

A Semiotic Analysis of Ukraine-US Relations through the Lens of Political Cartoons

Chiayee Khorsheed Faqe

Soran University-Department of English

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31918/twejer.2582.12>

Published: 10/08/2025

Abstract

This current study is an attempt to investigate the sense of semiotic analysis of political cartoons that appeared in digital media during the tense meeting between President Donald Trump and Volodymyr Zelensky on February 28, 2025, in the Oval Office of the White House. The study attempts to explore the complex meanings exchanged during the showdown meeting between Trump and Zelensky. A global platform for editorial cartoons and journalism websites, CARTOON MOVEMENT, is selected by the researcher as the source of data collection for seven selected political cartoons pertaining to the explosive meeting between the two presidents in the Oval Office at the White House. The cartoonists caricatured the cartoons between February 28th, 2025, and March 3rd, 2025. In order to classify and analyze the chosen political cartoons from the most popular cartoon internet domain, the present study applies Barth's (1968, 1977) model of semiotic analysis in the best interests of data analysis. The results show how political cartoons influence political discourse when leaders and presidents meet and how their fellow-citizens analyze such kind of relationship. The researcher discovered that the political cartoons on the US and Ukraine relations depict a lack of diplomacy in politics and how clashes in negotiations killed the diplomatic norms and respect with which cartoonists enact meaning through the texts, icons, and symbols.

Keyword: Political Cartoon, Semiotic Analysis, Barth's Mode, Ukraine-US Relations, Zelensky, Trump.

Introduction

Cartoons have been a part of political issues for more than two hundred years, but this genre still has not gotten its true value and manifestation and needs to receive widespread recognition. Caricatures and social artifacts portray cartoons as a reaction to a prevalent social phenomenon. For this reason, Stockl (2004) represents cartoons as “guided by socially determined intentions.” That is to say, cartoons are designed to show similarities between the images used and the real issue in reality, which the cartoonists want to show by using analogy in a humorous representation. Cartoons involve several modes, including visual mode, auditory mode, and verbal mode, which work jointly and fill up humorously to convey a message. In the era of new communication technology, cartoons have become a new collaborative mode in the field of media discourse, which includes TV, newspapers, magazines, journals, paintings, and more. Updated forms include social media platforms, in particular Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram.

Political events are, for cartoonists, the most reliable occasions to produce peculiar and creative work. Cartoonists in political cartoons launch a significant amount of criticism against a phenomenon and also reveal the hidden message humorously. Cartoons not only convey humor, but also serve to convey the ideologies, attitudes, and views of the cartoonist's society. Analyzing and interpreting the message behind cartoons requires an ideal viewpoint that is strongly equipped with the hidden meaning of socio-cultural background. For this reason, current study attempts to offer a semiotic analysis of political cartoons produced by American media cartoonists during the explosive meeting between Trump and Zelensky at the White House on February 28th, 2025. The cartoons will depict the political tension between the US administration and the Ukrainian government over the ongoing war between Russia and Ukraine.

Therefore, the political cartoons created between February 28th and March 3rd are used as the source of the data in the study. Meanwhile, this study attempts to answer the following research questions:

1. How do political cartoons depict the power dynamics between Ukraine and the US?
2. In what ways do political cartoons convey public sentiments about US foreign policy toward Ukraine?
3. How do the political cartoons depict the role of the US administration in the ongoing Russian-Ukrainian war?

Theoretical Background and Literature Review

In this part of the study, a comprehensive overview of the definition and the nature of cartoons, political cartoons, the semiotic approach, and some previous studies is presented.

Cartoons

Cartoons are incredibly captivating to watch since they feature animations designed specifically for young people. Not just kids, but also some teenagers and parents who enjoy cartoons, find joy and amusement. Cartoon images are those that evoke fantasy, movements that show positional changes or humorous images that are relevant to the current circumstance. People normally use cartoons to convey a hidden message so as to make the situation more interesting. The message that the cartoons convey intends to grab the reader's attention and motivate readers to think in an ideal recognition.

According to Johnson (1937) and Willett (1993), cartoons date back to the time of ancient Egypt, where images of humans and animals were painted on walls. Cartoons commonly present social phenomena and events to evaluate and

comment on society (Mateus, 2016). According to Harrison (1981, p.16), the word "cartoon" is derived from the French and Italian words for "card" and "paper." A "cartoon" was once a full-sized, preliminary sketch of an artwork created on paper. Cartoons always and more significantly, offer an outstanding representation of current events and societal trends through the use of analogy, comical juxtaposition, and caricature. To Samson and Huber (2001), cartoons are defined as “jokes told in pictures” where cartoons caricature a person, an action, or an event in a satirical way, which differs from comics in terms of drawing it from a story that often originated in reality.

Political Cartoons

For thousands of years, newspapers and magazines have traditionally employed political cartoons as a means of attacking political leaders and regimes. Cartoonists are able to express social commentary beyond the written word thanks to their distinctive fusions of artistic commentary and pictorial/graphical journalism. According to Matthews (2011), political cartoons are hand-portrayed pictures that immerse visualization and frequently have text that stipulates a conversation. In terms of functions, political cartoons have specific functions as they are not only created for the sake of fun and amusement, but also political cartoons are images and representations of a social trend and social phenomenon in reality.

According to Martin (2008, p. 18), political cartoons are the representation of social trends that easily “affect people’s behavior and ultimately their lives,” which means that political cartoons represent ideological and social goals. In terms of ideology, political cartoons (Sturken & Cartwright 2001, p. 21) are “means through which ideologies are produced and onto which ideologies are

projected.” Socially, political cartoons serve as "tools to make points and proclaim identity." (Martin 2008, p.18).

Furthermore, Akande (2002, p. 11) provides a comprehensive list of key features of political cartoons. First, political cartoons use humor to try to make a political point, which sets them apart from other media. Second, political cartoons offer daily or weekly assessments of significant occasions, figures, and concerns; political cartoons offer up-to-date commentary and criticism of political happenings. Third, people view political cartoons as a diversionary medium. A fourth characteristic that sets political cartoons apart is their capacity to be both humorous and emotionally devastating at the same time. Political cartoons serve as a tool for developing and evaluating political conditions, which is its fifth characteristic. By offering political opinions that could influence a reader's views and opinions, political cartoons can likewise further political goals.

Previous Studies

Numerous studies and investigations have addressed humorous cartoons, in particular political cartoons. A study entitled "About Face: Facial Prominence of George W. Bush in Political Cartoons as a Function of War" conducted by Calogero and Mullen (2008) revealed that when the conflict started, the target's face was portrayed with less prominence. The cartoon's subject matter and deliberate attempts to disparage the target did not account for these outcomes. It deviates from predictions of facial prominence effects when a political leader is portrayed as less strong and powerful following wartime engagement.

Also, Bal et al. (2009) conducted a study about the caricatures of South African President Jacob Zuma and how the cartoon both enhanced and distorted his political reputation and brand. They concluded that the caricature clearly questioned Zuma's assertions of systematic injustice by the court system. Zuma's

reputation as a troubled yet controversial and polarizing leader was further cemented by the cartoonist Zapiro. The Zapiro's comic was highly contentious, according to the writers. Its pictorial nature, which makes it much more emotional than textual critique, is what caused the uproar.

Similarly, Sani et al. (2012) carried out a research study entitled "Linguistic analysis on the construction of satire in Nigerian political cartoons: the example of newspaper cartoons". The researchers looked at Nigerian editorial political cartoons and found that political cartoons are used to spread ideas, make arguments, and give specific information about current issues in society. Nigerian cartoonists specifically use language to craft satire, serving as a tool to initiate positive social and political transformations in Nigeria. Because interjections are used to convey strong emotions or feelings, Nigerian cartoonists commonly employ them in their written cartoons to make satirical statements about political figures. Hasanah and Hidayat (2020) conducted a semiotic study of Anies' cartoons during his first 100 days as Jakarta's governor. Using Pierce's typology of signs, the study divided the sign into symbols, indices, and icons. The study determined that cartoons with strong symbolic significance reflected Indonesians' aspirations for Anies' government.

Furter, to find out how the caricature depicted the 2018 Egyptian presidential elections, Mohamed (2020) carried out a semiotic study. He examined key topics and concepts, language and non-linguistic semiotic indicators, and the symbols employed in caricature painting. The study revealed that caricatures employ signals, gestures, and visual representations of pictures to convey subliminal meanings that may remain unspoken by applying Pierce's semiotics theory.

Al-Momani et al. (2017) carried out a semiotic analysis of political cartoons created in Jordan throughout the years (2007, 2010, and 2013) parliamentary election campaigns. Barthes's observation led to the idea that cartoon comedy sent

strong messages that needed to be looked at in terms of how different cartoon signs related to each other and how they affected society and ideas.

Thus, the current study adopts a semiotic approach for the analyses of the collected data. According to Eco (1986, p. 15), semiotics is a “philosophical approach that seeks to interpret messages in terms of their signs and patterns of symbolism.” Both Saussure (1938) and Peirce (1931–1958) proposed semiotics for the first time. Saussure (1938) classifies a sign into two main elements: the signifier (an object outside the world) and the signified (a word in the language or what the object stands for). While Pierce signifies the sign system into three main elements: the signifier, the signified, and the interpretant.

Both Peirce (1931-1958) and Saussure (1938) influenced other semioticians who have significantly advanced sign studies. One of such semioticians is Roland Barth. In his works (1957, 1964, 1972, 1977), Barth examines the sign's denotative and connotative interpretations. Barth says that there are three main parts to the system of meaning: the linguistic meaning (the text), the non-coded iconic message (the literal meaning or denoted meaning), and the coded iconic message (the symbolic meaning or connoted meaning).

Research Method

Based on content document analysis, this qualitative study investigates how American media depicted the political tensions between Ukraine and the United States following the ongoing war between Russia and Ukraine. The conflict follows Trump's election as the new US president, who pledged to halt the war in Russia and Ukraine throughout the campaign. So, this study uses Barth's (1968, 1977) model to look at the political cartoon data. In this model, he divides the system of meaning into three types: linguistic messages, coded iconic messages, and non-coded iconic messages. To Barth, a non-coded iconic message pertains

to the denoted meaning of the sign. Coded iconic message refers to the connoted meaning of the sign. The linguistic message refers to the text that corresponds with the graphic, providing a more detailed explanation of the image.

Data Collection

The data for the current study consist of seven political cartoons featuring the recent political, American government promises, and military aid tensions between Ukraine government and US administration (28th February 2025) collected from a well-known Netherlands editorial cartoons website, namely CAROON MOVEMENT. Different cartoonists caricatured the meeting between Trump and Zelensky, which turned into a scandal of diplomacy and frantic talk. The political cartoons were collected and classified due to their dramatic themes.

The analysis of the data vehemently aims to investigate the attitudinal, political, and military changes and to highlight the American withdrawal of military aid to Ukraine. The US government compelled the Ukrainian president to declare a ceasefire and call for peace, and subsequently obligated Zelensky to sign an export agreement for mineral materials.

Data Analysis

This section presents the findings for each selected cartoon. The contextual background of all selected cartoons is related to the explosive meeting between American President Donald Trump and Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky on February 28, 2025, in the Oval Office at the White House.



Figure 1. Cartoonist (Dennis Goris)

<https://www.cartoonmovement.com/cartoon/art-bad-deal>

The first cartoon in figure 1 represents the impact of political decisions made during Ukraine President Zelensky's visit to the White House, along with Trump's troubling sense of responsibility. In the following table, the researcher presents a detailed analysis of the first cartoon (Figure 1).

Table 1: First cartoon analysis

Linguistic Message	<i>The cartoon's main linguistic concept revolves around the current political events between the US administration and Ukraine, specifically the impeachment trial of Trump and the controversy surrounding the new US disapproval actions.</i>
Iconic Meaning	<i>A bucket of red liquid represents violence, which would be a result of a political decision leading to more suffering and casualties. It also denotes Trump's lack of responsibility and sense of carelessness toward the Ukrainian government.</i>
Non-iconic Meaning	<i>The denotative meaning is that Trump is meeting with a high-ranking official in the Ukrainian government, who appears to be Zelensky. Trump represents US administration policy and a car waving the Ukrainian flag.</i>

The holistic interpretation of the cartoon indicates that Trump's political decisions would have severe harmful consequences for Ukraine. It also suggests how powerful presidents can exert influence on the lives of weak and vulnerable people and nations. Additionally, the cartoon highlights the negative effects of Trump's foreign policy's political ignorance and indifference toward the precarious political relations with Ukraine. The comprehensive understanding of the cartoon launches a sharp criticism of Trump's leadership regarding the whole world, particularly Ukraine. Trump holds a bucket of red liquid, signaling the red carpet, poured onto the ground as a symbol of political maneuvering leading to real-world suffering and violence.



Figure 2. Cartoonist (Daniel Boris)

<https://www.cartoonmovement.com/cartoon/its-not-what-you-wear-matters-most>

The second cartoon in figure 2 depicts an acrimonious encounter between US President Trump and Ukraine's President Zelensky. The cartoon depicts Trump as angry and frustrated, while Zelensky appears skeptical and introspective. The cartoon also depicts a formal meeting between the two presidents, where the dissimilarity in their clothing choices highlights their leadership differences. The following table offers a more detailed semiotic representation of the second cartoon, as shown in Figure 2.

Table 2: Second cartoon analysis

Linguistic Message	<i>The linguistic message of the cartoon merges Zelensky's internal critical monologue with the formal suit of Trump. The cartoon clarifies how Trump's suit misguides Zelensky's expectations.</i>
Iconic Meaning	<i>The cartoon critiques Trump's formality and dynamic positions. Zelensky's remark emphasizes that leaders may act carelessly and foolishly even when dressed in formal suits.</i>
Non-iconic Meaning	<i>Both presidents sat on couches having a conversation. Trump's appearance with flushed cheeks shows a kind of anger, while Zelensky represents a kind of skeptical attitude.</i>

A significant amount of criticism is directed toward the conventional expectations of political views in light of the formal and semi-casual style of clothes, according to the comprehensive message conveyed by the second cartoon in figure 2, which interprets that critique. In a hilarious manner, Zelensky wishes to convey to the entire world that formal clothes are not the means by which effective leaders are created.

One of the things that make a leader effective is their ability to fight for authenticity and the rights of the nation. When it comes to juxtaposing, Zelensky seems to be more comprehensible, approachable, and recognizable. The formal suit that Trump wears gives the impression that he is extremely formal, emotionless, and self-absorbed.



Figure 3. *Cartoonist* (Christo Komarnitski)

<https://www.cartoonmovement.com/cartoon/zelensky-oval-office?cartoonist=/cartoonist/123>

To illustrate the power dynamics and political difficulties that exist between the United States administration and Zelensky, the cartoon depicted in figure 3 represents a stressful meeting or a form of confrontation. During this discussion, the Russian president hides behind Zelensky's chair in an attempt to drown the Ukrainian president. The vivid visual illustrates the precariousness and intimidation that are inherent in the political relations of the real world.

Table 3: Third cartoon analysis

Linguistic Message	<i>The linguistic message of the cartoon denotes the issue of intense power conflict in the real world. The cartoon serves challenges, struggles, and vulnerability in leadership. There is also a kind of dialogue absence that shows the unstable position of the Ukrainian president, who is surrounded by Trump and Putin.</i>
Iconic Meaning	<i>The cartoon's emblematic significance illustrates the dynamics between minor nations and major global powers. This signifies that a little nation such as Ukraine is under jeopardy.</i>
Non-iconic Meaning	<i>Three world presidents—Trump, Putin, and Zelensky—along with others show in the cartoon gathering. While Zelensky expresses a non-iconic sensation of unease and anxiety, Putin and Trump seem relentless on their mission.</i>

For the purpose of comprehending the wider themes and messages conveyed by the cartoon, the most comprehensive analysis of the animation involves analyzing the numerous components and how they are related to one another. There is a combative realm that is marked by the aggressive attitude of both Trump and Putin. The cartoon only represents coercion and oppression, both of which are detrimental to the practice of diplomacy. It is important to note that the cartoon draws attention to the concept of isolation and severe pressure, while also navigating the complexities of international relations and negotiating the struggle that leads to the observation of powerful characters that are overwhelming.



Figure 4. *Cartoonist (Dale Cummings)*

<https://www.cartoonmovement.com/cartoon/deal-unravels>

Figure 4 illustrates that Trump intends to finalize a minerals agreement. Nonetheless, it seems that the minerals agreement bears no relevance for the Ukrainian populace. During the summit, the commercial agenda seems to favor mineral agreements over security assurances or a ceasefire with Russia. For Trump, the mining agreement serves as a quid pro quo for security assurances. The Ukrainian President diplomatically declines to endorse the minerals agreement absent concrete security assurances.

Table 4: Fourth cartoon analysis

Linguistic Message	<i>The linguistic meaning of the cartoon explores a kind of critique over the integrity of deals. Trump resembles a dealmaker figure, while Zelensky walks away as a linguistic sign of dissatisfaction.</i>
Iconic Meaning	<i>The fourth cartoon conveys the iconic message of skepticism about promises. Such deals are a matter of the sovereignty of a nation, not a matter of being sealed or printed on a toilet paper roll.</i>
Non-iconic Meaning	<i>The cartoon depicts two presidents. Trump holds a toilet paper roll, and Zelensky walks away and insults Trump with the back of his left hand raised with his middle finger.</i>

The entire image embodies cynicism in political debate. Zelensky's portrayal in the cartoon signifies disenchantment and a deficit of credibility. Engaging with such an agreement on toilet paper rolls suggests that transactions are ephemeral and prompts an evaluation of their value and authenticity. Observers may readily see frustration and deceit in political conversations. It is perpetually debatable that in any political or economic agreement, both parties strive to achieve optimal results for their respective nations. It is essential to recognize that, at times, the proposals presented are not accorded the gravity they warrant.



Figure 5. *Cartoonist (Raul Fernando Zuleta)*

<https://www.cartoonmovement.com/cartoon/juego-diplomatico>

The cartoon depicted in figure 5 contains significant captions regarding the future of Ukraine. The cartoon shows how American President Trump and Russian President Putin decide at the expense of susceptible nations.

Table 5: Fifth cartoon analysis

Linguistic Message	<i>The linguistic idea of the cartoon revolves around employing symbolism and metaphor to depict challenging political issues.</i>
Iconic Meaning	<i>The cartoon critiques the tendency of political leaders to prioritize their own agendas over the welfare of their constituents, highlighting the moral ramifications of their acts in a visually compelling manner.</i>
Non-iconic Meaning	<i>The non-iconic depiction highlights the ramifications of governmental actions and their sometimes imperceptible impacts on disadvantaged people, revealing the profound meanings and social critiques embedded within the cartoon.</i>

By demonstrating how leaders prioritize their strategies and competitiveness over the welfare of vulnerable groups, the cartoon raises questions about the fundamental nature of the relationships between political power and institutions. It brings to light the sometimes irrational pursuit of resources and power, which can have significant repercussions for those individuals who are most directly affected by such decisions.



Figure 6. *Cartoonist (Thiago Lucas)*

<https://www.cartoonmovement.com/cartoon/frying>

The cartoon shows Trump and Putin in armchairs gesturing at Zelensky in a burning fireplace. The world is burning. Trump and Putin appear to belittle Zelensky while he is vulnerable, creating a tough and important situation.

Table 6: Sixth cartoon analysis

Linguistic Message	<i>The cartoon expresses ideas on the risks of political manipulation and the results of unbridled authority.</i>
Iconic Meaning	<i>The iconic meaning highlights the moral and ethical consequences of authority, the misery experienced by people engaged in political conflict, and the possible hazards presented by self-serving leadership.</i>
Non-iconic Meaning	<i>Presenting a serious crisis involving major political leaders, the non-iconic message emphasizes on the characters, their arrangement, and the immediate visual aspects without interpretation or deeper significance.</i>

The cartoon's depiction of political power relations and conflict has a significant impact on the general impression that viewers take away from it. The video depicts Zelensky in a weak posture within a fireplace that is encircled by flames. It also depicts Trump and Putin as dominant characters that ridicule or humiliate him.



Figure 7. Cartoonist (Maarten Wolternik)

<https://www.cartoonmovement.com/cartoon/back-us>

The cartoon in figure 7 depicts serious topics, drawing attention to the ridiculousness of a leader having to balance competing forces while staying true to his nation's perspective.

Table 7: Seventh cartoon analysis

Linguistic Message	<i>The sarcasm and critique conveyed linguistically focus on the difficulties leaders like Zelensky face while trying to exert their authority within the complexity of global power.</i>
Iconic Meaning	<i>Emphasizing the complexity of power dynamics in world politics, the famous phrase shows the challenges smaller countries confront against more general geopolitical factors.</i>
Non-iconic Meaning	<i>The non-iconic message explores more deeply power dynamics, the nature of international relations, and the difficulties confronting leaders in a convoluted global scene.</i>

The ultimate manifestation of the cartoon in figure 7 illustrates the poignant commentary on the deep and frequently tense ties that exist in world politics. It places an emphasis on problems like power, influence, and the intricacy of leadership on the global stage.

Findings and Discussions

The confrontation between US President Trump and Ukrainian President Zelensky at the Oval office on February 28 shocked the world. Cartoonists all over the world portray this diplomatic relation between the two countries through their political cartoons caricatured. The cartoonists analyzed the attitude and signs of the figures within the showdown meeting instead of analyzing the meeting's political implications and hints.

The first caption is that political analysts to some extent believe that Trump and US vice President Vance killed democracy during their heated meeting with the vulnerable Ukrainian president. The behavior of two arrogant and confident US politicians with the Ukrainian leader – who was under tremendous pressure, on the verge of collapse – in a disrespectful and brutal manner. In terms of public diplomacy, Trump and Vice President Vance violated norms that even dictators typically adhere to. The only other regime that occasionally employs such brutality is North Korea. It's not surprising, then, that Trump has openly praised North Korean dictator Kim Jong-Un as a good leader and even a friend. What happened at the Oval Office was just an open of shout match, at the level of democracy is something unprecedented. What was witnessed at the Oval Office represents a low-level of negotiations that hardly found in dictators' meetings and mafia group gatherings.

Secondly, and more importantly, what transpired in the office did not uncover the underlying tensions; instead, the atmosphere remained bleak, marked by

Trump's overt anger towards Ukraine and Europe, leaving Zelensky in an untenable position. Fortunately, he understood that Ukraine's survival hinged on US support. Should we blame Zelensky? Could he have been more attuned to the necessity of American assistance and acted with greater foresight? The third caption that was Trump's assertion that Zelensky did not seek a ceasefire and preferred ongoing conflict was a blatant falsehood. Zelensky certainly wanted peace, but it had to be meaningful—a peace that went beyond a mere ceasefire that would allow for renewed Russian aggression. By other means, such a ceasefire would merely be the continuation of war through peaceful methods.

Most of all, the most disgusting and disregard was Trump's insist to thank US administration for their military aid during the ongoing war with Russia. Was this almost obligatory repetition of "thank you" meant to express gratitude for Trump and Vance's criticism of the absence of appreciation, or did it convey an underlying complaint, whether intentional or not? The US administration, in particular Trump's discourse—poses a threat to the very fabric of our social life. Many analysts have noted that this directly contributes to social instability. The absence of basic manners hinders genuine communication: I may appear to listen, but I do not. This mindset is increasingly becoming a widespread phenomenon.

Trump's current policy toward Europe is questionable, as he perceives Europe as having been established to mislead the United States. This indicates that Trump does not harbor positive intentions for Europe and may issue further threats, potentially leaving the continent vulnerable to Russian aggression. What Trump has demonstrated is a complete disregard for diplomacy and international politics. If Trump asserts that the EU was established to mislead the United States, Europe must respond decisively—politically, economically, and militarily—keeping all options open, including a potential alliance with China and reevaluating the

dollar's value. In essence, Europe needs to unite as much as possible and declare a state of emergency.

For Trump, the only priority is the interests of the United States. However, he must understand that the decline of European security will inevitably lead to domestic complications and could negatively impact US diplomatic relations. Europe must not underestimate Trump's insult toward Ukrainian President Zelensky. It is crucial for European leaders to swiftly clarify their stance and consider the future of their nations. Trump seems to believe that Zelensky should dictate his feelings, while in reality; it is Zelensky who deserves gratitude. In a typical exchange between allies, Zelensky should have asserted that it is Ukraine that merits respect and appreciation for defending not only its sovereignty but also the freedom of Europe and the United States.

Conclusions

The insults hurled at Ukrainian President Zelensky by Trump and Vance not only brought personal shame upon them but also symbolized a broader failure of empathy on the global stage. This backlash, amplified by various media outlets, transformed Zelensky into a figure of resilience and heroism, drawing unprecedented support from influential European nations. The warm welcome extended to him by British King Charles III and Prime Minister signals a powerful endorsement of Ukraine's struggle, positioning Zelensky as a beacon of hope against the backdrop of Trump's dismissive rhetoric.

Zelensky's limited political experience contrasts sharply with his audacious confrontation of the US administration, where he asserted his stance in imperfect English. His response to Trump's claim that “you don’t have any cards” — “I am not playing cards” — symbolically redefines the power dynamics at play, challenging Trump’s ambiguous posture toward Russia. Through this exchange,

Zelensky not only counters disrespect but also embodies a collective European resolve against aggression. This exchange highlighted Zelensky's challenge to Trump's ambiguous stance on Russia and Putin. Zelensky also echoed Trump's sentiments, stating that the war would have ended in two days without US involvement, while Russia claimed it would have taken three. This was a direct response to Trump's disrespect toward Zelensky, who represents a broader European perspective in his dealings with Trump. Furthermore, Zelensky told US vice president not to raise his voice, indicating that he was not worthy of me to raise his voice.

Moreover, the cordial welcome from the British Prime Minister and King Charles III sends a clear message from Britain and Europe to Trump and his administration: they should not treat the enemy of their enemy in such a manner. This direct welcome also signals that Ukraine is not alone and will not be abandoned. By openly honoring Ukraine's leadership, the British officials emphasize that Ukraine is not fighting alone. The British officials underline by freely respecting Ukraine's leadership that country is not battling alone. Their generosity supports the idea that Europe supports Ukraine's fight for security and sovereignty strongly. This act reminds us unequivocally that the world community is observing and that any attempt to discredit Ukraine's position will not go unpacked. In the end, this show of solidarity underlines to Ukraine and its enemies that support for Ukraine is constant and uncompromising, therefore strengthening the belief that friends will keep standing together against challenges.

List of References

- Akande, O. (2002). A semiotic analysis of political cartoons: A case study of Nigeria. Ph.D Dissertation, University of Oklahoma.
- Al-Momani, K., Badarneh, M. A., & Migdadi, F. (2017). A semiotic analysis of political cartoons in Jordan in light of the Arab Spring. *Humor*, 30(1), 63-95. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1515/humor-2016-0033>
- Bal, A.S., Pitt, L., Berthon, P., and DesAutels, P. (2009).—Caricatures, cartoons, spoofs and satires: Political brands as butts, *Journal of Public Affairs*, 9 (229-237).
- Barthes, R (1964). *Elements of semiology* (trans. Annette Lavers & Colin Smith). London: Jonathan Cape.
- Barthes, R. (1972). *Mythology*. New York: Noonday Press.
- Barthes, R. (1977). *Image-music-text*. London: Fontana.
- Calogero, R. & Mullen, B. (2008). —About face: Facial prominence of George W. Bush in political cartoons as a function of war” *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19 (107-116).
- Chandler, D. (2002). *Semiotics: The basics*. London: Routledge.
- Johnson.S. (1937) Cartoons: Oxford University Press, *American Journal Association for public opinion research*
- Harrison, R. (1981). *The cartoon: Communication to the Quick*. London: Sage Publications.
- Hasanah, N., & Hidayat, D. N. (2020). A semiotic analysis of political cartoons on the first 100 days of Anies Baswedan government. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature and Culture*, 5(2), 322-333. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.30659/e.5.2.322-333>

- Martin, R .(2008). Thoughts on the Muhammad cartoon fiasco. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research* 21(1). 16–21.
- Mateus, S. (2016). Political cartoons as communicative weapons: the hypothesis of the “Double Standard Thesis” in three Portuguese cartoons. *Estudos em Comunicação*, 23, 195-221.
- Matthews, C. (2011). *Witticism of transition: humor and rhetoric of editorial cartoons on journalism*.
- Mohamed W. (2020). Semiotics of Elections in Political Caricature of Online Newspaper: A Case Study of 2018 Presidential Egyptian Elections. *Arab Journal for Media and Communication Research (AJMCR)*, 2020(30), 2-40. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21608/jkom.2020.112656>
- Peirce, C. (1958). *Collected writings*, 8 vols., Ed. Charles Hartshorne, Paul Weiss & Arthur W. Burks. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Samson, A. & Oswald, H. (2001). The interaction of cartoonist’s gender and formal features of cartoons. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research* 20. 1–25.
- Sani, I., Abdullah, M., Ali, A.M., and Abdullah, F.S. (2012). —Linguistic analysis on the construction of satire in Nigerian political cartoons: *The example of newspaper cartoons*|| *Journal of Media and Communication Studies*, 4:3 (52-59).
- Saussure, F. 1983 [1916]. *Course in general linguistics* (trans. Roy Harris). London: Duckwort.
- Sturken, M. & Lisa C. (2001). *Practices of looking: An introduction to visual culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Stöckl, H. (2004). In between modes: Language and image in printed media. In Eija Ventola, Cassily Charles & Martin Kaltenbacher (eds.), *Perspectives of multimodality*, 9–30. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Willett, F. (1993). *African Art: an Introduction*. African Arts, 4(4), 72.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3345891>

شيكارى ھىمايى بۇ پەيوەندى نيوان ئۇكرانياو ئەمىرىكا لەرىگەى وىنە كارتۇنىيە سىياسىيەكان

یوخته

ئەم توۋىزىنەمىيە ھەمۇنچە بۇ شىكارى ھىمايى بۇ ئەم وىنە كارتۇنە سىياسىيەنى كە لە دىدارە توندو گىرژىيەكەى نىوان سەرۆكى ئەمىرىكا دۇنالد تىرمپ و سەرۆكى ئۇكرانىا فۇلئىدىمىر زىلنسىكى لە ۲۸ شوباتى ۲۰۲۵ كەلە ئۇقال ئۇففىسى كۆشكى سىپى رويدا. مالىپىرى Cartoon Movement وەك سەرچاۋەى سەرەكى داتاي توۋىزىنەمەكە بەكار ھىنراۋە بۇ ھەلۋاردنى ھەوت لەم وىنە كاريكاتىرىيەنى لەبەرۋاي ۲۸ شوبات ۲۰۲۵ بۇ ۳ مارسى ۲۰۲۵ بىلو كرانەمە لەم مالىپەرە كاريكاتىرىيە. بۇ پۇلئىن كىردن و شىكارى كىردنى داتاي وەرگىراۋ، توۋىزەر مۇدىلى بارت (۱۹۶۸، ۱۹۷۷) وەك مۇدىلىكى شىكارى ھىمايى بۇ داتاكانى بەكار ھىنا. دەرئىنجاى توۋىزىنەمەكە دەر خەرى ئەمەيە كە ئەم گىرژى و ئالۋىيەى لە دىدارى ھەردووك سەرۆك رويدا ھەمۇ بەھا دىبىلۇماسىيەكان و رىزى كۆشت كە كارتۇنىستەكان لەرگىگەى دەقى كورت، ئايكۇن و ھىماكانەمە مانايان يىداۋو.

كلىلە وشەكان: وینەى كارتونى سىياسى ، شىكارى ھىمايى ، پەيۋەندى ئوكرانيا و ئەمىرىكا ، قۇلدىمىر زىلېنسكى ، دۇنالد ترامپ

تحليل سيميائي للعلاقات الأوكرانية الأمريكية من خلال الرسوم الكاريكاتورية السياسية

ملخص

تحاول هذه الدراسة تحليل الرسوم الكاريكاتورية السياسية الرمزية للقاء المتوتر بين الرئيس الأمريكي دونالد ترامب والرئيس الأوكراني فولوديمير زيلينسكي في ٢٨ فبراير ٢٠٢٥ في المكتب ثوفال بالبيت الأبيض. تم استخدام موقع Cartoon Movement كمصدر رئيسي للبيانات لاختيار سبعة من الرسوم الكاريكاتورية المنشورة في الفترة من ٢٨ فبراير ٢٠٢٥ إلى ٣ مارس ٢٠٢٥. ولتصنيف البيانات وتحليلها استخدم الباحث نموذج بارث (١٩٦٨، ١٩٧٧) كنموذج تحليل رمزي للبيانات. وتشير نتائج الدراسة إلى أن التوتر الذي حدث خلال اللقاء بين الرئيسين قتل كل القيم الدبلوماسية والاحترام الذي أعطاه رسامو الكاريكاتير معناه من خلال النصوص القصيرة والأيقونات والرموز.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الرسوم الكاريكاتورية السياسية، التحليل السيميائي ، العلاقات بين أوكرانيا والولايات المتحدة ، فولوديمير زيلينسكي، دونالد ترامب