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Abstract

This thesis seeks to demonstrate that the theoretical concerns of spectatorship and gender, which are usually reserved for analysis of live-action cinema, equally apply to the animation of Chuck Jones. Chapter one provides a brief history of animation. It describes the major technological advances in animation and the major styles that flourished in America between 1940 and 1960. The influence of Walt Disney and Tex Avery are examined in relation to Jones' work and biography. Chapter two discusses the cartoons featuring Bugs Bunny as the main character, while chapter three concentrates on the cartoons featuring Daffy Duck and other characters. In both chapters under the rubric of spectatorship, I centre on the gaze between the viewer and the screen. I employ popular theories of the gaze, including definitions of voyeurism as postulated by Freud and Laura Mulvey. In both chapters under the rubric of gender, I examine the function of the female within Jones' cartoons and analyze the elements of camp and homosexuality which are prevalent. The concluding chapter analyzes the cartoons which feature Bugs and Daffy together. In this chapter in addition to a discussion of the gaze between the viewer and the screen, I consider the gaze between the two characters. This analysis reveals that the animation of
Chuck Jones can enable film theoreticians to gain a deeper insight into the nature of the cinematic apparatus.
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Introduction
The Animation of Chuck Jones: Not Just For Kids

The main argument of this thesis is that the animation of Chuck Jones concerns itself primarily with issues of gender and spectatorship. By focusing on his studio work from 1940 to 1960 at Warner Brothers, I will add to the argument that animation is not only a valid area for film theory but is, also, an excellent example of the cinematic apparatus. By this I mean both the technology implicit in creating a film, as well as the various elements of plot, characterization, mise-en-scene, montage and psychological and social aspects, which combine to create an entire viewing experience. In the drive to simulate reality, which live-action undertakes, animation has been regarded, at best, as an entertaining sub-category of cinema. This is apparent in the lack of serious theory which has centered around animation. Very few theorists have seen fit to attribute the same seriousness of intent to animation as to live-action. It is looked upon as catering to children, and hence not worth studying seriously. While live-action has been considered the more cinematic of the two, both in terms of technical progress and of narrative, this was not the case in the early stages of cinema. Animation only declined when it became tied to live-action. For example, animation had used color long before it was introduced into live-action cinema. As live-action became the more
dominant area, animation reverted back to a more simplistic form. This will be discussed in chapter one.

During the studio era, there was a resemblance between both types of cinema. Like live-action, animation had its share of hack artists and auteurs. Chuck Jones is clearly an auteur, with a strong, distinctive style differing from that of his peers. Not only are his cartoons technically sophisticated, withstanding the passage of time, and considered outstanding examples of animation, but he relies on culture in much the same way as any director. His stories are drawn from clever satires of literary classics, opera, and theatre as well as from witty, original, and very adult dialogues and situations. A close analysis of his work will prove that important theoretical concerns such as the gaze and gender relations cross all categories within the cinematic apparatus. The theories that I am primarily concerned with are tied to the look and sexuality, as I consider them essential to the concept of cinema.

In order to better understand the nature and scope of Chuck Jones' work, it is necessary to provide a brief history of animation. This first chapter will examine the major breakthroughs in the field of animation from technique to technology. It will also examine how animation was influenced by live-action as both became intertwined in the early days of cinema.
I will look at the growth of cartoons from newspapers and comic strips to the vaudeville circuit and various "Magic Lantern" shows. The contributions of John Bray, Windsor McKay, and the Fleischer brothers will be considered. Emphasis will be placed on the Disney tradition, since it was this studio which exercised the greatest influence at the time of which I write. Not only did the animators at Warners attempt to free themselves of the Disney shadow, and in so doing created their own brilliant style, but Mr. Jones, above all, was influenced by the "cute" style of Disney animation. So, Disney will be considered primarily in relation to Chuck Jones' work as a factor from which he tried to free himself. Finally, I will consider the establishment and aims of the Warners studio itself. This will include a brief biographical sketch of Tex Avery and his influence on Jones, as well as Jones' own personal biography.

The thesis will be grouped into three sections after this chapter. The first will consider only the Bugs Bunny cartoons, the second will examine the Daffy Duck cartoons, and the last will examine the cartoons featuring both, primarily the "Hunter Trilogy". The chapters will begin by examining the most basic level involved in any study of cinema, live-action or animation - the viewing. The notions of spectatorship, voyeurism, and how one looks, will be related to the cartoons discussed here; in addition other viewpoints, ranging
from Freud (1905,1961) to Laura Mulvey (1975,1986), will be introduced.

The basic issue is this: since animation does not have the restrictions which live-action must obey because of its human element, voyeurism is taken to a whole new level. There is also none of the same guilt involved in watching cartoons, since these are fictitious characters who can sustain no real damage. The best example of this is the Coyote/Roadrunner series which Chuck Jones created as a satire of hunt and chase films. While watching the coyote, the viewer experiences a sadistic rush. There is, however, a de-emotionalization of this sadism, since it is only animals, and imaginary ones, rather than people who are being blown up. Characters other than Daffy or Bugs will be considered in conjunction with the section on Daffy.

Also involved in the voyeuristic thrill is the notion of distance. One is accustomed to the privileged position of viewing without being viewed, yet Chuck Jones, as a director, continually breaks the fourth wall. Usually, the character is unaware of the viewer's presence, as he lives in a self-contained world. At the most unexpected moments, his characters will turn and speak to the audience, drawing us directly into their private lives. Taking this one step further, the entire notion of self reflexivity in animation must be addressed. In this regard, I will refer to his cinematic masterpiece
entitled *Duck Amuck* (1953). The last chapter will take a slightly different focus. While this thesis will primarily concentrate on the gaze between the viewer and the characters, the final chapter will also include the look between the characters. This is because Bugs and Daffy are presented as two equals rather than as the sidekick of the other.

From the issue of viewing, I turn to what is being viewed. It is necessary at this point to examine gender roles. Much feminist cinematic critique such as that of Sybil Delgaudio (1980) can be applied to animation. What becomes immediately obvious is that animators in general, and Chuck Jones' cartoons in particular, find it much easier to stick to male characters than to create well rounded and believable female characters. Females are either incidental, or pale imitations of the male character. For example, *For Scent-imental Reasons* (1949) features Pepe le Pew, a skunk, chasing a poor cat. She has no real characteristics, and is denied even the power of speech. When she does become the aggressive one, he is turned off, and, indeed, she becomes a caricature. Pepe may also be a caricature, but he is at least charming. Situations such as these may, in part, have arisen from the male "stronghold" existing in the animation studios, especially Warner Brothers. All the important relationships are male/male, whether they be between man and animal, animal and animal, or even alien and animal,
as seen in the *Marvin the Martian* series (1948 -1963). Even an otherwise rational female, for example Mama Bear, becomes giddy and stereotypically female in the face of a few tossed off compliments by Bugs. This male/female interaction will be explored.

Within the gender issue, we can concentrate on sexuality. Specifically, I will deal with the issues of camp and homosexuality. Animation lends itself to camp. Briefly, I will introduce a definition of camp based on theories by Mark Booth (1983). As camp is very much rooted in self-publicity, theatricality, and role playing, cartoons are a natural forum. One of the most commented upon aspects of Chuck Jones' work is his dressing of characters in drag. Not only does this follow from the previous discussion of gender roles, but ties to the issue of homosexuality. There are many examples of weddings between the male characters, for example *The Rabbit of Seville* (1950) and *What's Opera Doc?* (1957). Here, it must be noted that although these characters may be in female garb, it is still understood that they are male. The transition from male to female is in costume only and is merely for the purpose of a gag. It must also be remembered that although these are male characters, rarely does their sexual preference manifest itself, other than for these drag comedy gags. For example, Bugs rarely pursues a female rabbit, in which case his own masculinity would become important. When dealing with
Elmer, it does not matter that Bugs is male. It only becomes important when Bugs resorts to drag, whereupon humour arises out of seeing a male pose as a female in order to trick another male.

None of these characters exists outside of the role played. However, Chuck Jones has cleverly created a star system not unlike the one which came out of the Hollywood studio era. This is not so unusual when we consider that he worked within that same studio system and consciously meant to satirize it. This idea will be examined in the chapter on Daffy, since the cartoons viewed involve him playing characters with their own personae, for example, The Scarlet Pimpernel. As a fictitious character takes on another fictitious role (as opposed to Bugs just playing Bugs), the issues of camp and high versus low art arises. Warhol's use of camp and the star system in his films will be cited as the definitive example.

In keeping with accepted traditions of cinematic sexuality, I will use specific examples from the films to illustrate that his creation of roles, personae and characteristics is exactly like that of live-cinema. The audience expects certain traits fulfilled when watching a Bugs cartoon or Daffy and Porky short, in the same way that any filmgoer has expectations of their favorite star. Jones takes this one step further. Many of his cartoons are drawn from literary, theatrical, operatic or cinematic pieces. Hence, in a cartoon such as The Scarlet
Pumpernickel (1950), not only does he satirize the original literary source, but also, Douglas Fairbanks and the days of movie swashbucklers. This works on many levels. Not only does the audience have certain expectations of the treatment of the story itself, but they also expect Daffy as the hero to fulfill his own well known character traits and the mannerisms of a Fairbanks or Errol Flynn.

In the chapter on both Bugs and Daffy, it will also be important to examine the nature of their partnership. Using the theoretical frameworks which will have been established, their relationship will be analyzed to discover whether it succeeds according to Jones' own guidelines and character traits.

As can be seen, many theoretical cinematic concerns will be addressed. Rather than studying only live-action, or examining it separately from animation, the two should be taken as complementing halves. By recognizing their similarities, theoreticans could gain a deeper insight into the nature of the cinematic apparatus. These two areas need not exist independently of each other. Chuck Jones uses the elements of cinema (sound, image, character and plot) to their fullest potential. By examining his work, it is my hope to contribute to an understanding both of what is being watched and of those doing the viewing.
A) A Brief History Of Animation

Before undertaking an analysis of Chuck Jones' work, it is necessary to place him in context by examining the development of animation, as well as the formation of the various animation studios and their contributions to both the field and his work. This survey will show that Chuck Jones helped to develop a cartoon genre based on American values and cultural references.

The end of the nineteenth century saw a growth in newspapers and a rise in the use of cartoons. The comic strip, the predecessor of the animated cartoon, had its origin in the circulation wars of the 1890's. Both the Hearst and Pulitzer chains used them as a means of attracting readers to their daily and weekly papers during this time of fierce competition. The comic strip would soon provide both plotlines and characters for the animated film.

Animation has its roots in the graphic arts, as it is based on hand-drawn pictures. Originally, animation was practiced by those interested in dabbling in science rather than in art. Filmmakers disregarded animation because they felt the ability to show the real world was central to film art. Shooting a live-action scene can be very simple, such as a conversation between two people at a table or an elaborate musical number. The actual process of filming is not affected by how much detail lies within a film. Animation requires far more work as each detail must be drawn in by hand. Both live-
action and animation, however, are tied to the principles of persistence of vision and the phi-phenomenon. The former is where the brain holds an image a fraction of a second longer than the eye retains it, while the latter depends on our mental process of interpreting the still images. Cinema is dependent upon this optical illusion too because movements on the filmstrip are made fluid when the mind fills in these gaps. The concept of persistence of vision was researched widely in Europe during the 1800's by intellectuals and those interested in science, such as the creators of the inventions to be mentioned below. The term "phi-phenomenon" was not coined until the mid 1900's.

In 1832, Dr. John Ayrton Paris developed the Thaumatrope, one of the first toys based on this principle.¹ It utilized the idea that when spinning a coin, the two sides of the image would blur into one. On one side of the Thaumatrope was a picture of a parrot and on the other was an empty cage. When the board was spun by its straps, it appeared as if the bird was in the cage. Joseph Plateau published his findings on the persistence of vision in 1832 and patented his own toy to support his findings. It was called the phenakistiscope. Along with W. G. Horner's zoetrope, it used hand drawn and colored paper strips. They were set into wheel-like machines using slits to separate the frames. When spun, the images moved, resulting in mini two second cartoons. The phenakistiscope, however, used mirrors. The viewer would look into the mirror through the slits on the board and see a
continuous movement when the board was spun. Both were treated as a toy or novelty item, rather than as an art form. That same year, Simon Ritter Von Stampfer created the stroboscope, which was basically the same as the phenakistiscope. Two years later, Baron Franz Von Uchatius combined the stroboscopic device with the magic lantern. Each lantern (or slide projector) had a slide showing a different part of a movement. He would run with a candle between the projectors and create sequences on the screen. This was the forerunner of the animated film. In 1853, he created the projecting phenakistiscope which used a phenakistiscope disc but only one lantern. When the disc was spun, movement would appear on the screen. Many variations on these devices had been invented by the end of the nineteenth century. All had Latin or Greek names to lend to their credibility. These discoveries were occurring simultaneously in many countries. As live-action is the bringing to life of an image, or animation, the two were tied from the early stages of film development. Both used the same principles to create their illusions of life. As we will see, it is only because people became fascinated with the simulation of reality that live-action became the dominant genre of cinema.

In the latter 1800's, Emile Reynaud invented the praxinoscope. Drawn on strips in frames approximately the same size as 35 mm film, it used mirrors set at angles to separate the frames. He went on to develop a mini theater and, in 1888, a public show. In 1892, Reynaud opened the Théâtre Optique at
the Musée Grevin, a wax Museum in Paris. Using back projection, music and sound effects, he showed color cartoons 10 and 15 minutes long. Reynaud was the first to turn animation into a spectacle. Unfortunately, he was unable to develop this art any further or compete with the films of Lumiere or Melies. As all interest lay in the photographed image, he was not successful in his endeavors.

Photography is not at the heart of animation, the way that it is in live-action. It is merely a means to simplify the copying and presentation of what has been drawn by hand. Even the plot devices in animation are achieved by conventions found within the graphic arts. For example, a character's clothes may change style, faces may age, or locations may switch without the character moving. Or the character may change color to depict varying emotional states. These changes are not achieved through photography as in live-action. Even the definition of an animated film is one created frame-by-frame. It is not based on a shot or series of shots as is live-action. The two are related, however, as previously noted. Not only do the same scientific principles govern both, but both are concerned with creating the illusion of life.

Live-action employs animation. For example, people and things can be animated using a technique called pixillation. The subject is photographed frame-by-frame and his position altered slightly between each frame. Hence, animation is not just restricted to cartoons. Live-action emerged as the dominant or more popular form because in the early days of
cinema, viewers were amazed by the simplest images. It was not necessary to continue to create elaborate cartoons which took far more effort when all people wanted to see were the simple recordings of daily life. Of course people began to demand more, but by the turn of the century no one thought of turning to animation to satisfy the public's demands. The money was in live-action. Serious filmmakers were too busy exploring this new medium and establishing it as an art to waste their time on animation, an area which had formerly been used to merely tell stories and did not appear to have any "artistic" merit. Animation was seen as "entertaining" but not much else. So all the technical advances which had been made in the field of animation were either forgotten or just ignored as it became a sub genre of live-action. Animation was influenced by live-action but in a negative way. Despite Reynaud's progress, animation lost color until its general introduction in mainstream cinema in the 1930's, although some cartoons such as McKay's *Little Nemo* (1911) were hand tinted. Also, like live-action, it lost sound until 1927. Hence, as animation became tied to photography, it suffered a set-back.

Windsor McKay and John Bray, two of the fathers of animation, both drew. They started out on the vaudeville circuit giving "chalk talks", which were akin to slow motion animation. These chalk talks animated drawings using single framing techniques. Generally the artist's hand would be seen sketching out a figure. When he removed his hand, the figure would appear to move slightly; for example, the figure might
turn his head. J. Stuart Blackton's *Humorous Phases of Funny Faces* in 1906 was the first film record of a chalk talk. In 1907 he made *The Haunted Hotel* for Vitagraph. By this time, animation was known as the "mouvement americain" in France.

McKay's *Little Nemo* in 1911 is generally considered the first full example of animation in the US. It was drawn on rice paper and mounted on cardboard. Each cardboard backed drawing was given a number and a mark in order to keep all the drawings registered. The finished drawings were mounted on a wooden frame in front of a horizontal camera. The action was then checked on a Mutoscope-like device for smoothness before shooting. Raoul Barré developed registration pegs and punched holes in the drawings to keep them in place. *Little Nemo* saw the use of the first cycle. This meant that the same seven cels were used six times to show three successive up/down movements of the character Flip's cigar. McKay also did the first color animation in the States by hand coloring each frame.

John Bray mass produced backgrounds through printing procedures. In 1914, he patented animation techniques used by McKay two years earlier. Another Bray patent described cutout animation. But it was Earl Hurd, in June 1915, who obtained the patent for cel animation. Early cartoons had jerky movements because there were no cels for the inbetween movements. There were also no varying speeds of movements. It was common to have holds in the action for several seconds in order to read the title cards.
In 1915, Dave and Max Fleischer developed rotoscoping, which was a way of tracing the movements of live-action into animation. It was also a way of standardizing movement as it was reproduced mechanically. They patented this in October 1917. Both ended up working for Bray, like many other animators. They remained there until a move to Paramount in the 1920's.

By 1916, both Bray and Barré were producing one cartoon per week. These were badly done, often showing reflections from the cels and containing mistakes. In 1917, Bray and Hurd combined their patents and formed the Bray Hurd Company. All the major animators now had to pay royalties. This was not unlike the trusts formed in cinema over such aspects as exhibition, which bled the smaller companies. Their patents consisted of animation techniques mostly stolen from McKay, which made the animation process easier. Examples included the patent for cels, as well as painting the reverse side of the sheet black in order to achieve a shaded effect when photographed. Bray also patented techniques to simplify tracing, flipping and mutascoping. He only combined with Hurd because he recognized the financial potential of cels and didn't want a long legal battle.

There are many claims as to who actually invented animation. The French claim Emile Cohl. In the US, McKay explored visual possibilities while Barré and Bray brought about mass production. McKay, however, took great care with his cartoons. They employed many cinematic devices in the way
they were shot. He never set out to mass produce and did not even patent or copyright his own films. He was very open with his techniques which, unfortunately, led to others stealing his inventions.

Bray, on the other hand, was first and foremost a businessman. He patented basic animation processes and received royalties from everyone. He joined with Hurd because Hurd had the cel patent. They then hired people like Max Fleischer and Paul Terry. Many have said that the Saturday morning cartoons of today are reminiscent of the studio efforts of 1915. The characters had three positions for mouthing the whole English language. The backdrops were repetitious and the plots were crude.

The first American cartoon units were established between 1909 and 1920. Only in the US was regular cartoon production organized. Many animators during this period came to the US to work. There was still a close relation between the world of the newspaper funnies and the cinematic cartoon. Popular characters made the transition between each medium. Popeye and Felix the Cat were actually more popular on film than in print. Koko the Clown was only on film, while Betty Boop started out in cinema and then moved to print. The earliest cartoonist to transfer a character had been Windsor McKay, who took Little Nemo from the NY Herald to film. His first example of animation had been Nemo. Gertie the Dinosaur (1914) was not a movie, but created to fit in with his vaudeville act.
His *The Sinking Of The Lusitania* in 1918 was the first feature-length cartoon ever made.

Sources for animation included not only comic strips but Mack Sennett comedies. This was part of the continued influence of live-cinema on animation. The tradition of introducing film stars into cartoons was also started. Audiences loved to see stars that might be playing in the feature to follow. This also emphasized the contrast with the real world. Max Fleischer's Koko may have come out of an ink bottle, but he did tricks in the "real" world. Right from the start, animal characters proved almost more popular then human ones in cartoons.

There was a fierce rivalry among cartoon characters, just as with human stars. Pat Sullivan's Felix the Cat was briefly more popular than Mickey Mouse which was no easy feat. Emile Cohl had been the first to develop a consistent character with his series in 1908 of Fantoche. Fantoche was the prototype of the little man in the cartoon world. He was the "everyman" that Chaplin was soon to make his trademark. These cartoons had no dialogue or captions and only simple, self-explanatory plots.

B) Disney

Despite the various contributions of these men in the early stages of animation, it was Walt Disney who came to dominate the cartoon as no art had ever been dominated. Disney first drew cartoons for the Kansas City Film Ad Company. They were
one minute black and white commercials using cutout paper puppets. He went on to produce Laugh-O-Grams which were satirical newsreels that he convinced local theatre owners to show. Disney then started his own company, which was also called Laugh-O-Grams. He made seven animated fairy tales, including Alice In Cartoonland, which combined live-action and animation. Seen today, these cartoons appear mechanical and stilted with little plot. In 1927 he began the "Oswald the Rabbit" series. Unfortunately, the rights of Oswald belonged to distributor Charles Mintz and so Disney was forced to create a new character. He also learned the valuable lesson of keeping the rights to everything he created. After much deliberation, Mickey Mouse was born.

The first two Mickey Mouse pictures, released in 1927, Plane Crazy and Gallopin Gaucho were silent. In 1928 he released Steamboat Willie, complete with dialogue and music fitted to the action. It still had a very simple plot involving Mickey playing "Turkey In The Straw" on various objects, including animals. Disney, although a brilliant story editor, was no animator. He depended on others, especially Ub Iwerks to draw for him. He even had to be taught how to draw Mickey, so he could use him in autographs and publicity events.

Disney was technically progressive. He was the first to bring back color and, in fact, arranged for Technicolor to process his films. His first color film was released in 1932 and entitled Flowers and Trees. Disney was also the first to
use a storyboard to plan his cartoons. He even sponsored the development of the multiplane camera. This camera separated the various cels so that each one was on a different level or plane. Each level was arranged according to size. For example, foreground objects were on the plane closest to the camera. From there, the images went back from the camera in terms of depth of field. This facilitated the creation of a three dimensional world and allowed the camera to roam through space in this world as it would in reality. All his advances were well publicized and only added to the brilliance of the Disney legend.

Disney's plots were carefully structured. They were simple and included no violent gags such as those later to be found in the work of Tex Avery. He presented the world of the average American, emphasizing morals, success and optimism. This strongly reflected his own midwest upbringing with its emphasis on hard work. While his films were frightening to children, the terror was psychological, for example, the fear of losing one's mother in Bambi (1942). Avery's films tended to have an insane edge to their violent gags.

The resemblances between the animal and human world that were found in his cartoons were reassuring rather than threatening. Every picture had a happy ending and basically good characters. The truly evil ones were always punished or destroyed. Disney leaned towards a nursery vulgarity with his penchant for bathroom humour and bottoms. This may be why there are so many shots of animals wriggling their bottoms
into the camera. There was no real sex or sexuality among his characters. Disney preferred animal to human characters, but they contained very human characteristics. They all had an element of innocence about them.

Mickey was the eternal optimist. He quickly mellowed from his more mischievous and violent beginnings. He was teamed up with his girlfriend Minnie, Pluto, a zestful, playful dog, Donald, the dignified, serious but easily enraged duck and Goofy, another dog. All of Disney's cartoons underlined traditional American values.

Disney's later cartoon style, for which he became popular, was based upon an animated reproduction of storybook illustrations which kept closer to reality than an "anything goes" mentality which would become popular in American animation. All his characters had very round and simple figures to ease the process of animation. This did not allow for individual creativity. While his world was not an exact copy of reality, it was still a limited world of make believe.

The "Silly Symphonies" series, which Warners' "Merrie Melodies" was later to parody, introduced new characters. Even these cartoons reaffirmed the notion of hard work being rewarding as seen, for example, in the enormously popular Three Little Pigs (1933). The first cartoon in the "Silly Symphonies" series was entitled The Skeleton Dance (1929). It was also the first in the musical cartoon genre, which he pioneered. Disney was not faced with the restrictions of filming with sound that faced live-action. He combined sound
and image in ways which became important to live-action. The perfect frame-by-frame synchronization was called "Mickey Mousing." Animators still use this term to refer to the precise coordination and synthesis of sound and image.

His first feature, Snow White, was not made until 1937. It depended heavily on rotoscoping for the figures of Snow White and her prince, convincing many that Disney was more comfortable in the world of his animal creations than with humans. The stilted nature of human characters versus the natural flow of his animals' movements was a problem to be found throughout his films.

After 1950, Disney turned to producing live action films. They were predominantly nature films, yet still carried that cute anthropomorphism of his cartoons. While the photography was excellent, the narrative was condescending in its attempt to humanize nature. He also produced adventure films and light comedies which combined live-action and animation, such as Mary Poppins (1964).

His films provided a diet of bland and steady optimism. There was nothing in Disney's films to shake you up or make you pause and think, as in other animation. He used animation as a forum for maintaining the status quo of reality rather than testing its limits or making a social or political statement.
C) Disney and the Other Studios

During the 1930's, the Disney studio grew in both manpower and output. He controlled the largest, most efficient animation studio in the world. It was, however, very restrictive for the individual graphic artists, for while he provided an excellent training base and state of the art equipment, Disney was becoming more business oriented and less creatively inclined. So, while the receipts remained good, the work was less varied and there was little individual creative work. Again, animation mirrored live-action in its factory-like production.

In 1940, Disney moved his studio to a newer and larger building. It was top quality, but the working conditions were more impersonal and controlled. The various production units were isolated and inbetweeners and inkers were stuck on different floors. Each floor was stationed by a secretary who monitored comings and goings. It was also rumoured that Disney was going to install a time clock. Many of the animators had worked free overtime during the production of Snow White. Now they were being faced with a string of layoffs and wage cuts.

Workers grumbled about the sweat-shop-like atmosphere. Studio conditions were tense. Finally the Screen Cartoonist Guild was established. Disney took the creation of this union as a personal insult. The problem was that although conditions at Disney's studio were better than at other studios, he was viewed as the "king" of animation. Workers felt that it was up to him to set the standards which others would then follow.
Disney's lawyer, Gunther Lessing, encouraged him to fight rather than recognize the existence of this union. Disputes during the summer of 1941 shut the studio for nine weeks. Unable to deal with what he saw as hostility directed at him, Disney went on holiday to recuperate, and the strike was settled in his absence. Many of the animators felt let down by this gesture. The lack of direct communication between Disney and his workers led to a general feeling of dissatisfaction. A number of talented artists, such as John Hubley, wanting greater freedom of expression, left the Disney studio to help form United Productions of America.

UPA was a very loose group. Many styles were expressed but this lack of tight control led to the loss of some strong founding members by 1955. UPA ended up producing cartoons in a few familiar styles, but its diversification led to more avant-garde animation. UPA also moved away from realism to a more practical use of the cartoon medium. Whereas all of Disney's animation was based on reality and utilized techniques such as rotoscoping, UPA established the trend towards a tougher, more cynical animation. They steered away from the romantic, innocent use of bright natural colors. There was nothing natural about this new style of animation. The UPA animators were also working with smaller budgets than those at Disney's studio. This resulted in certain cartoons looking quite cheap, a visual indication of cartoons to appear on television in the 1950's. The new characters such as Mr. Magoo or Gerald McBoing Boing, were witty and surrealistic not round, soft, coy and
cute. UPA's founder was Stephen Bosustow, who made his name with *Hell Bent For Election*, a 1944 cartoon for Roosevelt's campaign, directed by Chuck Jones.

There were a variety of prewar American animation studios. Charles Mintz was already releasing the "Oswald the Rabbit" cartoons through Universal as early as 1927. Eventually Walter Lantz replaced Mintz as head of the Oswald studio in Hollywood. Universal had also produced many of Windsor McKay's and Pat Sullivan's cartoons. Oswald lasted another ten years but was eventually replaced by Woody Woodpecker. Lantz also created Andy Panda. Twentieth Century Fox produced Paul Terry's "Terrytoons." Terry's main series of cartoons were his "Aesop's Fables". Like Lantz, he had not only worked at the Bray studios, but had been one of their proteges. Mighty Mouse and Heckel and Jeckel were also featured by this studio. Other studios were RKO with their Rainbow Parade, and Paramount who had Max Fleischer and his Popeye creation. Paramount had been releasing Bray's cartoons as part of their Paramount Screen Magazine. The Fleischer brothers had been hired at this time. Koko actually got his own series entitled "Inkwell Imps" in the late 1920's. They featured Koko and his dog Fitz who later became Bimbo, the friend of Betty Boop. MGM, which was producing "Happy Harmonies" under Fred C. Quimby employed William Hanna and Joseph Barbera, Tex Avery, Hugh Harman and Rudolph Ising who were to found the animation at Warner Brothers.
D) The Warner Studio and Tex Avery

Hugh Harman and Rudolph Ising became a team after a continuation of Disney's "Oswald" series was given to Walter Lantz. They put together a demo reel for a possible series. Harman then invented Bosko, a little black boy who in Fleischer inkwell tradition, interacted with a live action Rudy Ising. They created Bosko The Talk - Ink Kid in 1929. It was while looking for a buyer that they met Leon Schlesinger, head of Pacific Art and Title, who sold Warners on the idea of a talking cartoon series. This was the beginning of Warners' "Looney Tunes", with Bosko as the featured character. Not only was it an instant success but in 1930/31, it had more bookings than Mickey Mouse. The 1931/32 season saw the start of the "Merrie Melodies" series. Each cartoon had a different character and used a popular tune of the day. This was so that Warners could publicize its vast holdings of songs but also served to emphasize the bond between music and animation.

Bosko's first few cartoons such as Bosko the Doughboy (1931) and Bosko the Lumberjack (1932) did not play upon popular black stereotypes. Aside from an exaggerated drawl and vocal stereotype, the fact that he was black was irrelevant. It did not use the popular caricature that all blacks were lazy, preferring to gamble and eat fried chicken and watermelon. Nor did it show blacks as leaning towards singing soul songs rather than working.

The first "Looney Tune" was called Sinkin In The Bathtub. It premiered on May 6, 1930. Music was crucial in this
cartoon and was used to set the pace. While this series made musical advances, there was little visual innovation. The gags included nudity, underwear, toilets, cow's udders and spitting, in fact, much of the bathroom humour that Disney tended towards. Only occasionally were the gags sexual. By 1931 Harman and Ising were looking for solid laughs. The Bosko series used slapstick gags and recalled the 1920's comedy shorts. The scenes were typified by high quality black and white animation, using elements such as exploding bombs and charging armies. In 1932, Bosko's girlfriend, Honey, was given a bigger role but the cartoons began to resemble a Disney by-product. For example, Bosko's Party (1932) used cute animals and had a boring, routine plot.

The "Merrie Melodies" series which made use of the hot "whoopee" tunes of the day and had plots about period subjects--for example, speakeasies, vaudeville, the college football craze and Rasputin--were much more innovative. They referred to popular culture and trends. Each "Merrie Melody" had its own main protagonist. The ones that were not successful had a lack of character development. Goopy Gear soon became the star of this series. Goopy was a comedian, musician, and dancer whose trademark was an eccentric dance. He appeared in Bosko In Dutch (1932) where he did this dance on ice skates.

Harman and Ising also started the "come to life" idea. For example, in I Like Mountain Music (1933) the photos in the magazines came alive. These cartoons also paid tribute to
other cultures. *Pagan Moon* (1931) used South Seas music and *One Step Ahead Of My Shadow*, (1932) had a Chinese motif. In 1932/33 Harman and Ising had a fight with Schlesinger, who was producing the Warners' cartoons and both departed for MGM. MGM was releasing cartoons which looked increasingly like Disney's. Harman and Ising took their creation of Bosko with them to MGM and here his transformation into "the little negro boy" stereotype became complete. It was easy to create multiple plotlines based on this caricature, and this popular stereotype could be used to obtain cheap laughs.

Many of the other animators at the Warners studio at this time were comprised of ex-Disney people, so it was not surprising that they began initially to imitate the style he had developed. No one could equal his financial or artistic success, however. By the mid 1930's most of these animators had left, and the new breed established a distinct style. Warners became the master of the short animated film. As Stephen Schneider has observed:

> At Warner's, cartoons once again became aware that they were cartoons, and the directors began to make the most of the boundless freedoms available to the medium. Rather then creating the "illusion of life," the Warner animators began asking audiences to recognize that theirs was an art of pure illusion - but even so, go with it, folks, jump on for the rip-roaring ride. (44)

One of the most influential new animators at Warners was Tex Avery. He firmly established the notion of "anything
goes" in cartoons. Avery had worked for Walter Lantz before applying as a director to Schlesinger Productions. He was hired and given Chuck Jones, Bob Clampett, and Bob Cannon as the animators in his unit. Upon arriving, he looked over the recent cartoons to find a usable character. He settled on Porky Pig from *I Haven't Got A Hat*. His first film was entitled the *Golddiggers of 49* (1935). Porky was transformed into an adult and bore no resemblance to his earlier self. Rather than the bevy of chorus girls which were expected from the Berkeley musicals, Avery used the literal sense of the title. This cartoon was the bridge between the old and new style at Warner Brothers. While the cartoon was quite crudely drawn and slow, it bore traces of the "Avery timing" which would manifest itself in the later cartoons. After Avery's arrival, the animal stars of "Merrie Melodies" and "Looney Tunes" lost their innocence. The pace quickened and the gags increased. He became known for his extreme extremes, which are the drawings of poses or attitudes. The irreverence of characters and genres, changes in pace, and a destruction of logic all became part of Avery's style. Not only did he speed up the pace, but he stressed the importance of characterization. Avery himself said that, "I've always felt that what you did with a character was more important than the character itself. Bugs Bunny could have been a bird." Avery gave the trademark "What's up Doc?" to Bugs as well as developing Porky and inventing Daffy.
Avery played with and exploited various genre formats. He would begin with either a known film or genre and then undermine all the fundamental assumptions about it through his gags. Each successive gag increased in momentum. For example, a character could have an object dropped on his head and then turn around and fall off a cliff. Much of Avery's style stems from his horror of conformity. He would not satisfy the audience's need for identification. He questioned basic concepts of storytelling, such as "the hero." In *The Village Smithy* (1936), the narrator interrupts an out-of-sync rendition of Longfellow to introduce "our hero Porky Pig."

Avery especially enjoyed exploiting the fairy tale genre, perhaps in direct opposition to Disney. His characters continually broke the fourth wall, and he never let the audience forget they were watching a cartoon. He used cartoon/reality jokes where the audience would be in the film. The shadowed figures of the audience played roles, resulting in a cartoon within a cartoon. Avery also blurred frame/line distinctions. His gags accelerated until he perfected a new control of extremes. Both Avery and Jones emphasized the extremes over the in-betweens, which are intermediary drawings of movements between extremes. The speed of his gags and the wide variety of representational styles used, such as live action, stock footage, magazine ad drawings and drawing styles, allowed him to create new narrative structures. Avery loved satire, especially if used to deal blows to the pretentions of high culture. His cartoons were very physical
and dealt with the shattering of the illusion of control, whether of ourselves, others or nature.

Chuck Jones' cartoon characters control all levels of action and meaning. Avery's cartoons were more manic and depicted a fragmented and disjointed world. This became more evident when he moved to MGM in 1942 where his cartoons reflected the post WWII world. Disney and Avery were the two main influences on Chuck Jones' style. At this point, I will turn to Jones himself, beginning with a brief biographical sketch.

E) Chuck Jones

Chuck Jones graduated from the Chouinard Art Institute and went to work in a commercial art studio. In 1931 he quit to become a cel washer, where he was discovered by Ub Iwerks who had left Disney to start his own studio. He worked his way through cel painter, cel inker and up to in-betweener. Chuck Jones left for Universal where he worked with Walter Lantz and also did a brief stint with Charles Mintz. He then returned to Iwerks where he was fired, and so became a puppeteer and portrait artist. Jones took classes with Don Graham at Disney, who was the animator responsible for creating whole characters. Eventually he got a job with Leon Schlesinger, who had split with Harman -Ising to form his own studio. Jones was assigned to the Tex Avery unit, and in the late 1930's became director of his own unit when Frank Tashlin left to direct live action.
Initially, Jones' cartoons followed the Disney tradition. He produced cute subjects for Warners. His first effort as a director was *The Night Watchman* (1938). It featured a kitten who took his father's place as watchman in a kitchen. Over the next few years, he explored the theme of small animals and their relation to a forbidding environment. For example, *Dog Gone Modern* (1939) told of two puppies caught in a model of the house of the future. He created Sniffles the Mouse, a largely forgettable character. Jones directed the studio's first serious cartoon that same year. *Old Glory* featured Uncle Sam lecturing Porky on the true meaning of the Pledge of Allegiance. This cartoon had wartime references.

Warners took an early antifascist stand in its films, predating US involvement in WWII. It was the first studio to depict the first outright Hollywood attack on Nazis, in *Confessions Of A Nazi Spy* (May 1939). Both cartoon and live action heros went to war. Bugs gained his popularity during the war years. The gags took on new dimensions as characters gave a comeuppance to real villains. In 1944 Jones directed *Weakly Reporter*, which spoofed rationing. These war cartoons utilized the relaxation of sexual censorship and an increase in permissiveness on screen in their material. They provided "cheesecake" for the boys at the front.

Jones was experimenting with his own style during these years. Of all the animators, Jones kept trying to emulate Disney. He tried to make very beautiful cartoons. But in the early 1940's Jones set a new style in cartoon layouts. He used
a huge number of cuts in his cartoons and never used the same
color background over and over. Jones' characters expressed emotion
through physical detail, just like the great silent comedians.
His earlier cartoons were more realistic as he learned the
basics of motions and how to draw. His pre-1941 cartoons were
also more gentle.

He created the Inki and the Minah Bird series. The Minah
would appear like some supernatural being and thwart Inki's
movements and heroic endeavors by merely showing up at
unlikely times. He would walk through the scene with a deadpan
expression to the strains of Mendelssohn's "Fingal Cave" and
hop on the odd beats. From 1942 onwards, he broke with
realism. He began working with writer Mike Maltese, who was a
brilliant gagsman. Believability is more important than
realism in animation.

Cartoons in Jones' unit always began with a "Yes" session,
in which no idea was ever dismissed. A storyboard was then
created and given to the director. No scripts were ever used.
The director drew approximately 300 key poses/character
layouts per six minute cartoon. These drawings were a guide.
The characters were staged in individual scenes, and
backgrounds were decided upon. The director and background
designer would go over the story together until about 300
sketches were laid out on animation paper. Dialogue was
written under the story sketches as the storyboard grew. At
this stage the actors were called into the dialogue room or
sound stage, and the director would go over the sketches. The
dialogue would be rehearsed, then processed and put onto a Moviola. The director would then bring the dialogue, background layouts and drawings together. The six minute length was always kept in mind, and much of the editing was done in the director's head. There were 12-24 individual drawings per second. The pen drawings were transferred onto cels by hand inking or a form of phototransfering, which involved camera work. One cartoon took roughly five weeks to create. Jones simulated live action editing more so than other directors. Characters were drawn naturally, but they were based upon their own system of anatomy. For example, Marc Antony gives the impression of being a dog but his movements are not like those of a real dog. His front is too big and he has a tiny rear. It is believable because he moves naturally according to his own shape. That is what is important.

Jones was influenced more by Keaton than by Chaplin. He uses the Keaton trait of flicking the eyes towards the camera. The coyote does it whenever he realizes that something is going to fall on him. Unlike Avery, Jones confines his exaggerated movements to strong reactions. He does not use them as frequently as Avery. For example, the coyote's jaw drops in amazement at the roadrunner's speed, or the worker's look of disbelief is exaggerated when seeing the singing frog. His movements seem to suspend time. It is time marking animation, in that it has a noticeable rhythm and beat.

Jones breaks all the laws of physics. Yet the characters are always made aware what is happening before any laws are
violated. It is as if nothing can be transgressed until the transgressor realizes the full extent of the trouble he is about to have. This is most notable in his idea of falling. These are usually shot as straight on shots. Jones explained it as the same law that governs cars at a traffic light. When a light turns green, the first car moves, and then the second, etc. Not all the cars move at once. This is how his characters fall. First the trunk falls, then the neck and, finally, the head. By applying this principle to a body, the humour is increased and the agony prolonged. The actual landing never seems to hurt. It is the idea of it that carries the emotional impact. Jones is sensitive to his characters. There is always the feeling that if one should get hurt he'll still survive.

Jones had come out of a household where drawing and doodling had been encouraged. His training in art had provided the basics, but the emotion came from Jones himself. He was influenced by both Disney and Avery, two radically different schools of thought. From Disney, he learned the cuteness, which he outgrew and the love of a beautiful cartoon. From Avery he learned the art of timing, without which the American cartoon is nothing. Avery taught Jones the importance of character, timing, of loving what you create, and of respecting impulsive thought. Jones' cartoons are not the mass produced crude examples found on television today. He worked for cinema not television and his stories followed accordingly. Jones created visual and narrative masterpieces which drew heavily from live-action cinema. Although in
animation, he was still part of a studio era and his work often reflects this.

The American tradition of animation that Warners was to become famous for was based upon a verbal and visual madness: hyperbole, comic abstraction, and mythic frenzy. It drew upon a cinematic and literary tradition while making no effort to remain true to any ideals. It took issues very seriously and treated all its subject matter with respect but was not afraid to have fun. Jones' cartoons especially reflect a light-heartedness that audiences in the war and post-war years came to love. Jones placed his cartoons in a social context and never failed to understand the changing needs of his audience. It was no different than what live action attempted to do, namely, satisfy the public. His issues are relevant and his presentation no less cinematic than anything found in live-action.

It is my concern to show that his work is connected to the study of film theory and cannot merely be dismissed as child's play. The following chapters will examine specific cartoons in terms of gender and spectatorship. I will begin with the Bugs Bunny cartoons and analyze them in relation to theoretical concerns, in hopes of justifying the claim that Chuck Jones' work possesses a distinct and strong cinematic identity and is not tied to live-action for its motivation.
Notes


2 According to the definition of Lynn Smith and Robert Del Tradici, the Mutascope was "A viewing machine, manufactured in 1895 by the American Mutoscope Company, which used the "flip book" principle to create the illusion of movement. It contained a series of continuous photographs arranged on a horizontal axis. A coin was dropped into the machine to operate the hand-crank that moved the pictures rapidly and created the illusion of movement." *History of Animated Film* eds. Lynn Smith and Robert Del Tradici (Montreal : McGill UP, 1988) 3:16.
3 In order to concentrate on animation developments in the US, the contributions of animators in other countries will be ignored. Cohl did have many contributions to the field. Further information can be found in Ralph Stephenson, *The Animated Film* (London: Tantivy Press, 1973): 24-34.


5 I have chosen not to dwell on the other studios in as much depth for two reasons. The first is that unlike Disney they did not exert a tremendous influence on either the work of Chuck Jones or the animation field in general. Second, there is not much written about these other studios. The quality of their cartoons was not particularly impressive. Hence, only Disney and the Warner Brothers' studio will be dealt with as having relevance to this topic.

6 For further information on Tex Avery see, for example, Danny and Gerald Peary, eds. *The American Animated Cartoon* (New York: E.P.Dutton, 1980): 110-127; and Steve Schneider,

Chapter Two

Bugs Bunny

If the work of Chuck Jones is to be analyzed as an example of the notions of gender and spectatorship, it is necessary to begin by examining the most basic aspect of the cinematic apparatus. Cinema does not exist without the gaze of the viewer. This process of looking (between both the spectator/screen and the characters themselves) is an issue of concern for film theorists. Animation in general, and Jones' work in particular, is not limited by the same boundaries as live action film. Because they are fictionalized creatures, the antics of Bugs Bunny or Daffy Duck are not limited by their very "humanity." They can perform feats which are not only impossible for human beings but also walk away from them unscathed. The viewing pleasure is only limited by the imagination of the director. Therefore, watching animation is the quintessential voyeuristic experience.

A) Spectatorship (The Gaze)

When discussing spectatorship, the role of the spectator must first be explained. The notion of the spectator stems from psychoanalytic film theory and has been used extensively in feminist critiques. It refers to the subject of the images being projected and emphasizes the idea of consumption. The spectator receives and consumes the film. This reception (which is generally applied to mainstream films only) is governed by various elements in the text as well as cinematic
codes such as how images are framed. The two most popular concepts of the gaze place them as either sadistic or masochistic.

The arguments which place the viewing of live action under either a sadistic or a masochistic gaze, can be applied just as strongly to Jones' work. Since it is not my intention to argue, here, for either type of gaze, but merely point out how some of these theoretical concerns are manifest in Chuck Jones' cartoons, only the "sadistic" form of the gaze will be examined. The best understanding of the sadistic gaze comes from Laura Mulvey's 1975 article entitled "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." Mulvey probes the relationship between gender and spectatorship to formulate the notion that the spectator is masculine. She uses examples of voyeurism and fetishism in mainstream films to show how women are treated. Mainstream film is also referred to as dominant cinema and is based on a commercial and economic ideal.

Cinema is a representation in which women are simplified and reduced to a sexual stereotype since they are portrayed as irrational, emotional beings (as in screwball comedies), or as victims. Perhaps this portrayal is a conscious act created by the patriarchal ideology manifest in North American culture. This dominant cinema becomes economic because people will not go to movies which do not give them what they want.

The dominant spectator is male. Women are in the film but their presence in the audience is ignored. Within dominant cinema, the hero or main protagonist tends to be male. This
creates a bond between hero and spectator as the viewer identifies with the character. The female love interest is desired by both the hero and spectator, and because of this bond, the viewer is able to possess or save the female through the actions of the hero. The camera looks at the world the way that a male would, and females become the erotic display/spectacle. The female viewer has been conditioned to watch in the same way as the male. Her desires are ignored and irrelevant. The onscreen female becomes an object, the masochistic recipient of the male sadistic gaze.

Mulvey suggests that cinema offers the pleasure of scopophilia, which Freud saw as one of the component instincts of sexuality that exists independently of other erotogenic zones. Scopophilia is the pleasure of looking and of taking other people as objects and subjecting them to an assertive gaze. Cinema offers an excessive form of voyeurism as it presents the opportunity to view without any interaction or possible retributions for this action. The conditions of viewing a film do not allow for the look to be returned in mainstream cinema. The darkness of the theatre and the unfolding of events without regard to the viewer, combine to create this voyeuristic experience. In cinema, the gaze can rest between the spectator/screen, the characters to each other or the characters to the spectator. The concept of self-reflexivity is tied into this.

Voyeurism is tied to the idea of sexual arousal. This stems from the fact that, in cinema, the images are created for a
male gaze. Women are either fetishized, saved, or ignored (as in the case of a buddy movie). The entire concept of desire is forbidden to the female due to her lack of a phallus. Women become a nonsubject in the discourse of the gaze. She can only exist as spectacle, for she has been conditioned to view herself in the same way as men view women. She is on display for the camera, audience and other characters. By presenting this way of looking as reality, the cinematic apparatus attempts to deny that this is just a representation.

Mainstream film combines spectacle and narrative as it creates the conditions for the power of the male gaze. This gaze is projected onto the male protagonist with whom an identification is forged. Through this identification, the viewer can indirectly control events onscreen. Mulvey contends that this entire voyeuristic experience is tied to sadism because the pleasure arises from "ascertaining guilt (immediately associated with castration), asserting control and subjecting the guilty person through punishment or forgiveness."(311) This sadism finds an ideal outlet in the narrative as it needs change to occur. It needs some type of battle of will/strength. It depends upon a story. This theory has not been applied to animation. It is important to realize that not all animation can be examined in light of this theory. Animation is a general term; it is not synonymous with cartoon. The style of animation which Chuck Jones helped to create and define is rooted within the same Hollywood tradition as these films which are continually a subject of
study. They draw upon the same cultural references and values, as well as portraying similar images of characters.

The first similarity between the two is the narrative structure. Chuck Jones' cartoons can be regarded as miniature films. They contain a protagonist, antagonist, and a clearly defined beginning, middle and end. Because many people grew up watching them on television, it is easy to forget that his work was created for the cinema. It was never originally intended for television, which has its own format. In the same way that live action cinema is considered higher in quality than its television counterpart, the cinematic cartoon is a much superior work to that found on television. Although budgets were not high at the Warner's animation studio, the amounts still allowed for a better quality cartoon. Also, however much animation may have been dismissed as not worthy of attention by those within the industry, all shared a disdain of television.

This brings us to Mulvey's point about distancing. Since they were being watched in a movie theatre, the same viewing conditions applied to both the cartoon and the feature. Darkness would envelop the viewer no matter what was onscreen and events in Jones' cartoons still unfolded according to the Hollywood narrative structure and without regard to the audience. One of the reasons that this theory can be applied to his work and not just animation (or even just all cartoons) in general is his characterization. One of the "problems" with Mulvey and cartoons is the absence of female characters. Much
of the identification process involved in voyeurism stems from the depiction of the human form. Cartoons tended to use animals as characters, rather than as human beings. This would place a barrier in terms of identification. While Disney attempted to anthropomorphize his characters, they were still too cute to be believably human. Chuck Jones, however, developed his characters so strongly that their actual form was irrelevant. These characters were developed out of Jones' own personal biography. Viewers either saw aspects of themselves or character traits they wished to possess, just as with any movie hero. As Richard Schickel points out:

[Bugs] was a con man in the classic American mold, adept in the techniques and ethics of survival, equally at home in the jungle of the city and in Elmer Fudd's carrot patch. In the war years, when he flourished most gloriously, Bugs Bunny embodied the cocky humour of a nation that had survived its economic crisis with fewer psychological scars than anyone had thought possible and was facing a terrible war with grace, gallantry, humour, and solidarity that was equally surprising. (202)

All the characters that Jones worked with, but perhaps Bugs Bunny most of all, were examples of the American values which infused that nation's personality. Bugs Bunny was as much of a hero (or perhaps anti-hero) as Bogart. There was nothing really rabbit-like about him. He was a streetwise survivor, who used verbal humour and brains to win any situation. Both
adults and children could easily identify with him. Given the tumultuousness of the postwar years, as America attempted to deal with both its status as a super-power and its return to "normal" life, it is no surprise that he became so popular. Bugs was a product of American culture. Because he was a cartoon character, it was even more enjoyable to identify with him, as he could do things which would not work with a human character. Whenever a human actor is hurt, there is a slight discomfort, as the viewers are also human and can relate to that pain. In a cartoon, however, a character can sustain the worst injuries and just walk away. Unlike human actors, cartoon "actors" (for each character acts, and takes on many roles) have no reason for existing outside of the film. The viewer can watch them, secure in the knowledge that these characters are only on screen to give viewing pleasure. Also, the viewer can enjoy a character being run over by a train and then blown up without feeling any guilt. The characters can sustain no damage. The viewing experience is de-emotionalized, so that only the pleasure of watching remains. Hence, watching, for example, a Bugs Bunny cartoon is far more pleasurable than any adventure film, since Bugs has all the desirable qualities of a hero without any physical limitations. Even the very process of identification becomes intensified, since the character with whom one is identifying is not limited by human inabilities, for example the ability to survive after repeatedly falling off a cliff. It is the ideal cinematic situation.
To illustrate these points, Jones' cartoons entitled *Bugs' Bonnets* (1956) and *Bully For Bugs* (1953) can be examined. Both help to show that not only is the personality, rather than the look the most important aspect of these characters, but also that they are rooted in American cultural values. The former centers on the premise that the clothes make the man. In a typical Bugs/Elmer scenario, a chase occurs. In the midst of this, several hats which have fallen off a truck stray into their path. The various hats, which wind up on their heads, result in psychological changes. What is interesting is that no matter what hat they are wearing, they still retain elements of their own personality. For example, Bugs ends up wearing a gangster hat and a sergeant's hat while Elmer has a pilgrim hat and an old lady's bonnet. In each scenario, Bugs ultimately retains the higher status. Bugs' characters are more aggressive than Elmer's. Each of the characters they temporarily become is rooted in American culture: a pilgrim, a Chicago gangster, an Irish cop, or a boy scout. They are very familiar images, which are enhanced by the addition of Bugs' or Elmer's own personality quirks. Each change of hats comprises its own mini narrative and somehow connects to the next chain of events. The narrative structure is not destroyed.

*Bully For Bugs* not only demonstrates a strong characterization but is an example of a guilt-free viewing experience. Bugs has accidently ended up in a bullring. In typical Bugs fashion, he just wants to go about his business,
but is attacked by the bull, who has already scared off the bullfighter. Initially Bugs appears as the typical American tourist, complete with map, as he tries to figure out where the Big Carrot Fest is located. Once he has been provoked into war, however, Bugs snaps into the self-assured and confident hero role which is eagerly expected by the viewer. Both his pose and facial expression show his control of the situation as he plays with the bull on the bull's own turf. Bugs appears in matador garb (another example of the roles these characters take on) and plays with his victim. He smashes the bull with an anvil, or slaps him around as they both dance to the Mexican Hat Dance and La Cucaracha. There is humour in his use of violence. This humour is mirrored by Bugs' speech. He relies on verbal humour, often puns, uttering such phrases as, "What a gullibull." Both speech and stance are human in manner. Jones follows a live-action tradition, visually and narratively. He employs long shots, close ups, and over-the-shoulder shots of the bull chasing Bugs. Even the bull in his conniving is far more human than animal. So the identification process has been established.

Whereas these elements may contribute to a more positive viewing experience, the feminist critiques of the image of women in narrative films, unfortunately, also holds true in Jones' work. It can be argued that among mainstream narrative films, the female is never endowed with the same strength and sense of purpose as the male. The protagonist tends to be male, or when female, her character merely reaffirms the
status quo of society, which is dictated by men. Cinema, perhaps because of the relatively small number of women directors, is filled with the portrayal of strong male characters. Bearing in mind the 1940–60 time period which has been established in this study, it is not surprising that most of the positions of control in the cinema were filled by men. None of the directors at the Warner's animation studio was female. This is, perhaps, why no dominant female characters were created by Chuck Jones. Not only was there no real cinematic precedent, there was certainly no role model in animation. Disney had created some female characters, such as Minnie Mouse, but they were merely pale imitations of their male partners. While Chuck Jones may have created characters who felt animosity towards each other, there were still deep bonds between them. All the strong relationships are male/male. Before examining the relationship of Bugs Bunny to various other characters, it is necessary to provide a character sketch. The relationship between Bugs and Daffy, as the major pairing to come out of this studio shall be examined in detail in a later chapter.

It has never been established who was directly responsible for creating Bugs Bunny. While all the directors had a hand in his development, it was Jones' version of the rabbit that became the dominant one. Originally, Bugs was a lot crazier. He stood with bent legs, as if ready to run away. From this position, he evolved to standing straight with his weight on one leg. His other leg was out to one side while he was
munching on a carrot. What came to be the quintessential aspect of his personality, as Jones defined it, was that Bugs only wanted to be left alone. He was a metaphor for American isolationism. While Bugs was more human than animal, he never completely lost the reason for being a rabbit, the way that Mickey had no reason for being a mouse. While Disney's Mickey didn't love cheese and lived in a trailer, Jones maintained control of his character. Bugs lived in a natural environment, and one of the main reasons for his doing anything was to get a carrot, so there was a focus beneath his role playing. Bugs evolved in personality as the directors became more familiar with him. As he physically straightened up, he became more confident and insouciant. Much of his personality can be traced to Groucho Marx from whom he took the line, "Of course you realize, this means war!" The intellect of Groucho is combined with the weirdness and zaniness of Harpo. Both Bugs' mental and physical feats were demanding. In the cartoons that Jones directed, Bugs always started out in an environment which was natural to a rabbit. His line "I musta taken a wrong turn at Albuquerque," is an excuse for Bugs to be wherever the animators wanted him. Bugs would end up in unknown territory and wreak chaos, often unintentionally. When he was in a natural environment, however, he was a more believable character.

Jones was the only director to continually enforce this rule. In Grey Hounded Hare (1949), directed by Robert McKimson, Bugs starts out at a dogtrack. The premise of the
cartoon is that Bugs falls for the fake rabbit which the dogs chase around the track. McKimson's Bugs is far more obnoxious, looney and antagonistic than Jones'. It is not clear why Bugs would be there or why he is stupid enough to fall for a fake rabbit. This stupidity, combined with an unprovoked and malicious aggressiveness, as he beats up the dogs for no immediately apparent reason, runs counter to the popular portrayal of Bugs as more intelligent and humorous. It is not easy to identify with this version of Bugs, as opposed to Bugs as the streetsmart wise guy. Jones' Bugs only acts to save his own skin. He is not a bully. Also, he is not as concerned with females as McKimson has made him. In this cartoon, he is not only attracted to this fake rabbit but obsessed by it.

While Jones created a Bugs who thinks out his problems and solves them intellectually, the Bugs created by Fritz Freleng is far more physical. He gets clever at the last moment, rather than demonstrating "smarts" throughout the cartoon. Also Bugs is not necessarily the main focus. For example, in Roman Legion Hare (1955), he is teamed with Yosemite Sam. Sam is looking for victims for Nero to throw to the lions, and Bugs approaches him to find out what is going on. In a cartoon directed by Jones, Bugs would have minded his own business, until his routine was disrupted, at which point he would retaliate. As Chuck Jones stated in Cinema Journal: "I conceive Bugs to be a sort of counterrevolutionary rather than a revolutionary. He is for peace in his home; he refuses to be put upon; he insists in effect, upon being treated as a
citizen rather than a rabbit." (11) Bugs needs a reason for combat, but if he is pushed into a war, then he will win. This cartoon of Freleng's revolves more around Yosemite's stupidities rather than Bugs' cleverness. There is no verbal humour or sense that Bugs has been pushed to his breaking point. He survives the situation but not due to any great strategy on his part. There is no true satisfaction that he has bested his opponent.

The same holds true in another Freleng cartoon entitled Hare Do (1949). Bugs is chased by Elmer, and they end up in a movie theatre. Freleng does not take that opportunity to play with structure by creating a narrative within the narrative. Instead, one gag, that of climbing in and out of a crowded row of people, is repeated to achieve some sort of humour. They finally do end up on stage. Bugs pretends to be Elmer's manager as Elmer unicycles down a tightrope and into a lion's mouth. However, Elmer is wearing dark glasses and has no idea that Bugs is abusing him. Again, it is far more enjoyable for the viewer when Bugs not only plays with his opponents, but when they are fully aware of the fact that they are being duped, as in Jones' cartoons.

Of course Jones' Bugs underwent a transformation in his personality. In the Case Of The Missing Hare (1942), Bugs is more manic and similar to the early incarnations of Daffy Duck. Jones hadn't yet begun to enforce his rule about Bugs' habitat. Bugs is living in a tree. The opening keeps being plastered by a magician who advertises his show with posters.
This brings about the "war" between the two. Bugs shows up at the magician's show and proceeds to disrupt it. He is extremely hyper and more easily provoked. Bugs also possesses a hysterical and slightly evil sounding laugh which disappears in later cartoons. The humour in this cartoon stems not only from the fact that Bugs makes a fool of the magician but that good old American values win out. If Bugs is the American "everyman", then the magician is the foreigner with the funny accent who has no business being there. Through the humour of the gags, American values are reaffirmed.

In *Wackiki Wabbit* (1943), another of Jones' earlier Bugs Bunny cartoons, Bugs is less self-assured and controlled than his later incarnations. He is also more hyper. Two shipwrecked sailors, who are ready to eat each other, end up on an island where Bugs lives. He greets them with "What's the good word strangers?'s", rather than "What's up Doc?" which became his standard line. Bugs does manage to outsmart them but the humour in this cartoon comes with Jones' manipulation of cinematic devices. Bugs speaks in some type of South seas tongue, while subtitles appear for both the viewer and the characters. They respond in English, which is subtitled for Bugs' use. One of the characters even points to the subtitle and says, "Gee, did you say that?" This cartoon is dependent upon a knowledge of American comedies. It is funnier when the two shipwrecked men can be recognized as a parody of American comedy duos such as Abbott and Costello or Laurel and Hardy. All of Jones' cartoons work on a variety of levels. They are
humorous on a purely visual level, yet when combined with an understanding of American culture and values, they take on a new depth.

B) Gender

While it is important to establish spectatorship as the first level in understanding the cinematic apparatus, in that one must understand how one is looking, one must also establish the next level of consideration: gender. As mentioned in relation to Mulvey, gaze and gender are not separate entities. Once aware of the process of viewing, what is being seen becomes important. Cinema in general, and Jones' work in particular, work around codes of gender. Male/female relationships form the greater part of cinematic narrative. The other trend is male/male relationships which imply the lack of a female. Her presence is either ignored completely or belittled, as we will see in Jones' work through the use of drag. As female/female films are a rarity, women are never given the same opportunity to be individuals without being defined in relation to the opposite sex. Thus gender becomes the next item of importance as theory goes from the general to the specific. As Jane Gaines observes:

Cartoon situations and iconography are based on the most universally known, highly conventionalized and overworked material and as such function as what Roland Barthes calls mythic speech. Caricature as much
as symbol has a special susceptibility to mythic significance. (54)

She states that according to Barthes, myth uses incomplete images whose meaning is ready for signification. This ties in to gender in terms of its cultural references. The entire notion of gender which cinema employs is based on a social conditioning of recognizing the differences between male and female. Jones' cartoons are largely male/male. The female is introduced by way of parody and caricature. Without the necessary signification (or cultural reference) these images remain incomplete. Jones also uses myth in terms of story. For example, Bugs Bunny and the Three Bears (1944) needs an understanding of the mythic tale to fill it out. Myth is, in turn, dependent on cultural references to give it meaning. In this case, American cultural references are at work.

In the days when cartoons were shown in the theatres, the cartoon was the preview for the action to come in the feature. The female in the cartoon served the same purpose as the female in the feature, namely, to be a spectacle of visual attraction for men. Now, when there was no female, it was easy to put a male character into drag and let him fulfill that role through a parody of the female form. Cultural references are important in order to fully understand the character differences between males and females. Media typecasting of the two sexes gives the opposite character traits. Whereas males are cunning and aggressive, females are shrewd and passive. The concept of "male" is virtually
unlimited, yet that of "female" is, as Molly Haskell observes, identified by a "set of external, playable mannerisms." (Peary 211) Female characters have no more importance in the world of animation than they do in that of live action. Females in cartoons parody the female form in one of two ways. Either they are the quintessential female and, thus, more akin to a drag queen, in that both rely on exaggerated characteristics rather than a complete personality; or they are the dumpy house wife. Mama Bear fits the latter category.

By replacing the character of Goldilocks with that of Bugs, Jones invokes an entirely new cultural reference. Whereas Goldilocks had been food for all three bears, Bugs is not only food, but a con artist who can get out of any situation. In this case, he appeals to Mama Bear's vanity. The three bears have deliberately acted out the roles of the mythic three bears in hopes of drawing a Goldilocks to their home as they are starving. Each one is a caricature of the original. Papa bear is a short, violent male; Mama Bear is a dumpy and quiet housewife with a deadpan expression; and Baby or Junior Bear is a huge, stupid child. Bugs shows up and tosses a couple of compliments her way. Immediately, according to the tennets of the susceptible female, she falls for both his charm and him. Now, objectified, Mama Bear changes to fit what she thinks Bugs wants her to be, namely, a blonde/hooker/bombshell. Bugs, however, runs from her emotion. It is alright for him to use her as a means of survival, but when she becomes aggressive, she is also, by extension, unattractive. The power must remain
with the male figure. With a couple of insincere compliments, he has created a female monster. She turns her objectification back onto her creator through her pursuit. Unfortunately, like the majority of popular female characters, she is stuck within this web of physical, emotional and cultural stereotypes.

The issue of the female as "bombshell", "frump" or "nonexistent presence" also relates to the notion of camp and the use of drag. The best definition of camp comes from Mark Booth, who states that: "to be camp is to present oneself as being committed to the marginal with a commitment greater than the marginal merits." (146) These marginal groups parody their own subordinate social status without any yen for power. As will be seen later, the American cartoon tradition which Jones helped to define fits this definition when placed within the context of the movie industry. Camp is a self parody which depends upon the artificial nature of self-presentation and a theatricality of one's daily life. Camp people want to be seen; their personality becomes a work of art. Camp is marginal to the traditional male traits of industry, marriage, respectability, etc. The most common marginal group in society is the female. These camp males see themselves as facing the same oppressors as females. The human personality is interpreted in mainly sexual terms. The reason that camp becomes associated with homosexuality is that many feel that gay males act like fake women rather than like men. Since women concern themselves with trivial thoughts, camp men who emulate femininity do so as well. These men are not
transvestites. They have no desire to be taken for women in real life; their aims are essentially theatrical. These men imitate women through a portrayal of the various stereotypes propagated by the media. Feminist concerns over the image of women in cinema are valid: these images extend themselves into animation as well. While these stereotypes are definitely harmful, the frequent use of drag in the work of Chuck Jones is more campy than a deliberate ignoring of a female character. His characters are comedians, albeit fictional ones. When placed within a historical context, it can be seen that most of the popular comedians were male. This does not justify the fact that it was easier to dress an existing male character in drag, rather than create a worthwhile female character in order to receive the same laughs. However, by not creating strong female characters, and using female stereotypes for humour, Jones is defining his characters in sexual terms. As Sybil Delgaudio remarks:

Anthropomorphic characters are a step removed from human characters and require a certain degree of imitation of impersonation of human traits in order to succeed. Thus, Bugs and Daffy are, in a sense, impersonating male humans with respect to their values and behaviors, just as Petunia (Pig), Minnie (Mouse) and Daisy (Rabbit) are impersonating female humans with respect to theirs. (211)

It becomes a vicious cycle when one realizes that the female characters mentioned are merely feminized versions of
their male counterparts. So, when Bugs goes into drag, he is parodying a stereotype which was based on his own characteristics to begin with. Jones' male characters can play any role: spaceman, cowboy or woman, while women are restricted to playing a stereotype. The female character, as demonstrated by Mama Bear, is limited to playing the idea of a woman, complete with breasts, make-up and a susceptibility to seduction. In this way, she is no different from a drag queen. When Bugs impersonates a female in order to fool Porky or Elmer, as will be seen in the *Rabbit Of Seville* (1950), he acts like a "real" female, in that he has all the physical characteristics and mannerisms down pat, and yet he gets to retain the best of his "male" personality. Bugs is stronger, more aggressive and smarter than any true female would be portrayed. Bugs' own sexuality, or that of any of the other characters, is never an issue until it becomes a gag or a means of getting out of a situation. None of these characters has an inherent sexuality, except for parody purposes. If the strong relationships between the characters in the bulk of Jones' cartoons contributes to them being labelled "buddy" films, then the female is doubly unnecessary. If the traditional live-action formula for a buddy film is followed, then females are merely incidental characters, who ultimately have no relevance to the narrative. A man in drag can fulfill many of the same functions and provide a level of humour which a real female could not. The male impersonations of these "abstract" women look no different from the real thing; both
have false eyelashes, red lips, a hair ribbon, clingy skirt and breasts. Since the actual personality of these females is weak to nonexistent, all that is necessary for a believable performance are the physical attributes. Delgaudio goes on to observe that: "Bugs sees being a female in much the same grotesque way that the animators do - that is, in the exaggerated, garish garb of the transvestite..." (215) Bugs, however, gets to use physical violence when he is in drag, to get out of his situations; this is an escape which is not permitted for "real" females and is best exemplified by the Rabbit of Seville.

The cartoon is a spoof on the opera entitled The Barber of Seville. It begins with the familiar scenario of Elmer chasing Bugs through the forest. Bugs runs into an outdoor theatre and Elmer follows. However, Bugs has Elmer onstage and opens the curtains. Jones has now created a narrative within the narrative. Not only does the audience expect a Bugs/Elmer interplay, but the opera narrative must be accounted for. Also, whichever roles that they take on within the operatic narrative will be colored by their own character traits. All the humour stems from Bugs' literal interpretation of "Barber." Once Bugs gets Elmer into his shop, he does not have a chance. Bugs creates his own opera, using a visit to the barbershop as his base. This visit is also a means of getting back at Elmer. First, he hacks at Elmer's face with a razor. When Elmer tries to leap up and chase him, Bugs retorts to his drag outfit, in this case a harem girl, while singing, "What
would you want with a rabbit?/Can't you see that I'm much sweeter/I'm your little senorita." Elmer, being the sap that he is, falls for Bugs' seduction. There is not much more to this impersonation than the physical outfit and an ability to wriggle enticingly. Since this is cinema, there is no recollection of what has gone before, and so Elmer will always fall for this trick. Bugs ends the seduction by snipping Elmer's pants open with a pair of shears and wriggling off. Elmer discovers the deception and the chase is again on. Bugs once more gets Elmer in the chair and continues to torment him with such things as making a fruit salad on his head and giving him a full head of hair, complete with flowers. It can be speculated that all of Elmer's personality problems derive from the fact that he has no hair, since this is the only instance in any cartoon where he wears a look of absolute bliss. The two chase each other with various weapons until suddenly Bugs courts Elmer, now in wedding dress, and the two get married just in time to resolve the operatic and hence the narrative plot.

Elmer also appears as a bride in Bugs Bonnets. This time he asks Bugs to marry him, for no apparent reason. Bugs turns to the camera and says, "You know, I always think it helps a picture to have a romantic ending." Jones has deliberately tacked on a conventional ending, yet failed to introduce a female character to do so. Bugs and Elmer are shown as male because all characters have a gender but not necessarily a sexuality. Because camp is often associated with gay men, and
because of the frequent marriages occurring between the various male characters, an element of homosexuality makes itself felt. The gay community, like females, suffer from media images based only on stereotypes. The most common images are either the camp man or the "neurotic faggot". Bugs makes use of both stereotypes. In Hair Raising Hare (1946), Bugs escapes from a monster by playing a gay hairdresser. He uses the stereotypical lisp and mannerisms. These stereotypes show the dramatic, ridiculous and horrific qualities, in that they take an inconsequential aspect of an individual, and make it represent the whole person. They are tied to cultural references as well, for as Richard Dyer points out, "films use a certain set of visual and aural signs which immediately bespeak homosexuality and connote the qualities associated, stereotypically with it. " (31) Campiness, as one of these images, concentrates on life as a role. In Bugs Bonnets, the characters change roles as quickly as changing a hat. This again emphasizes that these cartoon characters only live for their roles.

Another element of Jones' opera-based cartoons is his understanding of opera itself. Jones remains true to the various operatic devices, including plotline, and use of space and rhythm. Narrative is tied to the music. These cartoons remain rooted within an operatic setting. The characters' roles within the opera correspond to their roles in the "real" world. In Rabbit of Seville, Bugs is in the position of higher status, as he dupes Elmer. In What's Opera Doc (1957), there
is no "real" world context to frame the operatic one, as in Seville. Bugs and Elmer carry their normal positions of hunter and rabbit right into the opera. Again, Jones ties an understanding of rhythm and music to narrative as he condenses Wagner's 16 hour Ring of the Nibelungen into 6 minutes without losing the feel for the plot. The cartoon seems almost serious, which is why it is so funny. Elmer is chasing Bugs with his "spear and magic helmet." Rather than occurring in a forest, Jones has created a self-contained, extremely stylized world filled with shadows, bold colors and jagged peaks, which would not be out of place in a grand opera house. It is stylization taken to an extreme. He also remains true to Wagner's characters by placing Bugs in drag to play the role of Brünnhilde. This Brünnhilde has none of the strength or character of the original. It is another case of Bugs using feminine wiles to outsmart Elmer. When Elmer first sees Bugs he cries, "Oh, Brünnhilde you're so lovely." Bugs responds with, "Yes I know it. I can't help it." He is given an assurance and confidence in his physical charms which real females are denied. Bugs is still a male and, as such, possesses a confidence no matter what outfit he wears. He is allowed to be comfortable with his physical attributes because they do not represent his entire being. His outfit consists of a blonde wig and brass bikini. He is riding astride a very effeminate horse. Since the operatic roles are being fulfilled by Bugs and Elmer, the horse is the visual stereotype of the large and effeminate tenor. Of course Elmer falls in love with
Bugs and their courtship is only disrupted by Bugs' helmet falling off his head. Once it is revealed that he is a rabbit, Elmer tries to kill him once again. Because this is occurring within an operatic world, he can succeed. The only time that this self-contained world makes any reference to its medium is at the end. Having killed Bugs, Elmer is filled with remorse and carries him off into the sunset in his arms. At this point, Bugs lifts his head and says, "Well what did you expect in an opera, a happy ending?" With this extreme formalism, Jones is making a comment on the pretensions of high art, in this case opera. Nowhere is this comment stronger than in *Long Haired Hare* (1949).

Even though Jones works within the medium of animation, which is not granted the same seriousness of intent as opera or literature, his characters are so strongly developed that he can borrow from these other media and use his own "actors" to create an often more powerful and memorable version. In *Long Haired Hare* Jones actually pits the pretensions of an opera singer against the perhaps more simple but popular folk singer. Even when he borrows from other media, he always keeps his characters focused. Here, Bugs is singing a variety of folk tunes which keeps interrupting the practice of an opera singer. Bugs' catchy tune is looked down upon by this highbrow artiste in the same way that animation was dismissed by serious filmmakers. Bugs' choice of song is in line with his personality. He is one of the people. When the tenor accidently begins to mix it in with his opera scores, it is
funny but inappropriate to his character. The humour stems from this inappropriateness and the fact that even an artist such as he is not immune to the charms of a folk song. Bugs sings his songs in the outdoors and is free, while the tenor is restricted to singing in a room. He does not have the same space. The tenor is a pompous character. That he holds an obvious disdain for low art is evident when he breaks Bugs' guitar. Bugs, ironically enough, calls him a music hater. In a sense, he is because he does not love music for its own sake, as does Bugs. Bugs finally reaches his breaking point and declares war. He invades the tenor's music hall. Once again he proves that he can battle on anyone's turf and win. At first he impersonates a variety of fans, including a starstruck female, who hands the tenor an exploding pen. Bugs then poses as Leopold Stokowski (who always plays the conductor in the Warner cartoons, and was the conductor in Fantasia (1940), another spoof on Disney) and destroys the tenor by making him hold a ridiculously long note. It is a completely ludicrous situation but effectively makes a point. Eventually, the opera house collapses, as does the tenor. Bugs finishes off the last few notes of the score by strumming them on his banjo. Thus "low" art cannot be suppressed.

It is important when studying any type of cinema to begin with spectatorship, so that one understands on what basis the gaze is established, before examining the text/subject. The Bugs Bunny cartoons provide a good base for examining Jones' work. These theoretical concerns of gender and spectatorship
are also manifest among Chuck Jones' other cartoons. The next chapter will focus primarily on the cartoons of Daffy Duck, with reference to Jones' other major characters when applicable. It will reveal that the aforementioned themes of gender and spectatorship in relation to understanding the cinematic apparatus continue throughout his work and, thus, place his entire oeuvre firmly within the concerns of film theory.
Chapter Three

Daffy Duck

This chapter will continue to draw upon the theories discussed in the previous chapter. While the focus will be upon the Daffy Duck cartoons, it will also examine ones which feature other characters. I will begin with spectatorship and the idea of the gaze. At this point I intend to approach it from the basis of the cinematic apparatus itself. By this, I plan to discuss the use of self-reflexivity in the cartoon entitled Duck Amuck. After this, I will return to the analysis of gender in Jones' work by looking at the characters of Pepe le Pew and Marc Antony. A brief sketch of Daffy's development will be provided, before turning to how camp is used in these cartoons. Whereas in the Bugs cartoons the use of camp was restricted to the use of drag, here it is connected to the idea of the star system and self-publicity, much more recently exemplified by the work of Andy Warhol. The next item of consideration is Jones' use of literary sources. As will be explained, this is also tied into the gaze. Other characters will be referred to in this section as well. Thus gender will include character traits and how these qualities work when Jones plays with form and genre.
A) Spectatorship

At this point I will return to the notion of the gaze. Rather than focusing on how the spectator views the subject matter, I plan to examine the cinematic apparatus itself. Unlike other artforms, such as painting where the brushstrokes are admired and studied as a part of the work, the actual workings of film are concealed. In fact, film is based upon a manufactured object which needs devices to give it motion and fluidity. The viewer relies upon the phi phenomenon to make it seem as if motion is occurring, and persistence of vision to retain the image on the retina and give fluidity. The actual film stock is never seen and only rarely is the medium itself referred to, as in Woody Allen's Annie Hall (1979). The process of referring to the medium is known as self-reflexivity. Jones utilizes this principle in his cartoon called Duck Amuck.

As noted earlier, film theorists tend to disregard animation in favor of "physical reality." Norman McLaren pointed out that animation was "the art of movements that are drawn; not the art of drawings that move" (Small 67). Since an animated film is created frame by frame, the problem lies in how to differ single frame activity from the "conventional" filming, using a continuously running camera. Small and Levinson observe in their article, "Towards A Theory Of Animation" that by single frame is meant the frame-by-frame control over individual images.
Single frame cinematography can be used to simulate live-action filming. Yet animation goes a step beyond live-action since animated movements violate physical law. They go on to discuss how animation can substitute for montage, since montage is the cinematic editing or putting together of individual shots into longer filmic units and animators often build works which use groups of frames over single frames. There are two ways of putting two pieces of film together: end to end or by overlapping them through the techniques of dissolve, double exposure, etc. To do this, optical printers are required. Animation and montage share the same technical optical printers used for animated effects and conventional cuts. Not only is there animation as montage but also montage as animation. In montage, cuts occur at the points where the filmmaker exercises control over his images. The points of contact between the shots are single frame changes. Montage is a version of animation in which the sites of single frame control separate throughout the film by continuously filmed frames. Montage can show perceived movement and metamorphosis, as does animation. One example is the roaring lions in Potemkin. It is also found in Léger's Ballet Mécanique, where the rapid cutting between "hat" and "shoe" create a metamorphosis. Animation can be taken as montage because its processing is basically editing in camera.
While animation can show anything, American cartoons tended to use uncomplicated plots. They were usually one gag films, with the action revolving around that one gag. Even *Duck Amuck* utilises a simple linear structure while manipulating cinematic limits. It begins with Daffy playing a musketeer, when suddenly his scenery is removed. This cartoon plays with the conventions of scenery, either removing it completely or changing it to something inappropriate in the middle of a scene. Daffy, as an actor, is equipped for anything and attempts to keep up with the change of roles required by each scene change. The irony of this situation is that Daffy, a product of someone's imagination, has to explain to his creator what constitutes an animated film. This "animator" also toys with the conventions of sound. Having drawn a guitar for Daffy, he fails to provide any sound. Daffy must hold up a sign requesting it. What follows is a succession of noises, ranging from a horn to gunfire to barnyard animals. Daffy cannot even get angry because his voice has been replaced by the crowing of a rooster. Finally, Daffy's own form is changed, without his knowledge, into a fantastical creature. The understanding of cinematic technique is also manipulated. When Daffy requests a close up, the camera zooms in to a tiny square in one corner of the screen, upon which Daffy asks, "This is a close up?" The camera then pulls into such a tight close up that only the whites of his eyes
fill the frame. He must walk backwards in order to reach a medium close up. At this point, Daffy goes crazy and demands that the picture get started. Instead, the words "The End" come onscreen. Ever the trooper, he continues to try to entertain the audience. When the film stock itself appears, as the frame splits into two, Daffy is so enraged that he attempts to beat up his other image. The various ways in which Jones manipulates the cinematic apparatus, usually hidden from the viewer, is a form of torture to Daffy. He is a cartoon character, and his existence depends on our belief in the reality of his world. This is not possible if all the different filmic techniques are being played with. At last Daffy demands to know who his tormentor is, and the camera pulls back to reveal Bugs. This is yet another manipulation by Jones. Bugs is Daffy's unseen animator and yet he too is fictitious.

While this film is humorous, it is also an essay on the nature of both animated film and the mechanics of all film. The displaying of the frame boundaries is the most basic aspect in film. The audience laughs at Daffy being placed in frustrating and humiliating scenarios which subject his very being. And yet, "the comic payoff is the reflection of these themes in Daffy's character, his responses, and within the world of the cartoon - his literally cosmic humiliation." (Peary 231) This film, along with the character of Daffy, is conscious of itself
as cinema. He is a victim of the power of the media, not himself. His demand to know who is responsible is an attempt to save face.

Daffy is a perfect paranoiac. This cartoon is his "bad trip." For a cartoon character as neurotic as Daffy, it is filled with self-destruction fantasies and delusions. Leonard Maltin observed that:

Louis Black has written, 'The cartoon stands as an almost clinical study of deconstruction of a text, in the way it presents a whole at the beginning and then dismembers every facet of the cartoon, only to put them together at the end.' (239)

Daffy is forced to live and struggle on an empty screen without the props which normally make up his world. He ends up having to be himself, without the benefit of any role and, thus, is at his most vulnerable and honest. In order to gain insight into the personality of Daffy Duck, a character sketch will be provided in the section on gender.

While Jones toys with conventions and expectations, the one sure factor in his cartoons is that in a similar situation, his characters will respond in a unique, and typical way to their personality. For example, the coyote/roadrunner series, while initially spoofing chase films, features the two acting in a similar manner throughout the cartoons in which they appear. For the
coyote, the danger of losing his dignity forces him to continue. Like Daffy, the coyote is his own worst enemy. The more frustrated he becomes, the more wild the scheme he will try to capture the roadrunner. He wants something to eat but is addicted to one particular food-- the roadrunner. As his pursuit of the roadrunner becomes more manic, the roadrunner itself becomes unimportant. What begins to matter to him is his next contraption and how it will work. Jones has created the Acme company which provides anyone with anything, even a coyote with gadgets to kill a roadrunner. There is no financial exchange. It is just a factory that supplies coyotes.

The American cartoon depicts death and human defeat followed by resurrection and transfiguration. It glorifies rebirth rather than death. Jones approaches his films in terms of his characters' personalities. He violates the reality in the frame only as an exercise in logic, as in Duck Amuck. His work approaches minimalism. The best example is the roadrunner series. There is no need for dialogue or titles, merely Acme product labels. Acme is a symbol of American consumerism gone wild. Time is also unimportant. Only logical sequence occurs. The viewer has no idea how long each coyote cartoon lasts, nor does it matter. It is a continual, lifelong process of trying to catch the roadrunner. It is akin to theories put forth by the New Wave critics where situations and characters fill plot vacuums. However, there are rules.
For example, the roadrunner must always stay on the road and can never take an active role in the hostilities.

The coyote suffers from a self-defeating obsession to put his will over the actions of a force of nature. His mania has outgrown the natural causes for his pursuit. All the sympathy lies with the coyote. Jones utilizes mise-en-scene to show all screen time with the coyote and from his point of view. The roadrunner has no real characteristics. The coyote represents an obsessed personality who is doomed by his own intellectuality as he uses more and more complex technology. In Zoom and Bored (1957) he builds a trough up the side of a cliff. It is obvious that he worked on it for a long time but by the time the camera has panned to the top to see it work, the coyote can't let the fuse burn. He lights the dynamite and it immediately blows up. By contrast, the roadrunner is just a carefree and intuitive bird.

Two ideas manifest themselves. The first is that of hubris. As he tries to extend his abilities and control through technology, he only exaggerates his inabilities and lack of control. As Richard Thompson in his article "Meep-Meep!" noted:

Of all road films, Jones' most clearly show the American neurosis of euphoric vehicular ambition. The coyote's failure results not from faulty thinking--his ideas are ingenious and valid--but rather from not quite thinking on a
large enough scale to foresee chance reversals of physical principles. (222)

The second idea is the myth of Sisyphus. The coyote is doomed to be his own continual victim. It is the curse of knowledge. The roadrunner can run through a painted brick wall but the coyote cannot because he knows it's a fake. In cartoons the image is the idea, as Thompson remarks:

And cartoon images, like film noir, and good Surrealism, occupy our attention for their flashy virtuosity, while on another level they slowly corrode away the legs of rational conceptions of the world. (225)

Resurrection occurs so that the cartoon victim can proceed to the next mishap. The coyote, like Elmer and Daffy, is an inept contender with life's problems. He is also mistake-prone and hopelessly hopeful. Jones' characters are unusual individuals trying to survive in a complex world. These cartoons recall the films of Keaton, Chaplin and Langdon. The golden age of comedy was a primary source of inspiration for animators.

B) Gender

Whereas Bugs parodies the notion of the female through his use of drag, Daffy actually possesses some of those same qualities. The concern with gender, in this case, is that Daffy's emotionalism is an actual suggestion of feminine stereotypical traits. He does not need to put on
a costume to enact a female caricature, since the qualities are innately within him. This is ironic, since Bugs only appears in costume to portray a female, while Daffy wears outfits for every role except that.

By the time that Daffy appeared in Duck Amuck, he had completed his transformation from a mere lunatic figure to a complex character, full of human emotions and imperfections. The early Daffy cartoons portrayed him as a looney duck. He could still fly, and was often seen living on a lake. Many times he was an object of prey for a human hunter. In Tex Avery's Porky's Duck Hunt (1937), Daffy is the crazy duck whom Porky is attempting to kill. He quacks and flies as he torments Porky at the lake. Daffy is quite malicious, toying with Porky and his dog. This is opposed to his later actions of merely looking out for himself. There does not seem to be the same degree of explicit self-preservation in these early cartoons. He also admits to being crazy. At one point, Porky has sent his dog to retrieve Daffy from the water, as he believes he has shot him. Instead, Daffy gets the dog. When Porky protests that that is not in the script, Daffy replies, "Don't let it worry you skipper. I'm just a crazy, darn fool duck." While Avery's style was more crazy and chaotic than Jones', Jones' early Daffy cartoons were also less controlled. In Daffy Duck and the Dinosaur (1939), Jones places him in the stone age "for no reason". A caveman, who resembles Jack Benny, and his
dinosaur called Fido, go out to hunt duck. Again Daffy is seen swimming on a lake, and laughing his maniacal laugh. At one point the caveman comments that, "That Duck acts like he's crazy." Daffy not only agrees but slaps the caveman across the face before running off. Daffy eventually gives the caveman a beer and sends him off with the promise of getting a duck breakfast. The caveman is made to follow signs of varying shapes and sizes, promising duck up ahead, until he reaches his destination. As will be seen, this became a trademark stunt of Daffy's. Finally, the caveman is confronted by a giant inflatable duck. Daffy hands him a carving knife and motions for him to stab the duck. This results in the deaths of the caveman, Fido and Daffy, who comments while floating on a cloud, "You know, maybe that wasn't such a hot idea after all." The caveman then replies, "Goodnight Folks."

In his early stages, all the animators treated Daffy as a lunatic. In Robert Clampett's The Daffy Doc (1938), Daffy plays an assistant to Dr. Quack. His actions are off-the-wall and unpredictable. For example, when the doctor asks for silence, Daffy holds up a sign which changes to read "Hush Yor Mof", a Hebrew letter equivalent and "Silence is Foo". While handing over the instruments, he continues to increase the tempo until he throws them all in the air and does a dance on the table while laughing. Having gone insane, he is thrown out of
the operating room. Daffy lands in an artificial lung. When he pulls himself free, various parts of his body expand and contract from the excess air. Determined to prove himself as a doctor, he goes out and hits Porky over the head to use as a patient. In order to call a consultation, Daffy hits himself over the head so as to see triple. He also chases Porky with a saw, in an attempt to operate. Eventually they both land in the artificial lung.

Chuck Jones took Daffy from his earlier, less controlled form, to his more popular self. He made him less ducklike. In this way he was like Bugs. Daffy's personality was so strong that his form as a duck became secondary. Jones took him through roles in various genres, making him an individual characterized by his words. He based Daffy on his own weaknesses, only multiplied. As noted by Chuck Jones in the American Animated Cartoon, "The preservation of Daffy's dignity depends on the avoidance of humiliation." (131) His personality is rooted in a cowardly self-preservation.

Whereas Bugs is a conman and self-assured, Daffy is anxiety-ridden. Not having this confidence means that he has had to work at his personality, until he has turned it into a work of art. Bugs plays himself in the majority of his cartoons, but Daffy plays other people. Regardless of this fact, his character is so strong that his
personality fills each role. This lends a camp element to his character.

Mark Booth has divided camp personalities into a number of types. The two types which are applicable to Daffy are the Bourgeois Gentilhomme and the Manic Poseur. The first is the butt of camp scorn. This type aspires to wit and style but has neither. In the second case, the individual attempts to glamourize his neurosis. Daffy is well aware of his neurosis and actually uses it as excuses for his behavior. He has to be the focus of all attention. Role playing and theatricality are important to his personality.

The roles which Jones places him into spoof the original and familiar genre expectations. Jones has created his own star system, which mocks the traditional Hollywood establishment. This was not defined as camp until Warhol, working in the 1960's and 1970's, took mass media production and heroes as his subject matter. Jones was doing the same thing in the 1940's and 1950's. In looking at a mass produced culture and the consumption of the individual, Warhol set up an alternative studio system, complete with a star system, using transvestites and members of a "fringe" society to make his point. Jones worked within animation but his star system was no less alternative.

Jones, working thirty years earlier, put into practice Warhol's notion that anyone could be a star or make a
star out of others. Jones also used the celebrity value of Hollywood to cultivate stars. Warhol encouraged people to perform without the benefit of direction or scripts in order to attain a competition to outdo each other. Jones' cartoons were heavily scripted but none of his characters could exist without a script. They did not go off and have their own life once the camera stopped rolling. Nevertheless, the same desire to outdo resulted, as will be seen in the cartoons of Bugs and Daffy together. Taken this way, all their gestures were natural, or as natural as possible for an imaginary character.

Warhol made ordinary people into stars and Jones did the same for ordinary animals. These were not fantastical creatures; they were rooted in reality. Warhol also reexposed the everyday. He recycled works and people, resulting in camp's recreation of surplus value from leftovers. According to camp ideology, art is made from leftovers of popular taste.

This bears a direct relationship to the cartoons of Daffy Duck. Jones took popular characters and genres such as Robin Hood or the detective genre and, using humour, "recycled" them into new works. Rather than putting Daffy into a plotline designed especially for him, many of his cartoons involved a retelling of a well-known narrative.

This resulted in a double set of expectations. The viewer expected certain Daffy characteristics, such as an inability to deal with any situation on an emotional
level, which would lead in turn, to a tantrum. There were also certain conventions within the narrative which had to be fulfilled. For example, in *Robin Hood Daffy* (1958) Jones retold the Robin Hood fable. Hence the viewer would expect certain plot elements, such as Robin's taking from the rich and giving to the poor, a talent for archery, and the appearance of a Merry Man. The plot of this story is that Daffy, as Robin, meets up with Porky, who plays Friar Tuck. Porky refuses to believe that Daffy is really Robin Hood. The harder that Daffy tries to prove it, the more flustered and incompetent he becomes. When he tries to swing off a tree to rob a rich gentleman riding along, he proceeds to hit other trees all along his descent. Not only does Jones mock the original heroics, he also spoofs the popular portrayals by Fairbanks and Flynn, which would have been familiar to audiences at that time.

Porky Pig was always cast as an observer to Daffy's antics. Here, as a supporting player, he can only laugh at all of Daffy's attempts to prove that he is really Robin Hood. This only enrages Daffy more. Daffy is a self-preservationist who is continually cast in roles which he is incapable of handling. This role-playing is important to his personality. Jones has created comic characters which are "unusual for the chopping up of motion and the surrealist imposition: a Robin Hood duck, whose flattened beak springs out with each repeated faux pas as a reminder of the importance of his primary
ineptness. ..." (Farber 52). Jones' characters are totally invulnerable. They can't be stopped and, as such, become victims of their own invulnerability. This will also be shown to be the case with the coyote. Since the aim of Jones' cartoons is laughter, there is a certain lightness about them. He uses all of man's emotions and behavior as the butt for his humour.

Daffy always plays the hero because his personality and pride won't allow him to be anything less. In Dripalong Daffy (1951), he plays a "Western Type Hero" ready to assume any role at a moment's notice. Porky plays the "comic relief." Riding upon his beautiful steed Tin Foil, (again the spoofing of a popular character, Silver) Daffy approaches a "Lawless Western Town". He decides to assume the role of sheriff and "clean up this one horse town." He has not been selected to fulfill this role. When he first strolls into the saloon, he demands that someone take him on. He unholsters his gun and pulls his pants off with it. No one pays him any attention. He is a joke. Finally, Nasty Canasta challenges him. Daffy pulls out his gun expecting to frighten him and Nasty eats it. Jones is parodying all the conventions and expectations inherent in a Western.

Daffy is also known for his quips and asides to the audience. He is continually breaking the fourth wall. In response to a question from Canasta asking Daffy if that's what he would like (taking on Canasta), he quips,
"I would like? I would like? I would like a trip to Europe." Jones continually undermines the audience's expectations of what should happen next, and because of this, the viewer cannot relax and watch, knowing what action will follow.

True to the genre, there is a shoot-out. Again, Jones does not allow it to be a normal duel. Before Daffy can do anything, Porky winds up a toy soldier and sends it over to Nasty. Thinking it a cute toy, he picks it up and is immediately shot. The townspeople go crazy with delight and appoint Porky as their sheriff. Daffy is extremely vexed at his lack of attention. He runs about screaming, "Put down that comedy relief! I'm the hero of this picture! Carry Me!" He is completely ignored. In a final role reversal, Porky appoints Daffy as his underling. Daffy has to literally clean up the one horse town, to which Porky quips, "Lucky for him, it is a one horse town."

Jones uses many high angle shots found in *High Noon* type showdowns. There is also a continual distant spur jangling and yet none of the characters wears spurs. Daffy carries around a selection of badges which enable him to assume any role at any given moment. This is a comment on the viewer's acceptance of a character in a role as long as he has the proper accoutrements.

Porky also gets the job done for Daffy in *Deduce You Say* (1956). He is cast as the observing and learning
Watson to Daffy's supposedly wiser Dorlock Holmes. Porky narrates the tale. At first we see Holmes engaged in what Watson calls his favorite pasttime-- deducting, except Holmes is deducting expenses for some kind of tax return. When a telegram arrives from the Shropshire Slasher, Watson remains calm, while Daffy seeing the messenger trip, spews a whole theory about murder. Anything can set him off. They set out for the Slasher's favorite bar where Daffy goes around collecting clues. He does this by putting ashes and beer into an envelope while accusing everyone of murder. They all think he is a lunatic. Watson calmly continues to comment on Holmes' brilliance. Slasher shows up, making his presence known by hurling a knife. Holmes decides that this is a clue. He attempts to arrest the Slasher. Approaching him he says, "Beastly weather we're having, what?" At this point Holmes goes mad and screams, "Deny it if you can, and deny too that you're the Shropshire Slasher!" All of his attempts to use force on this character, who is huge, fail. Watson approaches him and simply asks him to return to prison. The Slasher agrees. The are both very English and polite in their actions. All that Daffy succeeds in accomplishing is getting himself pummelled. Finally, Watson asks him where he went to school to be a detective. Daffy replies "Elementary, my dear Watson. Elementary." Again the viewer knows that as part of the Holmes tale, Jones must include that trademark line of
dialogue. Jones fulfills all the convention expectations but on his own terms. His reworking of the material gives it its humour.

In *Duck Dodgers In The 24 1/2 Century* (1953) Jones casts Daffy as a Buck Rogers hero. For all the heroic qualities he appears to possess, he is a bumbling character. Daffy's downfall is that he is totally convinced of his infallibility. Porky is cast as the eager young space cadet as they set out to Planet X to get the shaving cream molecule. Daffy's opponent is Marvin the Martian, who is trying to claim the planet in the name of Mars, at the same time as Daffy. Throughout most of the film. Porky is the one who saves Daffy and retaliates against Marvin. Daffy not only does not appreciate the help but feels that Porky is trying to do Daffy's job. Daffy flies off the handle. His failure to remain calm and rational in a situation is why he always undermines his own intentions. Daffy actually does succeed in claiming the planet for the earth and kicking off the martian, but by this point it is nothing more than a clump of dirt. After he enthusiastically claims it in the name of "Duck Dodgers In The 24 1/2 Century!!!", Porky responds, "Big Deal." As the observer character, he has put everything into perspective.

Perhaps Daffy's greatest success and failure is in *The Scarlett Punpernickel* (1950). Tired of always playing the comic relief, Daffy attempts to sell a script to Warner.
It is a mock epic and a cartoon within a cartoon. This cartoon also reiterates the star system idea. Jones has cast his other characters in various roles: Porky is the Lord High Chamberlin, Sylvester is the Grand Duke, Mama Bear is a Lady in Waiting and Henry the Chicken Hawk is a messenger. All the characters retain their own familiar qualities. For example, Mama Bear plays the harp while wearing a deadpan expression throughout all her scenes, no matter how exciting the drama around her. Porky stutters and blusters, and Sylvester is his conceited self, determined to have his way.

In telling the tale, Jones exaggerates the Michael Curtiz look of grandiose sets and use of shadows. He also parodies the daring heroics of Errol Flynn. When Daffy as the Scarlett Pumpernickel jumps out of a window and misses his horse, he comments, "Funny, that never happens to Errol Flynn." The next time that he does this, he uses a parachute, commenting, "Here's a wrinkle Errol never thought of." Daffy wants to be triumphant and survive without having to do the necessary work or be nice.

Daffy Duck is not a good writer. Because he is the writer of this scenario, Daffy seems to be succeeding at his task of saving the Lady Melissa. However, he has to fail because his personality is based on a lack of success. Therefore, he narrates the story to someone else. Within the story he narrates, he succeeds, but as a
writer he fails. Warner keeps demanding to know what happens next, and Daffy resorts to a series of cliches in the end. He has the storm break, the dam break, a volcano erupt, and the price of foodstuffs skyrocket. When Warner wants to know what happens then, Daffy has the hero blow his brains out, quipping that "It's getting so you have to kill yourself to get a role around here."

The spectator admires Daffy's courage. Chuck Jones noted that, "Daffy gallantly and publicly represents all the character traits that the rest of us try to keep subdued." (240) He is a loser and a misfit but he does things which we cannot. Daffy is recognized more by his mistakes than by his triumphs. All of Jones' characters are recognized by their personal characteristics and how they express them in relation to conflict, love, and the desire to succeed.

Jones is so concerned with how a character reacts to a given situation that he created a parable about the average man and greed. Entitled One Froggy Evening (1955), it dealt with the story of a construction worker who finds a singing frog and immediately realizes the financial potential. As with the tenor who only sang opera and despised folk songs and singing for pleasure, the worker only sees the money he can make. The frog will not be a party to this. He sings, presumably because he enjoys it.
The only sound in this tale is the singing. The rest is told through pantomime, although it is explained. When the man initially attempts to sell the idea of the frog to an agent, the action is filmed from outside the window of the office. The audience can see the explanation but hear nothing. A series of accidents always prevents others from hearing the frog. Either they arrive a fraction of a second late, or when the man rents a hall, the curtain breaks. He manages to raise it just as the frog has finished singing and is sitting looking dopey and croaking. Due to the pantomime nature of the story, there occurs a break between the anthropomorphized movement and natural animal movement. In an interview Jones stated that, "It's like an excessive punishment for one man's greed for his desire to exploit the discovery of the singing frog and make millions" (Ford 36). While the worker wants to join the establishment and enjoy its rewards, he loses everything. Not only does he lose his money, he is locked in a Psychopathic Hospital for trying to convince a policeman of the frog's abilities. Ironically, the frog continues to sing in the hospital. When released, the worker is a bum. He, in turn, plants the frog in a building being constructed. The scene cuts to a futuristic city about a hundred years later. Another worker finds the frog and the whole thing starts again. Jones called it an "exemplification of frustration" (Ford 36). As with his other characters, this one is believable.
precisely because of his limitations. The notion of a parable also ties this tale into Jones' use of literary sources, which have a moral point.

While the problems of (non) female depiction do not necessarily manifest themselves in the cartoons which star Daffy, they certainly do come up with his other characters. As explained in the chapter on Bugs Bunny, the problem of gender lies in both the depiction of the male and the "non-depiction" of the female. The Pepe le Pew cartoon entitled For Scent-Imental Reasons furthers this problematic portrayal. The story revolves around Pepe, who is a very suave and charming French skunk. He invades a perfume shop, and a female cat is sent to get rid of him. All the Pepe cartoons involve the cat getting a white stripe down her back, in order to attract the attentions of Pepe. In this case, the gag comes about when she hits a table and a bottle of white hair dye runs down her back. Pepe not only appears to adore the opposite sex, but he is absolutely convinced of his infallible charms. He does not understand that she wants nothing to do with him. Despite her protests, he continues to try to kiss her. It is not charming; it is harrassment. However, the cat cannot even make a verbal protestation. She is denied the power of speech, and hence, the power to say "no". Pepe is a fully developed character who articulates his desires. He has an ego and a sense of humour. Based upon the character of Pepe le
Moko played by Charles Boyer in the movie *Algiers* (1938), he is the American stereotype of the debonair Frenchman. When he chases her around the shop, Pepe remains calm. He jauntily jumps around, while the cat races frantically to escape him. Finally, she resorts to locking herself in a glass case. When he cannot persuade her or threaten her to come out, he fakes a suicide. It is a ruse to get her to come out, which is totally dependant upon her possessing the stereotypical qualities of compassion and soft-heartedness. He knows that as a female, she will come running out to save and forgive him. After she has done just that, Pepe quips, "I missed. Fortunately for you." He has no remorse for the means used. When she again runs off, he sighs and exclaims, "C'est la guerre." She is something to be won. Eventually she jumps out of a window, and mistaking it for a noble gesture of suicide, he jumps also. She lands in a barrel of water, while he ends up in a vat of blue paint. He looks just as handsome, except he is blue. The cat, however, is wet and snivelling. The stripe is gone but she is very unattractive. Now she becomes attracted to him. Since she is no longer a beautiful skunk (or even a beautiful cat), he no longer wants her. She pursues him, with her attention unwanted. It is akin to the situation with Mama Bear; once the female becomes the pursuer, she becomes unattractive.
While cartoons tend to revolve around natural foils and battling duos, many of the pursuits in Jones' work have taken on a sexual bent. The pursuit is now a seduction, not predatory, and the end is sexual. The humour is supposed to come out of seeing a male chase a female who wants to be left alone. It is analogous to a "humorous rape." The female is always breathless, which Pepe finds sexy, and on the run. Pepe never tires. The cat is also never given the retaliatory actions permitted Bugs. For example, it would be humorous if having been pursued, she could then turn around and humiliate Pepe, the way that Bugs does Elmer. Unfortunately, this is impossible. First of all, she is female, not a male in drag, and therefore does not innately possess any qualities of strength and self-confidence. Second, Pepe is the equivalent of Bugs. He is a master at remaining in control. Her desire for Pepe can be taken as a giving in to his attention. She does submit to him in other cartoons, such as in Two Scents Worth (1956). Hence, it reinforces the myth that an unrelenting pursuit leads to a surrender and a capture of the heart. As Chuck Jones pointed out: "...Pepe always represented... what I wanted to be, and what I think every man would like to be: irresistible, at least in one's own eyes. You don't have to be irresistible in women's eyes if you think you are..." (Peary 213). This totally negates any wishes the female may have and relegates her to an object to be
possessed. The truth of the man's actions in this case appears to be irrelevant, as long as he thinks that he is being charming. Pepe fails to understand the female's position, even when the roles are reversed. While he possesses an overt but honest love of women and truly believes that she is a skunk, from the female's point of view, it is misogyny.

Jones not only deals with sexuality but the notion of romantic love. He spoofs the Hollywood tradition of the young couple overcoming all obstacles to be together in his cartoon entitled *Feed the Kitty* (1952). In it, a young kitten shows up in Marc Antony's backyard. Marc is a giant and ferocious dog. The kitten, however, is undaunted by him and makes itself comfortable on Marc's back. This kitten is extraordinarily cute. It is tiny and black with big, round eyes. As soon as it purrs, Marc is a lost cause. He is determined to protect the kitten from everything. The kitten appears to be female, due to its cuteness and Marc's adoration of it and yet later in the cartoon, Marc's owner refers to it as a "he". The plot revolves around Marc trying to keep his owner, a female only ever seen from the skirt down, from discovering the existence of the kitten. Since he has so much stuff already, the owner has forbidden him from bringing anything else into the house. He disguises the kitten as a toy and a powder puff in an effort to keep it hidden. Eventually the cat gets into the baking. Marc tries to
get it out and is thrown out of the house for being such a nuisance. Fearing that his love is being turned into cookies, he begins to howl. His face runs the gamut of every emotion as he believes the kitten to be dead. At last he is let back in and given a cookie which resembles the kitten. Sobbing, he places it on his back and carries it around, as he did the kitten. The kitten shows up safe, however, and they are reunited. Marc is allowed to keep the kitten provided he cares for and protects it. The love between the helpless kitten who can wind this dog around its finger is both touching and absurd. Marc continually showers it with kisses. He is such a "macho" dog, being so large and muscle ridden that only love could turn him into such a besotted fool. It is an amusing and oft repeated cliche. Marc also protects the kitten from a hungry cat, while watchdog in a construction site, in *Cat Feud* (1958). He feels no remorse at pummelling this starving cat in the name of protecting his kitten. Even though the owner calls the kitten a "he", it is never really confirmed either way. It has the characteristics of a female, as it is small, cute and oblivious to danger. It needs a strong manly type like Marc Antony to protect it.

These issues of gender and spectatorship occur consistently throughout Jones' work. The concerns go beyond notions of sexuality and voyeurism to include problems of genre and characterization. Jones thwarts the
spectator's desires and expectations at all levels. It is not a "safe" viewing experience. Even the most basic film concept, such as a close up can be undermined. Beginning with the structure of the cartoons, Jones then shapes new conventions of character and genre. In the next chapter, I will deal with the pairing of Bugs and Daffy and the resulting effects. Up to now, the cartoons have featured one main character with a supporting character. I will now deal with what happens when two very strong characters are placed together.
Conclusion

Bugs and Daffy: Together At Last

There is no established suitable theoretical framework which easily encompasses the cartoons featuring Bugs and Daffy. Instead, they must be viewed within the same notions of gender and spectatorship that I have discussed in the previous two chapters. I will attempt to formulate a theory for these cartoons which will encompass the guidelines by which Jones works.

Three specific areas will be focussed upon. The first is the nature of Bugs' and Daffy's look towards each other. Previous chapters dealt with the gaze existing between viewer and character. This was because the other characters they were teamed with were not of equal status and, thus, the gaze between the viewer and screen was more important. With the pairing of the two, their equality results in a demonstrative and self-reflexive gaze which adds a significance, missing in the other cartoons. I now intend to concentrate on the characters themselves with respect to a sadistic or masochistic gaze. I will also explain why a third character is generally introduced against whom the other two work.

Second, I will raise the expectation of whether or not these cartoons work in accordance with the previous theories set out, or could either Bugs or Daffy be replaced with any other character?
The last area is a consideration of the male/female division. According to Mulvey, the male viewer has a scopophilic gaze, whereby he sadistically places the female as object. Male is equated with sadism and female with masochism. What is not often asked is whether the female watching the same scene finds masochism enjoyable or whether she also takes on a more sadistic position. It is my contention that while watching the Bugs and Daffy cartoons the female does receive the same enjoyment as the male without being viewed herself as either an object or a fake male. The social conditioning of gender differences, which color any viewing experience, is transcended in these cartoons since the sex of Bugs or Daffy is irrelevant. Gender conflict is ignored in favor of a battle waged in terms of animal against human. As such, the sex of the viewer does not matter since the experience is influenced by one's humanity rather than by one's gender.

The first set of cartoons to be examined will be the ones known as the "Hunter Trilogy". They include Rabbit Fire (1951), Rabbit Seasoning (1952), and Duck! Rabbit! Duck! (1953). These cartoons are the heart of all the "Bugs and Daffy" cartoons, as they pit the two both alongside and against each other.

While Bugs is the wise-cracking con man in charge of any situation, Daffy is the neurotic bumbler, desperate to survive but always losing out because of his own lack
of emotional control. Although many of the cartoons studied in previous chapters were created after these, it is my contention that the cartoons featuring the two together are the quintessential cartoons for both characters. Their relationship is both sadistic and masochistic, and no one else is as perfect a foil or as admirable an adversary as the other.

The confrontation with Bugs in the "Hunter Trilogy" centres around the basic gag of trying to convince Elmer that it is a different hunting season. Elmer is dangerous as he has the gun but is also the dupe. As he says in response to Bugs and Daffy trying to tempt his tastebuds with ways to cook the other, "Sorry guys, I'm a vegetarian. I just hunt for the sport of it." Unlike the coyote, there is no sense of a kill for survival.

This gag takes the form of three phases. Initially, Bugs and Daffy are under Elmer's gun. They try to get the other shot and Bugs usually wins by outsmarting Daffy at "pronoun" games. In the next stage, they play con games. In Rabbit Fire the two read cookbooks on how to cook the other, while in Duck! Rabbit! Duck! they confuse Elmer by screwing up the hunting seasons. For example, in order not to be shot during duck season, Daffy keeps saying "I'm a..", ranging from goat to crab, at which point Bugs holds up a sign proclaiming it to be that very season and Elmer shoots. Daffy finally flips and begs Elmer to keep shooting him. Elmer then asks Bugs, as the game warden,
what season it is. Bugs replies, "It's baseball season," and Elmer goes crazy. The final stage consists of a variation in role. Using imitation and disguise, they confuse Elmer by dressing as the other. If that fails then Bugs will resort to drag, which always works. Daffy generally won't stand for this behavior and tries to get Elmer to see behind the obvious disguise. Only in Rabbit Fire does he willingly assist Bugs by playing the dog to his lady hunter. This is probably because he is allowed to indulge his sadistic side and bite Elmer. At the end of that cartoon they pronounce it to be "Elmer season," and dress up as Elmer, mimicking his trademark line, "Be very very quiet. I'm hunting Elmers," as they both hunt their prey.

So while Bugs and Daffy need the other to fully show up the character traits which Jones has created, it is important that there is a third character for them to work against. They cannot merely be enemies because if Bugs is an anti-hero, in the tradition of Bogart, then Daffy is also a hero. The only character that Daffy is not superior to is Bugs. However, they complement each other. Bugs is very cool and suave; he is always in control, and yet, Daffy is far more human. He is flawed, but possesses a determination of which Bugs cannot conceive. If they were directly pitted against the other, Bugs would probably always win, but it would not be satisfying to the viewer.
This is tied into the gaze which exists between the two. Bugs and Daffy are aware of their status. Not only are they fulfilling their roles, they are also being themselves, for without the labels of "Bugs" or "Daffy", they have no existence. The nature of their sparring takes the form of verbal abuse and glances directed at the audience in order to elicit emotion. Unlike in their other cartoons, neither character is leading the other. They are equals. Bugs' looks are generally a self-satisfied smirk, while Daffy's tend to try to draw sympathy for a plight into which he has landed himself. They possess a demonstrative and self-reflexive gaze between themselves. Both are aware of the strengths and weaknesses of the other, which is why their war is engaged on a level ground. This is also the reason why they need a third party against which to work. If they just waged war on each other, a perpetual stalemate would exist.

Unlike Bugs' other foes, Daffy is not intellectually inferior. He merely undermines his own plans. They may try to con each other, but ultimately, there must be a third element which they are allied (no matter how tentatively) against. That is why these cartoons are the quintessential expression of both Bugs and Daffy.

In the cartoons which only featured one of them, examples were given of how female characters were either ignored or stereotyped and objectified. It is arguable
that women have been conditioned to view in the same way as men. Viewing pleasure is not necessarily predicated on male terms. This also holds true in films where women are not represented at all. For example, in Duck Dodgers no women were portrayed and, thus, could not be parodied. It was a male buddy film. Women are not supposed to be offended that no females exist in this all male world, but to take pleasure from the antics which evolve from the lack of an equal female character. This cartoon employed the convention of two males on a road trip to achieve some goal. Even if Daffy is superior to Porky, the stereotype of the hero/sidekick bond is utilized. In the cartoons featuring both Bugs and Daffy, the problem of how women view is nonexistent. Men and women take the same pleasure in watching these cartoons.

It is only in the cartoons which feature both characters that Bugs' Groucho Marx wit and tough urbanity can fully express itself. The two are well-rounded characters but with the other, they are truly complete. For example, Daffy can only partner Porky so often. Daffy is both sadistic and masochistic. He lives for the drama of his own histrionics, and Porky, while capable of achieving the goals Daffy sets (capturing the Slasher or claiming a planet), is a very understated character. It takes Bugs' control of any situation and his intelligence to play straight man to Daffy's melodrama while still remaining his equal.
In Rabbit Fire, Daffy is seen setting out signs which read "Rabbit Season". He cheerfully admits to the camera, "Survival of the fittest, and besides, it's fun!" In the previously examined Daffy cartoons, he possesses this same attitude of "do to others before they do to you" but because of the fact that he has sidekicks and not partners, he usually takes everyone down with him. Bugs may be an unwilling accomplice to Daffy's schemes, but he can at least save himself, if not Daffy as well.

One of the most famous examples of Daffy's attempt to harm Bugs is in Rabbit Seasoning. Most often Daffy tries to get Bugs killed through verbal argument rather than through physical action, as with the coyote cartoons. This is his downfall because Bugs is a great manipulator. Daffy tries to convince Elmer to shoot Bugs by saying "Shoot him now," which Bugs repeats right back. Daffy gets so riled up that he does not notice that Bugs has changed the phrase to "He doesn't have to shoot you now." This is Daffy's undoing, for Elmer complies with his fervent demand to "Shoot me now!" and, once more, the beak is shot askew as a reminder of his own ineptitude. Daffy decides to try that fight again. Calmly, they recite their previous lines until Bugs again exclaims that same line. Daffy responds, "Aha! Pronoun Trouble. It's not he doesn't have to shoot you now, it's he doesn't have to shoot me now. Well I say he does have to shoot me now! So shoot me now!" And off goes the beak.
It is also important that both are fighting against the common "evil" of Elmer the hunter. Again, in true Bugs fashion, he does not get involved until Daffy drags him into the situation. Bugs just wants to be left alone. Richard Thompson (1975) examined this issue, asking:

How do Bugs and Daffy differ? Bugs is a winner and Daffy is a loser. In these films we have the clearest definition of general roles: Elmer never knows what's going on; Bugs always knows what's going on and is in control of events; Daffy is bright enough to understand how to be in control, but he never quite makes it. Both Bugs and Daffy are talkers, but Daffy talks too much - Daffy's vanity is disastrous. Bugs stands back from a situation, analyzes it, and makes his move; Daffy becomes emotionally involved, loses his distance and blows it. He's stuck with a one track mind which fixes on only one facet of the problem and loses sight of the larger pattern. Bugs is a strong, more traditional American hero - Daffy is much more complicated. He's a coward, he claims, but a live coward - he feels a preemptive necessity to set someone else (Bugs) up for the destruction he knows is stalking him. (40)

Hence if Daffy enters into sadistic relations with other characters, such as Porky, and is masochistic towards
himself, for example through his greed, then Bugs feeds off this masochism, achieving his own success at Daffy's expense.

In terms of American cultural references, it could be argued that Daffy possesses the post WW2 mentality of angst while Bugs is the strong American hero who reacts to threats upon his person or property. Bugs may not look for any reward from his actions, but Daffy's yen for heroism is tied to a lack of scruples and an overwhelming sense of self-pity, self-righteousness and self-aggrandizement.

Bugs' sense of control also manifests itself in the way that the cartoons are shot. In any given cartoon, Bugs plays himself among the various period people, whereas Daffy gets into the period costumes and tries to speak and act the part. He longs to be a movie hero. Daffy recognizes impending doom and mentally records the damage which tends to follow him. Within the frame, Bugs tends to be either in the centre or rising from his hole, which is in the centre. Daffy, on the other hand, walks into a static shot or there is a cut from a static shot of Bugs and Elmer to a shot tracking Daffy as he moves to join his co-stars. Within the mise-en-scene, he's an outsider and less privileged. If Bugs is the centre of events, then Daffy is trying to find this same calm.

While Bugs and Daffy may tentatively be friends, they are not buddies. There is no bond between them. They may
join together to fight against a common foe, but in the process, they are quite willing to sacrifice the other. That is why these cartoons lie outside of Mulvey's notion of the sadistic gaze. Even the one time where Bugs dresses up in drag and Daffy does go along with it, Elmer is quicker to see through the disguises. Reduced to a basic level, these cartoons feature two characters (animals) who want to outsmart the stupid hunter. Mankind is the objectified and parodied object in this case. Thus women can view and enjoy these cartoons as fully and, more importantly, in the same way as men. It is animal against human, and gender becomes irrelevant. Elmer is not the conventional image of a man. He is bald and soft, almost eunuch-like in his appearance. He has a speech impediment which is used as a basis for humour. He is an absurd and unrealistic character. As such, both men and women have the same ease or difficulty relating to him. There is no male sexual prowess or manly strength to bond him more firmly with the male viewers.

Elmer is parodied further in Beanstalk Bunny (1955). Jones continues his play on genres by casting Daffy as Jack, in the tale of Jack and the Beanstalk, and casting Elmer as the giant. The humor comes when Daffy runs into Bugs. Both know that there is no place for a rabbit in this story but, once again, Daffy is willing to ally with him if it will save his skin. Daffy is very conscious that he is playing a role, as he exclaims, "I'd better
get to climbing that thing or we won't have any picture." Daffy plays both himself (a duck) and Jack. Because he is Jack, he wants the gold which, according to the story, should come to him. But he becomes just a duck in dealing with Bugs and tries to weasel his way out of the punishment Jack must take. Bugs' calm in this picture stems from the fact that everyone knows that there is no rabbit in the story, and so no harm will come his way.

At one point, Bugs and Daffy end up running around in Elmer's ears, nose and mouth, creating a Swiftian image. Jones is working on the premise that if miniaturization is going to be used, then it has to be as realistic as possible. The audience has to believe in it. Bugs eventually escapes, but Daffy in his thirst for greed ends up as the hands on Elmer's watch.

Both this cartoon and Ali Baba Bunny (1957) continue to demonstrate the perfect unity of this match. In the latter cartoon, they come upon Ali Baba's cave of treasure, having taken a wrong turn on the way to Pismo Beach. Daffy sees the wealth first and punches Bugs into the ground, crying, "I'm rich! I'm wealthy! I'm comfortably well off!" Meanwhile Ali Baba's servant is outside, desperately trying to remember the correct "s" word which will open the cave.

In addition to playing with the conventions of the genre, Bugs uses disguise. He dresses like a genie to outsmart the servant Hassan. When Bugs saves himself and
Daffy and tries to persuade him to leave, Daffy refuses. Daffy tries to get all the treasure for himself, but the genie turns him into a midget. In the end, Bugs finds a pearl, but a tiny Daffy runs out to grab it, screaming, "It's mine! I'm a happy miser." Daffy has brought about his own ruin but he is philosophical about it.

Because Daffy and Bugs are trying to escape from a giant and genie in these two cartoons, the same principles of viewing hold true. It is as easy or as difficult for a male or female spectator to identify with either of these fantasy, stereotyped characters. The differences in gender and social conditioning which any audience member brings to a viewing experience becomes irrelevant. The conflict is not male/female or even animal/human. It is animal/fantasy creature.

In studying the work of Chuck Jones, I have attempted to show that the issues of gender and spectatorship are evident throughout his animation. He does not offer solutions to any of the theoretical concerns which are manifest and, in fact, most of the time he is rooted within the patriarchal-minded Hollywood studio system. However, his work, represents a purity of the cinematic apparatus which many live-action films did not achieve, due to the large number of movies churned out under the studio system.

Not only is he a master of characterization, but he has a clear understanding of cinematic techniques, such
as framing, mise-en-scene and montage. He is also capable of redefining the notion of genre and to a lesser degree questioning the value of the star system upon which Hollywood is based.

Although there is much about the field of animation which is easily dismissible, it has been my contention that the great contributions in cinema were not just made by the live-action giants such as Griffith, Renoir or Eisenstein. Jones made many significant contributions to cinema in terms of how the cinematic apparatus can be viewed. It is even more impressive that these contributions were made at that time in animation, a field whose possibilities have only recently begun to be fully explored. I have tried to prove that just because something has always only been judged according to its entertainment value, is no reason to dismiss its potential validity and importance in other cultural areas. Animation, especially that of Chuck Jones, is no longer just for kids.
Filmography
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