

Poo. They enlist his aid in convincing the citizens of South Park to empty their wallets in order to sustain the town's economy. Such ironic reversal is reminiscent of Swift's "A Modest Proposal." The harsh satiric gesture involved in creating a Christmas icon from fecal matter hardly needs to be stressed, but perhaps the most ironic twist in this case is that Mr. Hankey has become a Christmas commodity in our world. As Zeidner asks, "[C]an a show really expose the inanity and hypocrisy of culture when it becomes this popular with the very types of people it sets out to mock?"

The same question could be asked of *The Simpsons* since, not only has it introduced phrases like "Don't have a cow, man," and "Cowabunga, dude" into the cultural lexicon, it has also sold countless t-shirts featuring Bart's image underneath such captions. This brings me back to my student in her Eric Cartman baseball cap because wearing such a cap or shirt, or giving Mr. Hankey dolls as stocking stuffers begs the following question: Are these gestures themselves satiric comments, or do they become part of the satiric object? In other words, does such commodification align the owner of the object with the satirist or with the satirized? Of course, both shows have satirized both our rabid consumerism as well as the Frankenstein monster that is the modern marketing machine, but that only punctuates the issue, so in closing I would like to suggest a possible approach.

In his book *The Difference Satire Makes*, Frederic V. Bogel argues against traditional theories of satire, such as the Juvenalian/Horatian taxonomy, because he claims that they do not adequately explain how satire functions and circulates in society. In effect, he argues that they evade the very kind of question I just posed. According to Bogel, this is so because traditional explications of satire make the erroneous assumption that the reader is always aligned with the satirist's critical voice against the satirized subject. Bogel calls this the "sighted repellent object, sank same" (2) approach. He further claims that these relationships are more complex than that, and I think my analysis of popular animated satire bears him out. Bogel writes:

[T]he crucial fact is not that satirists find folly or wickedness in the world and then wish to expose that alien something. Instead,