

that *Pogo* was not to be taken seriously anyway then, one supposes, its censorship should not be taken too seriously either.

The second issue involves a closer look at the kinds of topics that attracted any form of censorship (or manipulation) of *Pogo*. As noted, steps were taken against the strip when it was perceived to be attacking Joe McCarthy, southern segregation, or Lyndon Johnson's war. These were all topics that represented solid liberal viewpoints of the 1950s and 1960s. Equally liberal, but more in tune with a broad national viewpoint, was the *Pogo* satire concerning Nikita Khrushchev and of Soviet Communism in general. It was not censored in the American press, only in some foreign newspapers. Therefore, it would appear that controversial political satire on the comics page was not, by itself, objectionable as long as it fit into the anticommunist consensus of the Cold War (Hamby, Matusow, Patterson). It was also conceivable (though unstated) that anticommunist commentary was safe in the daily comics because it could act as a type of mild indoctrination aimed at young people (and their elders) that aided in reinforcing Cold War American ideals. Taken all together, then, it is possible to argue that a close examination of the comic strip *Pogo* and its problems with press censorship may provide a glimpse into the political culture of the era from a source that at first might appear to be too unpretentious to be taken seriously.

Eric Jarvis

Department of History

King's College, University of Western Ontario

266 Epworth Avenue

London, Ontario, Canada N6A 2M3