a shotgun rider draws all the fire that's really aimed at the stagecoach so that Dole is sort of taking the flack.

M Yeah, I think this. I think the way really it worked out in my thinking about it was that Ford for a long time was very low profile and was not involved with it, but Dole was . . . I don't know whether it's a defensive situation he's in here, or an offensive situation. I know he was pretty much the hatchet man for the campaign. But he was definitely the tough guy out in front of all this stuff. And, Jerry was sticking in the White House doing the presidential number.

J Again, I want to go back to the idea that the comparison, the ludicrous comparison which seems to me . .

M So, anyway, where was I. So, in other words you have this fantastic comparison again with Dole as the Vice Presidential candidate and some guy who's sitting up there drawing fire. Again, they're from different species. Yet, the comparison is sort of strange but accurate in that they're both taking flak that's usually aimed somewhere else. I originally, I think
the way this was evolving, was that I originally had Ford up here, Dole riding shotgun with arrows sticking out of him, all over the place, and firing and the arrows were just firing at Dole and Jerry was going to be in a three piece suit kind of thing with nothing bothering him and Dole's drawing all the fire and shooting all the bullets. It probably would have been a little more effective because of all the action. But the, I said, "What the hell, Jerry isn't . . . he's not even in the damn campaign yet." So, I stuck him inside.

J Right, Right. And then my second topic sentence kind of deals more with that. So then, but you think it's true to say you are maybe making a comparison between Dole and the shotgun rider that characteristic somehow that you think the audience will think about shotgun riders are going to be applied to Dole since he's . . .

M Yeah.

J Now the second one. You may like this one better. I had to get someone to . . . I must have been doing coursework or something during the day because I remembered very little and I had forgotten that Ford really decided he was President . . . the campaign at that point.

M Well, that's kind of standard. The incumbent . . .

J Umhuh, So, this one I said that Ford is in hiding in the Presidency claiming that Dole has the campaign because he's too busy being President. But actually Ford's running the show. So, then I said Ford's hiding in the Presidency and just as the driver is hiding in the stagecoach, he doesn't draw any fire but he's controlling the horses. So, Ford is really the driver of this campaign. And then again a ludicrous comparison. Of course Ford has to be President. He's President and he has to do this. What do you mean hiding? That's silly. Yet, it's not silly because he hasn't been campaigning. Both Ford and this guy who's hiding, who are pretending not to be involved, but are actually running things. You say, well, the guy hiding in the stagecoach is actually driving it and the guy in the stagecoach is actually President Ford. So, President Ford is pretending not to and hiding in his office but actually running the campaign.

M I think that's basically it.
J And you think that's the way . . .

M It's hard for me to figure out which.

J What was your original?

M Yeah, it's kind of hard to remember a lot of what you're thinking going into the cartoon really. Even though it's subject to a lot of different interpretations there's always one reason you did the cartoon. But I can't really remember what the basic thing was.

J I have one more. That was this one, and I came up with just one topic sentence, or sentence for this. And, that was that "Debating between vice presidential candidates is just a campaign gimmick because vice presidents don't have any power and never do anything in office anyway." So, I said then, "Vice Presidents are to executive power like riders in the back seat are to the driving of the car." Basically these guys are in the back seat and they're pretending not to be. Then I think here the fantastical image is really strong, and maybe stronger than in some of the cartoons. And that is that these people are candidates for the second highest office in the land and that it's just absolutely silly to compare them to a couple of kids who are pretending to have a race in the back seat of some cars. Yet, it's not silly because these people, being vice presidential candidates, are debating the office as if they were really going to do something, if they were in an office, and these two little children are pretending to drive the cars like they were really driving the cars. So, the comparison is fantastic and absurd. But, actually, both are true because both are playing a game of make believe. And then . . .

M That didn't come out too bad.

J What you've done through these labels -- have presented these candidates and their roles in the debates as kids playing make believe with power and so since you use one image to refer to both vice presidents and children playing make believe, the attributes of children playing make believe are applied to these two people so that the audience says, "Huh, that's the way it is." And then, finally, is the sort of formal argument. The kids in the back seat are just pretending and the kids, that's what the audience says, and then what you say are, "Hey, these kids are Dole and Mondale"
and so then the audience says, "Dole and Mondale are just pretending to be important, or to be serious policy makers."

M No, I don't think that's it.

J What is it that you think is off the mark?

M Well, I don't think... you know, I'm not criticizing these two people as much as I'm criticizing the thought of a vice presidential debate. I think that's the thought that triggered this whole cartoon -- that you're really not, I don't know, it's probably invalid. Probably vice presidential debates are a good idea for a debate.

J Part of it also is that I'm working with the images and I know that you're talking about the debates. But, since I'm looking at the cartoon these people come into my mind more often. But, I think that basically in the topic sentence it's the debate that's silly because these men don't really do anything. Okay, I had one more thing to ask you about the -- and I know I've really sort of put you through a lot here...

M No.

J And that is, now you seem to have, if not my interpretations of your cartoons, you seem to have kind of agreed with or supported what I think, what my explanations were in terms of how the cartoons look, or how they work and how the audience interprets them or whatever. And basically, I'm saying, well, it's an absurd comparison, a paradox and because you use one image to refer to two things characteristically the first which is the setting that you put the idea you're really talking about in are applied to characteristics of the second; they're sort of self-persuasive because the audience is only looking at one thing. I can't divide them up. And that further, you expect the audience to supply... Okay, so basically then, what you're saying, what I'm saying is that the third way cartoons work is that you expect the audience to know that these people are never going to finish their painting, and then you say that these people are really Sadat and Begin and so since these two are presented together as one visual construction they can't separate out Sadat and Begin from the painters because Sadat and Begin in this picture are the painters and so they must therefore, Sadat and Begin are never going to finish the peace agreement.
M Right.

J Okay, so what I want to know now and if there's any one of those explanations that seems to be more accurate to you in terms of what happened in the cartoon.

M You mean in all the cartoons that you've . . .

J Of the kinds of explanations that I've, you know, the ludicrous comparison and straightforward comparison or sort of formal argument where the audience supplies a claim and you supplied a claim. You know, what's more important, is it that there's one image or is it that the comparison is ridiculous or that . . .

M No, I think it's the image. It's the one image. The comparison is almost always ridiculous. It almost has to be. Because if it's not then you're talking about a documentary. A couple of lawyers discussing the law in an office and it is not an image at all. So you really, I think that's sort of a given . . .

J And the one image then referring to both the setting and the same thing you talked about.

M Yeah, the reality.

J And, now, what I've said basically was that this image sort of almost in a way, forces the audience to buy your argument because they can't separate them out. They can't separate the setting from . . .

M Yeah, that's right they can't. And they can't say -- the great thing about cartooning is that they can't say that Sadat and Begin are not painters. Of course they are -- right there they are.

J Right there in front of you.

M And so, by looking at the cartoon you're accepting the whole bunch of premises you couldn't possibly accept really.

J Okay, and then I have one final thing and that is, do you think then what I've been talking about in terms of how I think these cartoons work, do you think that applies to how people interpret them or how you, what goes on in you mind when you make them up, or both?
M I think it's funny how people interpret them. I don't think it's interesting what goes on in the creator's mind. I mean it sort of is, but it shouldn't be on a day-to-day basis. That gets more into the personality of the guy who's drawing them and it really is beside the point. It's sort of like show business or something. So, you really are talking about audience reaction I think more than anything else.

J Okay, yeah, I kind of think so too.
APPENDIX B

Interview with Tony Auth

A See, the thing is, what is the role of a political cartoonist? It's entertainment. It's education. It's ridicule, outrage. It's trying to form public opinion. So, they bounce around a lot. That's why I was so scared when you picked these five dates at random.

J Right. Well, I picked five -- I have some sort of constraints on me in terms of I want to see if my own ideas about how cartoons work; my own theoretical assumptions are something that you perceive to be really happening when people look at a cartoon or when you draw one. And, in order to do that I couldn't just pick the ten I liked best, or the ten that were real examplars of my own theory. But, I wanted to get some that worked, some that didn't, some that really reflected what I thought happened, and some that didn't. And, I did get that good cross-section.

A Yeah. There were some interesting five cartoons that came up.

J And I have five selected out of your book, too. You led me to one of the questions I wanted to ask you and that is: What your job as a cartoonist was, and you said, an educator, ridicule, and a number of other things. Would you say it was fundamentally persuasive?

A No. I think it's fundamentally -- the best cartoons -- again, like, see, this is a fine cartoon, a first-rate cartoon, funny as hell. It's not my idea of the art at its highest level, though. I'm not ashamed of that, at all. But I think the best cartoons are analysis . . . of events . . . that somehow cut through all the fog and the oratory, and the rhetoric, and the cultural overlays, and whatever else people have to deal with, and get to the point. And if you succeed, what happens is if people agree with it they say fantastic, got right to it. If they don't agree, they'll just say -- they'll accuse you of being oversimplified. And it's always much more complicated. And, of course it is.
Oh, well, sure. Well, how do you -- you have pictures, then. You deal with pictures, and as you said, you're dealing with complicated issues. And your purpose, you said, is analysis of those issues. How do you do that with pictures?

Well, it's a very good medium for making one point at a time. So, very rarely do I even attempt to say more than one thing in any one cartoon. And, there are lots of things to say about complicated issues.

Well, how do you say that one thing? What techniques...

Well, if I -- figuring out what to say, I have a -- somewhere on this bulletin board, a list of questions. Techniques for, you know -- First of all, I read stories. I play with things. Some things are obvious. Oh, I showed you a cartoon about that. If it's Rizzo stealing -- Rizzo coming up with the sick pay stuff, it's an easy thing. I know immediately the subject matter. I know immediately how I feel about it. It's not like Three Mile Island. But, assuming that we haven't got a situation like that, I have to try and figure out what I want to say. So, that goes on constantly. I read eighteen magazines. I'm scrounging around looking for stuff. And, once I know what I want to say about something, then it's a matter of -- Okay, how can I say that? And that's when I go into different techniques. I can say it sometimes by -- you know, I have a . . . one of my favorite questions is "What's really happening?" And if you can answer that question, it doesn't matter how absurd it is, because you can draw anything. And, some of the best cartoons, well, what's really happening is something that's just crazy. So you illustrate that, and it's a funny cartoon.

You said "absurd." Do you use absurdity?

Yeah, cartoons are -- I guess what they really do is show the attempt is to show something that really true by carrying it to such an extreme that it's crazy. So, it becomes absurd. I was at a thing last night. It was a Gridiron dinner. And, it was journalists and theater people and they put together this satirical show. Some of it was very funny. But, I was sitting there thinking -- we have this new Governor, Dick Thornberg. And he's just new in office. There's no scandal. There's no hint of scandal. He appears to be a bright, serious guy. And,
they tried to lampoon him. And, it didn't work. Because it's not appropriate. You know, it suddenly -- if it were Richard Nixon or Frank Rizzo, it would have been okay. But with him it's just vicious. There's not enough underpinning. So that's somehow very important. And that's what I think people talk about when they say a cartoon isn't fair.

J What generally -- if you were awarding the Pulitzer or whatever, what kind of thing would you look for? What are some characteristics of a good cartoon?

A First, fortunately, they don't give it for a good cartoon. They give it for a year's work. Or in Herblock's case, for the entire body of his work. And that's much fairer than one cartoon. I look for serious statements about what's going on, not jokes about the headlines. That's my first dividing line between humorists and comedians. And there's a lot of people doing this and I just think they're a lot of comedians. But a guy like Jules Pfeiffer, or Mac-Nelly, or Herblock or Edward Sorel, they're serious artists. And, they're fine humorists. I don't know how you define what goes into all that stuff, except that somehow there's meat there that you don't see when people are just drawing elephants and donkeys. You know what I mean.

J Um hm. What are some faults -- say if you see a lot of cartoons that you think are bad. What's wrong with those cartoons?

A Well, usually, in far too many cases, what's happening is that they're ripping off another artist. And you can see it very clearly. They've seen an idea and they file it somewhere in their brain and now they're changing the labels on it. So, really, really good cartoons are pretty original, well, or not tired, used ideas, hackneyed concepts. You know that when Nast was doing all those allegorical cartoons -- with justice swinging the sword, and the Tammany Tiger and all that -- they were very, very powerful. People had never seen those kinds of cartoons before that. It was incredibly original, very powerful. They made people -- sent chills up their spine. You do that now, and you can't. It'd be like somebody painting the Last Supper again. It's already been done. I mean, it was fine when it was done, but things move on. So the rules keep changing.
J This is a great question. And I know you're going to -- where or how -- I want to ask you how you get your ideas. What I mean by ideas is not what to draw about, but how to draw it.

A Yeah. It's a very common question, very difficult to answer. I suspect -- you see, I've been drawing since I was five. I think I'm extremely visually oriented. I think I have a capacity and other cartoonists have a capacity to have a kind of visual data bank. And you use it -- The Little King. . . now I went through a period when I was eight or nine years old where I was fascinated with The Little King. And I spent hours trying to learn how to draw The Little King. I eventually got tired of that and moved on. That's how people learn how to draw. They, you know, go through phases. At least the younger people who read comic books. The older people didn't, so they did other things. So here I am, twenty years later, playing around with Rizzo, and the crown comes in, and it was not a conscious leap. But the brain made the leap. The Little King. It's hard to explain.

J I have one other. We'll get, maybe, talking about specific cartoons. I have one other question for now. That is, Do you ever have any really terrific ideas for cartoons that you abandon because you figure your audience won't understand them?

A Well, I usually have to be convinced to abandon them. If I think it's really terrific, I assume that people will understand it. If my editor doesn't get it, and it just falls flat for him because he hasn't read the book or seen the movie, or whatever it is, my first inclination usually is to question whether he's typical. And I take it around, and show it to other people. If people in this building don't get it, then I get gradually convinced that sure enough, you know . . . However, that doesn't always carry the day. I mean, sometimes I'll think it's so good that I'll do it anyway, because, first of all, I refuse to start talking down to the audience. And secondly, there's a certain thing about quality. And, like the cartoon about nuclear waste, with The Sorcerer's Apprentice, I literally was on the phone for three days, explaining that. It doesn't matter. It's a fine piece of work. And, I'm glad I did it. But, usually I'll be convinced not to do that.
Yes, you said, in The Sorcerer's Apprentice, that you used a metaphor that people didn't understand. That's what you said in your book. Could you talk about that for a minute? If you'd like, I've got a copy.

No, I really don't need it. Well, that's what you were talking about. It was a parody, really. My cartoon was a parody of a motion picture that my assumption was, it was a classic, and that most people had seen it. It turns out, that relatively small numbers of people have seen this movie. But, it was one of those things where -- I like folklore. I like fairy tales. I like those kinds of oral traditions, legends, and things like that. And they're very valuable to be used in cartoons. Rizzo Hood is another one. So, here is one, and I don't know how I put it together with The Sorcerer's Apprentice, but I was thinking, oh, nuclear waste, we made a Faustian bargain, we're dealing with forces that we just don't understand, and yet, we're plunging ahead. And, you know, click, The Sorcerer's Apprentice. Magic -- had all the right things -- young, ignorant, well-meaning ... So, my editor, in fact, said, "What's this about?" And I said, "Oh, come on. Everybody's seen this movie. It's a great cartoon." He says, "Really?" I said, "Yeah, don't worry about it." Mr. Selby's Treehouse was another one. I didn't get many phone calls about that one. But, I'm sure there were a lot of people that saw that cartoon and wondered just what the hell it was all about. It was a fairly small story in the paper, and yet, I thought it was really an important thing. And Kind of, also, even if you didn't read the story and you didn't know who Mr. Selby was, I thought that the image was really a good image for conjuring up all kinds of feelings. The confrontation between the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries. The old values and the new technology. So, I went ahead with that one, too.

I'd like to go on, but I don't know how your time is.

I've got lots of it.

Oh, good. That's good. I'd like to go on. What I want to do -- sort of, for the purposes of my study and keeping things straight. Well, basically, what I'm looking for from you is some information about how you think cartoons work and some corroboration of my perspective. Now, in order not to lay what we call
demand characteristics on you, my design is to show you five of your cartoons first and have you discuss them with me, without much direction, without me saying "This is what I think," and then take the other five and I'll show you how my theoretical opinions fit in with what I think you've done. And then what I'd like is a really honest -- MacNelly promised me he would be absolutely honest as to whether he agreed with me or not -- and I would like to ask that you do that, too. A really honest evaluation of whether you think I'm, you know, whether they make sense to you or whether you think I'm off, you know, completely off the wall or what. But we'll start with the ones that I'd like to ask you to talk about, and . . .

A Well, first of all, just let me say that it's -- I think it's okay to disagree about what the cartoon means. That's fine and since we're dealing with visual images and not words, which tend to be more precise, different people are always going to bring different -- depending on their experience. So, I mean, that's okay. But I'll be very honest about what I intended.

J Sure. And, basically what I'm focusing on is not so much "the message" of the cartoon, although I'll come up with one for each cartoon, but how what you put here communicates that. At first I'd like you to address that. What is your message and how does what you put here communicate that. This is "Detente."

A Well, essentially, what "Detente" is is learning to live the fact that here we are, these two countries have the potential to destroy one another. And, they're joining in the effort not to, but at the same time, the competition goes on. So, what you've got is kind of this warlike competition. But the acknowledgement that that's dangerous, but is also sort of under control.

J And the tanks, joined -- how does this work to . . .

A Well, nobody can fire at the other person without both being destroyed. You know, there's one barrel.

J I see. Okay. All right, let's see what's next. Oh, it's one of the ones you sent me. "This was your FBI."

A Oh, yeah. That was the one that probably didn't work.
I thought . . .

J I think that's very interesting. Okay, and I'd like you to tell me why it . . .

A Well, I don't know. Maybe it did. But what the news story that was associated with this was that there was a story that FBI memos which had been unearthed with the freedom of information act indicated that there was a very prominent Black who was cooperating with the FBI in an effort to discredit Martin Luther King.

J With those tapes of his . . .

A That was the inference. But see, everybody who knows anything about the FBI knows that just because you see something in a memo doesn't make it true. And news stories didn't get into that. And what I attempted to do with this cartoon was to really put that -- that was the point I wanted to make. What happened was that these guys wrote whatever Hoover wanted to see. And everybody knows that, only it's one of those things that it's real easy to forget. 'Oh, a Black was cooperating with the FBI?' Well, not really, not necessarily. So, I just made up an imaginary . . . my wavy lines indicate that it's sort of dreamy. I don't know if anybody knows that but me. So, anyway, this is a scenario as I imagine it may have happened. Hoover, you know -- they say "Go out and get a Black," the agents go out. No Blacks will cooperate. And they go back to their typewriters and say, "Well, we found one." Because if you showed Hoover something he didn't like, he sent you to Alaska or something.

J Or worse. You said that this didn't work well. Or maybe you feel that it's not the best or among the best work that you do. What is it about this cartoon, about the visual elements that . . .

A I suspect that the problem is in the receptivity of the average reader. I just, something tells me after looking at this four months later, or whatever, that a reader opening the paper that day and looking at this wouldn't have been boosted up to a certain level of consciousness where this would be really -- where they would be really receptive to this. I don't know how to say it. I mean I have a -- sometimes I have cartoons that I wait for the right time to publish them. And things like that. It's a little different.
It's a little strange. I changed, maybe I changed too many rules at one time. I don't know. I'm glad I did it. I think it was worth doing. I'm just not so sure it was effective as a lot of other cartoons.

J Does that have to do with the fact that it's four frames instead of one?

A Mm, I don't think so. It's pretty complicated. That's another element to it. It is a little more complicated, and so, what have I done? I've really changed my format in a whole lot of ways. I've invented an imaginary scenario in the past tense. I haven't really told the readers -- I don't know. It's really difficult to articulate these -- maybe I could have done this in a way that would have been like the "Detente" cartoon. One image, effective, quick. I tend to like those the best. But maybe not. And anyway, you've got the deadline coming every day, cranking the stuff out.

J Yeah. I think we'll -- we can probably dispense with "Mayor for Life." That was one of the ones I was going to talk about. But, you already discussed that pretty much. Did you say -- anything you could add about "Mayor for Life?"

A No, just that . . . I think we've already discussed that.

J Okay. Right. The next one's in the book. This is "Tax increase, Tax cut." I always find something to call them.

A A lot of people have done cartoons about Jerry Ford bumping his head, and falling down, and doing -- I never did that. Unless -- because I thought it was a real bum rap. For one thing, he's the most athletic president we've ever had in a long time. And if sixteen hundred reporters were following you around, you know -- However, it was a good metaphor in this case where he obviously couldn't make up his mind. In fact, he was making contradictory public statements about whether we should have a tax increase or a tax cut. So, I took advantage of the widespread feeling that he was a bumbler. And used that as a metaphor for this -- and he did go skiing. So it fit nicely in a package.

J Sure. And, then the People's Temple cartoon that I
have right here.

A Well, now this was a situation where there was just no question about what to do a cartoon on. And it started with -- early in the day, what we knew was that Ryan and those other people had been killed, by this religious group. And, uh, supposedly Christian. It wouldn't be the first time that people had been murdered in the name of Christianity. So, the cartoon started with just these crossed rifles. On top of the steeple. And, you know, this is certainly not an indictment of Christianity. But, here you got the cross becoming a symbol of violence instead of a symbol of peace. And then, midway through the drawing and we find out that nine hundred people had been killed, or committed suicide.

J Really . . . oh, boy.

A And then I put all the crosses in -- but the, churches are surrounded by graveyards, so -- I did a better cartoon on what this is all about, later, but you picked this day.

J Um, Now, I'd like to show you some of the ones that I -- what I did was, I do rhetorical criticism, sort of like literary criticism only of persuasion, communication. And what I did was, I have some theoretical assumptions that I use. And I sort of translated them into real shorthand forms so that this is very simplified. And since they're following some theories of mine, they may seem repetitive. I hope you don't get bored. What I'd like to do is just explain to you how I think this cartoon works and then you can -- I have some different ways of talking about it. And I'd like to hear your response to them. Is one better than the other? Is one all wet? Do they all seem the same, varying degrees of complexity? Does it seem to be what you're really doing or what the people are really seeing? "Judith Campbell Exner" is this one. And first I wrote what I would call a topic sentence for the cartoon. What you seem to mean, more or less. And that is, Judith Campbell Exner, just as you said, cashes in on her affair. She's been making money on her alleged affair with Kennedy.

A Right.

J And the first way I explain it is a metaphor. Well, I'm dealing with metaphor in general. But in some
different senses of the word. And the first is sort of straightforward. As in, Exner's bed is to her finances as someone else's cashbox would be to their finances. Or, Exner's bed is her cashbox.

A Uh, huh.

J And then, a more complex way of looking at it is that you compare things from two completely different spheres and that is where your message comes through.

A Um.

J You compare a bed with a cash register and, on the outset, that seems absurd, or fantastic.

A Right.

J After all, who would sleep in a cash drawer? But, what you're calling attention to are some paradoxical similarities in comparing things that are really very far apart. And you're pointing out that as far apart as these things may seem, that they do have one thing in common. And -- Exner's bed and the cash box, that is. There's money to be found in both places.

A Right.

J And, so this is sort of a paradox explanation. And then, there's another, third point of view. That what you've done as an artist, as a drawer, and this is one way in which I think that drawing is quite different from words in communicating with metaphor. That is that you haven't said, "Exner's bed is a cash box," in so many words. You've united these images. Bed and cashbox are one in this picture. So that the audience is forced to see Exner's bed as you see it. In other words, a cash box. Since they can't divide those images because you've united them as one, they've either got to see it your way, or they've got to close their eyes.

A Another way to look at that, though, is that what I'm doing is sharing my vision with everybody who looks at this picture. I'm not forcing it on them, in the sense that they have to accept it. But all they say is, "Oh, sure, that's how Auth sees Exner's bed."

J Right. I realize that, but the difference in words is that the physical reference, bed and cash box, will always be separated. In words.
A Right.

J Whereas in pictures, you can unite these in one so that the audience can't pull it apart, so they really have to . . .

A These are my favorite kinds of cartoons, surreal cartoons. Manipulative visual cartoons that don't depend on words or captions or -- they're more -- one of my favorite painters is Magritte, and, so I really like that kind of manipulation when it can communicate what you think about something or somebody.

J Clearly, as this does. That's, I think, the unification of images, is the way that I think most clearly distinguishes (end of side one) Okay, um . . .

A Is that the end of that?

J Yes, I think so.

A I agree with everything.

J Oh, no it's not. Actually, I'm not through with it. There's one more. This breaks down the cartoon in the form of a sort of quasi-logical or semi-logical formal argument. And that is two premises and a claim. This is how the cartoon works from this perspective and that is, the first premise is supplied by the audience, something they already know without ever looking at your cartoon, or that they would already know just at a glance. And that is, a cash drawer is where you get money.

A Uh huh.

J Okay, and then what you have imposed and joined with that first knowledge that they have is your second premise. And that is that this particular cash box is Exner's bed. And so your claim is, since you've joined these, again, into one, your claim is that since you get money from a cash box, and since the cash drawer is Exner's bed, then Exner's bed is where she gets money.

A Okay. I'll tell you where I'm coming from. My thing was -- the news stories focused on the fact that she was publishing this book about this alleged affair. I got turned off by that. And I just, I suppose a lot of other people did, too. But, faced with my
revulsion, I decided to try and communicate that. So, what I did was to take this image of her dreamily smoking her cigarette, obviously post-intercourse, dreamy, happy, content. That we're all very familiar with from movies and, you used to go from the passionate kiss to the dreamy cigarette and the audience knew immediately what had happened between the cuts. And then I turned the bed into a cash box. So, you hadn't mentioned that, which to me was a very important aspect of the cartoon.

J Um hm. And that'll happen in these explanations. Because there's only so much you can deal with at one time. So you pick . . .

A But that, see . . . she might not have been in the bed. To me very important that she be in the bed, in that state, to create a mood that whether or not the reader articulated it, would be communicated anyway. They would get that feeling.

J Sure. In the explanation . . .

A And that's part of the juxtaposition, too. Because when most people are in that mood, they're not thinking about how to cash in, how to make money. They're enjoying a very . . .

J Oh.

A See what I mean?

J Yes, I do. I do. So, in other words, the contradiction between the bed and this image is heightened by her . . .

A I think so. And I doubt that many people would pick up on that consciously. But I suspect that subconsciously, it makes a very real difference.

J Sure. Yes, well that's really . . . that does open up the cartoon quite a bit more for me in terms of -- these are little skeleton criticisms. That makes it a lot fuller.

A I'm not getting defensive. I'm just really trying to -- I mean, I hadn't really ever articulated that before, myself.

J That is really nice, though. Let's see. That was one of favorites. Okay. Here's one. I don't know how
well I did explaining it fully. It took me about an hour to try and remember who these people were. I finally got Cy Vance and Andy Young and Brezinski. All right, so much for my own political awareness. Basically, I said that the basic statement of the cartoon seemed to me was that Carter's advisors can't seem to come to a decision or an agreement regarding African policy. Is that more or less . . .

A Absolutely.

J Okay. And . . .

A Just one -- you know, this is just a purely illustrative cartoon. One of the things you can do with cartoons is to just transport people, places things anywhere you want, anywhere in time. So, they can't figure Africa out. So, I put them in the middle of the jungle and immediately make what that must feel like, clear.

J Right. So, the first version would be: Carter, et al., are as lost regarding the African policy as the white hunters in this picture are lost in this veldt.

A Right.

J Then, so then you just state it in analogical form.

A Well, not so much lost as . . . See there? The bearers know what they want to do. They're pretty determined. It's Carter. Well, he doesn't know which bearer to follow. And they tend to want to go off in different directions.

J Yes, and you are right about that. I couldn't fine one word for both his attitude and theirs. In the next version I have that paradoxical similarities are pointed out between Carter and his advisors and the three sort of tourist types who can't agree on which way to go. And, again, at first glance, a comparison between the President and his three top advisors on foreign policy and a bunch of sort of dumb rubes on safari seems absurd. But actually looking at it again it is not absurd. Because, and then you point out this paradoxical similarity that both Carter and the advisors and these dumb tourist rube types are having trouble negotiating through Africa.
A Right. You know the words you're using are interesting. In that one of the functions of a cartoon is to bring these people down to a level where ordinary people can appreciate what's really going on. And there is a great tendency to want to make presidents kings, want to deify leaders and one of the real things with that is these guys are lost . . .

J Um hm.

A This could be you, folks. So you got them, you know. They'll be having flat tires. They'll be unable to fix their sinks. They're human beings.

J Right.

A And it's really important to keep that in mind.

J I think that you've further illustrated just what you've said by, I guess, my third perspective on metaphor, which would be that you have, wanting to communicate that these people are like any sort of tourist types who would get lost somewhere, in other words, they're confused, they can't agree on which way to go. What you've done is again, combined images through using labels and the figure of Carter so that, again, you are sort of persuading the audience to see your view by unifying these images. You aren't saying that Vance and Brezinski and Young and Carter are like hunters. In this picture they are hunters and the audience looks at this and they see it your way. And if they disagree with that then they just have to deny the whole image, rather than driving a wedge through the things you want to compare and rebutting it. They can't do that because of the unification.

A That's right.

J And then, finally, the premises. The first premise that the audience picks up immediately is that these guys can't decide which way to go.

A Right.

J And then, what you insinuate into that is that these guys are really Vance and Young and Brezinski and Carter trying to develop an African policy. And so the claim, then, is since these hunters are lost and since Carter and his buddies are the hunters, then Carter and his buddies are lost regarding African policy so that the
premises and the claim in your cartoon are sort of joined together.

A Yeah, I'm sitting here thinking that . . . I think I mentioned it to you that Arnold Roth always says that humor is like a frog. You can dissect it, but something dies in the process.

J Oh, I know what you mean.

A You know, I kind of liked this cartoon when I did it. But, when you explain it . . . so what? There's an element, somehow, in a good cartoon that defies description. I mean, why is this funny? Is it funny? I don't know. I think it's funny.

J Because it's absurd?

A No, I don't . . . Well, anyway. On to the next one.

J Here's another favorite of mine.

A Oh, yeah.

J And the message I came up with was that Nixon's explanation of the gaps in the Watergate tapes is an obvious illusion.

A Well, not quite. This was done the day that we found out there were gaps. And to transport yourself back in time to '72, whenever it was when all this stuff started happening -- My reaction was, "Oh, for God's sake!" And so then I said, "All right, what can I say about this?" And so the fact that there are gaps in the tapes I've illustrated this way. And then turned it into a magic trick, because it is crazy. And yet, you've got the contradiction then. Is Nixon being proud and showing off the fact as if it were an achievement? Something that he ought to be ashamed of? And that's why this is funny. And then, this works particularly well. (indicates sign)


A You know, you can't believe this guy.

J Sure. Incredible in both senses.

A Right.
J Being . . . he's supposed to be fantastic, but he's really not. He's really just not to be believed.

A Not to be believed.

J What I had basically was that you're calling attention to, again, the paradox here is that Nixon is our first man, the President. And you are comparing him to some burlesque entertainer. Now, that would be absurd. But actually, . . .

A Yeah, that works, too because the whole thing had degenerated by this time into burlesque.

J Yeah, the seemingly absurd comparison turns out to be more apt than you would think at first, because both Nixon and the magician are illusionists who are willfully trying to deceive the public. And then again, you retain, in a comparison of paradoxical similarities, you retain the difference. Both Nixon and a magician are trying to deceive the public. Yet, the magician may very well be the better man. Because at least he lets the public -- at least the public knows he's trying to deceive them. Or he lets the public know.

A Right. I had . . . that's very interesting. I never thought about the attempted deception. That really makes it work well.

J This was really one of my favorites that you did. And, then . . .

A I showed you . . . Did you see the first of this was not . . . I made him a magician.

J Right. He was just in front of a judge. And then you turned him into a magician. To continue, the, you have again, sort of portrayed Nixon and a magician. Again, in a single image. So that, again the audience looks at the cartoon and they see Nixon as you see him. And if they don't want to see him as you see him, then they have to cover it up.

A Right.

J They can't just cover up part of it or something.

A Right. Yeah, that's an interesting concept about words as opposed to images. Another thing I like about this cartoon is that he gets to wear fancy clothes. You know, he could be a statesman.
J Actually, he's better tailored there than he usually was. The suits don't bag in the front like they always did. In your picture . . . he ought to appreciate that. What do you think basically about my ideas regarding this one?

A Oh, I think they're great. Very astute analysis.

J This'll be over soon.

A Listen, relax. No sweat.

J Now I have the Horn of Africa.

A It's really a pleasure to help you because I'm so tired of people sending fill in the blanks. And I just won't do it. But somebody who's serious enough to want to come and talk is great.

J I take cartoons very seriously. And, just because I think that they're an important force. Now this one, The Horn of Africa. I have here that -- and this worked a little differently, I really had trouble with this one at first just because I wasn't used to the way it worked. Basically, I think that you're saying here that the Soviets are dispensing a dubious gift or a gift of dubious value to the African nations in terms of Cuban-armed soldiers and military advisors.

A Right. Also that first of all it's an American image. And so, I'm twisting that. Turning it into a Communist image. And also, it's the horn of plenty. I consider this a not real great cartoon, but it works. It's sort of a craftsman-like piece of work. You get the horn of plenty and the horn of Africa, the juxtaposition of the American image into a Communist image. This is an unending supply of -- you know, the horn of plenty. It goes on and on. This is . . .

J And you've drawn that into perspective so it does seem to go on. What I thought is that here you are, you're doing almost exactly the opposite. That you're calling attention, apparently, the horn of plenty, and this horn here, the communists are dumping on Africa are, at the outset, similar. They're horns that drop gifts. I think what you're really calling attention to is that these gifts and the gifts traditionally coming out of the horn of plenty are different.

A Right, you've got the peace versus war.
J Right, especially since the horn of plenty, the cornucopia is sort of thanksgiving . . .

A Absolutely, yes. Bounty, peace, prosperity. . .

J Okay, so then what you've done is presented this. The audience knows that it's the container, the horn is the container for the gift. And, by making the horn of plenty spilling out malevolent, dangerous things, you sort of say, "These things look alike but they're really not," as opposed to just the opposite, the original paradox which says, "these things don't look alike, but they really are."

A Right.

J Again, it's a paradox, or a seemingly -- this looks like it's a seemingly good comparison that turns out to be absurd -- rather than a seemingly absurd comparison that turns out to be good.

A Right. It's sorta inside out.

J Right. I wonder. You said that this didn't really turn you on, this cartoon. Do you think that's why?

A Um, you know, I guess what it is, that -- you see it turned me on the day I did it. I tried not to do cartoons that I'm not happy with. I'll keep working and come up with ones that I am happy with. I think cartoons have a half-life. And I usually don't go back and look at them. So, like getting this stuff ready for you, I'm looking at stuff that's a year old. And, what I'm saying is that the half-life expired. Whereas it hasn't on some of the others. And I'm very fond of the ones with real long half-lives. Um, the Sorcerer's Apprentice, Mr. Selby's Treehouse, those are unending cartoons. I mean, there's no half-life on those. So, that's a real high achievement. This one, we can understand it. And we can talk about it. But it no longer -- I mean it's lost its vigor.

J And these are the last ones in the book. I really like this one, too. This is His Master's Voice.

A Yeah. I like this one, too. I had a lot of fun with it. Part of the thing about cartooning is that you're forced to look for new ways to say either the same thing you've said a number of times before because it's still true, or saying something that just seems so obvious that why would you bother to say it again, except that that's the real challenge. If you can say
that thing again in a way that has life and force and vitality, then that's okay. You've said something.

J Well, this is certainly a new way to say something. And I would say basically what you're saying is just what you said -- Nixon is following Johnson's war policies regarding Vietnam.

A Well, and don't forget that he had run as -- he was going to end the war.

J Right.

A So, I actually have a lot of friends who voted for Nixon because they wanted to end the war.

J Okay. So then basically, the first way: structuring it into a formal analogy is regarding the war, Nixon is to Johnson as 'a dog listening to the voice of his master.' Sort of a fundamental, bare-bones explanation of what you're saying. And then, when you get a little more elaborate about, the artist again is calling attention to a fantastic or ludicrous or absurd comparison/similarities between Nixon and this little, obedient RCA dog. So RCA turns into LBJ and you put it in a different context. The reason it's absurd is that Nixon, well, he's the president in his own right. And a Republican, and therefore definitely not expected, especially regarding his campaign policies, to continue the policies of a Democrat president.

A There's different ways to -- I mean I lucked out, though with LBJ and RCA, but there's other points about this. I don't know if this cartoon addresses them or not. The fact that these guys are opposite political parties really has much less to do with the fact that they are pro-establishment, they basically have been following the same foreign policy for all these many years, you know. The difference in parties, this is a little unfair in a way because I could have focused on that and that would have been a more sophisticated point. Here, I've carried it to the absurdity of Nixon being a lackey to Lyndon Johnson, which wasn't the case. But you could infer that from his actions, which is what I focused on.

J Um hm. Okay. So, well, you're saying also that's why -- regarding the war -- Nixon is to Johnson, regarding war policies.

A Right.
Okay. Because Nixon certainly did away quickly with The Great Society.

For sure. Right.

You have presented us with your view of Nixon. You convince us that Nixon is like an obedient and faithful dog by presenting Nixon and the dog as one image, or the dog with Nixon's head, so that . . .

He does look like a dog, doesn't he?

Oh, yes he does, especially in this drawing with these big dewlaps, his big jowls. And, again, this visual construction, this is a unified picture, even though there are different elements in it. It's still, it's a unified picture. It's constructed so that you take it all in at once. And, since it's unified, since Nixon and obedient dog are presented as one image, what can you do? You have to see it that way or you have to just ignore the cartoon entirely.

Yeah. I'll tell you, there's a cartoon that I have seen, any number of times by any number of people that does this, and it's so tiresome. And it's where you have, like, six pictures where Johnson turns into Nixon or where Carter turns into Nixon. It's so pathetic at this point. But that's what I mean by an original image as opposed to a tired, old, cliche.

Sure. What do you think fresh metaphors do for — I mean, is that what you're talking about? Fresh, new metaphors as opposed to old ones? We have two different kinds; we have poetic metaphors which maybe, Dylan Thomas compares life to a shroud or something like that, and then you have metaphors that are everyday, like the hood of a car or the foot of a mountain that are pedestrian.

Right, right. I think pedestrian images are often the best. They are metaphors that everybody can relate to. We were talking earlier about flat tires and leaky sinks. It used to be much more common for political cartoons to be allegorical. They would be parodies on Shakespearian plays, and in a sense, that's what kind of cartoon this is. This image is familiar to people.

Right. I see.

But it's simpler.
J I'd like to ask you to . . .

A I'm trying to cooperate.

J You're being, I'm getting a lot from both you and from MacNelly. I've really gotten more than I, more corroboration and more helpfulness than I ever thought I would or expected to. So, I'm really pleased with how these are turning out. We have, let's see, 10 cartoons. "Detente;" "This Was Your FBI," "Mayor for Life," the Ford one on the skis, "Tax increase, Tax Cut," the "People's Temple" cartoon, "Judith Campbell Exner," "African Policy," "The Incredible Nixon," "Horn of Africa," and "His Master's Voice." What I'd like to ask you to do, and you can probably do this yourself with a pencil, is to rank order them in terms of which you think is the best. Best to worst.

A Can't do it. Can't do it.

J Oh?

A No, I can. I will. I can try. But, I don't want to compare apples with oranges. And they're different kinds of cartoons in terms of what the attempt is. So, I can rate them on a scale of 1-10, But independently of each other.

J Oh, I see.

A Something like that. And I might have a couple of ones.

J Okay, that's -- could you do that? That'll be fine.

A Okay.

J Do you want to look at them again?

A No, I know what they are. What is -- 10 is good, one is terrible?

J Fine.

A Okay. "Detente's" a 10. The ones in the book are all going to be 10's. Cause that's the only ones I put in the book.

J Sure.

J Okay.

A I hope that doesn't, uh . . .

J Oh, no.

A throw off your study, or something. But, I just can't compare . . .

J Well, as a matter of fact, I even forgot to ask MacNelly to do it. In general, what are your overall impressions of the theoretical perspectives that I was using? Is there one particular one, I can remind you of them, one is sort of stating the cartoon in, as a formal analogy, like Nixon is to Johnson as a dog listening to his master?

A Right.

J Okay, and then this one was the absurd or paradoxical comparison, comparing things from very widely different spheres so that it seems ridiculous. But actually, it's apt. This is the one that emphasizes that the cartoon communicates or persuades primarily by unifying two images into one. By visually doing that so that the audience can't separate them, and rebut them as they can with words. And then this is the premise, claim. So that one, the audience thinks of this one, and you supply this one, and when they're put together, because of the one image up here, then this is what comes out.

A Right. I think they're all valid. And I think that which ever one seems most appropriate is going to be determined by the particular cartoon you're looking at. Because, don't forget, when I'm -- I really don't have rules. And I really, I experiment. I play. I consciously, the only rule is trying to have no rules when you're thinking of these things. You're very good at after-the-fact figuring out what went on, and sometimes I can do that too. Sometimes I'll look at somebody else's cartoon, a cartoon of Jeff's, perhaps, or Oliphant's. It doesn't matter. And if it's the kind of cartoon that I would have done, I think that I see immediately how their mind operated. I'm not sure. But I see how, of course click, click,
click, click and I see the whole chain of events. But when you're going through the chain, it's work. And you have to find the next link. And so, those all seem real valid to me. In fact, they're in some ways very similar. They're sort of like the other side of the questions that I have to help me get going on my chain. How would this look to children? What's really going on here? Like I said, I have about 10 of them on that wall. And if I get stuck, I can start asking those questions. And getting kind of workmanlike, as opposed to inspirational.

J Sure, so you ask yourself, then, as a jog, when the muse isn't sitting on your desk.

A Right, I have various techniques. I also have a machine called a think tank with 35,000 random words in it. And if I'm stuck, sometimes I give that thing four or five cranks, and then look into the window and write down five random words. You could do the same thing with a dictionary, obviously. I like that magic.

J I like it, too.

A It has produced one cartoon. I've had it for three years. But that's all right. It's one of my weapons.

J And so your questions, then, are -- you're asking yourself to put your mind in another place?

A There are certain formulas. You can go through -- you would see them in a minute. Get a book of cartoons -- New Yorker cartoons would be excellent for this because they're -- some people say that there are 10 basic humorous situations. How many island, shipwrecked island cartoons have you seen? Thousands. It's amazing, they keep finding new ways to milk that situation of humor. But, so yeah, I just sort of file mentally certain things that I like, kind of cartoons that I seem able to construct, and I've put them into question form, to see if maybe that formula applies to a situation where I'm stuck.

J I'm wondering. Do you think -- this is sort of my ultimate theory, and I didn't really have time to ask MacNelly about this, but I thought I'd ask you and that is; when I was thinking about what cartoonists do, and how they do it, I thought, well, they're situation is
problematic because political notions are abstract: mercy, justice, fairness, things like that. That you're dealing with, say, in "Rizzo Hood." And the kind of drawings that cartoonists do are concrete. They're representational. And so, my notion is that that's problematic, because usually, political cartoons are one frame and so they can't be discursive or linear in the way that they present their message.

A Yeah, Garry Trudeau is a writer.

J Right, exactly.

A He's a brilliant writer.

J Yes. In a comic strip. Those are, again, discursive, they're long, they're one idea at a time.

A That's a liberating thing for me. I've thought about -- I've been approached. "Why don't you do a comic strip?" I think, "Why don't I?" Well, first of all it's a different talent. And I'm not so sure I could do it even if I wanted to, but secondly, I don't like -- it would feel claustrophobic. The humor depends almost entirely on development of character, interactions that go on between those characters and before long, for instance, you wouldn't get 90% of them if you didn't know who Lucy is. What kind of a person she is. I like the freedom of having a blank rectangle where there aren't any rules. That, to me, is just -- the sky's the limit. I don't -- to lock yourself into that kind of world just makes me squirm.

J Yes.

A But, that's mainly because I'm a graphic artist. Not a writer. I depend on images. And I also like very much to flip around. To do a whimsical cartoon one day, a very serious cartoon tomorrow, a surreal cartoon one day, a word-oriented cartoon the next. I think if I have a strength, it's in unpredictability and a certain wide-ranging repertoire of weapons.

J What I decided was that a way, and I really wanted to say the only way, although I'm more and more believing I can't say that, but a way that cartoonists overcome this problem, the problem of trying to communicate abstract ideas when they draw pictures of actual things, like desks and people and so forth, because you can't
draw a picture of mercy or justice or evil, is they do that metaphorically. Because it's the only way that they can -- because they haven't got a discursive format where they can present one idea and then another one, and then another one, and have a cumulative effect.

A Right. But there's another way you can do it, though. Yeah, maybe you're saying the same thing. You create a situation where the feeling gets conveyed. And you might -- of course you can always draw justice, with the blindfold, but you got the be deft to do that well. Now because that's considered like Nast --

J Sure, that's overused.

A It's a cliche, at this point. But so's the desert island. If it works, it works. But, if you can create a situation which conveys a certain emotion then you've communicated an abstraction. "Judith Campbell Exner's dreamy face and the cigarette.

J In juxtaposition.

A In juxtaposition create a sense of that collision.

J Of values.

A Right. It becomes a value judgement. I didn't draw Judith Campbell Exner as a terrible woman with the face of evil. A guy I show my cartoons to is always wanting me to make the people look more evil, and I say, "You're missing the point. You don't have to do that."

J Because of the situations,

A Yeah, you place them in a situation where their character is betrayed by the fact that they're in that situation, rather than using visual tricks, like a heavy beard and a frowning eyes, you know what I mean?

J Uh, huh. Sure. So that the context, or the guise, the costume, or whatever in which you draw them...

A In a sense, uh ..., I like a point of view that is sympathetic anyway. Because, it's like Candide is one of my favorite books. You step back a little further and you can be very sympathetic to all the
villains and crazies and whores.

J That reminds me of something I wanted to ask you, if I had time. In that "Judith Campbell Exner" cartoon, in essence you are calling her a whore.

A Yeah.

J Yet, could your buddy down the hall who writes the editorials do that?

A Um. We had a talk about this the other day when I came up with the first "Rizzo Hood" cartoon. I had the legend on the scroll, not, "He takes from the poor and gives to his merry men," it was "He robs the poor and gives to his merry men," and my editor objected to that and said, "If you use the word robbery, that's a crime and you're saying that he ought to be sent to jail. You have to be very careful." And I said, "Well, okay. But, how do you equate that with the fact that here I am showing him robbing the coach?" He says, "Well, you can say it in a picture." And you can't in words. But on the other hand, people say those things all the time. "This is robbery!" People don't really mean literal robbery. However when you deal with words and you're a newspaper, you have to be much more careful with words.

J But, somehow, I think it would be interesting . . . I'm waiting for the first cartoon libel case. I'm wondering if that's ever going to come up.

A Long gone.

J Long gone?

A Conrad's been sued a couple of times. Mayor Yorty sued him years ago. A very funny cartoon.

J Because of words, or because of the drawing.

A Because of the drawing. What it was, was Yorty was saying at the time he was mayor of Los Angeles. He was saying that he expected to be appointed a high official by the Nixon administration, probably Secretary of Defense. And Conrad, his reaction was the same as yours; "What is this guy talking about?" Nixon's not going to appoint him. Conrad's chain of thought went "What is this? He's nuts! The guy's crazy." So he draws him in his office, on the
phone, saying, "Oh, excuse me, I have to go now. The White House is sending for me. I'm going to be Secretary of Defense." While in come through the door a couple of doctors with a straight jacket.

J Oh, and so he sued him . . .

A He sued him, saying that Conrad had accused him of being mentally incompetent and it wasn't true.

J And it was because of the drawing. Clearly, it was because of the drawing.

A Yeah, the caption was straight. A straight line.

J Right.

A The juxtaposition was the line versus the image.

J The image. I see. But that would be much less likely to happen. For instance, Judith Campbell Exner didn't sue you did she?

A No. I've been sued once. In fact, it's going on now. A suit in California. I did a cartoon on a news story that was generated by this paper. We had some reporters travelling around the country doing stories on various kinds of swindles that people can do through the mail. And one of them was buy a square foot of land in Texas or something and if we find oil you get . . . I don't even remember the cartoon, but I did a cartoon on that and some people, one of those companies, they sued the paper and picked as many names as they could and added mine to the list. They haven't got a chance.

J No.

A You know, there was a law passed in France in the 1700's against portraying the King as an animal. Some of the cartoonists got into drawing him as a vulture, and different kinds of animals. They were getting into that, then. So, they passed this law. And what the cartoonists did, they started getting into drawing him as various kinds of vegetables.

J I think I'd rather be portrayed as a wolf than as an eggplant.

END
APPENDIX C

Interview with Don Wright

J The main thing that I am doing with you and that I've done with Tony Auth and Jeff MacNelly is that people in my field are commonly critical... What I'll do later on is type up a transcript and see if what you said, how it agrees with, whether it agrees or whether it doesn't with some ideas that I've had, whether it gives me new ideas about how I think cartoons communicate and what you've said in relation with what MacNelly and Auth said.

W Are we trying to find out how I feel about this or are we trying to find out how you feel?

J We're trying to find out how you feel, what you feel in general and how you feel about, whether any of my explanations make any sense to you. So, basically I suppose you would consider yourself a political commentator.

W Yes.

J And so, but you're stating a case usually. You make kind of one fundamental statement about some issue and how do you do that with pictures? I mean fundamentally you're making a very streamlined argument here. How do you use pictures?

W That's a tough question to answer. The chief ingredient is distortion which I think is what probably separates it from your written editorial. It is the only real weapon I have. People think it was unfair, distorted, all out of proposition. Your cartoonist is acting most of the time well within the philosophy represented by the editorial page itself. If the reader tends to scan all the other material around the cartoon, then the chances are he's going to get filled in on all the background and understand why we've arrived at that position.

J Ah.

W I don't know whether I've answered your question. It's very difficult to tell anybody what the hell that
process is.

J No, you've answered it quite well. I was wondering, however, if you could give me an example of what you would call distortion to get your point across.

W Well, I think I would have to look at a cartoon in order to do that. Give me an issue.

J Let's see if I can think of a fairly recent one. Well, what about the situation in Iran. Have you done anything on that recently or not, or on the SALT talks?

W The SALT talks, Iran, all of those things. Those are, I think, to most people here in the United States, kind of mundane subjects and they tend to, the SALT talks, of course, more than Iran, they tend not to feel anything one way or another. And that's what makes my job particularly tough to take an issue like that, say the SALT talks, and distort it enough to create any interest in it at all. And I don't think I've managed to do that with the SALT talks. Iran is simply another case of a guy in a black hat. Khomeni has become our villain. It's easy to paint him as a villain and we don't have to worry here about getting too much reaction from readers no matter how we paint Khomeni. So, we can just go crazy with that and so, when you do this - my goodness - you can just soar to all kinds of heights of unfairness. It's not very hard to treat.

J So, it's sort of . . .

W I'm trying to think of a specific example of what I've done but I think you've probably seen it all. Everyone's done pretty much the same thing with the cutting off of the hands, bathing in blood, all of those carry the situation, probably to extremes if you understand Iran. And you understand the revolution.

J Do you think it's a function of your profession that you don't, that it's a sort of a norm of your profession that you don't have to be, that people sort of generally consider well cartoonists don't have to be fair? That's part of the job? That goes with the territory that that's not necessary?

W I think they have to be honest and I think they have to be fair and know within themselves when they take a position, no matter how bizarre the cartoon that
they're prepared to defend it and understand why they've taken it. I think in that sense they have the same obligation a newspaper man has.

J Do you feel that you get away, in some instances, with more than an editorial writer might in terms of exaggerations.

W I get away with more than an editorial writer might, but on the other hand I don't have the same problems he has. He can build a case for his position and I cannot do that usually in a cartoon. I've got to approach it in a much more direct fashion.

J What criteria would you feel makes up a good cartoon? If you were picking this year's pulitzer prize winner, what would you look for?

W I currently wouldn't look for what the people who pick pulitzer prize winners look for lately. Who can say what constitutes impact and that's all it is is impact. It is going to depend on your drawing style and the thought behind it. The idea and each cartoon varies with those three ingredients. When you get all three of those things working at the same time you've usually got one helluva cartoon. But that doesn't really happen all that often. I think the pulitzer judges probably have a responsibility to look really at the body of a fellow's work, not based on ten cartoons he's done for the year, but try to look at his entire work for the year and see how consistent he's managed to be, incorporating those three ingredients.

J I was going to ask you what techniques you use to communicate your message, but I think you've already answered that question really, with distortion and exaggeration. Are there any particular distinctive characteristics that you feel are common to bad cartoons?

W Yes, too much of a tendency to rely on humor. There are very few guys doing this who know what humor is and can use it effectively. We've got a big crop of young people coming in to this business or whatever the hell it is, who don't really seem to have, seem to want to make a statement. They don't seem to have any passion about issues and seem to be bent on being funny. Some of them do it fairly well. But, most of them don't do it that well at all. I would hope to see this cycle out. They need, I think, probably Jeff
MacNelly may be one of the reasons for this. Now Jeff is not in that category. He used humor very effectively and he's one of the best, but there are kids coming along who are trying to follow in his footsteps and who apparently believe that humor is the meat of the cartoon, and it doesn't really matter about where you stand on anything but just try to draw a witty little thing every day. They hope to get syndicated and have lots of papers and make lots of money. I think that's dishonest as hell.

J So you think then, cartoonists who consider themselves comedians, that's one sort of . . . What about your own cartoons? I assume that like most people you have your good days and your bad days. Is there anything typical that is wrong with your cartoon if it doesn't work as well as you would like it to work?

W Yeah, it is overdrawn. It is overdrawn because I tend to want to compensate for the lack of an astonishingly good idea by enhancing the drawing. I think that by giving you a little more art work somehow you're going to forgive me.

J You're a political commentator and an artist both. Do these roles ever conflict?

W No, they work hand in hand. That's another thing that disturbs me about the trend in political cartooning today -- is that everyone is starting to look alike stylewise. I would hope to see some of the younger ones involved into some semblance of their own. MacNelly did this. MacNelly started out with Oliphant as his very favorite cartoonist and his style, at first, looked very much like Oliphant's. But, then it began to change and now he's very much Jeff MacNelly.

J Do you ever have real good ideas that you don't use or you would like to use but you don't because you feel your readers won't understand?

W I am less inclined now to worry about that than I was earlier in my career. My feeling is that I'm going to do enough of the very easy to understand rather base sort of cartoon to satisfy any readers I have and that I'm not going to worry about flying over their head occasionally. I would like to feel that I can reach all kinds of people on any given day.
Okay. Now what I would like to ask you to do, if it's at all possible, if you can show me some examples of what you consider to be some of your best current work or some of the best things you've done in the last year.

The reason it's going to be hard is that when I go back and look at my work I tend to be hypercritical. So that the chances are there isn't any of that work that I'm going to be that fond of. But I'll be glad to go back and look at some that I think have some merit in them if that's what you mean.

Sure, I'd love to.

On the death penalty there were three cartoons. This one was particularly effective to people; I know it has a lot of writing in it, but I was trying to do something in it.

What prompted you... I can pretty much... This is very recent. I can pretty much get the background for this but what incident particularly?

No single incident, just the situation itself. You had a fundamentalist... up against, well the religion of technology, if you will, and what I think was so terribly frustrating to us was that there was no way that we could win that. By over all the technological advancement and sophistication.

Well, in other words, a sort of the hands of western technology have been tied by Kholmeni although instead you used the Islamic punishment of cutting off... Okay, what gave you the idea to use...

That represented such an enormous setback to us at the time, the oil, our prestige and the spectre of the Soviet Union being more influenced in strategic position all because of this with the sword. I was trying to write a whole letter...

I see what you mean. So, it represents not just cutting off the oil but...

A complete and total primitive repudiation of us and the western industrialized world.

I see. So, what particularly, I mean if you had to sort of state the message...
W What does that state? I think more than anything else probably the outward sort of meaning of all that we were subjected to the arrangements and deals and implications of that were settled before, although it was quite necessary to sort of have a moving visit it was also irrelevant.

J So, it expresses a little bit of your annoyance. It said, "Why are we doing this?"

W Well, yeah that plus it's . . . there's a mentality in that . . .

J These are in strip form. How do you think in general the strip form compares with the single frame?

W I don't think you can do too much of it, but it does allow you much more latitude.

J How, why does it allow you . . .

W It allows you to set a situation up, put a middle in it and have an ending, which sometimes a single . . .

J It allows you to kind of tell a story. This is a Chicken Little cartoon on "Skylab is falling."

W Here's another Iran cartoon; here's a DC10.

J What gave you the idea to use the ball and chain to . . .

W I couldn't think of any simpler way to be absolutely certain people understood and it fits into the format of the cartoon composition wise.

J So you think that maybe this method is pretty . . . has an advantage of clarity?

W This method?

J The ball and chain, using that to represent . . .

W Yeah, almost purely for that reason.

J Here you use contrast. I guess again, an exaggeration might perpetrate a

W This is different too, in that it uses words a lot and you see a lot of that turning up in my cartoons lately too.

J Okay. And here again you used a comparison as with the ball and chain of saying the Czar and Kholmeni
are the shackles of the Iranian people and this absurd . . .

W And Gulf, American and Exxon are the shackles of the American people.

J How true. But to keep consistent with your cartoon, this is the current pornography of our situation, our gas situation. So, in comparison I think . . . I don't know, I don't want to sort of, well I think maybe you've talked about sort of two different kinds of methods, exaggeration . . . well, exaggeration, distortion and comparison. Kind of this so you use a ball and chain to represent the Khomeini power in Iran and the idea of pornography obscenity to represent the incredible increase in oil company profits. Which do you . . . which are you most fond of, or which do you find most useful?

W You mean between comparison?

J Umhum, and exaggeration and distortion.

W Well, I can't separate the two because first you, the comparison is built into the exaggeration and I think the reason it's a difficult question to answer is because I really don't see a finely defined point at which one turns off and the other comes on.

J Say, take the DC10 cartoon here. Then you would say that exaggeration and comparison are both working.

W Not so much comparison. In other words, what would I be comparing there? The DC10 is down and it is out for some time, we don't know how long. And that is quite fundamental to the case and that happens to be the problem. There's really nothing to compare that with. This has actually never happened before.

J So this uses chiefly exaggeration or hyperbole. . .

W Sure, the fact that they may have to turn them into buses and cart them all over the country in order to mover passengers.

J This might chiefly use . . .

W That uses comparison and there's very little, I might say about that, very little exaggeration, more just plain simple use of plain simple symbolsim to get the point across.
I see, this is the cartoon about the Shah and Khomeni (that's for the benefit of my tape recorder). If we could, I don't want this to get too tedious for you, so I would like to ask you to kind of tell me what was going on when you did these cartoons, it you could.

One of the things that was going on was that I was learning to draw. Let's see. This is a long time ago. You talking about this one or this one?

The bottom one. Mr. Mitchell and Mrs. Mitchell. Now, according to your note there it's when she was . . .

Well, this quite simply is when she was, Martha was quite outspoken and she was continually putting Mitchell in embarrassing situations just because of the fact that she was speaking. And she was not reluctant to answer questions. As a matter of fact she seemd to love it. She went so far as to call reporters on the phone and talk to them about whatever was bothering her. And this was just a source of discomfort, not only to Mitchell, but to the entire Nixon administration. So this is just a play on putting your foot in your mouth except in this case Mitchell is putting that to her in order to try to shut her up and he did this many, many times to no avail.

Okay, let's see. The next one. I've tried to kind of intersperse them. This one's from the book and the reproduction from the newspaper in 1978. The reproduction is absolutely horrible here and I especially think there may be something going on in that frame that I can't see because the reproduction was so bad.

This cartoon, when I look back on it, I think may have failed. Because all this cartoon was meant to say was that the spirit of Camp David was more of a spectre of disappointment and failure and I wanted to wrap that up in this figure. I wanted you to understand that that's what this figure represented without labelling it and I'm not sure when I went back and looked at it that it did manage to convey that feeling, but that's what I was trying to do. The Spirit of Camp David at the time this was drawn was a sort of phony up-beat. We were told that things were going well, but from the inside it didn't seem to be going that well at all, and as it proceeded, as you know right up to the very last moment it was going to fall through. That's what I was trying to catch here.
Umhum, I don't know. I got that. I thought maybe there was something . . . That much I really understood.

This coming in and going over like a black cloud and disappearing . . .

A spectral and sort of sad little critter. Okay, and he's a little wispy thing, the sad little wispy thing is the spirit. So you think . . . what kind of fundamental segment

That we were being told something that simply was not true. This happens a lot. This is the propaganda machine. This is how really the administration manages to use the press. Sometimes more successfully than other times, but it was so plainly evident that this was not going as well as we were being told. I think it became quite clear that this was a very legitimate comment.

So, then you weren't using maybe distortion here, but probably some other technique.

Only distortion in the drawing itself, with this figure which I had hoped would convey a feeling and I'm not sure it did.

I don't know. I disagree. I think it did. I mean, at least it did to me.

That's a good cartoon.

What made that work? You're fond of that one.

Well, it's so easily understood and it's what's wrong. You can't . . . This is the old lift them, let them lift themselves up by their boot straps theory. The antithesis of that is that it's unrealistic and certainly it's proved not to work. It's horribly simplistic and I think there are a lot of people in our society that feel that by simply telling them to go home that it will go away. But, my God, look at their homes and look where they're going and look at how cheap life becomes once you return to that way of living. That we've got to correct those conditions before we can expect them to act like civilized human beings, quite simply was the message.
J I see. And, how do you think . . . So your message is basically that these people couldn't possibly . . . they are being told to go home but they couldn't possibly go home and behave like civilized . . . and live that way.

W And live that way as constructive citizens in our society which is what we want them to do. We want them to do it in there. We want them to come out of that and do it. Which is an impossibility. That's not that well drawn but the cartoon speaks.

J This one, anti supreme court fanatics.

W Things have certainly changed. I don't remember exactly what inspired that cartoon, but I'm sure it was more was on the Warren court by some of the right wingers for one position or another and most of these people were all the same people. They were given to . . . let me see if I can recall. It really doesn't matter. It's just a slap at all the people with the very basest of instincts who feel that the very idea of giving equality to blacks and minorities is against everything America stands for. And I think they're coming from the sewer, at least philosophically. They lack sensitivity and that's exactly what I'm trying to say. That's really an insult to them. I would hope that that's the way they would take it. I don't think there's anything subtle about that, do you?

J No.

W Oh, now there's a cartoon. That's not a bad cartoon. I don't like the way it's drawn, however.

J It's hard to tell how it's drawn in that reproduction.

W Well, I remember it. I would like to have it back and do it over again. You would have to be familiar with that old line, "Doctor's, lawyers . . .

J "Indian chiefs."

W First of all, if you can't do that you may not get through this so I took some liberty there, not too much of it, I believe, but the point of the cartoon is, of course, that Carter was flailing about looking for answers and trying to appeal to broad spectrums of the public . . . trying to assure them that inflation was the fault of . . . and in that it includes, of
course, with the way it was going one might expect . . . cease to be blind. Anybody or anything. (tape not clear enough to be transcribed here)
This was prior to the time that he decided to really get down to the business of trying to combat inflation, which he really hasn't done yet, but to treat it as a very serious matter that might affect his campaign later on.

J So you sort of have taken Carter's argument and expanded it until it becomes absurd.

W That's correct.

J Now, and here's where I may really get into trouble. I've analyzed five of your cartoon randomly selected, well, selected by me for whatever reasons from my randomly selected sample and what I have here is quite a few . . . I have a few different ways of explaining how the cartoon works and what I would like to do is sort of fun through them with you. Well, I could explain it this way or this way . . . and some of them are very similar and some of them work for that cartoon and some of them I've probably pushed pretty hard to make the theories fit the cartoon, or pushed the cartoon or whatever. And I would like to see what parts of those make sense to you and what parts of those seem kind of off the beam too much.

Here you have the Cyrus Vance and Israeli-Egyptian peace plan. And the first way to explain that is kind of well, I'm interested in metaphor and one of the ways people talk about metaphor is saying it's a condensed analogy, like the analogy "Old age is the evening of life." So, you sort of condense that, you have a metaphor. Okay, and so here I decided well that the first way of talking about his one, and this is a fairly simple view, would be to restate . . . what you're saying here fundamentally, the point you're trying to make is that Cyrus Vance is never going to sell the other Arab nations that Israeli-Egyptian Peace Plan.

W Thank God. No thank God you understood that. I was a little uncertain the way we were going. Go ahead.

J The first way to make that into an analogy and condense it: Cyrus Vance is the unsuccessful salesman, the ineffectual salesman of this peace plan and that's one way of kind of explaining how it works. But you
know you've of course done that originally. And then in a little more detail, another way of looking at it is that a lot of times people make their point by making a ridiculous or absurd -- a seemingly ridiculous or ludicrous comparison that is actually quite apt. And so, what I said when I looked at it from another view -- I said well, the author has made a seemingly absurd comparison between Vance and the travelling salesman to compare Carter's Secretary of State to some Willie Loman, unsuccessful and ineffectual travelling salesman seems . . .

W Actually, I think it's perfect. That's what he is. Excuse me.

J No, but in a paradox if you say, "Well here's the Secretary of State" and here's this bum in a car and so in some respects it's absurd, but actually in reality quite apt.

W You used the word bum. Is that synonymous in your mind with a salesman?

J My archetypal travelling salesman is Willie Loman in Death of a Salesman, so I guess . . .

W But does this man look like a bum?

J No, he does not. He has a briefcase and a company car.

W I wouldn't want you to think of Vance as a bum necessarily here, but more of a, like so many, pathetic businessman.

J Okay, well maybe . . . The next one, what I'm talking about here is how you've done the drawing. One of the elements in the drawing which is unity of images. So, what I said about this was from the third point of view was that Wright gains adherence or agreement from his readers in viewing Vance as an inept salesman by uniting the image of Vance as a diplomat and Vance as a salesman. How you do that, I said, was through the dialogue. It contributes to that image, the unification of the image, but this sort of hard sale, fast talking, you know, "Hi there" overfriendly pitch that a salesman image is reinforced by this sort of motley or impromptu gathering of potential customers so that . . . and because Vance as diplomat and Vance as salesman are one image. The audience can't refute
that by saying, "Well, he's not a salesman," because if they look at this he's a salesman in here and so they either have to agree with you or they've got to shut their eyes sort of. So, this is how I'm saying in essence this persuades. And, then my final way that I looked at the cartoon was through sort of going toward more formal logical kind of argument so that you have a first premise which the reader kind of supplies. "Now this salesman in this picture here isn't doing too well because all of his customers took a powder," and then what the added sort of fill up that you supply is that this salesman is no salesman, this is Cy Vance. And who is the purveyor of this peace plan and then, which leads them to, since they supplied this one premise and you supplied the rest, the two of you have built together the claim that helped persuade them that Cy Vance is . . . since the salesman is unsuccessful and since that salesman is really Cy Vance then Cy Vance is unsuccessful with this peace plan. So, that's actually my run through with the first one, sort of in different ways. Are there any . . . Do you have any kind of response?

W I am in, sort of in total agreement. There's nothing there I could really contend.

J Does any of this kind of seem to make more sense to you than any other . . .

W It makes sense to me.

J Well, let's see. There're about kind of three ways of the ludicrous comparison. You didn't seem to agree with that as much as uniting the images of . . .

W It's such a small thing. It doesn't really bother me. If you want to think of Cyrus Vance as a bum, so to speak, that's really your business. I know what you're trying to say. But, I could never guarantee when you take this kind of literature as in this particular cartoon that Cyrus Vance is on -- that's an awful small figure and it would be very hard for you to tell instantly whether he was slightly scourious, maybe even unshaven or even inept looking. The figure is too small. That's incidental to the cartoon really as long as you can see, in my way of thinking, to briefcase as long as you know he's a salesman.

J As I said, sometimes to make these things fit, I'm
pushing them as far as they will go and I may have pushed them out of the realm of any kind of intention by you. I don't mind doing that as long as you feel free to be completely honest with whether it seems to make sense to you or not. Yeah, I really like this one. Here's another one. I like this. It's partly because I really like it and partly because I couldn't agree with you more concerning your political sentiments. I was a sophomore in college at the time. Now, this one about biological research. Basically I decided that your point was pretty much that Nixon had allowed... for one thing I thought Nixon, after I'd thought about it for a while, was probably somewhat incidental. Your central idea was that this biological warfare is completely inhuman and also that Nixon's move in...

and out of control

and that Nixon's move in cutting it off was long overdue. So, boiled down into sort of a little condensed version I said that your message seemed to be that the proponents and developers of biological and chemical weaponry are the mad scientists of the country if that's okay. So, that was sort of the fundamental comparison I thought you'd used. And then, here again, I tried to talk about it in terms of a paradox, in terms of an absurd comparison. And again, you may think no, it's not, it's directly to the point...

It's not that absurd.

Not that absurd, right. But that there are some paradoxical similarities at least in the way things are supposed to be or commonly used to be... (end of side one of tape)... Defense research is a respectable profession, I suppose, to these lunatic...

That's unfair. How effective would that cartoon have been if I said some researchers?

Oh, sure. It would not have been as direct. What I'm saying is that it's a seemingly absurd comparison, or it seems at first glance ludicrous to compare these researchers to mad scientists of horror fiction fame but in fact the comparison is apt. That biological weapons are seem completely barbarous and the concept of their use is so cruel that to even consider their use is lunatic. Okay, and that's the one explanation. Now, in terms of looking at the drawing in terms of uniting the images, I said that you force your readers
to believe that military biological weapons researchers are mad scientists by presenting the two as a single image and you use the military caps here.

W When you say I force them to do this -- you mean that I'm doing this momentarily, that I'm not giving their senses enough time to react to the reality. This is a cartoon. Is that what you mean? You're talking about the visual effect, itself.

J Well, the visual effect is almost self-persuasive. That when they look at a picture by you if you united two images . . .

W Given a reasonably intelligent person I would think he goes into a cartoon knowing it's a cartoon full of exaggeration. Fine, the effect that I would like to get is exactly what you're saying. I have a little bit of trouble with the . . . when you indicate that this is sort of an absolute, almost that I have left in their minds the impression . . . I don't think I can do that -- I don't think cartoons can do that.

J Oh no, I'm not sure. As a matter of fact, very little research has been done on the persuasiveness. What I'm saying is that when you unite two images -- when you show military researchers as mad scientists, see, what you've done is sort of show these sort of big wigs slaving over these . . . concoctions in the typical, the archetypal mad scientist's laboratory. And that these researchers are so integrated in the overall picture that shows them as mad scientists that at least for the moment when the reader looks at it, he sees them as mad scientists and if he refuses to do that he's got to cover up the picture and close his eyes.

W Okay, right.

J So, that it's the unification of images that persuades the reader. Now we come back to our little premise, premise claim arrangement, and this again breaks down the cartoon into some pattern of logical or quasi-logical argument and that is that here's the audience looking at the picture and supplying the premise that the men in those pictures are mad, malevolent lunatic scientists . . .

W Now, have they supplied that or have I supplied that?
Well, you've drawn that, but then they are going back to all their experiences, all the horror movies that they've ever seen. Because this is probably a visual kind of convention: the mad scientists laboratory where Frankenstein's monster might be created or Dr. Jeckel and Mr. Hyde. That they know what this means from their associations from their past I would say. That's what I mean by it's supplied by the audience. And then, the second premise, which is the new information that's supplied by you. That the men in these pictures, this picture, are really biological weapons researchers for the military. And then the claim puts those two together so that both you and your reader help construct the claim and therefore they tend to believe it more since they've had input into it that since the men are mad scientists and since they are biological weapons reasearchers for the military, then men who do biological weapons research for the military are mad scientists. Okay. Okay the fun's over. Now, the next one, yes. This was a very forceful cartoon I thought. I thought it was very interesting artistically. Before I was interested in strictly kind of isolating the arguments, but I've been discovering more and more as I look at cartoons that I cannot ignore some basic kind of artistic things that you've done here. And I decided that the point of this and because it was so economical -- I had some immediate impact and then to try to verbally explain something that's so compact was difficult, but I said ... 

W It was difficult for me, too.

Well, I have to. Reverend Jones, far from being the savior that his followers thought him to be is in fact the source of their destruction. That was kind of mainly their point. That the contrast of what he said he is and what he really is. And so then -- that was the first sort of condensed analogy that Reverend Jones is the mad dog of this religious movement. Okay, and with all the sort of basic things that go into what is a mad dog -- well, senseless, random violence because of some sort of mindlessness. So, I said then that, and again paradoxical similarities, a comparison that might seem absurd, especially visually here because they're so contrasted, but is actually true or apt, that the man ... Okay, you called attention to a sort of seemingly absurd comparison between this man, who looks like a saviour, a godly person who is looking up and he is sort of etherally drawn here, a little wispy, and generally looks filled with spirit
and then a bold, forceful, black, this dog with the foam coming out of the mouth and I couldn't quite decide if that was foam or blood, probably both. I came to the conclusion, and those horrible, wicked-looking teeth. So, that Jones was thought to have been this wonderful saviour of his people. Somebody who was fighting racial prejudice and all these things that many of us believe in. But was he? His inducing his followers to commit mass suicide was one of the most lunatic henesties of our time. It was absolutely completely reasonless, just like the kind of damage a mad dog would do. So, that the comparison once seemed absurd, but actually is all too apt as everybody would know. So that in some ways, it's a startling picture, but it's not a startling comparison because we kind of already believe this.

W No, as a matter of fact it's not startling. As a matter of fact I was disappointed with the cartoon. I thought it was certainly not startling.

J Because we know it already and you wouldn't find anybody who would argue with you.

W You kind of, at times, hate to do cartoons like that. But, that was a very difficult subject.

J Yes. I came across one of MacNelly's on that too and the cartoons are almost always stark. But, then I think you really do, I must say I think it's not controversial. This issue is not controversial. But, I must say that this is beautifully drawn here. It's so simple and everything. Now we have the unification of images and actually there's the man and his shadow and what you've done is turned him around kind of. What we typically think of the real thing and what we typically think of the shadow are reversed so, that you portray the conflicting roles of Jones as the saviour and Jones as the mad dog as one visual unit — the man and his shadow. Jones is the saviour as the man, presenting himself as a would-be saviour indeed, as he believed himself to be. And Jones as the mad dog, as the shadow, usually thought of as substanceless wisp. But, in this picture is actually the stronger, the far more forceful and powerful and communicative than this image that Jones is offering or had offered to his people so that the reader has a choice of images — you can accept this or you can accept this — but actually, you directed because of the blackness and
the forcefulness in the movement of the figure, you've directed the reader toward the mad dog image. And I think that you give them a choice partially because you know that they'll agree with you to begin with. And then, very simply the premise claim arrangement was that Jones said he was a saviour, but that saviour was really a mad dog. We are going now to the cartoon that has more humor, certainly than the Jones cartoon, which is a cartoon but not funny. It's typical of a cartoon, Jones is typical of how you can do, that cartoons are not always humorous. And this is "We Got Company" and I remember this situation. I was in Florida in 1970 and basically the point is because of his segregationist policy, or their segregation policy, Wallace and Maddox are the two most backward governors in the country and joining their disgraceful ranks with his defiance of the federal desegregation order is Claude Kirk of Florida. And so this seems very much like a home— you're sort of ashamed. This is my home state and look what it's coming to.

W Exacty.

J So, we Floridians can really be proud of good old Claude Kirk, who instead of making Florida the progressive state that it should be has gone back in times. Okay, so then basically the condensed kind of metaphor that you're using here is that Kirk has joined Maddox and Wallace as the caveman governors of Florida. And then, you put it in terms of a paradox in comparison, the author compares, you compare Kirk both to a caveman and to Maddox and Wallace and in a essence, both of these comparisons are seemingly absurd because of course, Alabama and Mississippi are thought of as being primitive whereas Florida was thought of as a Yankee-filled progressive, fairly progressive state, a big tourist business and more or less civilized.

W Not altogether. In north Florida, the Panhandle is not thought of in those terms really. You would have to confine that I think from probably now Orlando, down. Perhaps we could get away with that. South Florida and this area for sure, although it's changing too.

J I tell my friends that I'm from the South and they say, "No, you're from Miami," or "You're from Florida, that's not the south." But of course, we from Miami sort of typically think of from Orlando down as being Florida and the rest of it belongs to Georgia or something. Anyway, you've made sort of a . . . in this view of the cartoon you've made sort of a ludicrous comparison
since Kirk is the governor of a large, prosperous, tourist state, surely he is progressive; it's absurd to compare him either to a caveman or to men like Wallace and Maddox. Or is it? Kirk, like Wallace and Maddox, has defied the federal desegregation order so that it's sort of in spite of what you may think about Kirk being governor of a progressive state, a modern state, a tourist state. He is just as bad as these guys. Okay, and then again we have pretty strong unification of images. You call attention to similarities between Kirk and a caveman by presenting the two as a single visual unit. I mean, if you look at this picture of Kirk, you see him as a caveman. Or, if you don't want to see him as a caveman then you just can't look because you've unified those images so that the reader can't split them apart like he could if you presented your argument verbally. Okay, and then premise one -- the man at the entrance to the cavern is a caveman, a primitive person; and premise two, supplied by you, is that that man's really Claude Kirk, with particular regard to his segregationist policies and then the claim is that well, since that man's a caveman and primitive and since that caveman is Claude Kirk, then Claude Kirk is a caveman. Okay. And then, finally I have this one about Civil Service. My father claims that I don't understand this cartoon and he well may be right. I picked one interpretation and ignored his because mine worked. But, what I wanted to do ... you might very well agree with him and I might say I kind of did too, but I stuck with mine because I could explain it better in terms of ...
is so far-reaching and there are so many different layers and so many forms and so many people and automats and robots that any . . . where is he going to go? How is he going to make a start? And how does the directive go forth? Well, of course, it's going to get lost in between those layers and tons of paperwork and there just didn't seem to me . . . now, I'm of course, trying to be slightly vicious here too. What I want to show is that it, that the structure of government itself now is so enormous and unwieldy that it prohibits change. That it can fight you in so many ways because of the way it's structured that it's hopeless and that any directive or anything he would want to set into motion to change the bureaucracy itself would simply get swallowed up and absorbed by osmosis or something and you'd never hear it again. That, quite simply is what I was trying to do. The bulky, unwielding departments represented by various four doors.

J Now, our point of departure and the only reason I think maybe I didn't see it my father's way because I didn't want to . . .

W You said administration and it's not simply that.

J . . . is that I saw this, mainly because I wanted to, as the administration?

W Excuse me, I'm being sympathetic to Carter here. Is that clear?

J As a matter of fact it is clear, particularly because of this the new President's proposal. So that, as my father really did convince me of, although I ignored him, that this particularly means he's sent it along to the Civil Service, but he can't reform it because it's completely unwieldy and in fact the President who comes after him will try the same thing. And he won't be able to do it either. So, you've really used here the hyperbole or exaggeration rather than comparison. Since I want to see comparison I decided that that was his administration you were comparing to the Civil Service. But, really I know that's not true. So, you've used hyperbole. But you seem to agree with me in these other cartoons when I talk about using comparison and uniting images between sort of two different kinds of things like two different spheres like Carter and the, or Kirk and a caveman and Vance and a salesman and Jones and a mad dog and these researchers and
mad scientists. Finally, what do you think in general of these explanations?

W Well, I think . . . I'm impressed with them and I feel gratified too, because I was worried. Your spiel in the beginning led me to indicate that I might be disappointed. Because there was every danger that you not understand the cartoons at all. Or, what's worse that no one would, which made me wonder why I'm doing this, but -- there is some comparison in this too. Comparison between the way it is now and the way Carter would hope to have it.

J Oh, I see.

W I think that's what I meant earlier when I said it's really hard to find the line. Comparison, I think, you will find probably in every single cartoon in one form or another, in one way or another. Comparison seems to me to be the whole . . . I think the one element that everyone would have to have in order to understand the cartoon is to compare it with something they already know or something that is visible in the cartoon itself they can compare the situation with. If I am making myself clear?

J Yes, you are. I decided on that -- well, I looked at a lot of cartoons and I decided that comparison, well what I actually would call metaphor, if I can get a little more technical, is probably one of the fundamental ways in which cartoons communicate. It seems to me that cartoonists had a fundamental hurdle to overcome in that political matters, political issues almost always deal with abstract things like mercy and justice and even efficiency are abstract notions. You can't draw a picture of efficiency or mercy or justice and so, how on earth, without becoming very wordy, do you talk about mercy or justice or lack thereof in a picture? And I thought, well they do it by juxtaposing images or by combining two different images into one so that it's difficult . . . so that there are different kinds of cartoons. A discursive cartoon or a cartoon that tells a story as in some of the frame cartoons that sort of relate, well here are the policemen beating the protesters over the head and here are the protesters in jail, or whatever, and you tell a story. Or you can -- well you could use a metaphor that the anti-war protesters used to use is you could draw the policemen looking like a pig instead of showing them step by step what the policeman was doing.
And since the audience can't divide -- they can't remove the policeman attributes from the pig or the pig attributes from the policeman, the image does go together and at least momentarily they see it as you do by seeing that unified image. I thought that generally on focusing I focused on metaphor and comparison and so forth even though I know that there are other ways of doing cartoons. I think that there are some more complicated things. For instance like you've done here by reversing the foot in the mouth. Ordinarily the foot in the mouth would be...

W would affect only her.

J Right. But, you usually talk about people putting their foot in their mouth when they've made a mistake. But actually he's put his foot in her mouth to shut her up.

W Yes, but the impression that people got because of the situation itself, was at times, indeed she wasn't, but that she was speaking for the both of them as one. That was the impression that was scaring the hell out of Mitchell and Nixon.

J Right, even though you explain it here, this was kind of long ago, even though you explain it she also made it clear that she and her husband agreed politically. So, she has put his foot in her mouth and he's the one that's in... Right, exactly. I think an example of a discursive cartoon or a cartoon that tells a story louder than making a comparison -- in some ways it makes a comparison because what you have here is that except for what they are doing in their helmets these -- you have made these people look alike. In a sense you have emphasized the fact that these, this man who is being beaten and this man who is beating him are the same creatures and these policemen seem to have forgotten that and so you are saying these men, although they look different and two of them are doing bad things to the other two, they are of the same species and this seems to be ignored. But, in addition, this is a generally more thoroughly laid argument in the sense that you've done something along the lines of providing evidence here. It's more complicated an argument than some. It's like "Go home to your -- go back to your homes and act like civilized human beings." But the detail in the homes, as well, these homes are no homes. They are shacks and tenements and rat filled and garbage filled and so
forth and no one, no decent civilized human beings
could possibly live in a place like that. So, in a
way this is sort of a more discursive argument,
whereas say in this cartoon with having the ball and
chain with the Shah and Khomeni...

W There is no evidence. You just have to accept my
interpretation of the whole thing.

J Right. There is no . . . This is more into . . .
even though this is a frame cartoon showing a passage --
you've shown a passage in time here and that seems to
me to be the reason why you've used the frames. But,
basically it's a fundamental metaphor. The Shah
who was the ball and chain of the Iranian people and
they have adopted a new one which is Khomeni. And
so you are comparing both the Shah and Khomeny to
each other and to shackles and lack of freedom and all
the other things that people typically associate
with the ball and chain.

W . . . . . .

J Well, I think . . . I have a lot of Iranian friends
and it seems pretty profound to them, I can tell
you. They irritate me and . . . well, don't get
me started. It irritates me a lot. Iranian women
friends who are in favor of Khomeni and I go, oh,
you've spent all this time over here getting your
Ph.d. for nothing. But that's beside the point.

W . . . . . .

J No, I don't either. It makes me so mad. But . . .

W When you're in this business and you use things like
that you are constantly trying to push them back be­
cause it borders sometimes . . . . . . . . .
. . . . . . because you're a human being, absolute
total irritation . . . . . . .

J Um hum. Sure. Love it or leave it. Whatever. It
is interesting to find just when we're busy congratu­
lating ourselves for being these wonderful liberal
people that we are, you'll . . . I find that prejudice
in myself will rear its ugly head and show itself.
I get very disappointed in myself.

W As long as we're sure that everyone has that capacity
I'd feel a lot better. I mean, if that is the point
to be disappointed in oneself is an apparent fault. But, this preoccupation we have now, I wouldn't be

But that really . . . the resurgence of the Klan has really bothered me. Activity starting more and more. That's so scary. Backlash. I guess I thought that was all over. Well, I really do thank you.

I enjoyed this. I got just as much out of this as you did.

Oh, one more thing. I guess I forgot, and that is, if you could take these cartoons and say pick out the best . . . don't . . . . . it like that.

End
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