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Abstract

The animated film serves as a means for interrogating the political and social ideologies which influenced its development; features of its construction and aesthetics also gesture towards the historical and psychological factors affecting its production, albeit indirectly. This paper investigates the use of the animated cartoon as a medium for transmitting propaganda in America during the Second World War between the years 1941 and 1945; specifically, it examines the animated cartoon as documentation of homefront psychology in the Second World War, and includes an historical overview of Hollywood animation in addition to a critical analysis of both the cartoon propaganda aesthetic and the psychological factors shaping the design and dissemination of propaganda in entertainment media. The animated cartoon is positioned as a favourable focal point for the re-examination of popular wartime productions as propaganda as well as an entry point for examining presuppositions regarding the efficacy of mass entertainment as a pedagogical tool.
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Chapter One: An Introduction to the Major Studios, Their Work, and Their Stars

Most of the major Hollywood cartoon studios established themselves in the early 1920s and became prominent during the mid- to late 1930s. Disney's groundbreaking 1928 cartoon "Steamboat Willie" (featuring the relatively new Mortimer Mouse) was the first sound cartoon produced; this landmark achievement sparked strong competition among the studios to produce the better cartoon. More important, however, this competition forced the studios to develop their own styles; prior to 1935, the work of animators in most of the major studios, including Warner Bros. and Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer (MGM), so closely resembled Disney's productions that they were little more than Disney isotopes. One possible reason for these copycat cartoons could be the mobility of one of the founding Disney animators, Ub Iwerks, who established his own studio in 1930 and frequently worked and interacted with animators from other studios. (Arguably, it was this association which most strongly pushed Chuck Jones towards a decidedly Disneyesque style in his early and mostly forgotten cartoons.)

Another factor would be the overall exchange of animators among studios; Disney's animators were considered the best in Hollywood, and it was not uncommon for a studio to "raid" Disney's staff by offering higher salaries to animators and directors. As a result, many of the artists at Disney eventually dispersed themselves among the other studios, and later continued to replicate the Disney "flavour" in subsequent cartoons. For this reason, the Disney School of animation is an appropriate starting point for a study of wartime animation. Stylistically, it was a common ancestor of many studios' productions and influenced the individual artists either directly or indirectly; the later movement in rival studios to counter the Disney style resulted in the development of distinctive characteristics.

Despite the frequent inbreeding of animation units, each studio managed to mature independently to create identifiable styles by the mid- to late 1930s. The development of non-
Disney styles at Warner Bros. was due largely to the work of young directors such as Tex Avery, Bob Clampett, and Chuck Jones, whose creations broke away from the artistic conventions established by Walt Disney and Ub Iwerks at the Disney studio. They were directly responsible for introducing metatheatrics, hyperbole, and violence to the animated short film at a time when most artists were still pursuing the innocuous and realistic style of Disney. Distortion of expression was taken to new extremes (with Tex Avery's introduction of popped-out eyes and detached tongues) and gags were more grown-up; the new cartoons featured more sex and violence than most live-action features would have dared to show. These methods helped to define the Warner Bros. cartoon immediately prior to, and during, the wartime years. As well, these features were carried over to other studios with the artists as they moved to other studios such as MGM and Lantz.

As animation acquired a new look in the prelude to war, cartoons had a new aggressiveness about them which they had not had in the traditional Disney school. Chuck Jones, for example, went from designing Sniffles the Mouse to Daffy Duck in the early years of his career and continued to experiment with characters that had more complex, diabolical components to their personalities (most notably, Wile E. Coyote). Likewise, Disney created Donald Duck, a character whose greed, guile, and short temper gave him a wider range of expression than any previous Disney star. Cartoons reflected a new humanity that they had not alluded to in characters before. The new breed of antiheroes came of age during wartime when their various [mis]adventures in the war effort reflected the collective movement towards active participation in the war; the need for cooperation and unity is strongly reflected by the patriotic themes presented in the wartime cartoon. Animated cartoons "did their part" by illustrating the importance of individual involvement to the larger cause of the American war effort.

By the time the American war effort had been initiated, most major studios were eager
to start producing war-oriented materials. Wartime animation was produced by major animation studios for reasons other than patriotism, however; government-commissioned production was also an economic necessity. The war had effectively closed off the European market for American cartoons, and most of the Hollywood studios subsequently found themselves struggling financially. Entertainment-based companies competed for a piece of a relatively small domestic market; although the studios pushed to exploit the Americans' need for wartime entertainment as fully as possible, the economic reality was that this market was too limited to sustain the empires of corporate Hollywood. Studios had to look for alternative sources of investment, and a few found them in the U.S. government.

The studios' need for funding and the U.S. government's demand for cartoons in the early 1940s created mutualism between the entertainment industry and government agencies during the wartime years. The government turned to the studios to use animation as a medium for transmitting its messages to the public simply and effectively, and the studios benefitted financially from their production contracts with the government. George Lipsitz states that $117 billion (approximately sixty-seven percent of the U.S. government's business expenditures) was divided among a corporate elite of a hundred companies; among these were some of the prominent Hollywood studios (Smoodin 80). Furthermore, Eric Smoodin suggests that there may have been other motives besides money for studios to form partnerships with the government:

[T]he government and the movie studio hardly worked as equal partners. Studio assistance probably came about as much from political necessity as political fervor or a desire to increase profits; quite simply, the studios of this era often felt compelled to work with the government in order to prevent, or at least forestall, government investigation of major studio monopoly practice.

(Smoodin 80)
The working relationship that developed between the government and Hollywood corporations in the production of wartime animation was far more complex than a simple matter of patriotic duty; it was in the studios' best interests, financially and politically, to produce wartime cartoons, and if possible, to get on the U.S. government's multi-billion dollar payroll. As Smoodin notes, a friendly partnership with the government also carried significant fringe benefits that could prove valuable in the long term; major studios were effectively committed to the wartime cause as a means of deflecting investigation into their questionable business practices. In short, assisting the government in meeting its production objectives was in the studios' best interests at that time, and eligibility for government commissions would have implications on the futures of Hollywood studios.

Some major animation studios, such as Disney and Warner Bros. did receive sizable commissions from U.S. agencies and were able to prosper during World War II despite losing the overseas market. The Disney studios produced a number of training films for military and industrial instruction, as well as war bond and taxation advertisements. Warner Bros. was responsible for war bond trailers and U.S. Army cartoons such as Private Snafu. The government commissions simultaneously kept the studios afloat financially and influenced the production and content of their output; the new interdependence that emerged between the government and Hollywood meant that for the first time popular entertainment could be used to disseminate government propaganda.

Before receiving the government commissions, Disney continued to release cartoons which reflected the studio's trademark style: cute, with photorealistic details and family-oriented storylines. In the years immediately preceding the second World War, Disney started to move into feature-length animation, a market which it continues to dominate today. In 1937, the studio released its first feature-length cartoon, Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs, and the film received unanimous acclaim from critics and audiences. Following the
commercial success of *Snow White*, Disney could afford to begin production on two
large-scale projects simultaneously. The first was *Pinocchio*, a film that would achieve the
same success as *Snow White* and would reinforce Disney's dominance of feature-length
cartoon production. The second release, the experimental *Fantasia*, was not successful in the
box office, and lost money, despite being one of the most expensive undertakings at Disney.
Nevertheless, the studio's significant income, and its reign as the kingpin animation studio in
Hollywood at the end of the 1930's afforded Disney the freedom to invest in financially riskier
undertakings.

After the United States joined the war effort in 1941, the representation of war changed
dramatically in the homefront media. Initially, the few cartoons which directly addressed the
war overseas carried a pacifistic message. Disney's 1938 release "Ferdinand the Bull," and
MGM's 1939 cartoon "Peace on Earth," are animated fables that illustrate the irrationality of
war; in "Ferdinand" a bull prefers flowers over fighting matadors, and in "Peace" woodland
animals frolic in a post-apocalyptic world and reflect on humans' self-destruction. Notably,
both antiwar cartoons were released before American involvement in the war, and more
important, before studios began receiving government grants. However, the U.S. declaration
of war impacted heavily on the predominant themes of popular media and spawned a new
emphasis on victory and the struggle between good and evil. Heroism was the new ideal, and
the representation of a strong, united America in the popular media became the agenda at the
Hollywood studios.

Wartime resulted in a curious dichotomy at the Disney studios. The animation unit
divided its energies between popular features and work commissioned by the U.S. Department
of Defense and other government agencies (including the Government of Canada, which in
1942-43 requested eight short films on taxation from Disney). Disney's popular features
continued to consist of lighthearted and family-oriented fare and contrasted sharply with the
majority of its military and government productions; this difference is most apparent when comparing its most famous wartime short, "Der Fuehrer's Face" and its animated cohort "Education for Death" with the DOD-commissioned, live-action contemporaries, the "Know Your Enemy" series.

"Der Fuehrer's Face," which features Donald Duck as a factory worker living in Nazi Germany, does not present the same level of open antagonism as other wartime productions; arguably, this cartoon attempts to illustrate the irrationality of enemy governments and not necessarily the people living under them. Donald is shown living in poverty because of the Nazi Regime (a famous scene has Donald hoarding a single coffee bean on a string) and generally being unhappy with his circumstances, though the cartoon also mentions the blind faith of the population in their Fuhrer; this is further mocked in the award-winning soundtrack accompanying the cartoon: "Vee Heil, HEIL, right in zee Fuhrer's face." ("Der Fuhrer's Face" soundtrack, presented in Cartoons Go to War). The German population is represented primarily as a misguided mass of citizens who simultaneously contribute to the power of the Nazi system and are victims of it. "Der Fuhrer's Face" is a cartoon which is uncharacteristic of Disney's earlier style for two main reasons. First it features Donald Duck, one of the younger characters produced by the studio; the Kinney brothers created Donald to keep up with the new, wackier generation of characters coming out of other studios such as Warner Bros. Donald was one of the first Disney characters to experiment with a deviant personality, and with a more complicated set of traits, he is a more flexible character than Mickey or Goofy. Consequently, he can be a Nazi, whereas the early, more saccharine Mickey Mouse cannot.

"Der Fuhrer's Face" is especially notable for its transposition of an American character into "enemy territory," but it is not the only time that Disney represents the war from the enemy's perspective. The unfavourable depiction of enemy systems is also apparent in the
more sombre film, "Education for Death," which was produced by Disney in the same year as "Der Fuehrer's Face." The film follows the development of a young boy in Germany as he grows up under Nazism to become a soldier of the Reich. Essentially, the film demonstrates the corruption of youth by the systems of unhealthy, anti-American governments. Specifically, "Education for Death" attacks the Nazi Regime for its miseducation of youth in Germany; their education prepares them not for life but for death as they prepare to take part in the military conquests of their dictator. The use and disposal of young soldiers by the German military is equated with infanticide; through its quasi-study of German youth, "Education for Death" shows an uncommon sympathy for the anonymous German soldier. The audience witnesses the development of young boys living under the Reich as they mature into Nazi soldiers who come to the end of their "education" as they die on the battlefield. Unlike most works of its time, "Education" emphasizes the role of the government in distorting the minds of German citizens. Like "Der Fuhrer's Face," "Education" generates audience sympathy for the German population and assigns blame to the Nazi government. The contrast between the representation of the Nazi government and the American government suggests that Disney produced the films to endorse the latter; the American system is not directly represented in either cartoon, but it proves to be an absent power in the background of the animated shorts as they promote an examination and renewed appreciation of American values at a time when disgruntled citizens were inclined to question them.

"Der Fuehrer's Face" and "Education for Death" are stylistically very different; "Face" is notably cartoon-like, whereas "Education" is ultrarealistic and dark. However, thematically these two films are comparable, as they both depict the average German as a "cog" in the Nazi machine and indirectly advertise the American government. Simultaneously, this scenario distinguishes the German citizenry from the greater evil of Nazism, which is not attributed to the people but is instead represented as an abstract, corrupting force at work
within the country and its government and represents them in a dehumanizing way. The citizens of Germany lack individualism; they are merely automatons who absorb orders from the Nazi government, and accordingly behave in unacceptable ways. The implicit suggestion this representation makes in the cartoons is that Americans would never behave in this manner because unlike the generic Germans they posses the powers of self-determination and a trustworthy government. These particular cartoons do not invest much time in the direct representation of American life, but the conspicuous absence of an American in-group presence suggests a reified American identity in relief against an enemy country, its inherently evil systems of government, and dehumanized citizens. Thus, when Donald awakens from his Nazi nightmare in "Face" he finds himself safely returned to the comfort of his familiar American life; the relief he feels after waking from his dream is a relief which Disney producers expect the audience to share at the end of the film. The films' demonization of the Nazi regime is designed to stimulate a renewed appreciation of democracy in Americans and to remind the nation of what it stands to lose by not contributing to the war effort.

Disney also produced films that the popular audience would never see, such as the "Know Your Enemy" series. These were released only as training material for new U.S. Army recruits and, much like the Warner Bros. Snafu cartoons, were only played for U.S. military audiences; however, both their content and objective were analogous to the popular wartime cartoon. The films take the dehumanization of the enemy a step further than the popular cartoons do; "Know Your Enemy" reads much like a birdwatching manual or a wilderness feature in that it reduces the enemy soldier to a collection of unrelated facts and figures, some of which are grossly racist suppositions. A two-dimensional, generic representation of the enemy troops is produced through the quasi-scientific description presented in the films, which appear outwardly to be nothing more than a straightforward guide to identifying the enemy soldier by his uniform, physical characteristics, and behaviour. However, the reductive
representation of enemy forces also conditioned the recruits watching the training films to stop seeing the enemy as human beings, thus preparing them to kill without hesitation or remorse. The enemy in these films is never depicted as a civilian, and because the purpose of these films was instruction and not entertainment, they were not executed with the sense of humour or empathy evident in later productions.

Contrary to Disney's tame family cartoons and serious training features, the animated shorts produced at the Warner Bros. studio were experimental interpretations of wartime conflicts. Cartoons such as "Draftee Daffy" and "Draft Horse" directly represent the conscription of characters into the military. Cartoon idols such as Bugs Bunny and Daffy Duck were "drafted" into the war effort and shared the screen with caricatured versions of the real enemies of WWII America. More interesting is the fusion of the realistic and the purely fictional in the creation of certain cartoons which portray dimensions of war. This blending is most startling in the minimal caricaturing at the concluding moments of "Daffy—the Commando," in which the final scene has Daffy Duck sneaking up on a rotoscoped image of Adolf Hitler. Rotoscoping, a method patented in 1917 by Max Fleischer, is an animation technique that involves tracing over a projection of a recorded image to create an ultrarealistic cartoon structured upon live-action film material (Furniss 77). The "real" figure of Hitler, realized in the rotoscoped animation, is juxtaposed in the final scene against the very cartoony Daffy Duck. The rotoscoped Hitler closely resembles how he actually would have looked to most Americans; the speech he is delivering, however, is in Warner Bros.' parodied pseudo-German, which amounts to nothing more than elaborate throat-clearing and screaming. Through this caricature, Hitler enters the Looney Tunes universe, and the audience, too, is drawn into the escapism that is achieved through the erasure of the division between the real images of war and the war images represented in the cartoon. In the realm of cartoons, Daffy Duck can fight talking vultures in one frame and strike Adolf Hitler with a
hammer in the next. Nevertheless, however strange their scenarios appear, these cartoons reflected the audience's need to make sense of an absurd war.

The leaders of the Axis powers make appearances in several Warner Bros. cartoons, though not necessarily in a rotoscoped format. Goring, Mussolini, Tojo, and Hirohito are all featured in wartime productions released by Warner Bros. between 1941 and 1945; interestingly, the Warner Bros. studio tended to use political figures much more often than other studios. "Daffy—the Commando," for example, opens with a memo bearing cartoon images (a strange cartoon-within-a-cartoon) of Goring, Mussolini, and Hirohito in a "See no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil" pose. Goring even stars in his own cartoon, "Herr Meets Hare," produced in 1944. Goring, as Hitler's Air Minister, was recognizable as part of Hitler's inner circle but was not as infamous as Adolf Hitler was, despite the fact that it was he who helped to establish the Gestapo and put together the concentration camp system. However, Goring's notable obesity and egocentrism made him an easy target for ridicule. "Herr Meets Hare" is simply a chase cartoon situated in the Black Forest, with Goring substituting the predatory role traditionally held by Elmer Fudd; what makes it interesting as an anti-German film are the various stereotypical German references made throughout the piece. Besides taking place in quintessential Bavaria (the Black Forest) the cartoon includes some mention of lederhosen, opera, and, of course, Hitler (one of Bugs's more shocking disguises.) "Herr Meets Hare" is a cartoon that attacks all things German, and while its humour is low-brow, it marks a bloodless revenge engineered by the American entertainment industry.

The popular Warner Bros. cartoons also include a glimpse of idealized American heroism. The patriotic theme is particularly evident in two of the Daffy Duck cartoons, "Daffy—the Commando" and "Scrap Happy Daffy." "Daffy—the Commando" has Daffy, the lone American soldier acting as a one-man army as he infiltrates the German headquarters, harasses the vultures running the place, then sails through the air after being shot out of a
Nazi cannon with an American flag in each hand as patriotic music plays in the background. "Scrap Happy Daffy" features an even longer scene celebrating American identity and achievements with the song "Americans Don't Give Up." Daffy collapses in despair after trying to fight off a metal-eating Nazi goat that the German forces have sent to destroy the American scrap iron reserves. Patriotic ghosts appear before him (all of them Daffy isotopes wearing historic outfits) and chant "Americans don't give up" until Daffy, encouraged by their support, becomes a "Super-American" who shoots up into the sky wearing a Superman-like costume. Coincidentally, the Bugs Bunny cartoon "Super Rabbit" features Bugs as a comic superhero but concludes with him transforming into a "real Superman"—a U.S. Marine. The superlative courage of fantasy heroes, these features suggest, is outshone by the everyday heroics of the "real supermen" of the front lines; popular media elevated the duty of the common soldier to superhero status, such that good soldiering transcended all former definitions of action-hero exploits and came to represent a new hero-ideal. The nation was hungry for a new hero-mythology that incorporated their participation in the "Good War," and it sated its need through the image of the great American warrior.

Besides its popular features, Warner Bros. also produced a series of animated shorts to entertain and educate troops overseas. The Private Snafu series, commissioned by the U.S. Department of Defense, was included as part of the newsreel packages sent to U.S. Army battalions. Private Snafu, whose name is taken from the military anagram SNAFU (Situation Normal All Fouled/Fucked Up), represented the very worst possible soldier that the army could find. Through the mistakes of its bumbling hero, the Private Snafu series was designed to instruct new soldiers about the importance of obeying orders and the dire consequences they could potentially face if they decided to disobey. Furthermore, the cartoons illustrate the many immediate dangers that faced American soldiers overseas, and are appropriately named after various hazards, as in "Gas," "Spies," and "Secrets." Each
instalment of the cartoon had a different cautionary tale but the same imperative: to do as one was told—or else.

What is most surprising about the *Private Snafu* series is not its message, but the presentation of this message in the cartoons. Production was directed under strict guidelines set by the DOD that included instructions about how many frames an animator was permitted to produce from any one cartoon; these limits were set so that no single animator or animation unit would know the complete plot any one cartoon. However, the high-security measures seem superfluous and wholly ludicrous after viewing the material. The scripts were written by Ted Geisel (better known as Dr. Seuss) and have a singsong quality one might expect of his stories for children; however, considering the care taken by the DOD to conceal the production of Snafu, the pedestrian narratives and childish rhymes seem out of place in a military cartoon. Nevertheless, the DOD supervised the production of these cartoons and approved them for recruit viewing as part of their ongoing training. Unlike the Disney productions, these animated shorts focused less on recognizing the enemy and its associated threats; instead, it was a guide to being a competent and obedient American soldier.

The purpose of the character Private Snafu was to show soldiers what not to do while fighting overseas. Snafu is stupid, lazy, unattractive, and worst of all, disobedient; these are undesirable traits in any military unit, and the American army attempted to purge these from its forces by demonstrating what could go wrong if the troops disobeyed orders. The formulaic plot of any *Snafu* cartoon has Private Snafu being negligent of a military rule and consequently paying for it later on, sometimes causing the whole unit he is in to suffer some form of punishment as well. None of the cartoons depict Snafu as being disciplined by the army officials for his disobedience; they do not have to punish Snafu because the consequences of his actions are always swiftly delivered by an outside force manifested as anything from enemy troops to mosquitoes. What the viewer learns from Snafu's folly and
subsequent downfall is that he is the only one to blame for his injury because he failed to follow orders by not being prepared, not keeping secrets, or by just generally disobeying superiors.

Snafu is a bumbler, but the rules he flagrantly disregards in the cartoons are ones that soldiers actually had to obey for their own safety and the safety of their units; soldiers had to learn that risks, no matter how small, were not to be taken by disobeying orders. The DOD wanted to make this clear to every soldier in the U.S. Army, a force which demographically consisted of young males with limited education. With this in mind, the DOD decided to create animated shorts which would illustrate cause and effect simply enough for even the slowest recruits to understand. The childish writing, rhymes, and animation were meant to package important instructions in the familiar medium of the cartoon; the simple message "Don't be a Private Snafu" is reiterated again and again through different misadventures represented in the films. No formal knowledge of military procedure is necessary to understand what Snafu does incorrectly; all the recruits had to be conditioned to learn consistently was that if Snafu does something, they were expected to do the opposite. Thus, 

Snafu served as a visual primer for training new recruits to behave identically and in accordance with military rules.

One studio that did not receive the same high-profile commissions as the Disney and Warner Bros. studios was the production group at Max Fleischer. The Superman series, which included a few well-known World War II shorts, had arguably the most realistic graphics of any studio at that time. Realistic effects were achieved through extensive use of rotoscoping, and extensive study of the characters as they appeared in contemporary comics is apparent in the animated series' faithful interpretation of them. The Fleischer studios created the Superman series as a cartoon stylistically similar to the comic book series. The animators studied the comic book characters extensively and designed animated shorts which
marked one of the earliest successful comic book-to-animated film transitions. Familiarity with
the Man of Steel and his exploits was at least partly responsible for the success of the series
after its debut in September 1941; the plot formula of superhero-versus-arch villain initially
worked on the screen as well as it did in the comic strips. Furthermore, as the early cartoons
were being produced at approximately the same time as the Americans' entry into the war
(following the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour), the series' formulaic plot development
allowed directors of the series to introduce wartime themes while remaining relatively
consistent in their superhero storylines.

Substitution of arch villains by political ones in the Superman cartoons was frequent,
as it was in other studios' releases. However, the introduction of enemy soldiers into the
series was handled in a different and more xenophobic fashion than in other animated shorts.
The reason for the amount of discriminatory content is not because the Fleischer animation
staff were inherently more racist than other studios' workers, but because of the cartoons'
realistic style, which was achieved mainly through the use of Fleischer's rotoscope technique.
Superman was the first consistently realistic cartoon series produced for public consumption;
the Fleischer studio was backed by Paramount on the project and demanded one hundred
thousand U.S. dollars per cartoon—four times the production price of an average cartoon
(Maltin 120). The studio's large budget allowed them to use rotoscoping as a regular
technique in their animation to produce naturalistic figure movement. Extra care was taken to
make central characters look as realistic as possible in both movement and expression. In
the secondary villainous characters, however, the approach to character design exhibits two
very different standards at work; there is the same attention to detail in the figure, but the
facial design is grossly caricatured, particularly in the "ethnic" characters. This incongruence
between primary and secondary character design is clearly visible in two of the wartime
Superman cartoons, "Eleventh Hour" and "Jungle Drums."
"Eleventh Hour" presents Superman as a war hero as he destroys the Japanese naval forces in what is supposed to be Yokohama. The act of sabotage incites the wrath of the Japanese military, who retaliate by kidnapping Lois Lane and holding her hostage. When the kidnapping fails to put an end to Superman's destruction of the naval fleet, the soldiers prepare to execute Lane. Superman, however, saves Lane in his usual nick-of-time superhero fashion, returns her to safety, and resumes destroying Japanese battle ships. In the entire cartoon, there are no Japanese civilians, nor are there any Japanese soldiers who are represented as anything but cruel and irrational. In the only fight scene between Superman and the Japanese army, the hero battles against a horde of hideous, diminutive soldiers, all of whom are caricatured after Hideki Tojo, and who constitute the familiar "Yellow Peril" threat to healthy Western culture as represented by Superman, the all-American hero. The pairing of idealized characters with caricatured ones expresses the good-evil dichotomy at work in the typical Superman cartoon, but it also stands for the self-enemy symmetry felt by the American public during World War II. The representation of otherness through caricature in an otherwise realistic cartoon raises more complicated questions of identities realized in style and media which will be the focus of the next chapter.

Despite the cartoon's realistic design, there are liberties taken with the plot which are as bizarre and improbable as those seen in the outrageous Warner Bros. cartoons. One Superman cartoon that shows a number of inconsistencies in its scripting is "Jungle Drums," in which Superman meets up with an evil German mastermind in an anonymous African jungle inhabited by equally anonymous Africans. This encounter takes place after Lois Lane, the damsel-in-distress constant in the Superman plot formula, is captured and threatened by the German leader, who attempts to coerce Lane into releasing classified information. At this point, angry Africans help to threaten Lane by tying her to a stake and attempting to burn her in a scene reminiscent of other Hollywood cannibalism dramatizations. Besides being
historically inaccurate, the cartoon reinscribes popular misconceptions about Africa which are entirely irrelevant to the war effort. The lack of threatening German soldiers in the cartoon problematizes the issue of illustrating the wartime enemy in the series; "Jungle Drums" portrays Africans as new enemies who are politically uninvolved in the war (both in the cartoon and in reality) but in the service of a familiar enemy--the Germans. However, at a time when the Americans were actively trying to erase race divisions within their own nation in the interest of wartime unification, the use of blackface caricaturing was counterproductive to the cause of desegregation. The most obvious explanation for the continued appearance of negative Black stereotypes would be that Hollywood animators had a limited pool of images when it came to illustrating African scenes, so any wartime conflict situated in Africa would reflect traditional stereotypes about the region and its peoples. Nevertheless, the use of African stereotypes (the African as savage, as the White man's servant, and as a threat to White women) suggests a tendency in animation to turn to predictable stock caricatures to accentuate the contrasting elements of appearance in primary and secondary characters.

Another characteristic of the Superman series is the apparent lack of high-profile political figures (such as Hitler) in the cartoons. Instead, the enemy is represented as an indistinct mass of figures. Part of this design could be attributed to the fantasy element of the superhero cartoon wherein the superhero must emerge victorious after battling a horde of villains. On a practical level, there have to be enough bodies to throw around, and there simply has to be a large group of enemies for this to happen. However, the vagueness of the enemy in the cartoons may also be reflective of a vagueness in how the enemy was understood psychologically. Besides the appearances of a handful of political figures, the enemy--and especially the enemy soldier--was visually unfamiliar to people in America outside of popular images, that were themselves largely invented. The narrowness of enemy design is expressed in the replication of similar images; effectively, the enemy is made more
threatening in numbers, not through character development.

Besides a few superficial variables of style and content, the wartime cartoons demonstrate a similar dedication to defining American values. Complex problems of shifting identities at home and beyond were played out in the animated cartoon as a means of demystifying them for the American public. In achieving this end, the wartime notion of "victory through production" was as actively upheld by the cartoon business as it was in other industries. Wartime cartoons rose from the symbiosis between government funding and corporate need, but ultimately the art that was produced at this time also reflects the economic, political, and psychological reordering of America. The contribution of American animated cartoons to the war effort symbolized the entertainment industry's full commitment to doing its part and became a touchstone for aspects of the American self-identity during wartime.
Chapter Two: The Cartoon Medium and the Propaganda Aesthetic

Propaganda has frequently appeared in various forms of graphic media, so its diffusion into animation is in many ways a natural extension. Political comic strips and other graphic propagandist material have been around for centuries, and continue to enjoy massive popularity; the primary reason for the consistent effectiveness of the form is the unique propaganda aesthetic that applies only to cartoons:

The cartoonist, of course, exaggerates and oversimplifies situations, just as he exaggerates the physical features of his subjects; but the cartoon often preserves a vitality which has been lost from factual accounts of events. Why should the cartoon be such a useful vehicle for illustrating different attitudes to the war? There is, of course, the cliche that a picture is worth a thousand words, and good cartoons often express ideas far more vividly and simply than speeches or books. (Douglas 3)

However, this explanation does not allude to the means by which animated cartoons were able to modify representations of wartime themes and how their use as wartime propaganda was further problematized by the issues of mass consumption and artistic intent. Cartoons were an ideal vehicle for delivering political/nationalist messages because of their ability to represent abstract notions, such as a system of thought, in a concrete pictorial format which could the audience could then reabsorb as a sensory stimulus. The purpose of delivering stimuli to a receiver is to obtain a specific response; ultimately, what animation amounts to in the production and consumption of propaganda is the independent variable in a large scale behaviourist exercise.

Propaganda in the Second World War was reborn in the new marriage of industry and social conditioning; in particular, the entertainment industry became closely associated with
the production of propaganda. The value of entertainment as a propaganda medium coincides with the general movement towards behaviourism as the authoritative theory of psychology. The behaviourist movement was pioneered by Watson, and later, Skinner, whose theories revolved around the assumption that any given behaviour is a learned response to external cues. As the first "scientific" psychological movement able to produce systematic correlation in its figures, behaviourism appeared to offer a clear, empirical explanation for behaviour:

The individual organism is also affected by consequences. The process evolved though natural selection, but it operates on a very different scale...It has been most clearly demonstrated in the experiment an analysis of operant conditioning. If a given bit of behaviour has a consequence of a special sort it is more likely to occur again under similar occasions. The behaviour is said to be strengthened by its consequences and consequences having this effect are called reinforcers. (Skinner 19)

The next logical step was to apply the same ideas to the modification of human behaviour at a massive scale; one way that the ideas of behaviourism were applied to human learning was through propaganda. By definition, propaganda is a method of teaching behaviour; the integration of entertainment and propaganda did not change the fact that the material had a specific effect on the viewer, namely a shift in behaviour, values, or affect. However, the use of entertainment marked a transformation in how messages, political or otherwise, could be positively reinforced.

The most simple definition of a positive reinforcer is a reward; behaviour is modified through the encouragement of specific behaviours, and this change is achieved by rewarding a subject for a set of behaviours, thereby improving the chances of having a behaviour repeated:
Positive reinforcement, as the term implies, is strengthening. It lacks both the suppressive and the aggressive effects of punishment, and it is free of the effects of negative reinforcement that we associate with anxiety and fear. Positively reinforced behaviour is active participation in life, free of boredom and depression. When our behaviour is positively reinforced we say we enjoy what we are doing; we call ourselves happy. (Skinner 5)

With this purpose in mind, perhaps the most basic purpose of producing entertainment-based propaganda was to keep people happy at a time when there was very little to be happy about; the introduction of rations and strengthened regulations during wartime, as well as the ominous threat of foreign invasion, created an atmosphere of tension and frustration within nations. A way of offering moral support to citizens during difficult times was entertainment; keeping people content reduced the occurrence of internal conflicts and uprisings. Like the Roman circuses, wartime entertainment defused potentially explosive tensions and generally relaxed people by addressing their hardship and defining it as a small part of a great common cause. The happiness of a nation was far from being a trivial matter; during wartime, the nation had to have at least the appearance of unity and a well-orchestrated propaganda campaign would become an integral step in reeducating individuals to see themselves as part of the nation. Mentioning the individual's contribution in propaganda typically occurred in two phases. First, the effort of the American individual was lauded, then, in equal measure, the individual was strongly encouraged to continue his or her efforts, basically through a heavy dose of guilt. The transition from recognition to instruction is more subtle than one would perhaps think; ultimately, entertainment became associated with propaganda as a "sugar coating" for material addressing the harsher realities of wartime life.

As well as being a means of alleviating the pressure experienced during wartime, entertainment became a vehicle for propaganda; besides the more pragmatic messages
regarding regulations and special wartime measures, the medium of entertainment also taught the mass audiences a different way of conceptualizing their identities. The government recognized the value of entertainment as a pathway for the transmission of both kinds of messages, and exploited the medium as a positive contingent. The role of entertainment was developed as a positive reinforcer for desired behaviour in what amounted to a large scale experiment in operant conditioning:

By its very nature, operant behaviour encourages the invention of mental or cognitive processes said to initiate action. In a reflex, conditioned or unconditioned, there is a conspicuous prior cause. Something triggers the response. (Skinner 102)

The assumption of a cause and effect relationship between entertaining stimuli and learned social behaviour was predicated on the findings of experiments in classical behaviourism, which asserted that all behaviour, with the exception of a few innate behaviours, was learned through external cues. Following his first human experiments in 1910-1913, Watson famously argued that all human behaviour was the product of learning, including intelligence and emotion:

Give me a dozen healthy infants, well-formed, and my own specified world to bring them up and I'll guarantee to take any one at random and train him to become any type of specialist I might select--doctor, lawyer, artist, merchant-chief and, yes, even beggarman and thief, regardless of his talents, penchants, tendencies, abilities, vocations, and race of his ancestors. I am going beyond my facts and I admit it, but so have the advocates of the contrary and they have been doing it for many thousands of years. (Watson quoted in Todd 118)

According to behaviourist theory, all behaviour is taught with external cues; logically, if all behaviour was learned through conditioning, it had to be possible also to apply the same
stimulus-response theory to a mass sample.

The move of behaviourism from experimental science to mass education promptly succeeded various animal experiments which concluded that certain behaviours could be obtained through conditioning. Watson was the first to apply his ideas in a popular context; after losing his job at John Hopkins University in 1920, Watson immediately started work at an advertising agency, where he applied his theories of behaviour suggestion to commercial projects. (Coon 48) However, the first opportunity to test the effectiveness of behavioural science in an aggressive mass reeducation campaign arose after the United States officially entered the war on December 8, 1941. Although propaganda was far from being a new idea then, the development of new media drastically influenced its production and consumption.

Besides the development of new entertainment media, there was also the influence of the new and immediate demand for propagandist material. The need for a restructuring of self-identity arose as a result of the threat of war; a direct product of this cognitive rewiring was prejudice. Both Allport (343) and Aronson (312) recognize conflict as a possible cause of prejudice; Allport refers to the development of prejudice and scapegoats through what he terms the "frustration-aggression-hypothesis." (Allport 343) Aronson reiterates Allport's findings, but adds

[i]t is difficult to understand how the lynching of the blacks or the mistreatment of the Eta could be due only to economic competition. There is a great deal of emotion in these actions that suggests the presence of deeper psychological factors in addition to economics. Similarly, the zeal with which Nazis carried out their attempt to erase all members of the Jewish ethnic group (regardless of economic status) strongly suggests that the phenomenon was not exclusively economic or political, but was (at least in part) psychological. (Aronson 318)

The same psychological processes were at work in wartime America; the evolution of the
enemy stereotypes progressed as the Axis powers made the transition from being "someone else's problem" to being a viable threat to national interests. Threat was the catalyst that activated the psychological factors in propaganda production and consumption; this threat was translated into the inflated evil of the Other as enemy which was projected, proliferated, and perpetuated through the entertainment consumed by the public. Mass audiences essentially re-learned their identity as Americans through the graphic media. Allport notes that an in-group identity is strengthened in conflict through the perceived need for differentiation; one method of creating the semblance of difference is to create an out-group as a projection of anti-self (the shifting of self-identification in conflict is the subject of the next chapter.) An effective means of transmitting messages of nationalist reidentification is to exploit a set of images that the population has already been exposed to and has identified with: these cues can readily be found in entertainment media.

Entertainment media reflect the culture producing their images and are a form of self-portraiture; the way that these images are produced is a consequence of national, racial, and socioeconomic in-group identities. Entertainment is informed by a group's collective identity and is a medium for informing a group, such as a nation, through popular images easily recognizable to a specific population. Theoretically, a cyclical relationship exists between the producers and consumers of cultural media; a group defines itself through a medium such as entertainment, and this, in turn, feeds back into the group through its mass consumption of entertainment. However, this model of media production proves to be an oversimplification when considering the problem of control over these images; the production and consumption of propaganda is a more obvious example of the imperfect loop that results from the production and consumption of images. The government-designed images specifically to elicit a desired psychological response in consumers; during World War II, in particular, entertainment media became part of a large-scale "national re-education" project in the United
To be sure, during the war years proper, popular-media representations of the conflict constituted almost without exception a very particular way of making a production out of it: a set of representations constituting a carefully defined political or ideological construction of experience as regards the shaping of attitudes and understandings. We might call it remembering in wartime. A more common and serviceable term, of course, for all the sinister undertones it has generally come to carry, would be propaganda...centralized powers of control over popular-culture media were quickly vested in an agency called the Office of War Information; and it did its job with a thoroughness and dispatch—not to mention a ready acquiescence of the information and entertainment industries themselves—that a post-Vietnam or post-Watergate society might find unsettling in the extreme. (Beidler 9)

The U.S. government and its affiliated agencies, such as the Office of War Information (OWI), orchestrated the production of propagandist material by Hollywood studios but never referred to these productions as "propaganda"; the government determined that propaganda was an un-American thing, something that only the enemy produced and propagated to brainwash and enslave their people. A national education policy enacted through modified media, however, was a different thing completely—at least this is what the U.S. government wanted to make the nation believe. Nevertheless, the common denominator between what the U.S. authorities termed "propaganda" and their own reeducation strategy was an underlying assumption that people could be trained to modify their behaviour through public-domain media.

In associating reeducation projects with popular entertainment, the government exploited the familiarity of the Hollywood movie and the animated cartoon to sell propaganda
to mass audiences through a medium they could understand and enjoy. The choice of
entertainment as an avenue for the transmission of propagandist messages was based on its
established reputation of being a pleasurable distraction; propaganda paired with
entertainment was more palatable to the public and more discreet:

Certainly Americans were spared the mind-numbing indoctrination undergone
by citizens of the great totalitarian states and various other conquered peoples.
From first to last, it could truly be said that the nation endured war with virtually
no change in the basic configurations of the popular media we would now
classify as the arts, information, and entertainment. But in every case,
unprecedented central-government control became the order of the
day...remembering in wartime became a function of propaganda as official
policy at every level of operation. (Beidler 9-10)

In addition to the pleasure factor that entertainment media offered propaganda, there was the
more pragmatic matter of numbers; film entertainment was widely consumed in America and
was the most direct, expedient method of delivering any message to the population. Several
million moviegoers filled American theatres every day, and their numbers made entertainment
media, particularly films and trailers, very attractive options for the exposure of wartime
instructions.

Although mainstream entertainment in general was reassigned as propaganda
transmission, animation, experienced a more radical shift in purpose than any other medium
of entertainment during the wartime years. The rapid evolution of animated film from amusing
"fluff" to a major route for propagandist suggestion is most apparent in the works of major
studios between 1937 and 1944. Animators during this time finally broke away from emulating
Disney in their cartoons; the war instigated a shift in power from the staid, realistic animation
which Disney had pioneered to the new flamboyance of new artists at other studios, such as
Warner Bros. The transfer of energy into new, more stylized forms would change the phylogeny of animated film permanently; more important, it signifies a shift in thinking as well as in art.

To better understand the medium of animated film during wartime—how it was produced and applied—it is important to study the characteristic aesthetic features of the animated medium. Animation is actually a diffuse set of artistic disciplines, but these are all defined by frame-by-frame production. (Furniss 5-6) Because each frame is independently assembled, graphic representation in the animated cartoon is not bound by the same rules of representation that are a part of live-action pieces. The spectrum of representation in the animated medium extends from photorealism to abstraction and is also flexible as a multimedia form; in other words, different types of artistic media (e.g. film, paint, ink, graphite, clay) can be used in any single piece of animated work. Consequently, animated film possesses a unique aesthetic that must be examined in conjunction with a distinct propaganda aesthetic.

Though animation has evolved with new technology to become more of an intersection of different creative techniques, the fundamental characteristics of animation remain the same, namely, the flexibility to work within a wide continuum of representation and the option of alternating between varied methods of animation. Cartoon animation, and how it is exercised and defined, develops out of these characteristics. When describing a work as "cartoony," one generally means that it does not reflect things as they appear in reality, or that the piece is not realistic. However, this definition assumes that animation cannot be mimetic, and this generalization is inaccurate because it excludes techniques such as rotoscoping and, more recently, computer generated images (CGI). Although the common definition of "cartoony" is not especially useful for explaining the cartoon aesthetic, it does betray some of the presuppositions which have evolved around the cartoon: Cartoons are expected to be an unrealistic, or somewhat flawed representation of reality. This definition is only half-complete,
however; the images contained in some cartoons is completely divorced from reality, but others can also be almost parallel to "real" recorded images. What cartoon animation gives artists is a virtually unfettered choice of what and how things are represented in their work; a cartoon emerges as the direct product of style and intention.

The development of animation techniques is practically limitless, as the range of images they produce. Because the animator is entirely in control of the images being created in the frames, he or she has a great deal of artistic license over the product; Chuck Jones has stated in lectures that "the difference between humour and nonhumor can be one frame—cutting on one frame on the next." (Maltin 251) The mimetic limitations of conventional film do not apply to animation, and the artist is free to manipulate the image as he or she pleases. Images can be modified though alteration of medium, shape, light, or other features, resulting in a distorted image; distortion could mean the simple stretching and compression of images or more complicated mutation of images, such as metamorphosis, which involves the direct alteration of one image into another. Distortion is responsible for much of the humour in the gag cartoon, which has little or no plot development and relies strictly upon visual humour. Distortion is also integral to caricature, and to the hyperbolic imagery of the popular cartoon.

The relationship between realism and abstraction is shifted and skewed according to an artist's or director's specifications. Caricature, for example, is the abstraction of certain features of a real image which is applied for the purpose of emphasizing those particular elements. Indirectly, the subsequent exaggerated image and its method of production become useful in understanding creative intent; choices regarding image presentation and representation are informed by what the artist wishes to display, as well as what the producers expect the audience to pick up. The animated film serves as a graphic projection of artistic intent; consequently, the animated wartime film, studied as a piece of propagandist material, is one way to acquire a clearer picture of messages directed at restructuring identity according
to nationalist ideology. What makes the cartoon an ideal medium for this study is its proximity to artistic intent.

Issues of intent are central to the production of wartime animated film. The production of cartoons during this time was undertaken with the intention of reinforcing messages which, subsequently, would produce certain behaviours in the mass audience; the challenge was to make these messages simple enough to be understood by the general public. The reductive graphics in wartime cartoons, therefore, aimed for an emotional response rather than an intellectual one, and used only the most obvious symbolic references (e.g. cats as villains, mice as heroes.) The result was an artistic product which was ready to be consumed by every citizen of the United States, including the "lower third' of the population" (Bird and Rubenstein 28), or the uneducated lower strata of American society.

The cartoon medium was also appropriate for the task of reeducation in wartime America because it was able to explain instructions in a basic graphic format. Because cartoons often consisted of simplified iconic imagery, the government appropriated the cartoon for propaganda. The transition of the cartoon from entertainment to indoctrination is observable in its style as well as its theme. Two representative pieces from the pre-intervention period in the late 1930s are "Ferdinand the Bull" (Disney, 1938) and "Peace on Earth" (MGM, 1939); both cartoons carry an antiwar sentiment and an inclination towards extended metaphor, or specifically, the animal fable as a vehicle for antiwar messages. Leonard Maltin describes to these cartoons as stylistically advanced, with "greater sophistication in layout, backgrounds, and the like" (51); Maltin is especially interested in "Peace on Earth," which displays "the juxtaposition of a serious theme with 'cute' animal characters." (287) The sophistication of the pre-intervention cartoons was lost in the animated shorts of the early 1940s, which were produced with a different objective in mind. The key themes for these later features involved patriotism and support for American
involvement. Storylines also reflected a different estimation of the public's intelligence, and post-intervention cartoons steered away from metaphor, choosing instead to emphasize images and gags.

It is hardly a coincidence that cartoons became attractive as a potential vehicle for propaganda during the 1930s and 1940s, decades which marked the "golden age" of behaviourist psychology. Behaviourism, the first scientifically based school of psychology, was pioneered by Watson and Skinner, who theorized that the root of all behaviour in humans and other animals was the direct result of conditioning. Behaviourist theory proposed that through conditioning a linear stimulus-response relationship could be created and maintained with consistent reinforcement. An extension of this reasoning is evident in the government's use of appealing images to reinforce ideas graphically in the minds of viewers; by using a medium that audiences had already been conditioned to (as they were familiar with the popular cartoon and already held certain sets of expectations about them) the government could use the cartoon as a direct stimulus by substituting a few minor thematic variables that would produce a specific emotional or behavioral response.

The popularity of behaviourism during the wartime era is indicative of how the audience was understood by the producers of propaganda. The application of behaviourist ideas presupposed passive consumption by the consumers of propaganda; this assumption regarding audience reception was never formally tested, but because the behaviourist ideas guiding the production of propaganda in World War II were not concerned with the cognitive aspects of message reception, propaganda design aimed to elicit an emotional response and not an intellectual one. The key objective of propaganda was/is to produce a specified behaviour in a viewer without that person knowing it; the most efficient way to do this is to trigger a reflex response to external cues.

The first objective of the wartime cartoons in America was to create solidarity (albeit
temporary) among the viewers, which numbered approximately eighty million. Mass consumption of the cartoon product ensured that everyone watching the film would understand the same message at the same time. Besides the pseudo-collective of the wartime audiences being realized in movie houses across America, there was also the national collective which the cartoon producers hoped to define through the animated films:

[The first-run bill] expressed all sorts of difference—differences of genre, race, class, gender—as parts of an aesthetic whole, the better to manage those differences, to smooth over the tensions they might cause. Through a particular conception of variety, the film bill turned the theatre into a single public viewing place where everything could be seen, spectorial utopia seemingly providing a 360-degree view of the world. (Smoodin 71)

During a national crisis such as war, national solidarity was imperative; ethnic, socioeconomic, political, and regional divisions had to be minimized in the interest of unity within the country. Because the United States did not declare war until the bombing of Pearl Harbour on December 7, 1941, solidarity was not addressed in animation until the early forties (note that before this time there was hardly any reference to the war at all); however, finding themselves under the threat of invasion, Americans gathered under a collective self-identity, or what Allport describes as an in-group.

The definition of an in-group is dodgy at best; in-groups appear and define themselves according to proximity and purpose, factors that frequently shift and mutate with changing social mores. In defining in-groups, Allport explains that

[M]embers of an in-group all use the term 'we' with the same essential significance. Members of a family do so, likewise schoolmates, members of a lodge, labor union, club, city, state, nation. In a vaguer way, members of international bodies may do the same. Some we-organizations are transitory
When assuming that a nation is, in fact, an enormous in-group, the importance of "mass re-education" becomes clear: during wartime, a nation divided into subcultures over issues of race, class, regions, and other factors must be brought together into some form of unified self-identity or ideological unity. Self must be defined and ingrained into a nation's consciousness to create a distinct division between the self and the enemy other, and this specified awareness of self is performed in the reinforcement of specific images which make this distinction as clear as possible.

The Second World War has often been referred to as the "Good War" by many Americans, and at the time, the American population generally regarded U.S. involvement as an act of retaliation and righteousness that came as the result of enemy provocation. Reports of the villainy of the Axis powers and the atrocities committed by enemy armies justified the war effort in the minds of most Americans and made the evilness of the Axis inordinately simple to define. What fewer people knew was that the thoroughly negative image of the Axis powers was largely constructed by media accounts that amplified the barbarism of the enemy through selective representation. The shaping of the nation's sensibilities was facilitated by the lack of technology at the time of the war; television was not yet available, and newsreels shown in the theatres which depicted scenes from the war overseas were edited to present a carefully constructed picture of the war. Most Americans received information about the war either through the radio reports or censored newsreels; as a consequence, their impression of the war was essentially manufactured. Government and affiliated agencies, such as the Catholic Legion of Decency, oversaw the production and distribution of news and made decisions regarding the way in which Allied and Axis armies were represented; the edits that these agencies made determined the nation's impressions of the war. The censorship of entertainment, too, fell under the jurisdiction of government agencies; following U.S.
intervention, government agencies were in charge of what was produced and distributed by Hollywood:

On December 18, 1941, President Roosevelt officially called Hollywood to war and formally recognized the wartime role of cinema with the appointment of Lowell Mellett, then director of the Office of Government Reports, as Coordinator of Government Films. In June 1942 an executive order created the Office of War Information (OWI) under the directorship of former CBS news analyst Elmer Davis to gather "all varied Government press and information services under one leadership." Mellett's office then became the Bureau of Motion Pictures (BMP), which until 1943 acted as the main civilian liaison and contact point between Washington and Hollywood. (Doherty 43)

The establishment of organizations such as the OWI solidified the working relationship between the government and Hollywood studios; mainstream entertainment joined news media in disseminating the "official" version of events. After government organizations became actively involved in regulating the public's knowledge about the war through popular media, it became difficult to recognize where one began and the other ended.

U.S. isolationism ended with the new possibility of attack and, consequently, paranoia set off by the possibility of "infection" by the enemy Other. There was at the time an actual political offensive against the U.S. by Japan, but the effects of this conflict were not strictly confined to politics; it fundamentally altered the psychology of the nation. The attack on political boundaries instigated a redefinition of psychological boundaries, namely the limits of the self. Accordingly, the wartime media recorded and presented events to the public with a self-other binary in mind, which meant that live images had to be doctored to remain consistent with this construction. Atrocities committed by Allies were not usually mentioned, although in the occasional reports of violence against the enemy the media redefined U.S.
"collateral damage" as justified and even humorous; meanwhile, media promptly documented
the enemies' killings in the most unflattering detail. Mainstream publications included "lighter
fare", anecdotes such as the following except taken from the May 22, 1944 edition of *Life*
magazine:

When he said goodbye two years ago to Natalie Nickerson, 20, a war worker of
Phoenix, Arizona, a big handsome lieutenant promised her a Jap. Last week Natalie
received a human skull, autographed by her lieutenant and 13 friends, and inscribed
"This is a good Jap: a dead one picked up on the New Guinea beach." Natalie,
surprised at the gift, named it Tojo. The armed forces disapprove strongly of this sort
of thing. (Nomes and Yukio 152)

The lack of real-time news coverage meant that the objectivity of these depictions was not
usually questioned, and even there had been a more objective and immediate journalistic
approach available, it is very possible that there would have been no change in the audiences'
interpretation of events very much at all. The need for self-justification is strong enough that
people tend to see what they want to see and generate their own truths through selective
attention. Editing was simply easier to do when earlier technology provided a critical delay
between the acts of war and the reports of these actions; nevertheless, self-justification is so
necessary when attempting to comprehend the absurdities of war that technological
considerations become secondary to the problem of cognitive dissonance.

The push for self-justification in something as serious as wartime killing is a reaction
against the dissonance faced when presented with ideas not consistent with one's
understanding of self. The single most important task faced by generators of propaganda
during war is to eliminate this inconsistency. At the onset of World War II, and throughout the
war, American propaganda reinforced the notion of the self as good; to be American was to
be strong, loyal, free, and brave. The only justifiable reason for this ideal American to kill
another person would be if that person deserved it by being an enemy to America and its ideas. The enemy character embodied wholly negative traits: cowardice, weakness, automatism. The supposed evil of the enemy soldier dehumanized him, and because he was, therefore, a subhuman pest, it was acceptable to destroy him. This rationalization of killing the enemy was fuelled by images which depicted the enemy as subhuman, and strengthened the Us/Them dynamic necessary to justify actions taken against the enemy's military, and later, civilians.

Animation offers a greater range of possibilities in the production of propaganda pieces by allowing absolute control over image production, including that of the personified evil represented by the enemy. Unlike live action film, which had to be directed or edited to create a desired representation of the war, animation constructed images which were fully consistent with wartime themes. Animators could then effectively create any image they pleased, and were not bound by the same mimetic limitations that applied to live-action filming. Because animated images are constructed, and because the animated medium operated within a different continuum of representation, greater liberties could be taken with the formation of contrasting wartime images, including the creation of a wider cleavage between images of the self and of the enemy maintained through caricature and cartoon storytelling. The elasticity of abstract image production was used to emphasize the self-justification of American heroism through the pictorial dehumanization of the enemy. In effect, the animation of the wartime years most clearly illustrates the mythology of the American self by defining the parameters of graphic image construction, indirectly documenting the tenets of American homefront psychology. What the cartoons reveal is how the threat of war materialize graphically in animated material, and how the interpretation of the self and of the enemy influenced the design of animated short films.

The production of cartoons containing propaganda material correlates neatly with the
U.S. involvement in the Second World War. Prior to the 1941 attack on Pearl Harbour, little political material was included in animated films; there is almost no aggressive statement about the war, and arguably, there is no clear definition of the enemy. Hitler is mentioned, as is Mussolini, but neither is treated as a direct threat to Americans, per se. U.S. isolationism is felt through the noticeable absence of material referring to the military events unfolding in Europe and eastern Asia. However, following the U.S. decision to mobilize, Hollywood cartoon studios, assisted by funding from the American government, began their mission to produce cartoons that would inform the nation on the major wartime themes. In a memo to the Disney studios, the Office of War Information defined these core themes as (1) The Nature of the Enemy, (2) The Nature of the Allies, (3) The Need to Work, (4) The Need to Fight, (5) the Need to Sacrifice, (6) The Americans (Bird and Rubenstein 32-36). What these themes have in common are the objectives of reinforcing an American identity against the "nature of the enemy" and creating a sense of wholeness among Americans. These goals were pursued with urgency, as the government needed everyone behaving in a uniform way in the interest of national security. Wartime hardship was consequently portrayed as a collective experience and a patriotic duty; however, to propagate this message and convince the American viewers to adopt the new slogans of the war to replace their traditionally individualistic self-image, the government had to perform some ideological rewiring. The nation had to learn to see itself as a collective, not a large group of individuals. As a result, propaganda cartoons accentuated the American in-group identity as defined by collective effort; not doing one's part to subscribe to the desires of this in-group (wasting resources, being indiscreet with potentially sensitive information, not working to one's fullest abilities at an industrial job, or participating in other unacceptable behaviours) was equated with treason; the cliche "if you're not part of the solution, you're part of the problem," was essentially the central theme of American homefront propaganda.
Another possible reason for the sudden move towards total integration in the United States (bearing in mind that the war occurred before the Civil Rights movement and the end of segregation in some states) was simply the strain of war upon the country. One theory related to identity formation which Allport proposes in *The Nature of Prejudice* is the notion of strengthened in-group relations and out-group definitions in times of stress:

Heterogeneity and the urge toward upward mobility thus make for ferment in society, and are likely to bring ethnic prejudice in their wake. But the process seems to be speeded up in times of crisis. As the Roman empire crumbled the Christians were more frequently fed to the lions. During the period of war strain in America, race riots markedly increased (especially in the year 1943). Whenever the cotton business in the South has slumped, the number of lynching has appreciably increased. One investigator writes, "Throughout the history of the United States there seems to have been a direct correlation between the peaks of nativist spirit and the valleys of exceptional economic difficulty." (Allport 219)

Allport's suggestion of stress-induced nationalism applies to the emotional environment that war creates; citizens were already receptive to the notions of in-group and out-group relations, and as prejudice is frequently a by-product of social pressure or discord, it is particularly useful to examine in-group/out-group creation and interaction in wartime.

The objectives of propaganda went in two different but related directions. First, it had to reinforce in-group identification and create a "self" out of the heterogeneous American population. The identification of outsiders was prerequisite to the development of a national identity; the enemy had to be found and subsequently scapegoated:

The laboratory experiments [conducted by Miller and Bugelski (1948) and Rogers and Prentice-Dunn (1981)] help to clarify factors that seem to exist in
the real world. The general picture of scapegoating that emerges is that individuals tend to displace aggression onto groups that are disliked, that are visible, and that are relatively powerless. Moreover, the form the aggression takes depends on what is allowed or approved of by the ingroup in question: in society, lynchings of blacks and pogroms against Jews are not frequent occurrences, unless they are deemed appropriate by the dominant culture or subculture. (Aronson 319)

Cartoon art is but one example of how a culture represents these relationships; there were, of course, other graphic media used for propaganda pieces—printed (posters), motion picture, etc. However, cartoon art was the only medium capable of reinterpreting events and ideas as simple, easily digested, iconic images. A central feature of the cartoon propaganda aesthetic within the animated film was the ability to oversimplify representations through abstraction; as a result, identities in cartoons could be created using only a limited set of traits which were then exaggerated. Out-groups and In-groups were constructed in opposition to each other; in the construction of cartoon narratives, the enemy foreigner was created symmetrically to the American self. The result is a clear, uncomplicated comparison between good and evil, self and other, hero and villain, which reflects the cognitive dichotomy Americans were encouraged to make themselves during the war. The binary Us/Them foundation is standard in most animated shorts to a lesser degree (good guy versus bad guy, predator versus prey), and audiences were familiar with this formula; subsequently, the substitution of cartoon villains with political ones did little to disturb the traditional two-component setup. By eliminating the complexities of individualism, the artist creates a simple symmetrical comparison meant to emphasize difference and allow Americans to believe that God was on their side as they fought the "Good War."

Besides the technical and aesthetic advantages that animated cartoons had over other
graphic media, there was also the reputation of the medium itself. The fact that animated short film was considered children's fare made it an innocuous carrier of messages; herein lay its great appeal as a propaganda tool. Animated cartoons were "perceived as harmless because of its association with children's entertainment and whimsical and comic subjects, [it] came to be used, in the military theatre, as one of the central vehicles of wartime propaganda in order to make that propaganda seem as benign as possible." (Smoodin 72) The U.S. government refused to label their product "propaganda"; theirs was merely a "public service message," educational pieces that were to be consumed by the public for their own good.

To diffuse any doubt that the viewers had about the process of the mass education project, the government associated itself closely with Hollywood studios. The reputation of Hollywood productions as entertainment pieces, and particularly of cartoons as children's entertainment, served as positive reinforcement for wartime messages, but more important, they acted as a cover for propaganda pieces.

The military also sought the service of animators as its own great mass instruction project began in the United States; millions of soldiers and civilians had to be prepared for war, and part of this process was to watch animated films explaining their new occupation and its related hazards. Shamus Culhane, an animator for the Lantz studios at the onset of the war, recalls the motivation behind wartime cartoon production:

"The upper level brass, in all branches [of the U.S. military], firmly rejected the idea that visual aids in the form of slides and films could play an important role in the conversion of civilians into fighting men...The uses and maintenance of new and intricate weapons and equipment presented an awesome problem. The nation was faced with the need to convert hundreds of thousands of civilians into military specialists. Not only was it imperative to teach but the lessons would have to be learned quickly."
It was the biggest problem of mass education ever attempted, and from a standing start. Most of this heavy responsibility fell on the movie industry.

(Culhane 267-268)

Forty years before computer animation, conventional cel animation was the only medium that could break down complicated actions into stages or examine an action or object from different angles and dimensions (cross-section or side cut-away view). More important, however, was the symbiotic relationship that evolved with the production of these early commissioned films. Culhane notes that animation had not been considered to be a useful pedagogical tool until the mass education emergency of World War II. Their effectiveness in basic military instruction led to their use in more ambitious projects, and solidified the commercial partnership between the studios and government.

Following its success as moving manuals for military weaponry, animation began to appear in other, larger military films. The military soon began to explore the possibility of using animated films to change behaviours; after the success of Flat-Hatting, an earlier air force cartoon designed to show military pilots the danger of doing stunts in planes, the U.S. army realized the value of the cartoon as a behaviour-modifying medium, and that “there were many subjects that proved to be more effective in cartoon form than they would have been in live-action” (Culhane 269). Warner Bros. was commissioned by the U.S. military to produce the series Private Snafu and Hook for the U.S. Army and Navy, respectively. The purpose of these films was to eliminate insubordination in the military by showing a basic cause-effect correlation between disobedience and disaster; in particular, certain troublesome people or personalities were to be weeded out and modified:

In any group of men there is always some loudmouth who scoffs at authority, has his own unorthodox way of doing things, and often has enough charisma to attract a following. Frank Tashlin, directing at Warner Bros., made the first
cartoon that caricatured this kind of personality, *Private Snafu*, the guy who fouled up everything. (Culhane 269)

To the military, this type of renegade personality was dangerous and corrupted the ordered structure of the units. There was an imposed system of ranks and commands, and an important part of being a soldier was knowing where one's place was within this system. However, many men in the military, especially those in the lowest ranks who were constantly told what to do by their superiors, became resentful and occasionally lashed out—sometimes in ways that could put entire units in danger. The last thing these men needed was a pedantic film telling them what to do; it became a necessity to educate these men without offending them with more blatant orders to follow.

Besides the problem of insubordination, there was also the challenge of encouraging men of the same rank to cooperate with each other. The American army had divisions among its own soldiers which were based on racial, economical, and regional prejudice. Allport reports that racism against African-Americans and Jewish-Americans was still extremely common, and that discrimination actually worsened during the war due to stress (particularly against African-Americans, who were, like other minority group in the U.S. military, still fighting in segregated units; a poll taken in 1943 among white soldiers revealed that eighty-four percent opposed integration in the military [Smoodin 78]). Just as the civilian public in America had to be brought together into a homogenous self-unit, the military had to achieve at least the illusion of unity, and this required "another kind of film bill, made for a specific audience, [which] worked to create more overtly a sense of ideological wholeness" (Smoodin 71). *Private Snafu*, and his less famous Navy counterpart, *Hook*, seemed to be the answer.

The use of the animated cartoon as a method of conditioning troops to elicit a certain kind of behaviour signified an odd blending of art and social psychology; furthermore, it reveals the presuppositions that the government had about the military audiences of their
propaganda cartoons. These assumptions about the mass audience are projected in the form of cartoons such as *Private Snafu*, and suggest that the government and/or producers believed that the best way to reach recruits was to speak to them as youngsters, as those who might best understand the war through a medium that, while not yet associated solely with children, was certainly believed to be ideally suited to their intellectual level (Smoodin 72). The parallel between cartoons intended for consumption by a child audience and those destined for the soldiers is particularly noticeable in the writing. Besides having only simple, linear narratives, the cartoons are presented in rhymes *a la* Dr. Seuss, thanks to the participation of Ted Geisel, whose political cartoons have since been overshadowed by his *Cat in the Hat* fame. The use of giddy rhymes and childish storylines (for example, the Technical Fairy gag in "Snafuperman") suggest that the military generally considered the troops to be the intellectual equivalents of children, and not particularly bright children, either.

A similar movement is seen in cartoons produced for public consumption on the homefront. Often cartoons employ nursery-rhymish melodies and storybook characters to convey messages; again, the purpose was to restrict symbolism to the most simple images. "Fifth Column Mouse," for example, features the familiar conflict between cat and mouse; the story evolves around one traitorous rodent—the Fifth Column—who convinces the other mice to appease the cat by feeding and pampering it. The Fifth Column referred to a group of American citizens (especially those of a Japanese, German, or Italian cultural background) who reputedly undermined national security by giving sensitive information directly to the enemy; the Fifth Column is largely fictional, and rare "official" reports of spying that were investigated are highly questionable. Nevertheless, the Fifth Column remained a symbolic threat to what America stood for, and any effort, such as appeasement, which was not directly useful to the active defense of the nation was potentially an act of the Fifth Column. "Fifth Column Mouse" attempts to make this message apparent through a musical cartoon.
comprised of short, repetitive tunes and cute, Disneyesque characters. Far from being a funny cartoon, "Fifth Column Mouse" is basically a call to arms, an order to Americans to do their part or be considered a traitor. Besides being an extended commercial for war bonds, "Mouse" also identifies the external enemy to the audience; the aforementioned cat, who is the only enemy introduced in this cartoon, is not given any consistent Axis identification, but there are scenes in which the cat is given stereotypically Japanese characteristics. The use of these images in a cartoon with storybook features reflects an assumption that these are the only images middle Americans could be counted on to know; furthermore, the cat-and-mouse story is childish and almost condescending in its cause-effect simplicity, but at the same time its ubiquity makes it the perfect medium for ensuring that a message will be understood by audiences as there is no opportunity for misinterpretation.

Besides representing the American self and its moral intentions, the cartoons also created images of the enemy which reflected--and projected--fears the nation already had against the un-American foreigner. The Axis powers are all represented in the wartime cartoons; however, their representation is equal in neither quality nor quantity. Simply, the Japanese were most commonly represented and most grossly caricatured; although race was a central factor, it was not the only factor, and to assume that this representation was purely a matter of race without examining the homefront politics would be premature. First, the location of the studios in Hollywood, California was in the centre of a hotbed of anti-Japanese sentiment. Japanese-Americans were in the process of being relocated in the early-1940's as a result of a decision made by the government to protect the nation against what they thought was a Fifth Column threat against national safety. This assumption was entirely misguided and likely dishonest as there was confiscation of property involved, but it may also have been politically motivated. Most Americans believed that the Japanese were plotting to attack the continental U.S. at any time, and the government played upon this paranoia to keep
Americans on guard at all times. This meant nurturing the negative feelings that many Americans, particularly on the west coast, had against the threat of Japanese invasion, and constructing new associations between the enemy group and all kinds of perceived evil.

Another explanation of the frequency and severity of anti-Japanese themes in popular media is the fact that misgivings against Japanese-Americans existed long before the war began. Segments of the American population saw immigration from Japan in the early 1900s as an economic and/or political threat to the American population; this assumption precipitated enduring stereotypes about the Japanese, and these stereotypes became the basis for wartime propaganda:

The radical split between self and "other" helps to uphold a racial fantasy discernable in both Japanese and American contexts, the fantasy that dramatizes the impossible desire for a pure, undifferentiated origin. The racial "other" as stereotype emerges as both the grounds for anxiety and the source of its relief. As an image, arrested and controlled, it serves as an inverted mirror of identity. In racial terms, the "other" defines the purity of one's own lineage. (Renov, in Nornes and Yukio 99)

Individuals of Japanese ancestry were more identifiable racially because they looked different. The visibility of "Japanese" features made the group more vulnerable to prejudiced attack before the war, and especially after U.S. involvement commenced and anti-Japanese sentiments intensified.

The strengthening of anti-Japanese stereotypes presented a particular problem of representation for the popular media. The simplification of Japanese identity to a minimal set of physical characteristics resulted in a convenient stock villain, but the government was concerned that racially similar groups allied to the U.S. cause, such as the Chinese and Filipino populations, would be misidentified with the Japanese stereotype. To ensure that
racism was not "misdirected" at other groups, the conspicuous inclusion of Japanese iconic images, such as the Rising Sun, stood for the "bad otherness" of the Japanese. An extreme example of anti-Japanese propaganda in a popular cartoon can be observed in the animated short "Bugs Bunny Nips the Nips," wherein Bugs refers to Japanese soldiers with monikers like "slant-eyes" and "monkey-face," and everywhere Rising Sun flags fly over a razed tropical island. Racial groups considered friendly to the American cause were represented in the popular media as similar, or less othered as in the U.S. military pamphlet "Speaking of Pictures," in which the "good" Chinese individual is differentiated from the "malignant" Japanese person. As an attempt to enlighten troops in distinguishing their Asian friend from their foes, the pamphlet compares illustrations describing the identifying characteristics of each. Skin tone, for example, is likened to bronze in the Chinese but is described as lemon-toned in the Japanese (Nornes and Yukio 107); the pamphlet emphasizes the reliability of skin tone as a racial determiner and uses it to categorize individuals further to identify nationalities, or allies and opponents. The pseudoscientific application of skin tone reveal a movement towards an association between formerly othered groups and Americans. The attribution of positive, self-like qualities to specific foreign groups indicates a movement towards an "acceptable otherness" characterized by its similarity to the American self-identity.

The creation of radical otherness through popular entertainment media was sparked by political insecurity and the end of U.S. isolationist policy in World War II. However, the design and perpetuation of the enemy identity, and subsequent dichotomization of self and other, was a psychological exercise as much as it was a political one. The American nation and its self-identification was in a defensive position against what it saw as an external threat; a psychological exoskeleton suddenly emerged, but only when it appeared threatened by the outside. The popular cartoon as a medium of graphic wartime entertainment serves as faithful documentation of a nation's self-identification tempered in conflict, and captures the stages of
change in homefront psychology from neutrality to active involvement.
Almost as long as there has been war, there has been propaganda depicting the struggle between groups as a struggle between good and evil or heroes and villains. The graphic media used to illustrate the differences between Self and Other in times of conflict has changed over the centuries with the introduction of new techniques and technology, but there remains a constant in the imagery. A ubiquitous characteristic of wartime propaganda is the representation of Self and Other as an absolute binary, with Self represented as positive (brave, honest, good) and the Other as negative (cowardly, scheming, evil); all aesthetic differences aside, each group's propagandistic self-portrait in relation to an enemy group shares an identical set of values. The fact that each side of a conflict claims to be purely good problematizes the ideal of goodness as an essential quality; more important, the presence of parallel construction as a universal feature of propaganda explodes notions of self-other differentiation.

While the construction of the enemy image seems to represent an external threat to the boundaries of self, it is actually more important to recognize the significance of the enemy as an externalization of self-defining value judgements during the process of self-formation. The qualities which are incorporated into the creation of the enemy Other are produced in symmetry to the qualities of self; in this way, the enemy image is a conglomerate of traits that the self rejects. These unacceptable aspects of self, what Jung refers to as the "Shadow," are then projected into the enemy, who becomes the signifier of what are perceived as evil traits; the abstract constellation of negative characteristics is then converted into a concrete visual representation, and the manufactured image is then replicated in various media, including visual media.

The graphic form attempts to transmit the expression of fundamental "enemy" traits
produced in the process of self-construction within the nation in-group, and it is reasonable to assume that (1) the images of self and other presented in visual media would be constructed in opposition to each other, (2) these images are to be captured in emotive imagery rather than symbols, and (3) these images of the enemy would be readily understood by the masses, whose own process of self-construction as a nation during wartime made them especially receptive to such imagery. Wartime propaganda allows the transmission of imagery that is representative of people's understanding of themselves in relation to the Other they create or mythologize during times of conflict. (Recall Allport's assumption that prejudice is created out of direct conflict between groups). Consequently, propaganda is not a device for absolute brainwashing; it instead serves as a method of converting the images of the collective unconscious into an external, concrete form which is then transmitted back to the mass audience creating them. The mass audience receives and recognizes such images, and the process of externalizing Otherness reinforces the separation that is imposed between what is within self-identity and what is without it. In other words, taking an abstract idea of otherness constructed in parallel to self-identity and representing it as a "real" entity strengthens the false boundary between what is inside or outside the accepted in-group ideal; one is able to see the enemy as tangible and concrete, rather than as a product of the self.

In discussing the creation of the enemy, it is important to recognize the process of creating Otherness as an essentially narcissistic exercise. The Other is created out of Self; it is constructed out of self-projection. It is, therefore, contradictory to this understanding to set a boundary between the images of self and other; both sets of images originate in the self and are self-images:

*With the Freudian notion of the unconscious the involution of the strange in the psyche loses its pathological aspect and integrates within the assumed unity of human beings an *otherness* that is both biological *and* symbolic and becomes*
an integral part of the same. Henceforth the foreigner is neither a race nor a
nation. The foreigner is neither glorified as a secret volksgeist nor banished as
disruptive of rationalist urbanity. Uncanny, foreignness is within us; we are our
own foreigners, we are divided. (Kristeva 181)

The ego-ideal, or ideal self, is the psychic product of identity construction, and is the way that
people unconsciously choose to see themselves; in the case of wartime conflict, nationalism
represents a collective of self-ideals within a national in-group. However, the enemy other
could be considered the "evil twin" or dark half of the self-image which becomes a receptacle
for traits that the self wishes to reject; consequently, the enemy becomes an externalization of
self-hatred. The separation of self and other is achieved through comparison rather than
absolute differences; as Baudrillard notes,

Starting with modernity, we have entered an era of production of the Other. It
is no longer a question of killing, of devouring or seducing the Other, of facing
him, of competing with him, of loving or hating the Other. It is first of all a
matter of producing the Other. The Other is no longer an object of passion but
an object of production...otherness is lacking and, since we cannot experience
other as destiny, one must produce the other as difference. ("Plastic Surgery
for the Other," Ctheory.net)

The other is postured as an external, but its origin is as an extension of the self. As the
creation of otherness is a performance of self projected onto an object, there can be no real
distinction between what the conscious understands as self and other.

The realization of symmetry in self and other is also consistent with Jung's archetype
type which defines the Shadow, or negative side of self, as a consequence of unconscious
projection. Jung emphasizes that the production of the Shadow is an unconscious action that
cannot become consciously realized "without considerable moral effort...[and] recognizing the
dark aspects of the personality as present and real" (8). Because of the illusory barriers imposed by the ego in defining self-identity, the Shadow appears on a conscious level to be fully autonomous from the self when it is actually a sub-category of self-construct.

The Shadow and its counterpart, the ego-ideal, constitute a psychic totality (Grenzbegriff) or wholeness of self. One is always complementary to the other, and neither can be eliminated. The Other is, therefore, never wholly independent from self; one may draw an illusory distinction between the two, but this division cannot exist because the two concepts are conjoined in their creation. Liliane Frey-Rohn describes the total personality as "both thesis and antithesis. The personal shadow is therefore always complementary to the ego and represents all those personal characteristics that the conscious personality does not wish to acknowledge" (170, Rohn's italics). Consequently, the comparison of self to other is fallacious; however, the invention of a boundary within self-identity between the idealized self and the Shadow, and the way that this division is represented in external (in the case of propaganda, visual) cues is itself telling. There are striking similarities among the graphics of various nationalist propaganda which support Jung's hypothesis regarding the existence of a collective unconscious by displaying similar images to convey notions of heroism and villainy. Moreover, the qualities or emotions which these images evoke are also very similar; propagandist materials that depict patriotic sentiments during the Second World War, for example, develop the same contrast between self and other, good and evil, regardless of the nation of origin. In a comparison of these images, the definition of these terms--such as self/other--become increasingly blurred and indistinct. Furthermore, problematic philosophical issues arise out of this lack of difference as well, most notably the existence of good and evil as essential qualities. All these problems are related, directly or indirectly, to the central question of the Other.

If propaganda is the presentation of projected self-interests to be reflected back to the
self, then it serves a narcissistic function; the self seduces itself with its own set of images, and uses these visual cues to separate the Shadow from itself, to make it visible so that it may then consume it to reinforce its ego-ideal. In producing and consuming the enemy through graphics, the mass audience participates in a perverse cannibalism of its self-identity. The in-group dominates the entire process of image-formation, and becomes producer and consumer simultaneously, subject and object. However, in the production equation, which is fully controlled by self, where does the Other fit in? Baudrillard assumes that it cannot, and describes the Other as a constantly elusive "strange attractor":

In the end, all figures of otherness boil down to just one: that of the Object. In the end, all that is left is the inexorability of the Object, the irredeemability of the Object.

Even at the outer frontiers of science the Object appears ever more ungraspable: it remains internally indivisible and hence unanalysable, infinitely versatile, reversible, ironic, and contemptuous of all attempts to manipulate it. The subject tries desperately to follow it, even at the cost of abandoning rationality. The object is an insoluble enigma, because it is not itself and does not know itself. It resembles Chesterton's savage, whom one could not understand for the same reason that he could not understand himself. It thus constitutes an obstacle to all understanding. The Object's power and sovereignty derive from the fact that it is estranged from itself, whereas for us the exact opposite is true. Civilization's first gesture is to hold up the mirror to the Object, but the Object is only seemingly reflected therein; in fact it is the Object itself which is the mirror, and it is here the subject is taken in by the illusion of himself. (172-173)

Baudrillard rationalizes that there exists an absolute Other embodied in what he refers to as
"total eccentricity," but even this must be invented to some degree through self-comparison; total eccentricity or somewhat less eccentric behaviour are on the same scale of value which one measures against self-definition. Perhaps the search for the Other is not in "the alternative path [leading] to an exponential defined elsewhere," but in the process of self-identification itself. The systematic production-consumption loop of propaganda and the mass audience works to create an external representation of the Other for the purpose of reinforcing certain features of selfhood. In the case of wartime propaganda, the enemy is mythologized to strengthen ties between members of the in-group by contrasting the group body against idealized self-identity; this in-group mass collectively constructs the enemy by projecting a collective Shadow onto an outside group. Propaganda is a physical trace of the shift in group identity and the collective allegiance of a nation against the engineered villainy of the enemy identity.

In manufacturing a specific image of the enemy, the Shadow becomes an integral factor in the production of the other. The traits of the Shadow are immediately transposed onto the "real", external threat of military invasion; just as the Shadow is produced in self-identity construction at the individual level, the notion of the enemy as holistic and real occurs as the nation prepares itself psychologically for war. The mobilization of ideas in the form of propagandist materials divides the self-ideal and the enemy-Shadow into a strictly polarized self-other relationship; the result is a mythologized binary between insiders (those in the national in-group) and outsiders (those who are not members of the in-group and are, therefore, enemies):

The basic distinction between insiders and outsiders is parleyed into a paranoid ethic and metaphysic in which reality is seen as a morality play, a conflict between the tribes versus the enemy, Good versus Evil, the Sacred versus the profane.

(Keen 18)
This dualism is exploited in propaganda which is designed to accentuate the distinction, or widen the gap, between the self-identity of the nation and the identity it creates for its opponents.

The notion of a collective Shadow is contingent upon the definition of a holistic national identity, or self. What propaganda magnifies is a sense of selfhood among various groups and an association of these groups under a single umbrella-set of characteristics. These traits constitute an ego-ideal at the massive level, and reconfigures the nation in-group to include everyone within a certain "moral" boundary. The primary difference between the individual Shadow and the collective Shadow is the latter's perceived autonomy; whereas the individual Shadow is largely an unconscious entity which is only recognized externally under specific controlled conditions (as in psychotherapy, or introspection) or in cases of multiple personality disorder, the collective Shadow is represented as tangible and mutually exclusive from the ego-ideal of the in-group:

Insofar as individuals within a group or nation become identical with the prevailing cultural consciousness, they too partake of the collective Shadow. It takes considerable individual consciousness to escape from such an identification, so that our individual shadow qualities, and the collective Shadow of our culture and time, inevitably become intermingled. (Sanford 60)

In effect, the nation becomes afflicted with multiple personality disorder or what was once termed schizophrenia (split-mind); a new, distinct identity is simultaneously created by and separated from self. This evil half of self is created symmetrically to the ego-ideal and is projected outside the self onto a real group of people whose true attributes are masked by this self-projection; the subsequent hate which is directed at the outside group is actually an expression of unconscious self-hatred.

The position of the enemy as self-projection becomes less paradoxical after
considering the potency of cognitive dissonance. One needs an external signifier for evil to generate a necessity for the morally questionable behaviour that one participates in; this is known as self-justification. According to Jung's understanding of self-identification, the human psyche can be roughly schematized as a system of balances; identity construction works within this system of balances, and is always proportional. For instance, when one commits a violent act against another individual, the ego understands that the victim must have deserved it in some way; by shifting blame onto the victim, one is justified in committing violence. The self must create an Other which is threatening enough to require it to act in a manner which is dissonant to how self is constructed. This is also true in cases where entire nations are in conflict; the Other (enemy) must be represented as an immediate threat to the security of the self (nation) and as morally inferior to the in-group in order to justify violent actions against it. Consequently, the first step in creating consent within a nation for collateral damage against the enemy is the invention of a real external threat. The collective shadow is distanced from the ego-ideal (idealized self) through its association with the opposing group; through this division, the two halves of self-identity can be presented as mutually exclusive entities. However, in establishing this differentiation, one also divides the self and the collective self/consciousness splits into projected independent parts.

The qualities of the Shadow and ego-ideal are illustrated through the use of visual cues; in both animated and printed cartoon media, these cues are evident in character design. The two contrasting identifications are constructed symmetrically as well; characters are designed according to their identity as either friend or foe, and this effect is achieved through the use of emotive cues. One such signal is the apparent neoteny of heroic characters; neoteny refers to the tendency of higher organisms to assume or maintain a "youthful" or "cute" appearance as an evolutionary strategy. Stephen Jay Gould notes that Mickey Mouse is an example of neoteny in animated characters because his design has evolved through the
decades into a more babyish form; arguably, neoteny serves as a signifier for positive traits associated with youth, such as innocence, gentleness, and trust. In cartoons, the effect of neoteny is achieved through large heads and big eyes, and the conspicuous absence of most adult features and proportions; Bugs Bunny, for example, is an "adult" character, but his design reflects certain immature features, most notably his disproportionally sized cranium and eyes. Bugs also displays the typical sexlessness of cartoon heroes; Bugs is male, but he does not possess any obvious secondary sexual characteristics, and the frequent cross-dressing he engages in further complicates the establishment of gender. Cartoonists regularly turn to the same established sets of visual feature to signify the identity of a character and create sympathy for, or aversion to, what is otherwise just a set of lifeless drawings.

The construction and reabsorption of propaganda by an in-group mass complicates the establishment of Otherness, but this, in turn, problematizes the notion of self by challenging the assumption of self as a contained unit. If the process of creating propaganda is dominated by the self, there are no boundaries within it for self-definition other than the fictional divisions between self and other, which are themselves established by self. The identity of the outside group onto which Shadow traits is assimilated by the in-group through its label "enemy"; the in-group appropriates the enemy group by disregarding the group's self-identity and instead imposing its own dominating definition of the group. Paradoxically, by making the outside group seem as different from the ego-ideal as possible, the in-group actually forces itself onto the outside group by pushing its self-projected terms to create the enemy. The insistence of the outside group's Otherness makes the group "consumable" by the in-group as a self-reflecting image. This approach-avoidance movement between the groups is very much an unconscious movement; nevertheless, the fact that it is not motivated by conscious desire but by an unconscious drive reveals that the deeper mechanics of identity construction are behind it.
Although the drives behind the representation of identities are unconscious, the motivation and consequences of manufacturing propaganda are realized consciously; it would be financially unwise to base a multi-billion-dollar industry on unscientific, unconscious "hunches." It is necessary, therefore, to assert that the movement during World War II for increased "mass education" materials was orchestrated by individuals who understood human psychology well enough to design materials that would evoke an appropriate response in the mass audience. If one recalls that the Second World War fell within the decade in which psychology was moving from psychoanalysis to behaviourism, it would seem that propaganda resulted from the application of behaviourist ideas to the production of visual media; the propaganda industry could be seen as a large-scale conditioning experiment. Like all propaganda that preceded it, World War II propaganda was produced to elicit a specific emotional response from the audience; the fundamental difference was the introduction of mass production into the equation. The World War II homefront was the scene of the mass marketing of identity; mass education was hybridized with advertising, as smiling poster people sold an image of American economic domination and popular cartoon characters peddled war bonds in dozens of animated trailers commissioned by the Department of Defence in the early 1940s. Consumerism was espoused with a sense of patriotic duty, and this was evident in the capitalist interests that entered propaganda production:

[Wartime] posters also served to help reconstruct a positive image of business and American capitalism that had been badly shaken during the 1930s. The Depression had caused many to question large corporations' ability to lead in matters of economic and social policy. Through aggressive advertising campaigns, public-relations specialists turned this image around during the war. By arguing the superiority of American industrial might over the enemy, and pointing out how eagerly companies rose to the national emergency, these
campaigns began to restore the reputation of corporations. Business critics recognized the value of these public relations campaigns. (Bird and Rubenstein 88)

The cliche of war being good for business applied equally well to the business of advertising. Identity construction was reinforced through propaganda and subsequently used to sell in-group America to itself. Images used in wartime advertising played on the same emotional impulses of pride, hatred, and fear as conventional propaganda; however, the ads attached self-identity values to the production of goods. Propaganda represented American identity as a product to be consumed as a matter of duty; American progress through manufacturing became a key element in WWII imagery, and government pushed the theme of patriotic duty through industry. Propaganda attached patriotism and victory to production and buying power; the association of patriotism and consumerism is evident in the bond advertisements released during the war as animated trailers. In their commissioned productions, Hollywood studios presented animated shorts to associate government bonds with recognizable icons; the Warner Bros. release "Any Bonds Today?" is typical of the cartoon bond advertisement. "Any Bonds Today?" has no discernable plot development because it is in fact an extended commercial; basically, Bugs Bunny sings, dances, and does impressions as part of an animated stand-up act to sell bonds to sell bonds. Again, there is a strong tendency to commodify patriotism, but more interestingly, the cartoon illustrates how the marketability of Hollywood cartoons was an asset to the government in the sale of war bonds.

A consequence of the pairing of business and self-identification was the use of commercial images to sell the war to mass audiences. When recognizable marketing icons, such as cartoon characters and Hollywood actors became associated with American wartime values through government productions (e.g. bond ads), the reinforcement of idealized self-identification was achieved through graphic representation. As products of the American
psyche, these commercial images were reflections of American selfhood made external; during the war, government propaganda depicting homefront values contrasts the images of the enemy that were proliferated in propaganda pieces. The dissemination of American self-portraiture in the medium of advertisements complemented the Otherness of the enemy, thus maintaining psychic equipoise.

The need for balance in the human psyche is analogous to an organism's need for homeostasis; the relationship between the self and the other, and the conscious and the unconscious, complement each other in perfect proportion. Any failure or imbalance in this system presents a serious set of psychological symptoms, such as neurosis. Consequently, any changes in the proportions must be justified to oneself, through means such as projection or the externalization of unconscious motivations, and ultimately, a sense of equilibrium must be restored. However, the individual struggle for psychic balance can sometimes become manifest in political practices affecting a larger population. War, for instance, can be seen as a large-scale example of psychic rearrangement and conflict; the unconscious, projected into the enemy, becomes inordinately powerful, and this imbalance results in a conscious struggle against one's own projection:

The unconscious is prodigiously strengthened by this reflux of libido, and, through its archaic collective contents, begins to exercise a powerful influence on the conscious mind. The period of the Enlightenment closed, as we know, with the horrors of the French Revolution. And at the present time [1916], too, we are once more experiencing this uprising of the unconscious destructive forces of the collective psyche. The result has been mass-murder on an unparalleled scale. (Jung 94)

The unconscious is perceived as a real antagonistic force, and consequently, a conscious struggle materializes between conscious and unconscious self-images; the Shadow acquires a
new dimension in its projection upon an actual group of outsiders. As an archetype, the Shadow assumes a certain independence from the self in its "real" form of the enemy, and it is precisely this alteration which creates psychic tension:

On account of their affinity with physical phenomena, the archetypes usually appear in projection; and, because projections are unconscious, they appear on persons in the immediate environment, mostly in the form of abnormal over- or under-evaluations which provoke misunderstandings, quarrels, fanaticisms, and follies of every description.... In this way, too, there grow up modern myth-formations, i.e., fantastic rumours, suspicions, prejudices. (Jung 95)

Conflict emerges as the catalyst for the mythologization of both self and other as discrete categories; in turn, the labels of self-ideal and enemy are fed back into propaganda production to galvanize the definitions imposed by self/in-group. The scapegoating of an other as enemy often is a simple matter of proximity, but is always self-serving, a means towards and end:

[When somebody projects the devil upon his neighbour, he does so because this person has something about him which makes the attachment of such an image possible. But this is not to say that the man is on that account a devil; on the contrary, he may be a particularly good fellow, but antipathetic to the maker of the projection, so that a "devilish" (i.e., dividing) effect rises between them. Nor need the projector necessarily be a devil, although he has to recognize that he has something just as devilish in himself, and has only stumbled upon it by projecting it. But that does not make him a devil; indeed he may be just as decent as the other man. The appearance of the devil in such a case simply means that the two people are at present incompatible: for which reason the unconscious forces them apart and keeps them away from each other. The devil is a variant of the "shadow" archetype, i.e., of the
dangerous aspect of the unrecognized dark half of the personality. (Jung 96)

By projecting the shadow onto the political enemy (who presents a real threat to one's in-group politically or economically), the Other is reinvented as a direct danger to the autonomy of the self. Subsequently, what begins as a competition for limited resources is reconfigured as a struggle for self-identification; this association is played out in imagery which exemplifies the separation of Other from Self.

The self and the enemy as equal and opposite forces is graphically represented in the production of propaganda; the purpose of propagandist material is to connect the more pragmatic material goals of war to the abstract concepts of good and evil. This effect is achieved through the use of simple, antithetical imagery. This is perhaps not so much a reflection of the actual intelligence of the masses as it is an indication of the impression that agencies such as the Office of Facts and Figures and the Office of War Information had regarding the general public:

It would be wonderful indeed if the psychological war could be fought on an intellectual basis, if the American people who will win or lose this war were so educated and conditioned that we could bring them understanding on the terms we all prefer. But, through no fault of ours, they unfortunately are not so educated. And in pitting the strategy of truth against the strategy of terror, we cannot stop to educate—we must win a war. We must state the truth in terms that will be understood by all levels of intelligence. Further, we must dramatize the truth. (Bell and Lewis, quoted in Bird and Rubenstein 31)

To "dramatize the truth," a visible contrast had to be clearly represented between good and evil, and for this distinction to be made, a real difference would have to be assumed to exist between the two. This meant that a real Other had to be identified, but as Jung suggested, the Shadow was merely an extension of the self, and any distinction drawn between self and
other is invented. The cleavage between self and other could only be established through unconscious self-deception; one has to believe that the Other is autonomous from the self and that it indeed exists as an independent and antagonistic entity.

The identification of the Shadow as a physically separate Other may in fact be motivated by the unconscious portion of the psyche, although the way in which it is defined by the individual, and by the collective, is a conscious function. The conscious is effectively overcome by the unconscious; the latter explodes out of a repressed state and becomes manifest in the conscious effort of other-definition, and as Jung suggests,

This is precisely what the unconscious was after. Its position had been immeasurably strengthened beforehand by the rationalism of modern life, which, by depreciating everything irrational, precipitated the function of the irrational into the unconscious. But once this function finds itself in the unconscious, it works unceasing havoc, like an incurable disease whose focus cannot be eradicated because it is invisible. Individual and nation alike are then compelled to live the irrational in their own lives, even devoting their loftiest ideals and their best wits to expressing its madness in the most perfect form. (94)

Although the process of self-definition is primarily unconscious, the unconscious inevitably affects the personality at the conscious level. The denial of what one sees as other and the repression of negative traits through the construction of the shadow as anti-self recoils to influence the conscious presentation of these ideas. In effect, the act of repression (or rationalization) and denial of the Shadow as self empowers the negative aspects of personality and gives them license over conscious expression.

What does this understanding of the relationship between conscious and unconscious aspects of personality indicate about propaganda as a visual mode of self-expression?
Assuming that the primary motivation behind self-identification is unconscious and that the conscious presentation of self-ideation is mastered by unconscious drives, it is logical to conclude that propaganda, or any external expression of self/other identification, reflects the unconscious mind. Like other forms of parapraxis, such as freudian slips, the images presented in propaganda are generated by the unconscious for the purpose of making itself recognizable at a conscious level; the images themselves, though consciously designed, are guided by unconscious drives.

What emerges out of the images of the enemy is the product of an inverse relationship: the more self tries to assert its independence from the illusory other, the more power the other exerts over self. Ultimately, the self, and its motivation, is governed increasingly by the unconscious psychic element; meanwhile, the conscious attempts to represent the unconscious Other/Shadow as a separate, discrete entity through further repression achieved through the representation of other as physical and tangible. Thus, the other is a necessary accessory to self, and the need for self-definition fosters a parallel need for setting up boundaries through the transference of attributes to an outside, physical receptacle.

In psychoanalysis, transference typically occurs between a patient and psychiatrist; essentially, transference is a mode of projection wherein one's interpretation of another's personality or behaviour is tainted by the self and one's personality begins to infect one's understanding of the other person. The contamination of an object as it is understood by the self in the development of the enemy is an unavoidable consequence of transference; the saying "it takes two to tango" is an apt description for the process of group transference between conflicting groups:

Blame produces blame. Hence the paranoid person or nation will create a shared delusional system, a paranoia a deux. The enemy system involves a
process of two or more enemies dumping their (unconscious) psychological wastes in each other's backyards. All we despise in ourselves we attribute to them. And vice versa. Since this process of unconscious projection of the shadow is universal, enemies "need" each other to dispose of their accumulated, disowned, psychological toxins. We share a hate bond, an "adversarial symbiosis," an integrated system that guarantees that neither of us will be faced with our shadow. (Keen 21)

The conflict between groups which is precipitated by competition has its roots in evolutionary drives; greed, for example, is arguably one of the few natural instincts remaining in the human personality. However, at another level there is more to be seen than the battle over resources; such conflict is incorporated into self-understanding and relationships between people as individuals and as groups. Because the source of conflict eventually shifts from competitiveness to the problem of difference, and because the methods by which this conflict is realized alters accordingly from external cues to internal considerations (cognitive dissonance), with the latter being an abstract rather than a physical entity, the representation of identities absorbs external conflict as a means of expression; that is, the issues of identity become inextricably connected to the external political conflict. The result of this connection is the simplification of identities into self/other, ally/enemy divisions.

Propaganda illustrates a strict binary between self and other and enforces this division in the graphic simulation of physical difference. This is not to suggest that there are never any noticeable physical differences between groups, only that traits are exaggerated on both sides in direct opposition. Features are distorted to reflect specific ideological conflicts between groups; the self is designated as an "airtight" space characterized by positive attributes only. Likewise, the enemy is determined by its position outside this space, and the defense of the self is maintained by the vigilant rejection of Other-oriented traits. The
objective of self definition is containment; the barrier between self and other is made to seem material through the presumed impenetrability of the self. Ego issues the production of difference to defend itself from itself, or the unacceptable aspects of its own totality.

The ego rationalizes that the self is perfectly contained, and this mythologized completeness and closure of the self is understood as a unit independent from the outside. The self, both in terms of the individual and of the collective, must prevent the infection of the self with what is placed outside by the ego; the outside consists of all projections, i.e. archetypes, including that of the Shadow, which is, in turn, projected onto the opposing group. It is, therefore, fitting that the self is identified in propaganda as being somehow inoculated against outside influence; the self must constantly fight off the invasion of the outside in order to define itself, and exist as an autonomous structure.

The superhero of animated lore embodies the primordial struggle between self and other, between inside and outside; Superman, for instance, is a man of steel. Steel is renowned for its strength and inertness (as in stainless steel); in other words, it is resilient to outside forces. A comparison can be made between the man of steel and the ideology of self; the self is constructed as complete and impregnable by what is designated as other. The other may attack the membrane which envelops the self, but it cannot break through it; just as bullets are repelled by Superman's impenetrable body, the self is constructed against the invasion of the other. Continuing this analogy, the only thing which Superman cannot withstand is Kryptonite, an element which formed the chemical base of the planet Krypton, the planet of his origin. Kryptonite is a part of Superman's self; his defencelessness against it is a weakness against himself. Once again, self ultimately dominates the exchange between inside and outside.

The notion of the cartoon hero as an extension of the self can also be carried over to less conventional hero-types. The underdog is the other major character commonly
associated with the self; in the underdog one sees a likeable tenacity in fighting the enemy other despite being the disadvantaged opponent in a dispute. It takes a particular variety of courage to enter a conflict as a weaker competitor, a courage which the self appropriates in siding with the underdog; the assumption is that the underdog must be victorious in conflict. Consequently, one knows that Bugs Bunny and Daffy Duck can never lose a battle because they enter as underdogs; this position grants them a certain immunity, and like Superman, they become invincible to the outside. At times such characters achieve superhero status, sometimes with the help of unidentified chemicals, other times through sheer, ardent patriotism (Daffy Duck in "Scrap Happy Daffy" is a good example of this.) Moreover, the underdog is directly associated with Americans; this connection is apparent in cartoons such as "Super Rabbit," wherein Bugs Bunny, the indomitable underdog, achieves real superhero status when he joins the Marines. Homefront characters also participate as underdogs; the absence of characters, such as the grandmother in "Little Red Riding Rabbit" is explained by a note stating that they are working at Lockheed or a similar industrial centre; even the most unlikely characters contribute to the war effort, such as the dog statue in "Ding Dog Daddy" that is reincarnated as a missile at the end of the cartoon, much to the dismay of her canine beau. The underdog was easily appropriated by the animated cartoon, where it was subsequently paraded a representation of American personality; the underdog came to symbolize the righteous American war effort, both at home and overseas.

The use of the underdog in cartoons was a simple but effective method for transmitting messages of identity to the masses. Mass audiences readily sympathized with the cartoon heroes they knew before the war; the transposition of these characters into the battlefield did not alter the relationship between the viewers and the characters in any significant way. However, it is important to note that the audience had been altered by the experience of war, both at the front lines and at the homefront; consequently, the reception of the cartoons was
specifically designed to meet the tastes of a somewhat frustrated audience. Soldiers resting after a day of fighting and civilians forced to live with daily rations and shortages probably were not interested in regular "kiddie cartoons"; Americans wanted the cause of their hardship to be addressed. Viewing the wartime cartoon was a form of retribution delivered vicariously through the characters; audiences could witness their enemies, represented in parody or caricatures, and the subsequent destruction of evil characters brought them at least some small measure of satisfaction. The collective response of the mass audience was a confirmation of in-group solidarity as the cartoons reenacted a construction of self by rendering it visible and external.

Self is assumed by the ego to exist in a virtual vacuum devoid of outside influence, including the unconscious, which it separates itself from in the process of defining itself. During times of conflict between self and other, the ego seeks to defend itself from outside infection; in the wartime scenario this became manifest at the national level through the fear of invasion, both directly and indirectly. Although the threat of an enemy offensive was a possibility, there was a more immediate danger of covert invasion through spying. The Fifth Column was regarded as an insidious destructive element which had to be purged from the system; subversives and spies had to be identified and contained before they managed to infiltrate the self and bring the outside into the self. Xenophobia intensified under increased self-alienation; to complicate things further, all this came at a time when Americans were attempting to extend certain limits of self-identity to include formerly marginalized sectors of society, specifically African-Americans; new boundaries were being established and defended, and the categories of self and other were broadened and became increasingly holistic.

The self-other divide is most evident in the cartoon medium, which exercises a liberal scope of representation. Because the cartoon medium imposes so few limitations on the representation of themes, there is a close correlation between animated cartoons and the
unconscious machinery behind artistic production. Animated images are, in a sense, purely artificial; everything—even the simple movement of objects—is invented by the artist. In creating the illusion of life in the animated cartoon the artist exercises complete control. When this understanding is applied to the wartime cartoon, it becomes clearer how notions of identity and ideology become stabilized through the use of graphics. In animation, particularly cartoons, the extremities of artistic licence can be explored, and even the abstraction of ideas like selfhood, evil, and heroism can be fleshed in graphic form.

The power of the images used in visual propaganda lies in their ability to make the unconscious assessable to the conscious; archetypal imagery is converted into conscious stimuli, which is then reabsorbed through sensory perception. Propaganda is the conversion of the psychic into the real, and cartoons represent this process more precisely than other media because of its flexibility as an artistic medium. Cartoon images, despite their reputation as banal, disposable products of culture, are in actuality the most faithful representation of a nation's consciousness. The development of the popular animated film is a projection of otherwise inaccessible information regarding the intentions that shaped its creation as well as presuppositions about audience reception which influenced its distribution. The wartime cartoon generates a reflection of intangible understandings and processes which shaped a nation's process of re-identification; in this thorough historiography, one attains a glimpse of the American identity set in relief against the chaos of war.
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