

with Nikita Khrushchev's face (Kelly, 1957: 123-165; 1959: 195; 1960: 139-146; 1961: 24-27; 1962: intro., 9-12). On these occasions, censorship did not appear in American newspapers, whose readership would not be particularly offended by such satire, but, instead, in the foreign press that carried *Pogo*. In a 1962 sequence at least two papers objected to the pig character—the *Asahi Evening News*, an English language paper in Tokyo, and the *Toronto Globe and Mail*. Both papers decided to drop the strip while the Khrushchev face was present (Kelly, 1962: intro.). Kelly claimed to be surprised, “to find the cartoon of the pig accused of being satire in bad taste. Also, *Pogo* was accused of having gone in for editorial comment and of making fun of politics. The accusers were editors of a few papers carrying *Pogo* who thought they saw in the pig some resemblance to a head of state” (Kelly, 1962: intro.). Regarding the Tokyo paper, Kelly claimed to understand, since, after all, “they are so close to Vladivostok” (*New York Times*, 1962). He did not comment directly about the Toronto paper that had responded to the situation by placing an announcement in a box where the *Pogo* strip usually ran. It simply said that “*Pogo* will be back when Walt Kelly returns to the Okefenokee folk” (*Globe and Mail*, 1962). This decision stimulated a subsequent letter to the editor that claimed the paper “Owes readers an explanation of why, in a society of the free press, the satire of Communist hypocrisies through the medium of a comic strip (namely *Pogo*) is censored” (*Globe and Mail*, 1962). Soon, the *Globe and Mail* removed the little boxed message and replaced it with recycled old *Pogo* sequences that did not include any communist pigs. This policy continued for as long as Khrushchev lived in the Okefenokee (*Globe and Mail*, 1962). It should be noted that Kelly ended up publishing all of the Khrushchev strips later in book form as part of a continuing process of reissuing *Pogo* culled from the daily press run. Kelly usually published four books a year on average and while avoiding censorship was not the primary motive for these collections, it did permit the sidestepping of newspaper interventions (Kelly, 1957: 123-165; 1961: 24-27; 1962: 9-21).