UC Irvine
UC Irvine Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Revealing the Monsters Within: Andy Warhol, the 1972 Mao series, and Vote McGovern

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9k15w3vs

Author

Kasimoff, Naomi Michael

Publication Date

2017

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NoDerivatives License, availalbe at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
IRVINE

Revealing the Monsters Within: Andy Warhol, the 1972 *Mao* series, and *Vote McGovern*

THESIS

submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in Art History

by

Naomi Michael Kasimoff

Thesis Committee:
Professor Cécile Whiting, Chair
Associate Professor Roberta Wue
Assistant Professor James Nisbet

2017

DEDICATION

To

my parents Mike and Laura, my brothers Michael and Jacob, and my wonderful Michael

who helped me get through this year with their unending love and support.

I am forever grateful for your confidence in me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my committee chair, Professor Cécile Whiting, for her patience and guidance, without which I would not have been able to complete my thesis. I am grateful for having been able to work with you.

I would like to thank my committee members, Professor Roberta Wue and Professor James Nisbet, for always giving me great advice and for helping me to grow. Your encouragement during the past few years has helped me immensely.

In addition, I would like to thank Arielle Hinojosa-Garcia for keeping my on track with my deadlines and for always having a positive attitude.

Lastly, I would like to thank all of the professors at UCI who have helped me to achieve my academic goals. I learned so much from you because you educate your students instead of just talking at them and expecting them to learn.

ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

Revealing the Monsters Within: Andy Warhol, the 1972 *Mao* series, and *Vote McGovern*

By

Naomi Michael Kasimoff

Master of Arts in Art History

University of California, Irvine, 2017

Professor Cécile Whiting, Chair

In 1972 and 1973, Andy Warhol created a series of serigraphs that featured the Chinese communist leader Mao Zedong and a serigraph of the United States president Richard Nixon. These prints cast the political leaders as satirical pop culture icons. Looking at the leaders' public and political lives, Warhol's "campy" horror films, and classic horror films, I argue that Warhol altered the photos of Mao and Nixon and turned them into uncanny movie monster characters.

INTRODUCTION

When thinking about popular culture celebrities in Andy Warhol's art of the 1960s and 70s, names like Marilyn Monroe, Elvis Presley, and Elizabeth Taylor come to mind. These stars were immortalized through their presence in movies and magazines, but they were also immortalized through art with the work of Warhol. In the 1960s and early 70s, Warhol created screen print portraits of these and other celebrities by using photographs that he found in magazines or other print media, often applying psychedelic colors. Warhol's numerous and well-known prints reflect upon the American media and culture's obsession with celebrities.

In 1972 and 1973, Warhol produced images of two political figures who were very much in the news: Mao Zedong, leader of communist China and Richard Nixon, president of the United States. Warhol created two series of ten screen prints and four individual screen prints of the Chinese Communist leader, Mao Zedong. Then, in 1973, Warhol designed a screen print entitled *Vote McGovern* that featured Nixon. With these works, Warhol departed from his practice of depicting movie stars and instead featured two well known political leaders. I argue that Warhol's works of Mao and Nixon can be understood together as politically-charged representations of controversial politicians. While Warhol represented Nixon and Mao as American pop culture icons, he specifically aligned the men with characters from horror films. In other words, Warhol altered the photos of Mao and Nixon, turning them into uncanny and disturbing pop icons.

During his lifetime, Warhol produced or directed over six hundred films of various lengths which included short silent screen-tests, "portrait" films, and full-length films of various genres. Horror was one of the genres in which Warhol experimented and he recreated horror movie classics and included characters such as Dracula and Doctor Frankenstein's monster with

films such as *Blood for Dracula* (1974) and *Flesh for Frankenstein* (1973). Given that these films were produced more or less at the same time as Warhol's screen prints of Nixon and Mao, I compare the aesthetics of monstrosity in each. Warhol combined the look of classic movie monsters together with the idea of the split personality in his screen prints of Mao and Nixon. A final element to take into consideration is the idea of the split personality as depicted in horror films, notably, including the main character from Alfred Hitchcock's *Psycho* (1960).

Warhol's pictures of Mao and Nixon are generally considered as satirical representations of the political leaders.[1] Mao was elevated to the status of a "world-wide pop icon" through the reproducibility and multiplicity of his prints.[2] He became a celebrity in China because his face was reproduced billions of times in Chinese propaganda and he became pop icon in the West because Warhol, a prominent artist in the Pop art movement, used Mao's face in his work. On the other hand, Nixon was cast into a negative light, which was Warhol's intention.[3] The vibrant, clashing colors evoke a menacing tone that identifies Nixon as the wrong choice for president. Moving past these generally accepted observations of Nixon and Mao in Warhol's portraits, I will frame Mao and Nixon as horror film characters and reveal the monstrosity within.

---

[1] This information is culled from the following sources: Museum label for Andy Warhol, *Mao*, Santa Monica, Revolver Gallery, 27 May 2017.; Museum label for Andy Warhol, *Vote McGovern*, Santa Monica, Revolver Gallery, 27 May 2017.
[2] *Ibid*.
[3] *Ibid.*

The Public Mao

Before Mao and Nixon's ground-breaking meeting in China in 1972, which was part of Nixon's much-discussed weeklong visit to China, the two leaders had been known as political enemies. In 1949, Mao established and became the Chairman of the People's Republic of China. Throughout his career, Mao enforced a new way of life in China in which everyone was supposed to become part of one class, the revolutionary proletariat or working class.

The Cultural Revolution (1966-1976) tried to eliminate an upper class, and the intelligentsia were shamed and shunned.[4] The Chinese people had to be re-educated with the new ways and had to leave behind what they knew. They left behind the Four Olds, which were Old Customs, Old Culture, Old Habits, and Old Ideas.[5] If anyone was caught following the Old Ways, then he or she would be punished by the Red Guards, the social military force comprised of young adults that were chosen based on their "red" family background. The issue with this system was that any citizen could falsely accuse others of following the "Four Olds," and the criteria of what constituted an example of the "Four Olds" was ambiguous. People were humiliated in front of their neighbors and friends, had to endure hard labor, and personal belongings were taken from them. Still, throughout the time of the Cultural Revolution, Mao accumulated his largest following of people, even if they had to conform to his ideas without having a say in the matter.[6]

Mao's early regime was plagued with some difficult failures such as the Great Leap Forward (1958-1962), a campaign that was meant to speed up China's industrialization with the

---

[4] Roderick MacFarquhar and Michael Schoenhals, *Mao's Last Revolution*, (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006), 106-107.

[5] Jonathan Spence, *The Search for Modern China*, (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1999), 575.

[6] This information is culled from the following sources: Ji-li Jiang, *Red Scarf Girl: A Memoir of the Cultural Revolution*, (New York: HarperCollins, 1997).; Lu Xing, *Rhetoric of the Chinese Cultural Revolution: The Impact on Chinese Thought, Culture, and Communication*, (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 2004).

government's control over industry and agriculture.[7] This development ultimately resulted in a widespread famine and the death of over fifteen million people.[8] A series of events caused the downfall of the Great Leap Forward starting with the long working hours required of each individual, which did not allow him or her enough time to recuperate from the day's work. Also, workers were required to melt down steel in backyard furnaces so the steel could be reused, and the result was that not enough people were harvesting crops. Then natural disasters followed along with a famine that wiped out a lot of people.[9]

The United States and its western allies tended to highlight China's problems under communism and to view Mao as a failed leader with flawed ethics. American articles published in mainstream print journals such as *Time* and *Newsweek*, reported on the diminishing value of life under Mao. By choosing to focus on civil unrest, reporters posed the question of whether or not the disgruntlement of the Chinese people was reflective of "an internal struggle for party leadership."[10] However, in China, Mao was viewed and pictured as a strong political leader who was going to create a better China for his citizens. The people generally believed their leader, and they were ready to follow his orders. Although not everyone was on the same side as Mao or actually believed in his cause, print media was required to only show Mao in a positive light. Mao gave the orders and citizens regulated other citizens in order to make sure that their leader was represented correctly, especially in the widely circulated, mass-produced propaganda posters that were Mao-centric.[11]

---

[7] Alfred L. Chan, *Mao's Crusade: Politics and Policy Implementation in China's Great Leap Forward*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 13.

[8] Frederick C. Teiwes and Warren Sun, *China's Road to Disaster: Mao, Central Politicians, and Provincial Leaders in the Unfolding of the Great Leap Forward, 1995-1959*, (New York: Routledge, 2015), 52-55.

[9] Dennis Tao Yang, "China's Agricultural Crisis and Famine of 1959-1961: A Survey and Comparison to Soviet Famines," *Comparative Economic Studies 50*, (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008), 1-29.

[10] "Red China: Back to the Cave!", *Time* 88, no. 11 (1966): 28.

[11] Wu Hung, "Face of Authority: Tiananmen and Mao's Tiananmen Portrait", *Remaking Beijing: Tiananmen Square and the Creation of a Political Space,* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005), 78-79.

In China painted portraits of Mao were regulated and only the ones best representative of the Chinese leader were allowed to be in the public view, as they were propaganda images. One portrait of Mao known globally was originally exhibited in Mao's book entitled *Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung,* a widely-circulated, small book that included Mao's quotations and speeches. In the West, Mao's book became commonly known as the *Little Red Book*. *Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung* was the most printed book in the world between the mid-1960s and mid-1970s.[12] The book was intended to be in the possession of every Chinese citizen so over 740 million copies needed to be in print. Moreover, Mao also wanted his words to reach other audiences in other parts of the world, so over a billion copies were translated into several different languages and distributed around the world, with the intention of converting people to Communism and establishing Communist states.[13] The portrait in Mao's book is even more well known in China because it showed up in a number of other news media sources in China and in other locations including, even, a soccer stadium. This portrait is not to be confused with the equally popular Tiananmen Square portrait of Mao that has hung in the square since the day that Mao took over as the Chairman of the People's Republic of China (PRC).[14] These pictures could be easily confused as they were part of a larger collection of public images of Mao and are representative of how Mao's image was controlled and regulated by rules and conventions. These images were part of the formation of the cult of personality of Mao, which was created during the Cultural Revolution.[15] The pictures look similar as they depict Mao from roughly the same age: he is posed similarly and dons a similar expression. The main difference is that the light is

[12] John Gray, "How the West Embraced Chairman Mao's Little Red Book", New Statesman, May 23, 2014, https://www.newstatesman.com/culture/2014/05/how-west-embraced-chairman-mao-s-little-red-book.
[13] *Ibid.*
[14] Hung, "Face of Authority," 73.
[15] Barbara Mittler, "Mao Wherever You Go: The Art of Repetition in Revolutionary China," in *A Continuous Revolution: Making Sense of Cultural Revolution Culture*, (London: Harvard University Asia Center, 2012), http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1x07z47.

shining from Mao's left side in the Tiananmen Square portrait and the light is shining from Mao's right side in the *Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung* portrait. In the *Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung* picture, only Mao's head and shoulders are shown. Mao is wearing one of his traditional grey suits, an outfit that he adapted from Sun Yat-sen's Zhongshan manner of dress and intended as a nationalist garment that later became specific to Chinese communism. Mao looks into the eyes of the viewer and neither smiles nor frowns. The general feeling of the portrait is that Mao can see what the viewer is doing and is able to interact with the viewer through his gaze. These propaganda images portrayed Mao as a strong political leader.

The Public Nixon and the Infamous Meeting

The image of Nixon that Warhol used in the *Vote McGovern* piece is from an official

publicity photograph that was featured on the cover of the January 27, 1969 issue of *Newsweek*.

The original photograph was a full-color portrait of Nixon and his wife Pat. The pair stand close

to one another and in front of a green background. Throughout the magazine, Nixon is heralded

as a beacon of hope. Nixon's slogan on the invitation to the inauguration was "Forward

Together," a statement which by itself presents a bright and hopeful future. Additionally, looking

at this statement from an historical point of view, it promised unity rather than the disunity that

had become apparent in the country over the Vietnam War. Americans were torn in their

opinions about the war. There were those that spouted, "Support Our Troops!" and who also felt

that America's presence in the war was justified because of a fear that communism and China

would take over Vietnam. On the other hand, there were those who opposed America's

involvement with the war because they felt it was not America's place to get involved in it. By

the time of the election, disillusion with the Vietnam War had grown with the revelations about

the My Lai incident. There were a growing number of protests in cities around the country. But

Nixon promised to move the country away from Lyndon B. Johnson's era, described by

Newsweek as "a clamorous, contentious time memorable for its ruins almost as much as its great

monuments."[16] And with the introduction of Nixon as the new president, a tame, quiet future "of

less daring and less division"[17] seemed to be at hand, at least according to *Newsweek*.

Despite all of the controversies swirling around Nixon's presidency, one lasting

achievement was his grand tour in China. Nixon, his wife Pat, and their daughter Julie took a

week-long tour in February of 1972 to visit the country, but also to talk politics. In an issue of

---

[16] "'Let Us…Go Forward Together'", *Newsweek*, January 27, 1969, 17.
[17] *Ibid.*, 17.

Time magazine published on March 6, 1972, Nixon's famous tour dominated the entirety of that particular issue. The historic meeting between Nixon, Mao, and the premier Chou En-lai was all the media could talk about. Pictures in *Time* shaped a positive view of the trip.[18] On the front cover of the magazine, there are four pictures and a large Chinese character which means "friends." The other words that appear on the front cover are "Nixon's China Odyssey." The word choice implies that Nixon and his family undertook a voyage through China, like Ulysses in the Odyssey. The top left picture shows Mao and Nixon greeting each other with smiles and a handshake, an iconic moment of the trip that is representative of the new diplomatic relations that had been established. Other photos show Nixon's interaction with Mao and other members of the communist regime. The bottom left shows Nixon, Pat, Julie, Secretary of State William P. Rogers, and their guides on one part of the Great Wall of China while more of the Great Wall snakes behind them. Smiles are present on almost everyone's face. The last picture shows a scene from a performance by the Peking Ballet troupe. The dancers are wearing working-class clothes that all feature some red. They are also waving a couple of red flags. Together these photographs document the Nixons paying tribute to Mao, China's past, as well as modern Chinese culture.

The timing of Warhol's Mao and Nixon series coincided with the détente between China and the United States. But it also occurred at a moment when the Watergate scandal broke. On June 17, 1972, there was a break-in at the Democratic National Committee headquarters at the Watergate office complex in Washington DC. The break-in became an issue of national security concern because the Nixon administration attempted to cover it up and because the robbers were tied to Nixon's reelection campaign. The robbers were attempting to wiretap the phones and to steal documents. In 1972, Nixon was reelected as president, despite possible allegations of his involvement in the crime. There was no direct evidence that the robbers were tied to Nixon until

---

[18] "Richard Nixon's Long March to Shanghai", *Time* 99, no. 10 (1972): 11.

1974, when several of Nixon's former aides were accused of various charges linked to the

Watergate scandal. In July 1974, Nixon was forced to hand over the tapes that documented every

conversation in the Oval Office by the order of the Supreme Court. Facing inevitable

impeachment and charges for abusing his power, Nixon resigned on August 8.[19] All told, Warhol

undertook his screen prints of Mao and Nixon at a particularly charged moment in history.

---

[19] John J Sirica, *To Set the Record Straight: the Break-in, the Tapes, the Conspirators, the Pardon*, (New York: Norton, 1979).

Andy and Horror Films

A brief look at the history of horror films in the United States helps to contextualize Warhol's own horror films. Hollywood productions from the 1930s created by Universal Pictures such as Tod Browning's *Dracula* (1931) and James Whale's *Frankenstein* (1931) are often considered to be the link between horror and the Gothic literature from which they originated.[20] These films adopted techniques from German expressionism film such as developing sets and adjusting the lighting so that the effect is "a world internally awry."[21] These films helped establish the specific look of each of the monsters: Dracula's widow's peak, dark hair, his tantalizing gaze, his sensual appeal, and the implicit sexuality of his bite, which created his power of seduction[22] and Frankenstein's monster's enlarged forehead, green skin, and languish gaze. These physical features became tied to the characters. Moreover, specific actors such as Boris Karloff and Bela Lugosi defined the appearance and behavior of these monsters, thus drawing attention to who portrayed the classic characters. The "celebrity aspect" of the movie monsters could have appealed to Warhol and could have led him produce his horror films.

Browning and Whale's films are considered to be the first horror movies in part because they were created during film's transition from silent film to film with sound.[23] Although the films did not include "movie music," the voices of the characters and sound effects are present. With the new technology of sound in film, audiences were able to interact with film in another way. Early films with sound were considered uncomfortably strange because there were issues

---

[20] Mark Jancovich, Introduction in *Horror, the Film Reader*, ed. Mark Jancovich, (New York: Routledge, 2002), 11.
[21] Andrew Tudor, *Monsters and Mad Scientists: A Cultural History of the Horror Movie,* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 1989), 28.
[22] Kendall R. Phillips, *Projected Fears: Horror Films and American Culture,* (Westport: CT: Praeger Publishers, 2005), 28.
[23] Robert Spadoni, *Uncanny Bodies: The Coming of Sound Film and the Origins of the Horror Genre,* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), 1.

with synchronization of the sound and film,[24] so even though the actor's voices in the films could be heard, the dissonance was felt by the viewers. In *Composing for the Films*, Hanns Eisler and Theodor Adorno speculate that the voices did not sound like they were coming from anybody in the film because the audience was "uninformed" and because music was not yet a norm for film.[25] Robert Spadoni writes that *Dracula* and *Frankenstein* "trapped with their forms the uncanny reception energies of the early sound cinema."[26] Towards the end of the transition between silent film and film with sound, the novelty and strangeness of the sound had begun to fade,[27] but the way that *Dracula* and *Frankenstein* utilized sounds and silences was what helped to create a sense of uncanniness in the films: examples include Bela Lugosi's famous accent and his intonation as well as Boris Karloff's mainly incomprehensible speech. Additionally, the silences in the sound film are also elements that added to the uncanniness of the film because these were extended pauses in the dialogue that created suspense. On a similar note, the bodies that correlated to the voices were also eerie. Count Dracula was a handsome, seductive, undead vampire and Frankenstein's monster was a gray and green colored, dead-looking creature. The technology was for a while new and unsettling and in the case of *Dracula* and *Frankenstein*, the uncanniness from the sound and the movies themselves worked to their advantage.

Dracula* and *Frankenstein* are considered horror classics because they were the first films of their kind. *Dracula* did receive criticism at the time because of the technical issues with the audio and visual, issues with the clarity of the narrative, and some of the elements in the film are considered more "campy" than dramatic and scary.[28] However, Kendall R. Phillips proposed that the interest in *Dracula* could be from "the ways that *Dracula* resonated with broader cultural

---

[24] *Ibid.*, 17.
[25] Hanns Eisler and Theodor Adorno, *Composing for the Films*, (Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1947), 76.
[26] Spadoni, *Uncanny Bodies,* 7.
[27] *Ibid.,* 31.
[28] Phillips, *Projected Fears,* 14.

anxieties and the way that *Dracula* violated the kinds of expectations audiences might have brought to the film." On the other hand, Phillips states that *Frankenstein* was "superior on almost all fronts [and] is a far more sophisticated and engaging text." Frankenstein did better in the box office and with critics.[29] Viewers also found the film to be more impressive with its fright and shock value.[30]

Although color film was introduced in the 1930s with Technicolor, Universal Pictures did not utilize color for their horror films, only in the film posters. Through the use of color, the posters are able to convey the uncanny elements that the monsters express in the films. In one of the 1931 *Dracula* posters, Dracula poses in the top left corner of the poster and the other characters are in the bottom right corner. Although the figures do not directly interact with one another on the poster, they react to each other's poses. Dracula leans forward with a tensed hand and with an intense stare, as if he is entrancing those below him. The woman rests her hands on the sides of her face and stares with a vacant expression, reacting to Dracula's enchantment as if she has succumbed to his spell. The men in the poster crouch down or lean away from Dracula, recognizing that he has a supernatural power that they need to be cautious of. Dracula's skin is an off-putting, sickly green and yellow, which contrasts with the other figures on the poster who are pale, but look alive. *Frankenstein* is pictured in a similar way in a film poster from 1931. The monster's head takes up the majority of the poster and like Dracula, he has green and yellow flesh. Heavy shadows accentuate the monster's protruding brow, his sunken eyes, and his grimace. The monster gazes languidly at the viewer, which is fitting because the monster's limbs were dead so the only life that is in him is from the electricity. The other characters on the poster are Dr. Frankenstein immersed in his work and a woman who is draped over a bed or a sofa.

---

[29] "Biggest Money Pictures", *Variety*, June 21, 1932, 62.
[30] *Saturday Evening Post*, Dec. 12, 1931, 70.

Universal Pictures created several movie spin-offs that included different combinations of their core monster characters, including Dracula, Frankenstein, the Invisible Man, etc., throughout the 1930s and well into the 1950s. Universal was looking for a new direction with their horror films, due to the audience's lessening interest in film, so they turned to comedy as well as new technologies. The comedy/horror films that featured the comedy duo Abbot and Costello meeting characters such as Dracula and Frankenstein's monster, did especially well in the box office, in comparison to the studio's other films.[31] The Abbot and Costello films added comic relief to the tumultuous times of the 1950s. Also, throughout the decade new movie monsters were introduced, such as the *Creature from the Black Lagoon* (1954), a film that also did well in theaters.[32] Universal was also looking to expand its audience by utilizing color in film. The 1943 film *Phantom of the Opera* was the first monster movie to be filmed in Technicolor. Subsequently, not all the films that were produced after this classic were filmed in color. Since filming in color was expensive, Universal did not produce all films in color. It was not until the late 1940s that Universal used color in films, in general. But Universal did employ new technology such as 3-D effects to engage audiences in films such as *It Came from Outer Space* (1953). The overall purpose of introducing color and special effects was to maintain film's relevance in people's lives and to make audiences come back to movie theaters, instead of staying at home and watching their televisions.

In 1973 and 1974, Warhol was the producer of two Italian-French horror films, *Flesh for Frankenstein* and *Blood for Dracula*. When the films were shown in the United States, the titles were changed to *Andy Warhol's Frankenstein* and *Andy Warhol's Dracula* for marketing purposes. Both films are full-length horror movies, but also display some comic relief and are

---

[31] Bob Furmanek and Greg Kintz, "An in depth look at Creature from the Black Lagoon," 3-D Film Archive, http://www.3dfilmarchive.com/an-in-depth-look-at-creature-from-the-black-lagoon-1.
[32] *Ibid.*

also flagged for sexual content and grotesque, violent scenes. These films were actually part of a group of other independent films that were labeled by critics at the time as "video nasties."[33] As an increasing concern by the National Viewers' and Listeners' Association (NVALA) in the United Kingdom about sexual content grew, these films were banned and most were only available on video cassette, although there were concerns with the videos being available at all.[34] Instead of being like a true horror film with the inclusion of suspense and drama, Warhol's films include over-dramatization and theatrical elements, which also add to the camp film aesthetic. In short, the camp aesthetic was popularized in the 1960s and was defined by Susan Sontag as a style characterized by excess and irony.[35] Camp could be considered as going against the grain of high art of the time because it was not interested in beauty but rather in ironic send-up of the mainstream. *Flesh for Frankenstein* and *Blood for Dracula* included several critiques of social class, the inbreeding of the aristocracy, sexual repression, and heteronormativity. The protagonist of each film, Dracula and Dr. Frankenstein, are attacked the most since Dracula is portrayed as weak, dying, and unattractive (in comparison to the attractiveness of Dracula in the 1931 film) who can only live if he feeds on the blood of virgins, and Dr. Frankenstein is a perverse, headstrong man intent on creating a superior race by breeding two of his creations. Warhol's renditions of these classic films give a twist to these characters that raises issues of sexuality and race.

In *Flesh for Frankenstein* and *Blood for Dracula*, Warhol created characters that are visually similar to the original characters. Both of the films are in color and *Flesh for Frankenstein* has 3D effects. In *Flesh for Frankenstein*, the monster does not exactly look like

---

[33] Jancovich, Introduction in *Horror, the Film Reader*, 6.

[34] "Video Nasties," bbfc.co.uk, May, 19, 2005, http://www.bbfc.co.uk/education-resources/education-news/video-nasties.

[35] Susan Sontag, "Notes on "Camp"," *Against Interpretation, and other essays*, (New York: Anchor Books, 1990), 275-292.

the character that Boris Karloff portrayed, but there is the same general idea of the monster being created piecemeal with bulging scarring denoting that different parts of his body came from different bodies. Instead of yellowed, "ugly," skin, the monster is pieced with parts that Dr. Frankenstein admires as traits that he wants to promote when he is creating his "superior race." Dr. Frankenstein creates a mate for the monster so that they can reproduce and create a new race. Despite the monster's "perfect" features, he still possesses a monstrous nature in the fact that he has brute strength that he cannot control and, like the original character, he questions the unnaturalness of his existence and his place among living people. In *Blood for Dracula*, Dracula is visually similar, but not characteristically similar. In the film, Dracula is old and feeble, on the verge of death, unlike Bela Lugosi's Dracula who is handsome, young, and vibrant. Warhol's Dracula has to paint his hair and eyebrows black so as to appear lively against his sickly, pale skin. For most of the film, Warhol's Dracula is carted around in a wheelchair instead of quietly stalking though the night like Lugosi. Also, he can only blood from virgins or will he become ill and violently throw up the "unclean" blood. Warhol created the characters to be visually similar to the originals, but altered them in such a way so as to fit the overall narrative and to especially fit the camp aesthetic.

Andy and Mao

Given Andy Warhol's interest in reproducibility, it is possible that when he saw the portrait of Mao in *The Little Red Book*, he was drawn to it as a widely disseminated image. It is also not entirely surprising that he decided to picture Mao, who was a kind of political celebrity at the time not only because of *The Little Red Book*, but also because of widespread anti-communist press coverage in the USA. Bruno Bischofberger, an art dealer and friend of Warhol, asked Warhol to return to painting by creating a portrait of the most important person of the twentieth century, and his suggestion was Albert Einstein. Warhol replied that "[he] was just reading in Life magazine that the most famous person in the world today is Chairman Mao."[36] Warhol expressed that he wanted to paint the most *famous* person in the world, based off of the importance of celebrity and appearance, rather than an *important* person in the world who was well-known for his ideas.

The 1972 *Mao* series in many ways is similar to the portraits of celebrities that Warhol created in the 1960s. Warhol cropped the original photo of Mao, and he placed Mao's body off-center, excluding the top of his hair, and most of the suit on the chest and shoulders. The result was a focus on Mao's face. Throughout the entire series, Warhol used the same cropped photo. Not unlike the other celebrity prints from the 1960s, the 1972 *Mao* series is colored by bright psychedelic colors. Although Mao's hair is always black and the defining lines and shadows are also always black, Warhol uses color to differentiate between the different Mao prints in the set. In the prints, Mao's skin, his eyes, his lips, his suit, and the background are always a different color.

---

[36] "Andy Warhol and Chairman Mao," *Sotheby's*, March 8, 2017, http://www.sothebys.com/en/news-video/blogs/all-blogs/eye-on-asia/2017/03/andy-warhol-and-the-Chairman-Mao.html.

Since Warhol created ten screen prints and made two hundred and fifty copies of the screen prints, it will be advantageous to look at the ten prints that were intended to be viewed as a set. There is no specific order mandated in the display of the ten prints; the order is up to the museum or the collector, but generally the works are displayed in a grid-like structure. Each print measures 36 inches by 36 inches, which altogether brings one set to 180 inches by 72 inches, if the set is display in a five-by-two grid. The size of the set requires an entire wall in order to be displayed, making the set large enough to be displayed by itself. In this case, then, the photograph from the *Little Red Book* takes on the dimensions of the portrait in Tiananmen Square. Multiplicity and repetition are worth mentioning here as both the propaganda portraits of Mao from China and the *Mao* series by Warhol employ both of these aspects. Since Warhol was interested in repeating the same images multiple times, he could have felt drawn to the fact that propaganda posters work similarly as they are also mass produced.

The different color combinations cause the individual prints to be read differently. But in at least one, the colors render Mao uncanny. In the print where Mao has a green and yellow face, is wearing a red Mao suit and has a dark blue background, he has solid black eyes that could be those of a character in a horror film. The green skin and yellow highlights are reminiscent of the monster in horror film posters starting in the early 1930s and remaining popular until the early 1960s. Green and yellow in these posters are associated with sickness and differentiated the monster from the humans with a "normal" skin tone.[37] Another element of the horror movie monster is the heavy shadowing on the face. On the original photo, there are normal shadows on the left side of Mao's face since the light is coming from Mao's right. In Warhol's rendition, the shadows are deepened so much that they are almost pure black pigment, rather than shading on the face, neck, and part of Mao's shoulder. Also, Mao's hair is the same black as the shadows, so

---

[37] Ed Tony Nourmand and Graham Marsh, *Horror Poster Art*, (London, Aurum Press, 2004), 146.

the hair and shadows act as a frame for Mao's face, and the focus is directed back to his face. In Warhol's edition, Mao's eyes would blend in with the rest of his face if it were not for the yellow under his black irises and for the green pupils. Mao looks directly at the viewer, just as he does in the original photo. Mao's eyes are narrowed with his skin bunched up under his eyes. The look that Mao gives is intense because of the direct eye contact. He wants to hold your gaze, while his gaze will never waver. In the same horror film posters, the movie monster is pictured looking at the victims in the film, looking at the possible viewers of the film, or has a crazed expression. Since Mao looks out at the viewer, the viewer is offered two options: to be a victim included in Mao's film or to be a viewer of Mao's film.

With the inclusion of at least one monstrous Mao in the set, and there are undoubtedly others, Mao is aligned with monster movies and not a tradition of heroic portraits of leaders. Mao's approved public portraits were also a break from the Chinese tradition as leaders were not depicted in public political portraits until the early twentieth century.[38] Following the direction of Western tradition, Chinese political portraits were displayed in public spaces during ceremonial events. It is through the Western tradition that Mao's public portraits sought to portray him as a heroic leader, but it is through Andy Warhol's rendition that Mao's portrait is turned into a satire. Here, Mao is portrayed as a celebrity, but there is much more to Warhol's portrait of Mao; through reference of horror, Warhol's portrait is also a critique of Mao.

---

[38] Hung, "Face of Authority," 68.

Andy and Nixon

Warhol created *Vote McGovern* as an explicit anti-Nixon image. Instead of using the face of George McGovern, the other presidential candidate in the running, Warhol used an official press photo of Nixon. Typically, if someone is in favor of one candidate, he or she will choose a powerful and positive image of the person being supported. However, in this case, Warhol chose the candidate that he did not support and decided to recreate his image as a ghoulish figure. Warhol is best known as not being political, but his stance on Nixon, in particular, is clear in *Vote McGovern*.[39] If one sees Warhol's recreation in comparison to the original press photo, one cannot help but see a critique. The original press photograph appeared on the front cover of *Newsweek* so even those who did not have a subscription or did not even read *Newsweek* could have seen the photograph on a news-stand. In 1970, *Newsweek* had 2.61 million subscriptions so at least that many people had seen the image.

There are several differences between the original press photograph and Warhol's screen print. One important difference between the original and Warhol's to take note of is the fact that Pat, Nixon's wife, is no longer included in the picture, which brings up the question as to why Warhol had to use this particular image since he had to edit out a person and had to account for the overlap of the figures. There was an extra effort that had to be paid to this particular image mainly because it was not a simple transformation of a photograph into a serigraph. There was some reconstructive work required in order to fill out Nixon's figure. One reason that Warhol chose this particular photo was because it was published right after Nixon's inauguration, suggesting that Warhol sought to and ultimately did change the meaning of Nixon's inauguration. Instead of the reminder of Nixon's campaign slogan, "Forward Together," we have a reminder of

---

[39] Julia Ann Weekes, "Warhol's Pop Politics," *Smithsonian.com*, October 30, 2008, https://www.smithsonianmag.com/arts-culture/warhols-pop-politics-89185734/.

the candidate, McGovern, who ran against him and lost. Unlike the Mao prints, Nixon is centered. Like Warhol's Mao prints, Warhol cropped out most of Nixon's suit so that all we see is part of his shoulders and the top of his tie and the top of Nixon's head at the top edge of the picture. The cropped and close-up view of Nixon keeps the focus on the face.

Like the 1972 *Mao* series, *Vote McGovern* is not unlike Warhol's celebrity portraits from the 1960s with the use of the psychedelic colors and the focus on the celebrity's face. But as in the *Mao* series, Warhol makes some subtle alterations that hint at a monstrous side to Nixon. Warhol alters the color scheme so that there is an orange background; Nixon's shirt, suit, and tie are pink and red; Nixon's skin is blue and green; his eyes, mouth, and teeth are yellow-orange; and his hair is black with blue highlights. Nixon's skin tone is a sickly hue of blue and green, the colors occupying two parts of his face. The use of shadow and dark lines in the print define the wrinkles and the creases on Nixon's face, adding texture to his skin. Nixon's hair is a combination of black with blue highlights that acts as a frame to his face. Nixon's eyes, lips, and teeth are all the same shade of yellow-orange, which is reminiscent of horror movie monsters in films and their posters where the focus is on the eyes of monster either by unnatural color like the red eyes of *Rosemary's Baby* (1968) or with the use of light and shadow where only the eyes are illuminated, such is the case with *Dracula* (1931). In this case, it is the former with unnatural yellow eyes. In *Rosemary's Baby*, the child that Rosemary begat was the devil himself and in the film, he was pictured with red eyes, where red is understood to be an evil color. Instead of the epitome of evil and being directly linked with devil, Nixon's yellow-orange eyes are an unnatural hue that better represent an unnatural human being. Nixon's yellow-orange lips and teeth then are also unnatural and form a grimace.

Andy and the Double Persona

In his article entitled "The American Nightmare: Horror in the 70s," Robin Wood claims that the release of Alfred Hitchcock's *Psycho* film expanded the horror genre to encompass the modern American family.[40] Although Mark Jancovich later refutes Wood's ideas by stating that earlier horror films had already been situated in American society, it is important to note what kind of monster is present in *Psycho*. Jancovich points out that unlike previous monsters in horror films, the main character in Psycho is seemingly an ordinary teenager, who we later discover is actually "psychologically disturbed" with an insatiable urge to kill, yet unaware of his crimes. Norman Bates is similar to some other movie monsters because he displays a split personality, like Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde.

In effect, Warhol's prints are both representative of the double persona of the monster. The original photos of the men (both Mao and Nixon) are like Dr. Jekylls because these display the outward appearance of the men as they present themselves in society. The photos depict highly respected men who are integral parts, indeed leaders, of their society. However, Warhol's prints are Mr. Hydes because he highlights the suppressed, monstrous personality hiding behind the façade. Just like in Robert Louis Stevenson's 1886 novel where Jekyll tries to hide Hyde but does not succeed, Mao and Nixon do not succeed in hiding their true selves in Warhol's prints.

Additionally, the original photographs of the political leaders are also representative of Norman Bates' condition in *Psycho* since the horror in the film "is found in the psychological rather than the physiological."[41] In the 1960 film, a woman named Marion arrives at the Bates Motel, where Norman Bates is the owner. After a talk with the owner in which Marion learns about Norman being lonely and his difficult relationship with his mother, Marion returns to her

---

[40] Robin Wood, "The American Nightmare: Horror in the 70s" in *Horror, the Film Reader*, ed. Mark Jancovich, (New York: Routledge, 2002), 28.
[41] Phillips, *Projected Fears,* 64.

room to take a shower, where she is brutally stabbed to death. At the end of the thriller, it is finally revealed that Norman was the murderer and he was acting as his mother who he had also killed. Norman is an uncanny character because he has another side to him and he acts as his mother and he is also unaware of the fact that he killed Marion.

The original photographs of Mao and Nixon recall Norman Bates because their problematic condition lies within the psychological, rather than the physiological. They both appear "normal" in the photographs that are approved for the press to release, but the serious crimes that they committed during their lifetime lie just beneath the surface. For Nixon it was trying to fix the next election which ended up in the Watergate scandal, then lying to fellow Americas about his involvement with the crime. For Mao it was the millions of deaths which occurred under his regime.

Warhol's selection of press photos and their respective screen prints are two-faced accounts of the same political leaders. Warhol manages to capture the classic movie monster look by choosing photographs of Mao and Nixon that already display elements that Warhol can manipulate with color. Warhol is able to manipulate the original photograph so that the uncanny doppelganger refers to the original, creating the split personality effect, where even though Mao or Nixon may look normal in the original photograph, the viewers know the truth that Mao and Nixon are the uncanny monsters seen in Warhol's screen prints. Warhol's *Vote McGovern* from 1972 was intended as an anti-Nixon campaign piece and the same can be said for the *Mao* series.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Andy Warhol and Chairman Mao." *Sotheby's*, March 8, 2017.

      http://www.sothebys.com/en/news-video/blogs/all-blogs/eye-on-asia/2017/03/andy-

      warhol-and-the-Chairman-Mao.html.

"Biggest Money Pictures." *Variety*, June 21, 1932.

Chan, Alfred L. *Mao's Crusade: Politics and Policy Implementation in China's Great Leap*

      Forward. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Eisler, Hanns and Theodor Adorno. *Composing for the Films*. Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries

      Press, 1947.

Furmanek, Bob and Greg Kintz. "An in depth look at Creature from the Black Lagoon." 3-D

      Film Archive. Accessed 28 July 2017. http://www.3dfilmarchive.com/an-in-depth-look-

      at-creature-from-the-black-lagoon-1.

Gray, John. "How the West Embraced Chairman Mao's Little Red Book." *New Statesman*. May

      23, 2014, https://www.newstatesman.com/culture/2014/05/how-west-embraced-

      chairman-mao-s-little-red-book.

Hung, Wu. "Face of Authority: Tiananmen and Mao's Tiananmen Portrait." *Remaking Beijing:*

      Tiananmen Square and the Creation of a Political Space. Chicago: The University of

      Chicago Press, 2005.

Jancovich, Mark. Introduction in *Horror, the Film Reader*. ed. Mark Jancovich. New York:

      Routledge, 2002.

Jiang, Ji-li. *Red Scarf Girl: A Memoir of the Cultural Revolution*. New York: HarperCollins,

      1997.

"'Let Us…Go Forward Together.'" *Newsweek*. January 27, 1969.

MacFarquhar, Roderick and Michael Schoenhals. *Mao's Last Revolution*. Cambridge, MA: The

    Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006.

Mittler, Barbara. *A Continuous Revolution: Making Sense of Cultural Revolution Culture*.

    London: Harvard University Asia Center, 2012. http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1x07z47.

Nourmand, Ed Tony and Graham Marsh. *Horror Poster Art*. London: Aurum Press, 2004.

Phillips, Kendall R. *Projected Fears: Horror Films and American Culture.* Westport, CT:

    Praeger Publishers, 2005.

"Red China: Back to the Cave!", *Time* 88, no. 11 (1966): 28.

Revolver Gallery. Museum label for Andy Warhol, *Mao*. Santa Monica, CA, 27 May 2017.

Revolver Gallery. Museum label for Andy Warhol, *Vote McGovern*. Santa Monica, CA, 27 May

    2017.

"Richard Nixon's Long March to Shanghai", *Time* 99, no. 10 (1972): 11.

Saturday Evening Post, Dec. 12, 1931, 70.

Sirica, John J. *To Set the Record Straight: the Break-in, the Tapes, the Conspirators, the Pardon*.

    New York: Norton, 1979.

Sontag, Susan. "Notes on "Camp."" *Against Interpretation, and other essays*. New York: Anchor

    Books, 1990.

"Soviet Famines," *Comparative Economic Studies 50*, (London, Palgrave MacMillan, 2008), 1-

    29.

Spadoni, Robert. *Uncanny Bodies: The Coming of Sound Film and the Origins of the Horror

    Genre.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.

Spence, Jonathan. *The Search for Modern China*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1999.

Teiwes, Frederick C. and Warren Sun. *China's Road to Disaster: Mao, Central Politicians, and Provincial Leaders in the Unfolding of the Great Leap Forward*, *1995-1959*. New York: Routledge, 2015.

Tudor, Andrew. *Monsters and Mad Scientists: A Cultural History of the Horror Movie.* Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 1989.

"Video Nasties," bbfc.co.uk, May, 19, 2005, http://www.bbfc.co.uk/education-resources/education-news/video-nasties

Weekes, Julia Ann. "Warhol's Pop Politics." *Smithsonian.com*, October 30, 2008. https://www.smithsonianmag.com/arts-culture/warhols-pop-politics-89185734/.

Wood, Robin. "The American Nightmare: Horror in the 70s." *Horror, the Film Reader*. ed. Mark Jancovich. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Xing, Lu. *Rhetoric of the Chinese Cultural Revolution: The Impact on Chinese Thought, Culture, and Communication*. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 2004.

Yang, Dennis Tao. "China's Agricultural Crisis and Famine of 1959-1961: A Survey and Comparison to Soviet Famines." *Comparative Economic Studies 50*. London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008.