14090

NATIONAL LIBRARY
OTTAWA

BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE
OTTAWA

NAME OF AUTHOR. MARY...SUE...DEVEREAUX.....
TITLE OF THESIS. J.H.E...CHARACTERISTICS...OF...TIME
MAGAZINE...COVER...SUBJECTS, 1946-1971;
A...CONTENT ANALYSIS.....
UNIVERSITY. CARLETON...UNIVERSITY.....
DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED. MA.....
YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED. 1972.....

Permission is hereby granted to THE NATIONAL LIBRARY
OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies
of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and
neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be
printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's
written permission.

(Signed) Mary Sue Devereaux
PERMANENT ADDRESS:

..789...BRANSON AVENUE
..OTTAWA...ONTARIO.
.....

DATED Oct 6 19 72

NL-91 (10-68)

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF TIME
MAGAZINE COVER SUBJECTS, 1946-1971:
A CONTENT ANALYSIS

by

Mary Sue Devereaux, B.J.

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of
Graduate Studies in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
August 28, 1972

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty
of Graduate Studies acceptance of the thesis
"A Content Analysis of TIME
Magazine Covers, 1946-1971"
submitted by Mary Sue Devereaux, B.J.,
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts.

.....
Thesis Supervisor

.....
Chairman, Department of Sociology
and Anthropology

Carleton University
September 19, 1972

ABSTRACT

This is a content analysis of a sample of TIME Magazine cover subjects, spanning the years 1946 to 1971. The purpose was to discover first, what socio-economic characteristics are typical of such people, and second, how these characteristics have changed over time. The basic premise was that TIME Magazine covers reflect American society.

Over the years, the average cover subject was apt to be a white American male in his mid-50s of a Protestant faith. He had obtained at least an undergraduate degree, and more often than not, was a government official, either elected or appointed. Negroes and women were under-represented. These findings are consistent with those of other studies which described similar traits for elite groups.

This pattern held throughout the 26 years under investigation. Changes that did occur came after 1966. Most significant were declines in portrayals of businessmen and natural and physical scientists, and increases in politicians and entertainers. Cover subjects became younger and more than one frequently appeared on a single issue. But there was also a trend toward depicting events or phenomena rather than people. Some of these changes may be the result of the death in 1967 of TIME's founder and publisher, Henry R. Luce, and the subsequent freeing of the magazine from his influence.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my parents for their patience and forbearance during the time I was writing this thesis; Professor Bruce A. McFarlane, the chairman of my committee, for his advice and guidance, and for the trouble he went to on my behalf; Professor John Harp and Professor Hyman Burshtyn for their suggestions and assistance, particularly concerning the methodology of content analysis, and Professor John R. Weston of the Department of Journalism, who was also on the examining board. I am also indebted to Professor John deVries for his advice on the application of computer techniques to my study. Finally, I would like to thank the librarians in the Reference Department of the Ottawa Public Library who cheerfully carried twenty-six years' worth of TIME magazines up and down two flights of stairs for me when I was doing the initial research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
Chapter	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 THE MASS MEDIA	4
3 MAGAZINES	14
4 TIME MAGAZINE	21
5 CONTENT ANALYSIS	33
6 HEROES	39
7 ELITES	57
8 METHODOLOGY	78
9 FINDINGS	82
10 SPECIAL GROUPS	118
11 CONCLUSION	141
APPENDIX A	150
APPENDIX B	160
APPENDIX C	161
APPENDIX D	170
APPENDIX E	171
BIBLIOGRAPHY	182

Chapter 1

Introduction

Magnus Eisengrim did not bring his famous display of illusions to Canada until 1968. His fame was now so great that he once had his picture on the cover of TIME as the greatest magician in history (Davies, 1970: 299).

There are, however, carpers in the capital who say that Reston peaked a dozen years ago when he was the subject of a TIME Magazine cover story ... (Sutton, 1972: 13).

... About the time the killing took place, TIME Magazine put Daley on the cover and lavished him with praise The city's papers pointed at the TIME article as evidence of their own political perception (Royko, 1971: 130).

The first quote, from a recent Canadian novel, refers to a fictional character. The other two concern living persons (New York Times columnist James Reston and Chicago mayor Richard Daley) who actually have appeared on the cover of TIME Magazine. That this circumstance should be mentioned at all by writers of fact or fiction is an indication that they believe readers will understand the significance of an individual's having been chosen for a TIME cover story.

In terms of circulation, TIME is the world's most widely read newsmagazine. Its standard red-bordered cover (although the magazine was founded in 1923, the red border was not used until 1927) has become a ubiquitous element of American life. To be portrayed on the cover of this magazine is a journalistic accolade - recognition that one is or has done something worthy of national and even world attention. The cover story choice has prompted some critics to complain that the

the subject did not justify the honor:

The success of Ostropolitik is not immediately apparent after some four months of 1971, and it will take a miracle in the next four months - or the next forty years - to make TIME's cover story on Willy Brandt stand up (Chamberlain, 1971: 525).

There is even a superstition, the "TIME cover jinx", connected with the magazine, which applies to athletes, i.e. after appearing on the cover, the person or his team will suffer a losing streak. Nevertheless, it may be assumed that most people singled out for such recognition are not displeased.

The subject of a cover story does not depend solely on the editor's whim. As a newsmagazine, TIME must try to keep abreast of what is current and important. Thus, cover subjects tend to be involved in, or to represent, the most pressing news story of a particular week, or on slow weeks, a phenomenon or continuing situation that is having an impact. Of course, there is some editorial judgment exercised with respect to what is new, significant and noteworthy, but such judgment can never be too far removed from reality.

So it is that an examination of who or what is making the cover of TIME Magazine may be an indicator of what is happening in America. The purpose of this paper is to look at TIME's cover subjects since the end of the Second World War in hope that this will show changes and regularities in the type of person who is accorded mass attention and, presumably, is having some effect. Therefore, this is essentially a descriptive and exploratory investigation. No new theories or hypotheses will be advanced, although the following indicate the kind of question that may be answered: Are women, Negroes and youth playing a greater part? Do certain patterns of religion and ethnicity recur? What is the link between occupation and education? Do some types of

occupation appear more frequently and are they associated with particular sex or racial characteristics? Has emphasis turned from national to international concerns?

But discerning regularities and trends in TIME cover subjects, and then extrapolating to American society at large is a risky business. For this reason, it is considered unwise to postulate too much at this juncture. Thus, much of this paper will be concerned with testing TIME Magazine as a social indicator. In order to do this, it will be necessary to look at the mass media in general, magazines in particular, and TIME Magazine specifically. At that point, reasons for undertaking a content analysis of TIME covers will be explained. To put the findings in their proper light, several theories of heroes and elites will be noted. Next, the methods employed will be explicated and finally, the results of the analysis revealed. At the end, an attempt to draw some conclusions will be made.

Chapter 2

The Mass Media

Definitions of and ideas about the mass media are as numerous and varied as authors who promulgate them. At the most general level, several characteristics of mass communication may be distinguished. Mass communication employs modern technology. It is directed toward a large, heterogeneous audience, anonymous to the communicator. Messages, transmitted publicly, are timed to reach this audience quickly, often simultaneously, and are usually meant to be transient, not permanent, records. Because, in most cases, communicators operate within complex formal organizations that may entail great expense, there is a tendency for messages to become standardized in content and technique.

These characteristics apply in greater or lesser degree to the various media engaged in mass communication - books, newspapers, periodicals, radio, television and motion pictures - but they do not come close to suggesting the enormous importance that media can and do have. "... Man, alone of all creatures, reacts not just to his physical surroundings but to a pseudo-environment, a symbolic environment, and it may be more important than the actual one in governing what he thinks and does" (Peterson, 1963-64: 410). Increasingly, it is only with comparative rarity that people deal with physical reality first-hand. More often it is ideas about this reality with which they come in contact - ideas conveyed by the mass media as "... carriers of the values, the beliefs, the distinctive tone of society in which they operate" (Peterson, 1963-64: 411). As early as the beginning of the nineteenth century, Joseph Goerres, a German publicist, said, "What everybody desires and wants shall be expressed in

the newspapers; what is depressing and troubling everybody may not remain unexpressed" There are those who believe that mass communication is becoming "the main framework of the web of social life" (Wirth, 1948: 10).

According to George Gerbner, mass mediated public message systems are a "common culture through which communities cultivate shared and public notions about facts, values and contingencies of human existence" (1969: 123). The heterogeneous audience at which messages are aimed, by virtue of receiving those messages, moves toward homogeneity. There is a collective context within which and in response to which individual and group selections and interpretations of messages occur. A message cultivates consciousness of terms required for its meaningful perception. If these terms are shared, they form the basis for public interaction. The terms of broadest social interaction are those available in the most widely shared message systems of a culture. More and more, these systems are mass-produced.

Mass production and distribution of messages transform selected private perspectives into broad public perspectives, and thereby bring mass publics into being. They, in turn, are maintained through continued publication or broadcast. These publics are supplied with selections of information and entertainment, fact and fiction, considered important, interesting, entertaining and profitable with regard to the perspectives to be cultivated.

Individuals have become dependent on mass communication for their view of the structure of society as a whole. Standards of credulity and reality are set by the media, and even direct, personal experience may be organized in media-created stereotypes. In some ways, this may be advantageous since a key problem in any society is the maintenance of order and

social cohesion through promotion of consensus on the value system. Many writers contend that values taught by the most pervasive arts in a culture, i.e. the mass media, reflect dominant values.

Harold Lasswell has listed three major activities of communication specialists: 1) surveillance of the environment; 2) correlation of the parts of society as it responds to that environment, and 3) transmission of a social heritage (Wright, 1960: 608). More specifically, Gerbner has called the mass media cultural arms of the industrial system in which they are located. Through selection, treatment, emphasis and tone, the media 1) help define a set of significant realities; 2) structure the agenda of public (and private) discourse, and 3) make available the dominant perspectives from which realities, priorities, actions and policies may be viewed (Gerbner, 1961: 313).

In America, performance of these tasks results most frequently in maintenance of the status quo, for reasons related to the economic context in which most media operate. This is especially true of national media. "The distinctive communication roles of national media are often only by-products of their social system's characteristic conditions for industrial investment and popular support" (Gerbner, 1961: 314). Mass media content bears the imprint of the concrete circumstances of its creation. These include: external outlook and internal dynamics of the producing industry, relationship to competitors, control over resources and facilities of production and distribution, the position of its decision-makers in the industrial system, and their relationship to audiences, sponsors and markets. The social determinants of the communication industries are expressed through "... patterns of selection, omission, juxtaposition, through just the way things are 'looked at'" (Gerbner, 1958: 90).

Business influences are usually suggested as a primary

reason for the status quo maintaining effect that mass media seem to have. Communication industries are "commercial enterprises, not public service institutions. Their operation is conditioned by their commercial considerations" (Key, 1961: 378). "Since the mass media are supported by great business concerns geared into the current social and economic system, the media contribute to the maintenance of that system" (Lazarsfeld and Merton, 1957: 465). Not only is the status quo upheld, but essential questions about the structure of society may not be raised. "Social objectives are consistently surrendered by commercialized media when they clash with economic gains" (Lazarsfeld and Merton, 1957: 466). As Holsti has observed:

All editorial choice patterns in what and what not to make public (and in what proportion, with what emphasis, etc.) have an ideological basis and a political dimension rooted in the structural characteristics of the medium (1969: 49).

Status quo maintenance is believed to be the main effect of the media, especially with regard to political matters. Competition in this sphere exists more in terms of variations on a few basic themes, not clashing issues, since the tone and quality of media content is influenced by those who manufacture news and fix the nature of other politically relevant content available to the media.

It is safe to conclude that the major influence of the media upon political attitudes is by and large a reinforcement of the status quo The so-called American consensus may have its foundations partially in the characteristics of the American media (Key, 1961: 395).

Yet this situation is not entirely unidirectional, for "it is the consensual basis that already exists in society which lends to mass communication its effectiveness" (Wirth, 1948: 7). By emphasizing dominant values, the media are re-

sponding to what people want. Again, business considerations enter the picture, as wide audience appeal is required for mass dissemination. But more important, the media can enforce social norms in a manner reassuring to the audience. The gap between private attitudes and public morality can be closed, or at least narrowed, and those changes which must inevitably occur can be presented as less threatening than they would otherwise seem. "By expressing, dramatizing and repeating cultural patterns, both the traditional and newly emerging, the media reinforce tradition and at the same time explain new roles" (Breed, 1958: 110). As a form of adult socialization, the media keep a body of ultimate common values visible which constitute a source of continuing consensus despite the encroachments of change.

In fact, as was demonstrated in a study by Warren Breed, mass communication can also protect socio-cultural consensus by omitting content that might jeopardize the existing structure and public faith in it. Breed was led to conclude:

The media, then, withdraw from unnecessarily baring structural flaws in the working of institutions. They are an insulating mechanism in the potential clash between two powerful modes of behaviour, the normatively ideal way and the persistent pragmatic way (1958: 114).

But this is the negative side of an influence that the media may exert in either upholding, or occasionally changing, the status quo. Paul Lazarsfeld and Robert Merton noted the power a medium of mass communication may have in bringing certain individuals to public attention. They called this process status conferral. It has long been contended that mass media make news as well as report it. "The mere fact of an event being reported tends by itself to elevate this event to a level of importance beyond that of unrelated events" (Bauer and Bauer, 1960: 51). The same is true of people. A circular

belief comes into operation: people who matter are the focus of mass attention; the focus of mass attention must matter.

... The medium does not need to show that the subjects that fill it are timely or interesting or important - the fact that they are its subjects makes them so If TIME, Life and the television shows are full of Tom Fool this month, he's no fool (Jarrell, 1960: 365).

Recognition by the press or radio or magazines or newsreels testifies that one has arrived, that one is important enough to have been singled out from the large anonymous masses, that one's behaviour and opinions are significant enough to require public notice (Lazarsfeld and Merton, 1957: 461).

This is particularly evident in the case of many show business personalities who are "celebrated because they are displayed as celebrities. Rather than being celebrated because they occupy positions of prestige, they occupy positions of prestige because they are celebrated" (Mills, 1956: 74).

Nevertheless, status conferral by the media is not as frivolous as the foregoing suggests. The media bestow prestige upon and enhance the authority of individuals and groups by legitimizing their status. More often than not, the objects of such attention are those embodying the values of the status quo - values important to society. Noteworthy here is the frequency with which political leaders are chosen. "The attention which the news media give to political figures and their behaviour can enhance and legitimize their position of power through the process of status conferral" (Wright, 1960: 616).

One's social standing is raised by favorable media attention, but approval is not essential. "... Enhanced status accrues to those who merely receive attention in the media, quite apart from any editorial support" (Lazarsfeld and Merton, 1957: 461). However, in cases where attention is of a negative nature, although the individual who receives it may have his own status accentuated, the net result of such status

conferral may be to strengthen social control over other members of society and thereby maintain current values and norms. When deviant behaviour is brought to public view, "... disclosure through mass communication creates the social conditions under which most people must condemn the violations and support public, rather than private, standards of morality" (Wright, 1960: 615). Charles R. Wright has called this the "ethicizing function" that status conferral performs.

Besides status quo maintenance and its corollary, status conferral, myriad other functions and effects have been attributed to the mass media. After reviewing research evidence on the impact of the media, Raymond A. Bauer and Alice H. Bauer listed effects that have been ascribed to them. Mass media have been alleged to:

- 1) change specific attitudes
- 2) reinforce existing attitudes
- 3) offer diversion and recreation
- 4) enhance aesthetic experience and the level of culture
- 5) lower aesthetic tastes
- 6) stimulate specific behaviour
- 7) furnish vicarious experience that inhibits overt behaviour
- 8) furnish knowledge
- 9) divert time away from more desirable activities
- 10) divert time away from less desirable activities
- 11) divert money away from other activities
- 12) give status and prestige (directly and indirectly)
- 13) destroy reputations (1960: 21)

Some of these effects are obviously contradictory and are undoubtedly contingent upon very special circumstances. For reasons that will be explicated shortly, status quo maintenance and status conferral which promotes it, would seem to be the chief impact of the media in most situations.

Lazarsfeld and Merton said the optimum conditions for effective communication are monopolization (little or no opposition in the media to diffusion of values, policies or public images), canalization (the aim of redirecting, not altering,

basic attitudes), and supplementation (reinforcement of messages by face-to-face contact) (Lazarsfeld and Merton, 1957: 469). Rarely do these conditions exist simultaneously, and the most important, monopolization, is virtually never obtained in real life situations.

Yet some degree of monopolization may be possible on topics for which the audience has only vague internalized norms for independent judgment. It can be argued that opinions about personalities lack foundation in norms and standards, and therefore, may fit into this category. Such opinions may be especially dependent upon images conveyed by the media. This was demonstrated in a 1934 study by Albert D. Annis and Norman C. Meier who found that students' opinions about an obscure Australian politician were directly related to their having read either a favorable or unfavorable story about him planted in a college newspaper (Bauer and Bauer, 1960: 24).

At this point, it might be concluded that

....the mass media of communication exercise a distinctive advantage in inverse proportion to the importance of the issue involved A monopoly of information is possible in proportion to the newness of an issue and its lack of relationship to previously important issues (Bauer and Bauer, 1960: 24-25).

To some extent, this is true. But a more accurate assessment would be that the influence of the media is greatest in formation of opinions about substantive issues and events remote from the experience of people, and to which they can bring no applicable general convictions. "Importance" per se has little relevance, dependent as it is on individual concerns. For example, "the never-never world of foreign affairs, a mixture of secrecy and of remote events with meaning only to the relatively well-informed, may be such an area of special media influence" (Key, 1961: 401). The less informed one is about an issue, the more open one may be to media suggestions.

Another proviso should be added. The effects of communication are related to the communicator's perceived credibility. But, it has been argued that suggestions of the media, repeated year after year, may even affect opinions on basic issues. Ultimately, "messages rejected because of their untrustworthy source may eventually be accepted" (Key, 1961: 403).

Implicit in the preceding, yet thus far neglected, is the effect of an audience on the potential influence of messages disseminated by the media. The direct impact of mass media is fixed by the limits of the audience, their selectivity in attention and the system by which communication flows within the population, which in turn, may either enlarge the audience or dilute the effects of messages.

Thus, the premise has been advanced that communicators tend to cast messages in the idiom of their intended audience. From this, it is possible to draw three types of proposition relating audience attributes to communication content. First, authors write differently for dissimilar audiences. Second, literature reflects basic value differences of audiences. And third, these materials shape values and predispositions of audiences.

But as mentioned above, one of the characteristics of mass communication is the anonymity of the audience.

... Producers do not know in advance in detail who or how many the recipients will be, or what commitments they will be willing to make as a result of exposure, although market research can in all three cases narrow the range of uncertainty somewhat. (Parsons and White, 1960: 71)

The result of this situation has been that the media tend to address themselves to a centre point of taste, interest and capability which generally coincides with values, norms and standards prevalent in that society, in other words, the status quo.

Critics may deplore this, but it is eminently sensible if the media wish to reach large audiences. One of the few adequately proven findings of communication research is that people are inclined to seek out information that supports pre-existing attitudes and avoid contradictory communications. People may choose to attend or not to attend, among media and among messages.

To some extent, each medium of communication has its characteristic audience, and within those audiences the extent of attention to differing types of messages varies enormously In all these choices they may avoid ... messages contradictory of their current beliefs and values (Key, 1961: 369).

To secure an audience, it is, therefore, wise for the media to hew to established themes. As advocates of the status quo, the media find reinforcement for their messages as they come to rest in congenial group settings.

... In the total social system, given the dominant tone and content of the American mass media, group forces on balance provide a net resistance to those messages calculated to alter attitudes and a net reinforcement of messages calculated to maintain the status quo (Key, 1961: 367).

To sum up, the point of all this is that for a number of reasons, the chief tendency and effect of mass media in America is to support existing conditions. The media do not lead, but instead, reflect society. Hence, stability or change in media content is an indication that the society in which the media operate is either remaining static or undergoing alteration.

Chapter 3

Magazines

Despite encroachments of more modern forms of communication, magazines are still a significant medium. Historically, magazines played a not unimportant role in America. "Magazines furnished Americans with a common fund of subjects for discussion. They standardized certain externals of behaviour. They helped to diffuse what had once been regional specialties" (Peterson, 1964: 449). Roland E. Wolsley argued that today magazines still exert considerable influence. The editorial department of a magazine, he said, can affect readers' language and create or mold cultural standards and interests, in addition to the more mundane function of purveying facts and ideas (Wolsley, 1969: 376). The official concept of the influence of a general magazine, put forth by the Magazine Advertising Bureau, divides itself into two broad areas. First, magazines are reflectors of American life. Second, they can be instrumental in shaping public opinion.

Unlike newspapers or broadcast media, magazines have no spot news function. They are edited and read with deliberation. This latter circumstance is relevant in political matters. "Not pressed to meet daily deadlines and not limited by the newspapers' narrow conception of what is news, they can present political analyses of some depth" (Key, 1961: 376).

Yet as do other media, magazines that hope to attract a large readership lean toward status quo maintenance. The general pattern of their political attitude is one of orthodoxy on most matters of public policy. Here, too, imperatives of business are blamed for the trend. "Whether a magazine

firm should have a social purpose at all or whether such a purpose should be the main reason for being is a constantly debated matter, settled more by the nature of the economic order than the desires of the owners" (Wolsley, 1969: 376). The magazine has become a product of business and has to follow business methods and standards to survive.

Any magazine is likely, under such conditions, to invoke blessings upon the existing social order and warn readers away from social experiments that threaten to change the fundamental economy upon which the magazines are dependent (Wolsley, 1969: 387).

Moreover, "... magazine publishers are generally of the conservative class themselves" (Key, 1961: 381). Confirmation of this situation was secured in a 1953 study of the political ideas of several "business" journals (TIME was included in this group). In a five-month period, September 1951 to February 1952, the following themes were noted by the author regarding the magazines' approach to the role of government and the nature of the economy:

- 1) the state is intrinsically evil and any intervention in economics is dangerous
- 2) "freedom" means freedom from government intervention in economics
- 3) "free enterprise" is identified with freedom, morality and economic opportunity
- 4) all good things flow from free, unfettered operation of the free enterprise economy; bad results are attributed to the predicted, inevitable consequences of government interference (Bernstein, 1953: 262)

This was the view twenty years ago. Signs are that it is somewhat revised today. Nevertheless, it does give some indication of the status quo-reinforcing function of magazines.

Yet, as with other media, the magazine audience may also play a part in the production of material exalting current ways of life. The character of a magazine limits its audience and, therefore, its influence. "Because magazines depend on

public support, they must gratify public demand to assure it" (Wolsley, 1969: 384). If a magazine does not interest readers, it cannot endure. And if people will not read certain content, it will be withheld by editors. Edward Shils has observed:

The magazine is the embodiment of this new development [the drive of modern media for large audiences] The enlargement of its role in the reproduction and transmission of culture is the product of the latter-day need to gain ~~the~~ maximum audience, one in its turn impelled by the economic necessity of the subsidy. To speak to the largest possible audience, it has been necessary to make the content of what is transmitted in a single issue as heterogeneous as possible (1960: 295-296).

It might also be added that as well as heterogeneity, blandness is a criterion of successful magazine content. Nonetheless, all editors have access to readers' reactions and are influenced by them. "... Shifts in the nature of published articles may be taken as some indication of the popular mood" (Ellison and Gosser, 1959: 33).

One may counter that compared with other media, the magazine audience is small. But one of the reasons for the continued importance of magazines in the days of electronic media is the fact that the magazine audience has several special characteristics which give it an influence out of proportion to its size. In political and other areas, magazine readers, more highly-educated, are apt to be opinion leaders and political activists.

A study compared newspapers, radio, television and magazines as chief sources of information for the 1952 and 1956 American presidential campaigns. It found that "the small group that relied mainly on magazines ranked markedly higher than other media audiences in willingness to express opinions on issues and in disposition to appraise governmental performance" (Key, 1961: 347). This was probably due to their greater knowledge of the political situation, for as Table 3-1 (Key, 1961: 347) shows, the small number that relied chiefly on

Table 3-1

Most Important Source of Campaign Information in Relation to Issue Familiarity

<u>Issue Familiarity</u>		<u>Most Important Source</u>				
		magazines	combination	newspapers	television	radio
high	4	54%	42%	35%	32%	24%
	3	25	32	28	25	23
	2	14	11	21	20	15
low	1	7	15	16	23	38
		<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
N		80	47	423	862	185

Table 3-2

Relation of Most Important Source of Campaign Information to Level of Political Participation

<u>Participation Level</u>		<u>Most Important Source</u>				
		magazines	combination	newspapers	television	radio
high	4	56%	56%	34%	32%	13%
	3	34	36	46	44	44
	2	4	4	5	5	5
low	1	6	4	15	19	38
		<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
N		80	47	423	862	185

Source: V.O. Key, Public Opinion and American Democracy (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), 347-348.

magazines for information had greatest familiarity with issues.

Moreover, media audiences vary in their political participation. Although they were outnumbered by comparable persons in the television audience, magazine readers, as shown on Table 3-2 (Key, 1961: 348), had the highest percentage of political activists among their ranks.

So it is that magazines remain an important medium of mass communication, at least in part because they reach people who are willing to become involved in the events of the day. How these events are interpreted by magazines may affect the audience's course of action.

At this point, another trait of modern magazines should be noted. "A magazine is an artistic expression of an editorial idea" (Felker, 1969: 12). This applies in particular to the cover. "What readers see first, obviously, is the cover. It is also what they see longer than anything else related to the publication" (Wolsley, 1969: 118). Four factors determine the choice of cover content: method of circulation, advertising policy, use by readers (location is important, e. g. home, office, waiting room) and the magazine's purpose (e.g. if it is information, factual content can be emphasized on the cover). From reader-interest surveys and sales figures a publisher learns which covers are most successful. "If he wants his magazine read thoroughly, the cover must be used to its fullest typographical advantage" (Wolsley, 1969: 122).

Magazine editor, Robert Fulford, has stated:

... Magazines are the great style-reflectors of our visual culture. To know the look of a period (as opposed to the facts of a period) we should go to its magazines (1967: 10).

They are more carefully planned than newspapers or television shows but faster to produce than books or movies. Thus, magazines

... can spot a trend, assimilate it and publish it, all within a couple of months or less. They are

with it visually in a way no other medium can quite manage On any magazine, each individual editor and art director leaves his personal stamp; but none of them ever escapes entirely the texture of his period (Fulford, 1969: 10).

As an attempt to convey the essence of the entire magazine, the cover fits this description.

Hence, magazines and magazine covers may be considered reflectors of the society which produces them, and perhaps even more accurate reflectors than other media.

Newsmagazines

A special case is the newsmagazine. It has already been argued that part of the virtue of magazines as social indicators is their freedom from the time pressures of newspapers and broadcast media. This is not true of the newsmagazine which, if it is to be worthy of the name, must report current happenings, i.e. news. News has been defined as "... that material which is most likely to be looked to and accepted as the image of reality" (Bauer and Bauer, 1960: 51). Yet rather than diminish the validity of newsmagazines as social indicators, it may be reasoned that the necessity of reporting immediate events forces them to reflect what is occurring in society more quickly and accurately than other magazines. They deal with news and must be aware of emerging interests. Therefore, as social indicators, newsmagazines combine the general advantages of magazines and the imperatives of newspaper reporting. They have more time than newspapers to prepare their material, but it has to be presented with more haste than is the case with other magazines.

In the United States, the word "newsmagazine" usually refers to three weekly publications - TIME, Newsweek and U.S. News and World Report. Their function is not the same as newspapers or other magazines. They "... look back at the end

of the week, pick up the random blocks where they lie, rearrange them into an architecture, add their own backdrops, landscaping, climate and sound effects" (Bagdikian, 1962: 148). More specifically, their functions include: departmentalization; condensation; provision of historical background; reduction of writing to a single style and tone; the use of many photographs, illustrations and charts to make complex material clear; delving into new areas and tapping new sources, and concentration on one big story (the cover story) per issue.

There are two general criticisms that have been levelled at newsmagazines. First, they have set themselves an impossible task in trying to cover all world news. Second, they are inclined to emphasize human interest over hard news. But few would deny their importance, as the following quotes indicate:

Newsmagazines are much discussed, far out of proportion to their number (Wolsley, 1969: 280-281). Of the mass magazines they are perhaps most significant as sources of political information and outlook (Key, 1961: 377). Each week a politically crucial block of American voters - perhaps as many as ten million men and women - have arranged before their eyes a neatly reconstructed picture of the nation and the world (Bagdikian, 1962: 148).

It should also be remembered that newsmagazines are national media. "As instruments of world communication, national media represent authoritative voices in their society" (Gerbner, 1961: 313). They have the potential for establishing a common ground for communication with other peoples.

Like most magazines, newsmagazines attempt to gear their content to what readers want.

They try to understand their readers' backgrounds, making elaborate surveys to find out. By learning from continuous study who reads newsmagazines the editors know what mold of interest, what experience, what background and feeling to write toward (Wolsley, 1969: 280).

More will be said about the readership of TIME presently.

Chapter 4

TIME Magazine

TIME was the earliest newsmagazine, and today, in terms of circulation, is the biggest and most influential. Its first issue appeared March 3, 1923, shortly after its founding by Henry R. Luce and Britton Hadden. Both were dissatisfied with journalism as it then existed. In their prospectus for a weekly newsmagazine, the pair began with the premise that people in America were poorly informed, primarily because no publication had adapted itself to the amount of time busy men were able to devote to keeping up with current developments. They proposed a magazine that would organize the preceding week's news in a pattern of departments, give the news in narrative form and describe the people who made it. Each story was not an isolated occurrence, but part of a continuous stream of historical events. In 1944, then-president of TIME Incorporated, Roy Larsen, reiterated the TIME idea which was, he said, to help people be better informed "... by providing them each week with an epitome of what was really interesting and significant among mankind's doings upon this planet", but offered in an orderly and continuous flow that made sense (1944; 297). At TIME's fortieth birthday party in 1963, it was stated that the basic aim of keeping people informed remained.

The notion of objectivity was eschewed from the start. Believing it was the duty of the press to evaluate as well as report, Luce and Hadden said TIME would give both sides of a story but clearly indicate which it thought had the stronger position.

TIME would select the facts, tell what the facts meant, and state or strongly suggest what the reader should think or feel about them It spoke from

the beginning with complete assurance, ex cathedra authority and metallic certainty (Wood, 1971: 207).

The philosophy of giving the public what it wants was, according to Roy Larsen, rejected, as people cannot know what they want until they are offered a choice. At TIME, the objective, he said, was to "... give the public the truth we think it must have" (1944: 302).

In the prospectus, Henry Luce had written: "TIME is interested - not in how much it includes between its covers - but in how much it gets off its pages into the minds of its readers". TIME's point of view was to be presented in such a way "... that people would not say, 'I see that So-and-so said in TIME last week ...' but instead, 'Last week TIME said'" (Larsen, 1944: 299).

Britton Hadden died in 1929, so his influence on TIME was limited. However, until his death in 1967, Henry Luce played an active role in publication of the magazine. The extent to which his biases and predilections influenced TIME's content is evident in the marked changes of tone and style that the magazine has undergone in the last five years.

Books have been written about Henry Luce - analyzing his character and reminiscing about his exploits. A detailed review of his life and philosophy is not practical here, but some of his likes and dislikes should be noted.

He was born in China and throughout his life harbored a deep affection for the land and its people. He regarded the Communist victory there in 1948 as an unmitigated tragedy and never gave up hope that Chiang Kai-Shek might some day reverse it. Communism, in whatever form it appeared (including socialism) was, for Luce, evil.

His father was a missionary. Perhaps that was why Luce was religious "to the point of other-worldliness" (Rivers, 1965: 125). Although he was a Presbyterian, he respected and admired those of other religions who believed and practised the tenets of their faith. His was a sense of mission to im-

prove his fellow man, which he attempted to carry out through his magazines.

Another significant facet of Luce's outlook was a high estimation of business, businessmen and the capitalist system of free enterprise. He found TIME was unable to devote the amount of attention to these topics he felt they warranted. Consequently, he started a new magazine, Fortune, to explore these subjects in more depth.

In light of these inclinations, it is perhaps not surprising that Luce was a staunch Republican. In 1956, he ranked tenth among individual contributors to the Republican Party (Mills, 1956: 167). His esteem for Dwight D. Eisenhower (Luce had personally tried to persuade the general to seek the presidency) was matched by his near-loathing of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, a fact that influenced the content of TIME. A study of how the magazine stereotyped Presidents Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy showed the first to be portrayed in a totally negative way and the second in an almost consistently positive manner, while treatment of the third was more ambivalent (Merrill, 1965: 563-570).

Thus, any examination of TIME Magazine's content must take into account the effect that Henry Luce had on it. But lest the preceding suggest a situation of tyranny and despotism, it should be remarked that on balance, Luce's influence did far more to help TIME than to narrow its view and increase its biases. There can be no doubt that TIME was and continues to be a smashing success.

Essentially, there are three reasons for this success (Wood, 1971: 260-261). First, as noted above, TIME was designed for a market that previously had been inadequately served.

A second reason was Henry Luce, himself. TIME strongly reflected the personality of its publisher. Unlike newspapers or broadcast networks, one man can influence every idea,

picture or word in a magazine. A magazine that does not reflect the personality of a single individual will flounder editorially, as it will find it impossible to maintain a consistent direction and give readers a coherent point of view.

But consistency does not mean rigidity. The third reason for TIME's success was that it changed constantly as conditions and reading tastes changed. The success of any magazine depends on how well it develops a particular formula within the prevailing spirit and needs of the moment. In 1953, editor James A. Linen observed, "TIME today is completely different from TIME in the Forties. That TIME was totally different from TIME in the Thirties. And so on back" (Peterson, 1964: 261).

All newsmagazines cover the same material from the same sources with comparable personnel and facilities. Distinction lies in how completely and accurately each news weekly does its job. "TIME is distinct, and it is always TIME that does the work and makes the statements" (Wood, 1971: 211).

Substantial empirical proof of TIME's success may be found in its steadily mounting circulation. Because the adult population of the United States has increased since TIME's founding in 1923, gains in circulation seem probable. But if population increases sharply while a magazine's circulation does not, that magazine is in trouble. In 1964, Robert Root and Christine V. Root compared 1938 and 1963 circulation figures for a number of American magazines (Root and Root, 1964: 15-22). The increase for all newsmagazines averaged out at 131.1 per cent, considerably above the population gain of 44 per cent for the same period. TIME's circulation change in that 25-year period represented an increase of 308.4 per cent. In 1938, .5 per cent of the American population read TIME; in 1963, 1.5 per cent. According to Ayer's Directory of newspapers and magazines for 1972, TIME's total circulation is now about 5 3/4 million (see Table 4-1).

Table 4-1

TIME Magazine Circulation - 1972

TIME	4,262,625
TIME Asia	196,810
TIME Atlantic	441,190
TIME Canada	496,986
TIME Latin America	105,998
TIME Overseas Military	47,000
TIME South Pacific	<u>174,774</u>
Total	5,725,383

Source: 1972 Ayer Directory of Publications (Philadelphia, Pa.:
N.W. Ayer and Son Inc., 1972), 607.

In a sense, TIME's vast circulation allows it a degree of freedom from business considerations and interests unavailable to smaller enterprises. "There is a reverse and parallel angle to advertising: when a newspaper or magazine, a radio or television station becomes successful, the advertiser needs it as much as the other way around" (Kosten, 1960: 342). TIME fits this description and thus can afford to give more time and space to minority views if it so desires. Nevertheless, TIME's success is testimony to the fact that its main appeal is directed more toward the majority, a centre point in the American population. If selective perception and retention is a valid proposition, the circumstance of so many choosing to read it indicates that TIME must be tapping some responsive chord in America and reflecting American beliefs and attitudes in a satisfactory manner.

It is important to know who TIME readers are. "... The investigator wishing to assess the effects of communication cannot confine his analysis merely to the content of messages; his research design must also include evidence about the recipient of the communication" (Holsti, 1969: 36).

Evidence about the recipients of TIME was gathered in almost embarrassing detail by a 1966 statistical survey entitled "Profile of Subscribers to the National Edition of TIME" (TIME, August 5, 1966: 15). The median age of the typical TIME subscriber was 39.3; he was married and had 1.5 children. His average household income was \$14,904; he owned a home worth an average of \$27,235 and the average value of the family's liquid assets was \$37,441. Almost four-fifths of the subscribers had attended college and one-third of these had done post-graduate work. Seventy-three per cent were the heads of families and two-thirds of this number were engaged in managerial or professional work. The survey also looked into the worldly goods of subscribing families. As it turned out, one half had more than one car (67 per cent of them were purchased new), 76 per

cent a washing machine, 52 per cent a stereo set, 38 per cent a garbage disposal and 30 per cent a carving knife. Three-quarters spent some of their leisure time swimming, two-fifths bowling or golfing and one-third belonged to a country or other sporting club. Eighty-one per cent had served liquor the week before they were questioned. Their preferences ran to Scotch, gin, bourbon and vodka. The survey neglected to mention what color of underwear they favored.

These statistics suggest that the average TIME subscriber is well-ensconced in the middle or upper-middle class; he is a member of the "silent majority". Thus, it would appear that because TIME appeals to and is chosen by this group, the magazine echoes and reflects the beliefs and concerns of the American middle class. Since this is the group to which many other classes look for role models, it may be maintained that TIME reflects the viewpoint of a majority of Americans.

TIME's success, however, has not insulated it from criticism. In fact, that success has been attributed to what several authors feel are the magazine's shortcomings:

Its condensation of the news of the week involves a selectivity dictated by editorial policy, an evaluative tone fixed by the same standard, and often a warped picture of the political world. The world of TIME is one of black and white; that may be one of the reasons for its great success (Key, 1961: 377-378).

With justification it has been said: "No critic who has ever gone seriously about the business of tracing bias in TIME has lacked evidence" (Rivers, 1965: 111). Another writer complained:

In American politics and foreign news, TIME's reporting appears to be governed by an iron rule: when the facts fit the mold of TIME's wishes, the reporting can be superb; when they do not fit the mold, TIME's reporting can be so distorted as to raise serious questions about responsibility in mass communications (Bagdikian, 1962: 157).

Perhaps a more telling criticism was noted by William L. Rivers in his 1965 book about Washington Correspondents, The Opinionmakers. He cited a 1937 survey of reporters conducted by Leo Rosten which asked them what magazines they read regularly. TIME headed the list with 58.7 per cent (see Table 4-2). In 1965, Rivers undertook a similar study, although on that occasion reporters were asked which magazines they used regularly in their work. TIME, again, was first, but by only a narrow margin (see Table 4-3). Moreover, when asked about fairness and reliability, correspondents gave TIME the lowest score of all.

Nonetheless, the fact that TIME topped both the 1937 and 1965 reporters' lists of magazines to which they paid attention shows that it is not to be ignored, even by those supposedly "in the know". TIME is "substantial and widely quoted" (Wolsley, 1969: 211). Because it deals almost exclusively in national and international news, it has become a "national newspaper". According to Edward Shils, "America lacks a satisfactory intellectual weekly press, and, ironically, this is in part the achievement of TIME Magazine" (1960: 307). "For millions of middle-class Americans it is the interpreter of national and world affairs" (Bagdikian, 1962: 154). And, in spite of his criticism, Rivers admitted: "Without TIME, millions of Americans who formerly by-passed the dreary succession of fact that was once the heart of political journalism would not have been awakened to the zest of politics" (1965: 127).

Another indication of TIME's influence was noted by Ben H. Bagdikian: "Thousands of foreigners get their major impression of the United States from it" (1962: 154). Siegfried Kracauer observed that international understanding depends to some extent on the character of conceptions which people of one nation have of other nations, particularly as these conceptions are asserted in the mass media (1953: 53-72). It had always been a primary purpose of Luce "... to place before the

Table 4-2

Rosten's Survey (1937)

<u>Magazines Read Regularly</u>	<u>%</u>
TIME	58.7
The Nation	34.1
Harper's	34.1
Saturday Evening Post	34.1
Collier's	28.8
The New Republic	26.8
The New Yorker	24.7
The Atlantic Monthly	19.5
Fortune	18.5
Reader's Digest	16.4

number answering = 97

Table 4-3

River's Survey (1965)

<u>Magazines Used in Work</u>	<u>%</u>
TIME	33.5
U.S. News and World Report	33.0
Newsweek	32.5
The Reporter	24.6
government publications	11.3
Harper's	11.3
Business Week	10.8
The Economist	7.9
The New Republic	7.3
Fortune	4.4

number answering = 203

Source: William L. Rivers, The Opinionmakers (Boston: Beacon Press, 1965), 54.

world ... 'a significant face of the projection of America'" (Barkocy, 1963: 517). In 1961, the United States Information Agency distributed 1.8 million free copies of TIME in 56 countries as part of American propaganda. The editorial in the fortieth anniversary edition gushed:

It is a sobering and at the same time exciting realization for us that week after week more ideas and opinions are circulated across the U.S. and around the world by TIME than by any other magazine - or any means of communication (TIME, May 10, 1963: 10).

Because it reaches the kind of people a political leader must influence, the late American president, John F. Kennedy, considered TIME the most important magazine in America. "Kennedy once said, somewhat despairingly, that when he asked foreign leaders who exhibited detailed knowledge of U.S. affairs where they got their information, they invariably answered, 'In TIME'" (Rivers, 1965: 115).

By now, TIME's role in status quo maintenance and society reflection should be reasonably apparent. But TIME was, from its inception, also uniquely designed for status conferral. "In an era when the news was told largely in terms of events and issues, TIME set out to tell it in terms of people" (TIME, May 10, 1963: 11). Subscribing readily to the hero theory of history, TIME's founders said in their 1923 prospectus that people make the news so TIME would tell about these people. Specifically, the prospectus asserted: "It is important to know what they drink. It is more important to know to what gods they pray and what kinds of fights they love. The personalities of politics make public affairs live. Who are they and why? TIME will tell."

TIME may, in fact, have been responsible for a trend in reporting that Leo Lowenthal, among others, deplored: "While it was once rather contemptible to give much room to the private affairs and habits of public figures, this topic is now the focus of interest" (1961: 119).

The formula designed by Luce and Hadden consisted of a picture of a man or woman on the cover and a featured cover story inside which told about his or her life, thoughts, ideas and accomplishments - and how TIME viewed them.

TIME's gallery of cover subjects has included "... men and women well-remembered and long-forgotten" (TIME, June 22, 1959: 9). The main criterion of selection is news. Stress is on persons active in national and international affairs. But inspiration for TIME covers springs from a variety of sources.

The ideas range from those of the highest magnitude (the mystique of Charles de Gaulle, the theology of Paul Tillich) to those of personal motivation (the trials of Richard Burton, the hopes of Cassius Clay) to those of highest practicality (how better cars are built, better farms are run, better dresses are designed) (TIME, May 10, 1963: 11).

Since news is the first consideration, about a dozen people scheduled to be on the cover were upstaged at the last moment. However, portraits of most cover subjects are executed on the shortest possible notice and used as planned.

"Unlike nearly all other portraits, the paintings for TIME's cover are not commissioned by the subjects and need not necessarily please them; they must satisfy the artist and be acceptable to the editors" (TIME, April 30, 1965: 25). These portraits are not expected to be photographic - they must be much more. They contain elements of biography, history and journalism. The style employed by artists commissioned for TIME covers has ranged from the perceptive realism of Boris Chaliapin, Bernard Safran and Robert Vickrey, to the intricate designs of Boris Artzbasheff, the impressionism of Henry Koerner and the pop art of Andy Warhol. In almost fifty years, the magazine has commissioned about 1,700 portraits. TIME will not reveal the more or less standard fee paid for a cover portrait, which is said to be high for a magazine payment but low compared to the selling price of a painting by a well-known artist. "Yet many of the latter are attracted

because of the world-wide exposure afforded their painting" (Executive, December, 1965: 19).

This ~~e~~xtensive exposure is one of the reasons why being on the cover of TIME is an occurrence of some importance. It is not necessarily, but usually, recognition of one's position or fine achievement. "To be the object of such a biographical cover story has come to be one of the signs of being a major celebrity" (Winick, 1963: 302). When Pietro Annigoni did the portrait for a cover story on Harold Wilson, Mr. Wilson's only suggestion to the artist was that enough space be left for him "... to autograph the thousands of covers that he expected would descend upon him - which happened, as it does with most subjects, the first time he was on the cover" (TIME, April 30, 1965: 25).

In his book, The Power Elite, C. Wright Mills pointed out:

There is no doubt that it is enormously more important to one's prestige to have one's picture on the cover of a truly big national magazine than in the society column of any newspaper in America or even ten of them. And there is no doubt who gets on the cover of such magazines (1956: 75).

Mills had rather definite ideas on the type of people who would be singled out for this honor. However, the only way of knowing with any certainty who the subjects of TIME cover stories have been and are now, is to go to the magazine itself. Presumably, the type of people chosen for such status conferral and how they have changed over the years will indicate the extent to which society's status quo is being maintained or altered; and if the latter case is true, in what direction those changes have been moving. Content analysis seems to be the most logical method to employ for this purpose.

Chapter 5

Content Analysis

All communication has six basic elements: source, encoding process, message, channel, detector and decoding process. The message or communication content is "... that body of meanings through symbols (verbal, musical, pictorial, plastic, gestural) which makes up the communication itself" (Berelson, 1952:13). Content analysis is usually performed on the message, although results may be used to make inferences about other elements of communication.

Bernard Berelson defined content analysis as "a research technique for the objective, systematic and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication" (1952: 18). W. J. Paisley's definition is essentially the same: "... a phase of information-processing in which communication content is transformed, through objective and systematic application of categorization rules, into data that can be summarized and compared" (Holsti, 1969: 3).

C. E. Osgoode emphasized elements of the communication process other than the message when he said content analysis is "... a procedure where by one makes inferences about sources and receivers from evidence in the messages they exchange" (Holsti, 1969: 13). The general assumption here is that content analysis data will be compared directly or indirectly with independent indices (noncontent) of attributes or behaviour inferred from documents. Thus, Ole R. Holsti saw it as "... any technique for making inferences by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages" (1969: 14).

Clearly, definitions of content analysis are linked to

the purposes of investigators who intend to use it. The most cursory review of the literature reveals that these purposes have steadily become more numerous, imaginative and esoteric. But for the present, an explanation of some of the more mundane, traditional aims will suffice.

First it should be noted that whatever the purpose, all content analysts start with several fundamental beliefs: inferences about the relationship between intent and content or between content and effect can validly be made; the study of manifest content is meaningful as it constitutes a common universe of discourse among relevant parties, and the quantitative description of content is meaningful (Berelson, 1952: 18).

There are a number of advantages associated with content analysis of communications as a research tool. The material is accessible; the method is quantitative and near-objective (McQuail, 1969: 68). It employs standardized forms that are stable over relatively long periods, more open to comparative analysis, and the overt meaning of which may be more readily relied upon as material for analysis than other methods. It is a "nonreactive" or "unobtrusive" technique, a feature of some importance when dealing with communications produced on a week-to-week or even more frequent basis. People involved may lack the time and perspective to compare their objectives and output. Content analysis provides an overall picture without interfering in the production situation.

There are three fundamental uses of content analysis: 1) to describe the characteristics of communication content, both its substance and form; 2) to infer causes of content, i.e. to relate known characteristics of the source and audience to messages produced by and for them, and 3) to assess the effects of content (Berelson, 1952: 20-31). Of greatest significance here is the first since this undertaking is, for

the most part, descriptive and encompasses the tracing of trends in communication content.

Classifying similar samples of content taken at different times into a single set of categories yields a concise description of content trends, "... a valuable historical perspective against which the current content of the communication media can be understood" (Berelson, 1952: 31). Institutions, societies and cultures manifest laws and order beyond that apparent to large numbers of people at any one time. Systems of artifacts, according to Gerbner, express objective manifestations of this order. Thus, content is expressive of social relationships and institutional dynamics. It reflects the attitudes, interests and values (cultural patterns) of population groups by revealing their focus of attention. By means of content analysis it is possible to discover the topics that people were interested in during a certain period and what they thought about them. Inferences are made about population groups on the basis of content produced for them. Cultural patterns are derived from analysis of communications widely distributed in the community.

Equally important, such findings may be used to infer aspects of cultural change, since they may be correlated with corresponding changes in the audience or communicator. Two sorts of comparison can be made. Straight trend comparisons contain conclusions about changes in the frequency of various categories through time; such results may also be taken one step further to be evaluated against an outside noncontent standard, e.g. the actual population distribution of some characteristic.

Before noting previous studies that employed content analysis, it is in order to look at some of the problems associated with it. These problems should be regarded as warnings to curb the tendency to make sweeping generalizations from the findings of a content analysis.

When communication content is taken as an index of cultural patterns reflected in content, exactly what is being reflected? - the generalized culture and psychological level of the total population, or those of only the audience of the particular communication under analysis? If the latter, then changes in content may reflect changes in the audience rather than changes in constant population groups. "A most important problem, one rarely resolved beyond doubt, is the selection of materials which do in fact represent the culture, or at least some significant segment of it" (Holsti, 1969: 82). A partial solution, one used by McGranahan and Wayne in 1948, is to rely on material that meets the criterion of popularity. As demonstrated in the previous chapter, this is a requirement that TIME Magazine does, indeed, meet.

Such use of content analysis assumes that the nature of the audience about which inferences are made is a major determinant of content, although this is not always the case. The producers' conceptions (accurate or not) of audience values and attitudes govern what appears. However, with TIME it may be argued that its success indicates that what it produces is not anathema to its audience.

Berelson recognized the problem of cause and effect when he asked, "Do popular attitudes determine communication content, or does content determine popular attitudes?" (1952: 97). While there is undoubtedly a degree of mutual influence, and the problem of direction is important, the contention here is that the media's strongest effect is status quo maintenance. Thus, popular attitudes are more apt to influence content than vice versa.

Another problem is that even when communication content genuinely 'reflects' cultural patterns there may be a time lag. But, by its very nature, a newsmagazine obviates this difficulty.

Finally, "if the criterion itself is not a valid measure

of the phenomena to be explained, little is gained by demonstrating that content data are significantly related to it" (Holsti, 1969: 130). In a later section, an attempt will be made to show that the variables chosen for this study are significant and indicative of trends.

But despite these problems, the basic fact of consistent patterns of selective presentation has been confirmed by numerous content studies.

The striking features of any given analysis of content lie less in any isolated significance they may have for the medium under study than in the fact that the models are constantly reiterated and reappear in other media. They become ubiquitous mass symbols (Johns-Heine and Gerth, 1957: 233-234).

Content analysis of various forms of communication has been employed in countless investigations to determine cultural patterns of the society which produced them. Often, general values, attitudes and beliefs have been inferred from characteristics of those individuals who receive favored and unfavored treatment in such communication.

Fiction has provided a popular field of study for researchers. In fact, for at least thirty years, there has been a lively debate as to whether or not fiction reflects common values. In 1948, Ruth A. Inglis concluded that there was some truth in each of the two theories that were in vogue at the time - the reflection theory and the social control theory. The first held that as authors usually write for readers in their own society, literature reflects what they have in common. The second attributed to literature an active role in leading readers, who were believed to be in a state of passive suggestibility. Inglis' study partly justified and partly discredited each theory, neither of which was found to operate consistently (Inglis, 1948: 526-533).

More will be said later about their specific results, but now it is necessary only to note that many authors have used content analysis of fiction to discern trends in American life. Mass periodical fiction was the subject of a study by

Patrick Johns-Heine and Hans H. Gerth who examined heroes in an effort to derive values (1957: 226-234). Bernard Berelson and Patricia J. Salter also used magazine characters in an investigation of how people of various racial, ethnic and religious groups were portrayed (1957: 235-250). Donald G. Arnstine expanded his scope to include television and movie heroes in an attempt to discover to what extent values symbolized in the popular arts reflect those dominant in American culture (1961: 41-48).

But if fiction reflects society, it surely can be argued that this is even truer of more "factual" media. Leo Lowenthal used the subjects chosen for biographies in popular magazines for the periods 1901 to 1914, 1922 to 1930, 1930 to 1934 and 1940 to 1941 as evidence that American heroes had changed from "idols of production" to "idols of consumption" (1961: 109-140).

In 1965, Lionel S. Lewis set out to see if the decline of heroes noted by Lowenthal was the case with politicians. He applied content analysis to cover stories in TIME and Newsweek immediately before and after the 1936 and 1960 elections (1965: 116-118). Charles Winick studied the occupations of all the people who made the cover of TIME from 1923 to 1959 to discover the extent to which these cover subjects mirrored changes in American life (1963: 301-310).

The present study is an extension of Winick's, although to some degree, it overlaps, as the time period chosen was 1946 to 1971. Despite the similarity in basic ideas, this content analysis goes beyond that of Winick in looking at a number of other socio-economic characteristics of the subjects as well as their occupations. However, before explaining the precise methodology employed and the results it yielded, a rather long discussion of the significance of heroes and other elite groups in society is first needed to put the findings in their proper light.

Chapter 6

Heroes

Heroes and hero-worship are integral parts of any complex, changing society; which is to say that heroes must always be present in the cultures of nations or civilizations A hero always expresses fundamental and important themes of the culture in which he is found (Warner, 1959: 14-15).

Though they may disagree on the desirability of particular heroes, most authors who have written on the subject concur on the importance of heroes as a general type. Aside from their specific calling and the situation in which they evince their heroism, heroes have a more fundamental role to play.

When a society's heroic forms are crystallized around actual persons, these themes and the beliefs and values they represent, being manifest in a human, become emotionally convincing and understandable to everyone. Abstract principles, precepts and moral judgments are more easily felt and comprehended and more highly valued when they are met in a person endowed with a symbolic form that expresses them - a hero.

Heroes are used by all societies to maintain the social system. As the ideal achievement of right conduct, a hero is a model for imitation and a yardstick of accomplishment. He "acts as a jack" to lift people above where they would otherwise be without such a model (Klapp, 1962: 123).

In any social organization, a hero's functions include: boosting of morale, provision of institutionalized role-models and group self-images, and dramatization of causes which permits crystallization and mobilization of movements. Common identification with great heroes or leaders is a means of inducing consent. But to inspire others, a hero should be better

than the ordinary. If he is not well above the general level, or inconsistent, his effect is apt to be demoralizing. Any important change in a society's heroes signifies a corresponding change in the social order.

Development of modern mass media has made heroes more evident and accessible, and thereby expanded their role. The media bring users into sight of larger, higher reference groups. "They have multiplied the groups to which we look for confirmation of our self-image" (Mills, 1956: 314). Ideas, ideals and symbols associated with heroes do not take long to percolate down to the public. "The instrumentalities of mass communication lend themselves particularly well to the dissemination of these symbols on a scale hitherto thought impossible" (Wirth, 1948: 6). Evidence of this may be found in the rise of mass idols.

Mass media are important sources in the creation and perpetuation of culture heroes. By promoting social consensus in the form of mass idols, the media integrate the diverse, secular worlds of modern man into cohesion and unity. As well, they serve as socializing agents by providing, in the form of heroes, models of appropriate behaviour in life's recurring crises. "The more important role models for the social system are institutionalized in symbolic media that reach the average member reliably ..." (Klapp, 1962: 17).

People sharing the attitudes of loyalty, veneration, faith and possessiveness toward culture heroes in general and mass idols in particular, experience a sense of common identity and pride, as well as a shared perspective which makes collective action possible (Meyerhoff and Larson, 1965: 188).

Thus, with the aid of the media, heroes can more effectively perform their manifest function of providing role definition and their latent function of fostering social integration.

"Newswriters, historians and novelists have an important part in making types and consensus explicit" (Klapp, 1962: 20). In the case of the first group, it may be argued that reporters

today are trained to be accurate and objective. But "objective" coverage of what happens "... is dominated by the basic wishes, the hopes and fears, the non-logical symbolic themes and folk beliefs of the people who buy and read the papers" (Warner, 1959: 55). The degree of rationality and accuracy in news stories is directly related to the audience. It has been shown that the more rational among them tend to read newspapers and magazines since these carry more accurate and objective stories, but they also contain many emotive symbols. The reason for this is that modern reporters must arouse and hold interest, as other story-tellers do, by depicting heroes, villains, suspense, conflict, the defeat of evil and the triumph of good, although the veneer of empirical truth must also adorn the story. "The news report is consequently composed of fact combined with the thematic materials supplied by the reporter and the conventions and traditions of his profession as well as those of his society" (Warner, 1959: 55).

In the past, TIME has been criticized for its emphasis on people, as opposed to issues. However, if the foregoing description is correct, stress on individuals as heroes, villains or whatever, is more appealing to readers. Part of TIME's success may be its admitted awareness that true objectivity is impossible and its willingness to portray persons as heroes.

The media are related to heroes in another sense, too. As society has become more and more an audience directed by mass communication, to be a hero, or at least a celebrity, is the dream of many. Nor is it an impossible dream. "The chance of becoming famous might be called the great American jackpot" (Klapp, 1964: 26). "It would be a mistake to assume that incidents have to be significant in a moral, intellectual or material sense to hold the attention of the public" (Klapp, 1964: 70). The same applies to people. "In America ... a man who can knock a small white ball into a series of holes in the ground

with more efficiency and skill than anyone else thereby gains social access to the President of the United States" (Mills, 1956: 74). It is mainly through the mass media that the achievements of such persons are displayed for public admiration. Randall Jarrell, calling this an age of nonfiction, acknowledged the importance of the media in creating heroes: "These actually existing celebrities, of universally admitted importance, about whom we are told directly authoritative facts - how can fictional characters compare with them. These are our fictional characters" (1960: 368). His words take on added weight if it is true, as Fawn M. Brodie declared, that "the choice of qualities of a nation's heroes is a reliable index to that nation's health" (1970: 46).

The media today are largely responsible for a process to which all Americans, according to Orrin E. Klapp, are subject - social typing. Social types reflect society, being either models of how people should be or photographs (abstracts) of what people have been doing. Social typing consists of characterizing persons as heroes, villains or fools, i.e. recognizing that they are better than, dangerous to or fall short of norms applied to group members or status occupants. "It is safe to say that one cannot become famous or notorious without being typed. Individual opinions crystallize into consensual images" (Klapp, 1962: 12). Although everyone feels the effect of social typing, "this applies with greater force to leaders and others in the public eye; because of their prominence and because higher standards are set up for them, people watch more closely to see if they will slip" (Klapp, 1962: 23).

Social typing is a capricious process that operates with erratic inconsistency. "Many candidates for popularity have smashed on the rocks of social typing, while others have inexplicably succeeded ... this depends less on what people are than how they are dramatically cast" (Klapp, 1962: 6). Widely varying definitions of heroes, villains and fools suggest that

these types can be created out of similar personality material. "... The historic roles of hero, villain and fool could not be predicted from ... men's characters, intentions or behaviour, but only by knowing the particular dramatic and social situations in which they choose to act" (Klapp, 1964: 74-75). A small change in circumstance may cause the same men and deeds to be seen in opposite parts. Audience need and expectations can press particular roles on people and favor certain kinds of outcome. "Changes in climate can cause changes in role, whether or not the principal actors have really changed" (Klapp, 1964: 172). Conversely, to reiterate what was said before, changes in heroes (or other types) may be indicative of changes in society.

Obviously, it is best to be typed a hero. However, this is just a first step. Klapp has demonstrated that heroes can be divided and subdivided into numerous other categories, only the most relevant of which will be mentioned here.

Each type of hero represents certain themes of value and achievement. Winners stand for getting what you want, beating everybody, being a champ. Competitive, self-assertive and oligarchic, winners are heroes who come out on top. There are six types of winner: 1) the strong man, who is related to the conquering hero of primitive legend; 2) the top dog, who resembles the strong man except that emphasis is on his point of arrival rather than on what brought him there; 3) the underdog, who commands admiration by the unexpectedness of his success; 4) the brain; 5) the smart operator, who "... even though he does not claim knowledge or overcome everyone by smashing arguments or fists, somehow when the game is over ... has all the chips", and 6) the great lover (Klapp, 1962: 30-34).

Splendid performers are heroes who, unlike winners, need not be dominant or strong, but instead are concerned with making a "hit". More than any other type, they are creations of the media. "Mass communication has brought to the fore a variety of heroes whose specialty is a shining impression - some remarkable

thing they do before a crowd, camera or microphone" (Klapp, 1962: 35). They may be showmen (featured soloists or members of a team or cast), heroes of play (amateur or professional athletes) or playboys.

Heroes of social acceptability, as defined by Klapp, embody some kind of perfected likeableness. Pinups are models of bodily perfection. Charmers actively magnetize people with their wit, conversation, manner and eloquence. Good fellows epitomize naturally, continually and effectively demonstrated friendliness. And conforming heroes stand for the letter of the law, perfectly applied.

A third hero type is the independent spirit who acts and stands alone. "Americans are impressed not so much by the greatness of achievement as by the ability or will of these heroes to be different and follow the solitary path" (Klapp, 1962: 43). They may be bohemians, jesters or angry commentators.

Finally, there are group servants who most closely approach the traditional ideal hero. With a strong arm and a heart of gold they tirelessly serve the group. They represent co-operation, self-sacrifice and solidarity.

Not only is it important that a society have heroes, but it is also imperative that there be villains. "Loyalty to a nation or to a team is built by identification with hero types and hatred for villains" (Klapp, 1962: 23). These dualistically conceived roles touch the imaginable limits of moral belief. Each symbolizes in human form the moral code of the group; they express and recreate positive and negative moral beliefs and values.

In deviating from its mores, the villain serves society by acting as a scapegoat, a safety-valve for aggression and/or a hate-symbol, -what builds morale for law enforcement. The dimensions of an individual's villainy depend on his degree of visibility, the kind of threat he poses, his social position

and, as a result of these, the seriousness of the attitude toward him. Klapp distinguished five basic types of villain: 1) threats to order and status (desperado, rebel, flouter, rogue, troublemaker); 2) usurpers and abusers (oppressor, authoritarian, selfish grabber, snob); 3) strangers (intruder, suspicious isolate, monster); 4) traitors and sneaks (renegade, hidden traitor, deceiver, sneak attacker, chiseler and parasite, shirker, corruptor), and 5) social undesirables (Klapp, 1962: 55-60).

The ideal villain is a member of the in-group, who embodies the evils of the whole people and expresses them dramatically in crucial situations. When these conditions are fulfilled "... he functions most efficaciously to symbolize and express the ambivalence all individuals feel toward their domestication and the constraints of their membership in the group" (Warner, 1959: 86). He dramatizes their fears about disintegration of the group and punishment of those who attack the social order.

In popular myth the hero's role positively reaffirms and strengthens the ideals of the moral structure of the group; the villain's role as the hated betrayer of the group and its moral principles allows moral disapproval of antisocial acts and vicarious satisfaction in them, thus reaffirming and strengthening the private convictions of each member and the moral life of the group (Warner, 1959: 87).

An individual outside the group can be a convenient hated object but rarely an ideal one. There should be betrayal of the basic moral order. Out-group villains are a special case - they are most evident as enemies in a war situation. An enemy has been defined as "... something or someone we perceive to be threatening, harmful or injurious to our welfare and wishes" (Findlay et al, 1967: 1). David J. Findlay, Ole R. Holsti and Richard R. Fagen have listed the functions of enemies: they help identify sources of frustration and justify otherwise illegal or improper action; they are a focus for aggressiveness; they are a means for diverting attention from other more diffi-

cult or pressing problems, and they provide a contrast by which one can measure or inflate one's own worth. But, as with other sorts of villains, the main function of enemies is to foster in-group solidarity.

The role of enemy is more fixed than those filling it. It is interchangeable or transferable among various individuals, groups or nations. But caution must be exercised in defining enemies. "... If the idea of the enemy is invoked and mobilization is forced when the threat is not generally perceived or is non-existent, then the net result is low group morale and a loss of credibility for the leadership" (Findlay et al, 1967: 11). "Enemies as well as friends must be well-chosen, for they must serve as objects for the expression of two emotions basic to man and his social system - hatred and love" (Warner, 1959: 276).

War is a powerful context for creation of national symbols. Its manifest purpose may be to defeat the enemy, but if it is a popular war, its enduring by-product is a feeling of dignity and pride in the population, "an intense awareness of oneness. The strong belief that everyone must sacrifice to win a war greatly strengthens people's sense of their significance" (Warner, 1959: 275). "When the idea of the enemy becomes a prevalent concern, there is a corresponding effect upon the education of the young, upon mass media, and upon other realms where ideas, behaviour and roles are formed" (Findlay et al, 1967: 17).

In 1953, referring to cinema treatment of various national groups, Siegfried Kracauer said, "... screen campaigns for or against a nation are not likely to be launched unless they can feed on strong environmental moods in their favor" (1953: 56). The same might be said of other media. Nevertheless, today there are indications that there is less consensus on enemies and, as a result, positive benefits deriving from clear definitions of such groups are absent. The media have become less

able to demarcate enemies and villains because society itself is unsure of who may be classed under that rubric. The commonplace that one man's hero is another man's villain was never more true.

The last major social type that Klapp noted is the fool. They include ludicrous role failures, discounting types, non-conforming fools, overconforming fools and comic butts and jesters. Respectively, their functions are to: 1) penalize gross incompetence and role failure; 2) discount hidden weaknesses and poses in a world of social climbing and front; 3) set non-conformists apart from regular fellows, thereby favoring like-mindedness; 4) discount overconformity by providing devices whereby the alienated may spare themselves from commitment, and 5) provide outlets for tension (Klapp, 1962: 90-91).

Klapp's overall view of the heroes, villains and fools he found in American society was not optimistic. He was struck by the variety of role models he was able to define, compared with their relative paucity in simpler, more traditional societies. There is little order or hierarchy in the values expressed, no definite point of judgment and little consensus on absolute ethical standards. The large number of villain and fool types may mean disorganization. Villain labels tend to lose their potency as deviations become more frequent and flagrant, and may even turn into positive models. A large number of hero, villain and fool types indicates a pluralistic, secondary society with much individuation and many competing subgroups that demand loyalty. "In such a situation, no labelling is absolute, group viewpoints discount one another, relativism prevails" (Klapp, 1962: 135).

Klapp found the array of villain types a portent of weakening control. The frequency of actual behaviour increases the need to name it in various situations. Especially ominous is his belief that American society fails to present a united front against those villain types representing threats to order

and status. "A society that strongly and uniformly disapproves them is pretty well settled and has established routines and status" (Klapp, 1962: 55). This is not true of American society which is pluralistic and inconsistent.

Inconsistency is evident in the blurring of distinctions between hero and villain types. "... For example, a smart operator looks so much like a con-man that it is hard to tell who is which, let alone who is defeating the other" (Klapp, 1962: 67). American society has long put a premium on shrewdness and held gullibility in contempt. Sharp competition increases the number of suckers and causes foxes to be seen not as villains but as smart operators. A world of exploitation in which moral definitions are vague and where it is impossible to be entirely right or wrong is reflected here.

In such a world it is to be expected that he who manages to avoid being exploited or, better yet, exploits the exploiter, will have some of the qualities of a hero The smart operator as hero makes sense where exploitation and unclear moral definitions are the rule (Klapp, 1962: 33).

Klapp discovered several trends that characterized a number of the major hero types he found in America. First, he noted an accent on the physical. He attributed the absence of mystique to secularization of values, "the paring down of values to sense qualities appreciated promptly through the senses and without mystical or other complicated interpretation" (1962: 99). Only surface qualities have mass appeal; inner, spiritual qualities are likely to be shared by very few. "Loss of value consensus in modern times has been so great that people can agree on little but what is obvious and on the surface The secularized hero is the only one really suited on a large scale to a secularized culture" (Klapp, 1962: 99).

Klapp called this the age of playboys. Hero types reflect an era of leisure, shorter work weeks and rising luxury and productivity. When survival was a reason for work, heroes of

work were admired. But the shift to a play-oriented culture has given leisure a status value. "In such a setting, the hard work ethic can hardly be expected to survive long as an important hero-making force Our future Edison may well be devoting his talent to improving the pin-ball machine" (Klapp, 1962: 101-102).

He predicted much hero development among splendid performers because of increasing prominence lent to showmen and spectator sports by the mass media. To a growing extent, people's lives are oriented toward shows, largely because mass communication has made it easier for audiences to be involved in shows. Heroes become audience-directed, a specific form of other-directedness. Whereas other-directed individuals live with sensitivity to outside cues in order to be able to conform and blend, the audience-directed person aims to "wow" the crowd by being as conspicuous as possible. When he classified them, Klapp found three times as many hero types engaged in egoistic achievement as in group service (see Table 6-1). He envisioned a future world of grandstanders in which success in any walk of life will depend on one's ability to put on a show. "... People at the top of the power structure will feel they need to be showmen to compete with all these celebrities. The strong man will have to become a splendid performer" (Klapp, 1962: 37).

Offsetting this trend somewhat is the "cult of the Good Joe". A central theme of the American ethos, it embodies a dislike of such types as bullies, snobs and stuffed shirts, sympathy for underdogs, and approval of Good Joes who stand for belongingness and conformity. However, in Klapp's view, this front of Good-Joeism hides and compensates for an oligarchic tendency among winners. Conformers and joiners support the oligarchy, while deviant types make it harder to stand apart and criticize. Splendid performers increase audience dependency at the same time that they stress "individuality".

Klapp's pessimistic conclusion was that heroes in America

Table 6-1

Hero Types

	number of type names	%
egoistic achievement (strong men, top dogs, brains, smart operators, great lovers, splendid performers, independent spirits)	158	60
group servants (martyrs, defenders, do-gooders)	43	16
heroes of social acceptability (charmors, goodfellows, conformers, favorites)	42	16
unclassified	<u>23</u>	<u>8</u>
total	260	100

Source: Orrin E. Klapp, Heroes, Villains and Fools - The Changing American Character (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962), 37.

have deteriorated. He blamed modern communication for the rise of a class of celebrities who set the tone and standards of American life. "This class is characterized by ordinariness" (Klapp, 1962: 142). "Indeed, looking at our celebrities, one would think almost any kind of person can be famous in America" (Klapp, 1962: 96). Most of these celebrities are showmen whose achievements are due to specialties and gimmicks rather than real ability and character. They are specialists in creating a certain kind of impression. "... What the public seems to be getting - and enthusiastically receiving - most of the time are half-men, quarter-men or only the surfaces of men" (Klapp, 1962: 103).

Specifically, Klapp saw five ways in which American models have deteriorated:

- 1) Most positive models are little better than the average except in a narrow specialty. The values of entertainment and showmanship are encroaching on other areas.
- 2) "Character" (nobility, integrity, saintliness) is not one of their outstanding features.
- 3) Likeable types (Good Joes) are easily simulated by those lacking the goodwill implied by the role.
- 4) Models are diverse and contradictory. There are great disproportions of emphasis. They have no consistent effect as they do not favor consensus on the basic values and roles required of all.
- 5) The function of many models seems to have shifted from holding up an ideal to achieve, to compensating people for their lack of exceptional qualities.

Moreover, the fact that heroization of deviant types occurs, indicates that people realize how models have deteriorated and have taken a cynical attitude to the concept itself. "A badly alienated society may feel that most of its idols have feet of clay, may even repudiate heroism itself - the whole idea of dedicated and self-sacrificial striving" (Klapp, 1962: 137).

Klapp's conclusions reinforced those at which Leo Lowenthal had arrived after his content analysis of magazine biographies since the turn of the century. Table 6-2 shows that before World War I there was keen interest in political figures and an

Table 6-2

Distribution of Biographies According to Professions in The Saturday Evening Post and Colliers for Selected Years between 1901-1941

	<u>1901-1914</u>		<u>1922-1930</u>		<u>1930-1934</u>		<u>1940-1941</u>	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
political life	81	46	112	28	95	31	31	25
business and professional	49	28	72	18	42	14	25	20
entertainment	47	26	211	54	169	55	69	55
total	177	100	395	100	306	100	125	100
yearly average of biographies	36		66		77		125	

Table 6-3

Proportion of Biographies of Entertainers from the Realm of Serious Arts (literature, fine arts, music, dance, theatre) in The Saturday Evening Post and Colliers for Selected Years between 1901-1941

(in percentage of total biographies of entertainers in each period)

Period	proportion of entertainers from serious arts	total number of entertainers
1901-1914 (5 sample years)	77	47
1922-1930 (6 sample years)	38	211
1930-1934 (4 sample years)	29	169
1940-1941 (1 sample year)	9	69

Source: Leo Lowenthal, Literature, Popular Culture and Society (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: 1961), 111-112.

an almost equal distribution of persons from business and the professions, and the world of entertainment (Lowenthal, 1961: 111). After the war, there was a sharp drop in political biographies, a considerable decrease of interest in people from serious and important professions, and a corresponding increase in entertainers. Significantly, at the beginning of the century, about three-fourths of these entertainers were serious artists and writers; by 1940, such people had almost disappeared (see Table 6-3).

Lowenthal divided the years he examined into two eras - the era of production and the era of consumption - each having its own characteristic heroes. He found the former infinitely preferable to the latter: "The first quarter of the century cherishes biography in terms of an open-minded liberal society which really wants to know something about its own leading figures on the social, commercial and cultural fronts" (1961: 113). Entertainers were treated as embellishments of the national scene, "... not yet as something that in itself represents a social phenomenon which demands almost undivided attention" (Lowenthal, 1961: 113).

On the other hand, in the era of consumption, entertainment biographies ranked first with sports close to the top of these. Even "serious" non-political biographies were not so serious, portraying as they did a munitions trader, a fashion model, a quack doctor, an owner of an island resort and other similar persons. Lowenthal dubbed them "idols of consumption", as almost every one was either directly or indirectly related to the field of leisure and the consumer's world. Table 6-4 shows the heroes and their spheres of activity for biographies in the last period Lowenthal examined (1961: 116).

As Klapp was to do later, Lowenthal remarked on the ordinariness of these new heroes. "The character image on which an affirmative judgment is passed is that of a well-trained employee from a well-disciplined lower middle-class family" (Low-

Table 6-4

The Heroes and Their Spheres, 1940-1941

	number of stories	percentage
sphere of production	3	2
sphere of consumption	91	73
- entertainers and sports	69	55
- newspaper and radio	10	8
- agents of consumers' goods	5	4
- topics of light fiction	7	6
sphere of politics	<u>31</u>	<u>25</u>
total	125	100

Source: Leo Lowenthal, Literature, Popular Culture and Society (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1961), 116.

Table 6-5

Characterization of Political Figures, 1935-37 and 1959-61

	percent described as having characteristic				
time period	winner	socially acceptable	independent spirit	group servant	villain
1935-37 (N=43)	81.4	46.5	60.5	48.8	34.9
1959-61 (N=38)	92.1	28.9	52.6	18.4	63.2
chi square	2.03	2.58	.53	7.73	6.46

Source: Lionel S. Lewis, "Political Heroes: 1936 and 1960" Jour-
nalism Quarterly, XLII (Winter, 1965), 117.

enthal, 1961: 129). He saw these biographies as "an agent of make-believe adult education" - make-believe because satisfaction is derived from continual repetition of familiar patterns (status quo maintenance). The biographies did not extend the readers' horizons to the realm of the unknown.

We have already seen the movie actor performing on the screen and we have seen the cartoons of the competent newspaperman; we have heard what the radio comentator has to say and have noted the talents of boxers and baseball players. The biographies repeat what we have always known (Lowenthal, 1961: 135).

Lowenthal explained the rise in popularity of heroes of consumption as a response to feelings of powerlessness. As distance between average individuals and forces that determine their life and death becomes unbridgeable, they sought to identify with the normalcy epitomized by heroes of consumption. These heroes represent a "readily grasped empire of refuge and escape" - the individual can be at one with the great sphere of consumption (Lowenthal, 1961: 135). Social distance between the hero and the reader is reduced and the cult of the common man is generated.

Trends in America noted by other authors confirm those discerned by Klapp and Lowenthal. Johns-Heine and Gerth's analysis of values in mass periodical fiction from 1921 to 1940 revealed themes consistent with those Lowenthal discovered in biographies for the same period. They observed

... a shift in emphasis away from the "citan" success theme, in which the hero is exalted for his own genius over and above other group values to the "little man" success theme, in which the reward symbol is due the hero as the bearer of specific group virtues (Johns-Heine and Gerth, 1957: 230).

Their interpretation, however, was not as harsh as Lowenthal's. Although they, too, agreed that such a hero may give people a compensating sense of independence and individual significance when power and prestige seem to have become entrenched, Johns-Heine and Gerth linked their findings to events occurring in society. Under the impact of economic depression and political

pessimism, post-World War I expansiveness and optimism yielded to more traditionalist values. There was an attempt to perpetuate certain roots of American life, or at least the myth of them. The little man was the familiar standard-bearer of democratic values.

Lionel Lewis used Klapp's classification to test the hypothesis of Klapp and Lowenthal that heroes depicted in the media have become less desirable models to emulate - significant, worthwhile models have given way to worthless caricatures from the world of illusion. He classified political figures treated in TIME and Newsweek cover stories around election time in 1936 and 1960 as being winners, socially acceptable, independent spirits, group servants and/or villains (see Table 6-5) (Lewis, 1965: 117).

He observed that "political heroes like most heroes, at least in American society, are portrayed as being Winners - top dogs, underdogs, shrewd, powerful and intelligent" (Lewis, 1965: 117). In the first period they were more often described as powerful, while in the latter, being a top dog and shrewd was emphasized. However, the only statistically significant differences he found were in the increase of villains and decrease of group servants. Lewis concluded that the morality of Americans who accept political heroes is questionable since these heroes do not display the most meritorious traits. He speculated that this might explain the interest in Senate candidacy exhibited by football coaches, astronauts and movie stars.

Chapter 7

Elites

Over the years, people on the cover of TIME have conformed more or less to the hero types and trends recognized by Klapp, Lowenthal and others. However, as well as being heroes, these people must also be regarded as members of very special groups - elites. Attention will now be turned to explaining the concept of elites and their relation to the rest of society.

An elite is "... a minority of individuals designated to serve a collectivity in a socially valued way" (Keller, 1963: 4). They are an effective and responsible minority charged with performance of activities of interest and concern to others. Suzanne Keller has refined the concept and distinguished strategic elites. These consist of persons whose judgments, decisions and actions have important and determinable consequences for many members of society. Usually they are the leaders in political, economic, military, moral and cultural fields. Strategic elites are foci for realization of collective aims. "Their actions, words, gestures, impressions and prejudices carry more weight than those of other men because they personify the aims, aspirations and attitudes of multitudes. They come to stand for their sectors and all their manifold ramifications" (Keller, 1963: 100). C. Wright Mills' definition of the power elite circumscribes an even smaller group: "... those political, economic and military circles which as an intricate set of overlapping cliques share decisions having at least national consequences" (1956: 18).

But no matter how broadly or narrowly they are defined, all elites perform functions in society similar in many respects to those performed by heroes. "Socially significant elites are ultimately responsible for the realization of major social goals

and for the continuity of the social order" (Keller, 1963: 4). As both agents and symbols, their public actions involve expressive as well as instrumental features. In industrial societies, elites concerned with adaptive and goal attainment problems are judged by what they accomplish, while those concerned with integration and social solidarity, by what they represent. Yet all societies expect their elites to be committed to a general social and moral framework as well as to the specific norms of the institutional sphere in which they operate. "Societies, if they are to survive, require not only functional coordination but moral consensus, however loose and ill-defined" (Keller, 1963: 126). Moral obligation to ultimate ends is the duty of elites.

So it is that elites are collective agents and collective symbols. By observing them, members of society become more knowledgeable and informed about the several worlds around them. "Strategic elites may be ... considered as collective projections serving as models and mirrors of the ambitions, hopes and strivings of masses of men" (Keller, 1963: 157). "If any persons today receive the homage, reverence, fascinated interest and anxious ambivalence reserved for sacred entities, it is the strategic elites who embody an ideal image of society and in whom man worships and hates himself" (Keller, 1963: 140).

Elites may be classified in several ways. Following the Parsonian scheme, Keller divided them into external and internal elites. External elites concentrate on goal attainment and adaptation. Their fields of endeavour include politics, government administration, military affairs, diplomacy and science. In contrast, internal elites are concerned with problems of morality and morale. Leaders looked to for moral guidance and reassurance include clergymen, philosophers, educators, "first families" and the like. Their functions are to clarify and coordinate belief and conduct, to interpret changing reality in the light of collective ideals and to formulate or reassert ideolo-

gies related to life in their times. Those who promote social solidarity and morale constitute another sort of internal elite - artists, writers, popular entertainers, film stars and athletes. They stand for novelty, variety and play, and provide vicarious identities.

Two approaches may be taken in identifying members of these elites. The positional method designates leaders occupying the most important organizational positions as members of the elite: elected political officials, higher civil servants, business executives, officials of voluntary organizations, heads of religious groups, leaders of labor unions, military officers, etc. The reputational approach consists of identifying leaders through the opinions or judgments of others. (It could be that TIME performs this task on a national scale).

Nevertheless, when the reputational method is used, respondents are likely to cite an individual's position in industry, government or other organization as a reason for their choice. Thus, there is considerable overlap between the two approaches. This was evident in Floyd Hunter's 1959 study of leadership in America (see Table 7-1) (Bell et al, 1961: 110). He used the reputational method and found most of those chosen occupied high positions in formal organizations.

Implicit in the foregoing has been the relative importance of various elites. All elites are important in certain social and psychological contexts, but only some are important for society as a whole. There is a hierarchy among elites which may, in some measure, compensate for the deterioration of heroes.

Some elites are more elite than others Beauty queens, criminal masterminds, champion bridgeplayers and master chefs all hold top rank in certain pyramids of talent or power, but not all are equally significant in the life of society. Certain elites may arouse momentary attention, but only certain leadership groups have a general and sustained impact (Keller, 1963: 20).

The rank order of elites is determined by the nature of problems confronting society, the priority accorded them and the functional

Table 7-1

Top National Leaders

23 industrialists
15 Senators
10 Cabinet members
6 professionals (3 attorneys, 2 professors, 1 scientist)
5 bankers
5 publishers
5 Congressmen
4 assistant cabinet secretaries
3 labor leaders
3 military officers
4 Presidential assistants
3 transportation executives
2 ambassadors
2 governors
3 U.S. Presidents (2 retired)
1 each - Chief Justice of the Supreme Court,
communications executive (radio-TV),
religious leader, utilities executive,
U.N. representative, Vice-President

Type of Occupation

government	48
business	38
professional	6
labor	3
military	3
religion	1

Source: Wendell Bell and others, Public Leadership - A Critical Review with Special Reference to Adult Education (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1961), 110.

and moral solutions proposed to solve them. Elites move into ascendancy when their functions do likewise.

According to Keller, environment is always a factor in the rise and fall of elite positions. "External and internal changes, such as the rise of new ideas and inventions or the emergence of new world powers, are generally followed by changes in the organization and recruitment of strategic elites" (Keller, 1963: 236). For instance, a religious elite, prominent in an age of faith is subordinate in an age of science. Its previous function is subdivided among new elites.

Mills was also aware of the influence of circumstances on elites:

Only when revolution or crime threaten to disturb domestic order does the police captain, and only when diplomacy and war threaten international order, do the generals and admirals, come to be recognized for what at all times they are: indispensable elements of the order and power that prevails within and between the national states of the world (1956: 85).

Which branch of the power elite, political, business or military, seems to lead depends on the "tasks of the period" as the elite defines them.

Hence, "the make-up, capacities and decisions of elites both reflect and influence the characteristics of the societies in which they emerge" (Keller, 1963: 259). They represent the unity and diversity of their society. In periods of rapid social change, the outline of elites against a shifting background is sharply visible; in periods of relative stability, they merge with objects, manners and habits of the age. The study of elites as collective projections therefore provides important clues about the publics they serve and represent. Other members of society look to elites through a series of intermediary groups as "the embodiments of society's ideal values and as individuals crowned with success" (Keller, 1963: 162).

The spirit and vitality of a society, its resiliency and the sense of well-being among its members, are greatly dependent upon the character of its strategic

elites. The latter's high visibility, apart from their power to do well or ill, makes them a collective focus of expectations and a collective target for grievances (Keller, 1963: 227).

The mass media are crucial in fostering this high visibility. Keller contended that one of the chief tasks of the media is establishing the identity of public figures. Mills called mass communication "the prime means of acclaim and even a creator of those acclaimed" (1956: 84). On a small scale, Frank A. Stewart showed that the number of times one's name was mentioned in a local newspaper was a fair indicator of a community's influentials (Bell et al, 1961: 8). Mills said the same principle applies at the national level. The national means of mass communication are channels through which those at the top reach the underlying population. In the United States, "... headlines are devoted in considerable measure to the leaders of politics, science, business, defense and diplomacy" (Keller, 1963: 215). Without the media that are focused on them, elites would be uncelebrated.

Mills explained the rise of celebrities as being due, at least in part, to the media's influence. Celebrities he defined as "... the Names that need no further identification" (1956: 71-72). All those who succeed in America are apt to become involved in the world of the celebrity, where a hierarchy of publicity has replaced hierarchies of descent and great wealth. American celebrities "... include the trivial as well as the grim" (Mills, 1956: 92).

Mills found three types of people in the world of the celebrity. Professional celebrities from the fields of entertainment, sport, art, journalism, etc. make up about 30 per cent. They are the result of the star system in a society "... that makes a fetish out of competition" (Mills, 1956: 74). It does not matter what a man is best at; as long as he has won out over other competition, he is celebrated and the stars of other spheres and positions are drawn to him. Professional celebrities are the equivalent of Klapp's hero of the surface.

The second group in the world of the celebrity is the metropolitan 400. These are members of the "best" families - traditional society leaders.

Finally, there are the holders of key positions in the institutional hierarchy. Government and business officials constitute 58 per cent of the total celebrities; scientists, medical men, educators, religionists and labor leaders, seven per cent.

Institutional celebrities, particularly in the higher political, economic and military circles, all have publicity value. By virtue of their positions and by means of conscious public relations, "they strive to make their names notable, their actions acceptable, their policies popular" (Mills, 1956: 83). Thus, they tend to become national celebrities; however, Mills, unlike Klapp, did not see them becoming grandstanders. "It is true, they, too, must enter the world of publicity, become material for the mass media, but they are sought as material almost irrespective of what they do on and to these media" (Mills, 1956: 83). Something other than the star system is operating here. For Mills, Keller and other authors, that something is prestige.

Occupational Prestige

Thorstein Veblen observed: "The rewards ... in this life are esteem and admiration of others - the punishments are neglect and contempt - nor may anyone imagine that these are not as real as the others". Basically, there are three criteria employed in ranking statuses: 1) personal characteristics believed to be required to play a role effectively; 2) trained skills and abilities believed necessary to discharge it, and 3) the consequences of effects (social functions) of a role. However, these criteria in themselves do not explain so complicated a phenomenon as occupational prestige which is characterized by many inconsistencies and anomalies.

Perhaps the best explanation was put forth by Edward Shils.

He noted in society "... a widespread disposition to attribute charismatic properties to ordinary secular roles, institutions, symbols and strata or aggregates of persons" (Shils, 1965: 200). Charisma he defined as a state or quality of being produced by receipt of the gifts of grace.

Manifestations of charisma are alike in their extraordinariness. They evince a high intensity of certain vital, crucial qualities connected with "some very central feature of man's existence and the cosmos in which he lives" (Shils, 1965: 201). Such centrality is constituted by its formative power in initiating, creating, governing, transforming, maintaining or destroying what is vital in life. The religious idea of God or a fundamental principle governing the universe immediately comes to mind. Nevertheless,

scientific discovery, ethical promulgation, artistic creativity, political and organizational authority, and in fact all forms of genius, ... are as much instances of the category of charismatic things as is religious prophecy Charismatic connections may also become resident, in varying degrees of intensity, in institutions - in the qualities, norms and beliefs to which members are expected to adhere or are expected to possess - and, in an attenuated form, in categories or strata of the members of a society (Shils, 1965: 201-202).

The need for order in all societies was mentioned earlier in connection with heroes and the symbolic function of elites. "The generator or author of order arouses the charismatic responsiveness" (Shils, 1965: 203). God's law, natural law, scientific law, corporate bodies and institutions all embody, express or symbolize the essence of an ordered cosmos. Religion explains the world by reference to divine intention; science demands that one be in regular relations with the truths it has revealed; philosophy seeks to discern a continuous, coherent and just order; the constitution, legal system, effective governmental institutions and moral opinion in which they are embedded also provide meaningful orders. Thus, charisma is attributed to

the forces which men perceive as ruling their lives and also to individuals in contact with those forces.

A common characteristic of persons believed to have charisma is the possession of power. "The attribution of charismatic qualities occurs in the presence of order-disclosing, order-discovering power as such; it is a response to great ordering power" (Shils, 1965: 204). Power, the central, order-related event, implies that its possessor is capable of intervention in life's vital processes. Power most obviously resides with the highest authorities of a society - its presidents, kings, prime ministers, party secretaries, governors, judges and lawmakers - "rulers of the fullest, most inclusive order of existence here on earth" (Shils, 1965: 205). Thus, "all effective rulers possess charismatic qualities" (Shils, 1965: 204). Similarly, "corporate bodies - secular, economic, governmental, military and political - come to possess charismatic qualities simply by virtue of the tremendous power concentrated in them" (Shils, 1965: 207).

Shils' view of power also explains why the highly remunerated are esteemed. Wealth permits the exercise of great authority, or it is thought to be a reward for order-creating activities or a manifestation of creative, penetrating power.

Education is esteemed because it opens the way to contact with the norms of the central value system and facilitates entry to central, authoritative institutional roles.

"... Deference is ... a response to the presumptive charismatic connections of roles at the centre of society and at the centre of life" (Shils, 1965: 208-209). Its main recipients exercise authority in the central institutional system and occupy pivotal positions in the central value system. They engage in occupations whose role is to perceive and enunciate the most general principles in most immediate connection with the charismatic, or to maintain and protect the earthly order enjoined by those principles.

So it is that in the United States, highest prestige accrues

to Supreme Court Justices who assert the highest law, the Constitution, in the light of the most general principles. The Justice is a link between transcendent and earthly orders. Below him are State governors, physicians, Federal legislators, Cabinet members, scientists and professors. Governors exercise great authority; legislators create laws in accord with the Constitution. Scientists and scholars seek the pattern of the universe. "Creative and expressive persons, to the extent that their observations become known, are likewise connected with this ultimate normative and symbolic stratum" (Shils, 1965: 208). At the next level are persons like lawyers who interpret the law, and corporate directors who exercise considerable power. Least esteem is accorded those unskilled, uncreative occupations farthest from the centre of society and its central value system.

Although he did not articulate it in the same way, Mills apparently had a similar idea of the components of prestige. Prestige existed, he said, in the "shadow of money and power" (1956: 83). Because men of higher political, economic and military circles are an elite of money and power, they accumulate prestige above the ordinary. They are celebrated because they have prestige; they have prestige because they are thought to have power and wealth.

Authors concerned with the classification of occupations have long been troubled by the fact that some groups receive disproportionate rewards (material and psychic). Klapp's splendid performers are striking examples of this. Richard L. Simpson has explained it by invoking the concepts of product differentiation and monopoly. It is possible to command a high reward if the consuming public can be convinced that a particular product or service is unique and no other will suffice. In fact, it may or may not be so. "The important criterion in imputing uniqueness of this sort would seem to be whether the public thinks that a given position or its incumbent is unique ..." (Simpson, 1956: 132). So it is that the hero of surfaces, the

half- or quarter-man is hailed by the public. Nonetheless, as Keller observed, a hierarchy of elites exists. "There are numerous occupations that enjoy considerable public attention, fame or notoriety, but do not command real prestige ..." (Tumin, 1967: 39). Evidence of the stability of prestige was presented by Robert W. Hodge, Paul M. Siegel and Peter H. Rossi in 1963 after they had studied ratings over the years. Their conclusion: "... There have been no substantial changes in occupational prestige in the United States since 1925" (1969: 200).

This lends credence to Shils' theory that ultimately those persons holding positions in closest connection with vital processes of society will be accorded the highest status. Personal and organismic qualities may be important for deference in some situations, but they are not taken into account in the serious status system. Shils considered the relevant deference-status qualifications to be authority, creativity, penetration and promulgation which are embodied in one's occupational role and education. Although they may be intertwined with the foregoing, such things as income, style of life and kinship connections are essentially derivative, and of secondary importance in determining modern elite membership.

Socio-Economic Characteristics of Elites

While the hero types a society chooses are certainly important indicators of its values, as long as prestige ratings continue to favor certain power-related occupations, hasty conclusions about moral disintegration are to be avoided. In the hierarchy of elites, certain constant standards seem to ensure that particular groups will come out on top.

However, the people who belong to elite groups tend to exhibit a number of common characteristics. The characteristics vary from group to group, but there seems to be more inter- and intragroup homogeneity than could be explained by chance. For this reason, Mills, Keller and other writers have deemed it

worthwhile to look at elite recruitment and the socio-economic traits that seem to favor it. Elites share and divide the tasks of social, moral and cultural leadership. As a consequence, they reveal common and divergent social characteristics. Studies of elite recruitment help assess the degree of flexibility in the highest peaks of the social structure and help explain changes in style.

The socio-economic characteristics of each elite group will be explicated in greater detail later after the results of the TIME content analysis have been presented. For the moment, general traits discovered by other studies will give some indication of what may be expected among TIME cover subjects.

There is a preferred, even typical pattern, but not a uniform one The members of most strategic elites are white, male, native-born, of British or Northwest European descent, and of Protestant (especially Presbyterian and Episcopal) faiths (Keller, 1963: 207).

Elites tend to be more homogeneous as regards ascribed attributes (race, sex, religion, ancestry) than achieved attributes (wealth, education), but this is less true of recreational and artistic elites which are more accessible to women, Negroes and immigrants. Considering the composition of the American population, it would be anomalous if the vast majority of public leaders were not native-born white Protestants. Nevertheless, in some instances, they dominate to the exclusion of other minority leaders. For example, in military and diplomatic elites, nativity, ethnicity and religion are more salient than in the elites of sports and entertainment.

Interestingly, this WASP tendency was noted in an analysis of magazine fiction conducted by Bernard Berelson and Patricia J. Salter. They concluded that "the rule seems to be that the character receives better treatment the closer he is to the norm of the Americans, i.e. white, Protestant, English-speaking, Anglo-Saxon" (1957: 245-246). They also observed that minority and foreign groups from other European and Oriental countries were

accorded preferential treatment over two critical American minorities - Negroes and Jews. Characters from these two groups never appeared as heroes in the stories and had jobs with the lowest occupational ratings.

But perhaps the most striking disproportion in elite groups is the distribution of leaders from the two sexes. More will be said about this later. For now, it will be sufficient to say that although not all leadership is monopolized by men, public leadership in America is essentially a man's role.

Incumbency in elite positions is most common in the middle years. Formal and reputational leaders are generally at least 45. Leadership is rare in young adults or persons over 65, "... although sometimes a few senior leaders are precisely the most powerful in public affairs " (Bell et al, 1961: 56). Members of the entertainment elite are comparatively young. Lengthened career spans in other fields of endeavour have made members of other elites older upon achieving success. Keller reported that 60 per cent of business, political, diplomatic and military leaders were over 50 at the peak of their careers. She hypothesized: "The greater the degree of formal organization of an elite, the older its incumbents" (1963: 214).

The tendency for elites to be almost exclusively Caucasian has been noted, despite the fact that Negroes constitute about 10 per cent of the American population. According to the 1950, 1960 and 1970 Censuses, 6.7 per cent, 5.9 per cent and about five per cent of Americans respectively, were foreign-born whites. Table 7-2 shows that they are represented proportionate to their numbers in only the business elite (Keller, 1963: 310). They are under-represented in political, military and diplomatic elites, and vastly over-represented in the film elite.

The 1958 Census of Churches found that of those Americans claiming religious affiliation, 66.2 per cent were Protestant, 25.7 per cent Catholic and 3.2 per cent Jewish. Table 7-3 indicates that Protestants constituted similar percentages of only

Table 7-2

Trends in Ascribed Attributes - Nativity

Strategic Elite	Percentage of Foreign-Born	Percentage of Second Generation
political	2%	15%
military	2	9
diplomatic	4	8
business	6	18
film	25	no information

Table 7-3

Trends in Ascribed Attributes - Religion

Strategic Elite	Percentage of Protestant
diplomatic	60%
journalistic	70
political	81
business	85
military	90

Table 7-4

Trends in Ascribed Attributes - Education

Strategic Elite	Percentage of College Graduates
film (1930s)	18%
journalistic	52
business	61
higher civil servants	80
diplomatic	81
military	73-98
political	91

Source: Suzanne Keller, Beyond the Ruling Class - Strategic Elites in Modern Society (New York: Random House, 1961), 310-312.

the diplomatic and journalistic elites; in politics, business and the military they are over-represented (Keller, 1963: 311). Moreover, among American Protestants, Baptists made up the largest number, followed by Methodists and then Lutherans, whereas among elites, Presbyterian and Episcopalians predominate.

Members of most elites have a high level of formal education, well above that of the average citizen or even the average college graduate. College and post-college training is characteristic of all elites and indispensable to economic, military, diplomatic and scientific elites. It is becoming increasingly essential for political, journalistic and artistic elites. Table 7-4 shows the percentage of college graduates in each group (Keller, 1963: 312). To some extent, of course, education is correlated with social class origin.

Few members of elites have humble class origins. No social class is entirely excluded nor does any class monopolize access to elites. Nevertheless, the lowest stratum of manual workers is only minimally represented among most elites (see Table 7-5) (Keller, 1963: 311-312). C. Wright Mills found that the higher an individual's position in business, military and government elites, the more likely he was to have come from an upper class family. Table 7-6 shows the amount of occupational inheritance among a number of elites (Keller, 1963: 324).

Trends

Writers have noted and predicted trends among elites, both in reference to socio-economic characteristics of their members and to the way in which elites as groups are moving. A fuller evaluation of these ideas will be given after the TIME data have been examined. At this point, a few of the main themes of these authors will be adumbrated as possible trends that the TIME analysis may reveal.

Keller observed that elites (like Klapp's hero and villain types) seem to be proliferating. There is, she said, a greater

Table 7-5

Trends in Ascribed Attributes -
Father's Occupation

Strategic Elite	Percentage Professional	Percentage Proprietary and Official	Percentage Farmers	Percentage Wage-Earners
business	15%	57%	15%	15%
political	24	35	32	5
higher civil servants	28	26	29	10
diplomatic	32	36	6	3
journalistic	43	24	9	11
military	38-45	29	10	5
film	50	33	4	5

Table 7-6

Trends in Ascribed Attributes -
Occupational Inheritance

Strategic Elite	Percentage of Fathers in Same Field
diplomatic	2%
higher civil servants	3
Washington correspondents	11
political	15
business	23
military	25

Source: Suzanne Keller, Beyond the Ruling Class - Strategic Elites in Modern Society (New York: Random House, 1963), 311-312, 324.

variety of elites exercising more extensive powers. She attributed this to four main social processes: growth of population, occupational specialization, formal organization and moral diversity. "No strategic elite can today know all there is to be known and none can perform all the functions involved in social leadership" (Keller, 1963: 70).

At least in part, this proliferation is a response to sophisticated technology. Technological change, however, has a greater impact on business, military affairs, diplomacy, politics and science than on religion or art.

In an age that emphasizes the conquest of space and the utilization of new sources of energy, those elites concerned with providing the technological and organizational means for the achievement of these goals will play a particularly important strategic role (Keller, 1963: 215).

The result has been that the first group of elites (external) has come to resemble the latter two (internal) in that their ranks are more open to outsiders.

"Because of the premium placed on skill and expertise, strategic elites are increasingly becoming nonhereditary, functionally specific and non-permanent" (Keller, 1963: 166). Keller contended that the decline of hereditary transmission of elite status is manifested in all leadership groups except high society. Recruitment of elites is not yet random, as there is a link between material means and education, and the appeal of various types of success is unequally distributed among different strata. Nevertheless, the spread of science has rendered entrenched classes less able to monopolize elite positions. Prevalence of achievement and performance standards has led to the decline of amateurs and the rise of experts. Since experts are made, not born, the circulation of elites and the variety of individual and social types recruited has increased. There has been growth in the proportion of those from lower class backgrounds.

One of the social processes to which Keller attributed proliferation of elites was, as noted, the rise of formal organiza-

tions - bureaucratization. The dominance of large-scale organizations in the twentieth century has prompted a familiar lament: "Government is big, business, is big, labor is big" (J.W. Davis, 1963: 541). Thus, although experts have gained more significance, they tend to be functionaries within organized hierarchies. "... The route to the top for an archbishop, a four-star general, or a university chancellor has a great deal in common with that travelled by a corporation president" (Hacker, 1970: 60).

A result of the common career lines that elites must follow has been intensification of interconnections between them.

Most people, in their everyday working lives, tend to refer to "they", the anonymous eyes and ears of the world or the men in control of things as sources of authority. The strategic elites, who are the originators rather than the instruments of social action must be able, at least some of the time, to say "we" (Keller, 1963: 76).

Shils said that holders of greatest power over the lives of others are not necessarily in harmony with elites of other spheres. But however incomplete, there is noticeable consensus and mutual support among them. "There is a kind of reciprocal attraction among the fraternity of the successful - not between each and every member of the circles of the high and mighty, but between enough of them to insure a certain unity" (Mills, 1956: 281). With the growth of bureaucracy, requirements of top places in major hierarchies became similar. Consequently, by selection and training, the type of men who fill them became similar, too. "... Between these higher circles there is an interchangeability of 'executive ability', based formally in substance upon the co-optation by cliques of insiders" (Mills, 1956: 287).

Mills found this to be singularly true of the power elite - sizable proportions of top business, military and political men had occupied positions in one or both of the other worlds. He even defined the inner core of the power elite as those who exchange commanding roles at the top of one dominant institu-

tional order with those of another. Since World War II, he said, when corporate chieftains had joined the political directorate, the tendency for business and government to become more interconnected had reached "a new point of explicitness". The result was a new society, a political economy "... in which political and economic affairs are intricately and deeply joined together" and where the corporate rich sit at the apex (Mills, 1956: 260).

At the same time, the military became more closely allied with both the political and business spheres. For Mills, the exigencies of the Second World War provided the impetus for business to join itself to government. "War is ... the health of the corporate economy; during war the political economy tends to become more unified, and moreover, political legitimations of the most unquestionable sort - national security itself - are gained for corporate economic activities" (Mills, 1956: 167). The nature of the situation also made it imperative that the military intervene decisively in higher economic and political circles. "For unless the military sat in on corporate decisions they could not be sure that their programs would be carried out; and unless the corporation chieftains knew something of the war plans, they could not plan war production" (Mills, 1956: 212). After the war, military demands continued to shape and pace the corporate economy. Instead of retiring, many generals and admirals became members of boards of directors. There was a structural shift of American capitalism toward a permanent war economy to deal with the Cold War.

Mills observed that in the mid-twentieth century the influence of peaceful and civilian values in the United States had to be balanced by the unprecedented situation as it was defined by the elite. For the first time in American history, men in authority were talking about an "emergency" without a foreseeable end.

... The American elite does not have any real image of peace - other than as an uneasy interlude existing precariously by virtue of the balance of mutual fright.

In short, war or a high state of war preparedness is felt to be the normal and seemingly permanent condition of the United States (Mills, 1956: 184).

As the focus of the elite shifted from domestic problems to international problems centred on war, the military gained decisive political importance. Mills argued that there was in America no interest or combination of interests with the time, money and manpower to present a point of view which could effectively compete with that presented day in and day out by the military. "... There is no free and wide debate of military policy or policies of military relevance" (Mills, 1956: 221). As evidence, Mills noted that the "militarization of science" continued in peacetime - scientific and technological development was increasingly part of the military, its largest single supporter and director. Much of this scientific endeavour was in competition with the U.S.S.R., competition that extended into cultural as well as military and scientific affairs, in order to win national prestige.

He also observed that more and more it was not politicians, but corporate executives who sat with the military to plan organization of the war effort. The economy had become a permanent war and private corporation economy. As a result, the power elite was shaped by the coincidence of interest between those who controlled the major means of production and the newly-enlarged means of violence. Nonetheless, Mills conceded that the expanded role of the high military in basic political and economic decisions was due more to civilian political default than military usurpation. He said, "Historically the warlords have been only uneasy, poor relations within the American elite; now they are first cousins; soon they may become elder brothers" (Mills, 1956: 198).

Another related trend discerned by Mills was bureaucratization of politics - the decline of professional politicians in the sense of having been elected. "... Today the men at the top are much more likely to be bureaucrats, and rather less likely to be

party politicians than political outsiders" (Mills, 1956: 228). There is a sharp contrast between the many elected positions at lower and legislative levels and the few on national and administrative levels. Therefore, more recent members of the political elite are apt to have been appointed. He saw the centre of initiative and decision as having moved from Congress to the Executive.

Taking an overall view, Mills described what he found in the United States in the mid-Fifties as being dominated by a conservative mood. "It is a mood quite appropriate to men living in a material boom, a nationalist celebration, a political vacuum" (Mills, 1956: 326).

Writing a few years later at the beginning of the 1960s, Keller took a somewhat more optimistic outlook. In societies with the means to abolish material scarcity, she said, economic and political elites tend to prevail. Yet this is not an eternal situation. "In the future, scientific and other culture-producing elites may become supreme. The goals of social systems may no longer be set by the need for sheer biological survival but by the possibilities for a richer, more interesting life" (Keller, 1963: 125). She saw modern industrial societies advancing toward this condition.

Chapter 8

Methodology

At this point it is useful to observe that many authors have difficulty pinpointing exactly what persons they mean when they speak of "the elite". Keller stated: "A key problem, as yet unresolved, concerns the definition of elites employed in different studies and demarcation of their boundaries" (1963: 201). This is a problem, however, which appears to be somewhat overcome by choosing people who have appeared on the cover of TIME. They are leaders in all walks of life, and thus, may be considered the elite of each of these fields. Individually they may be heroes, but collectively they are the elite. The fact that these are the people who receive most media attention dispels "... the notion that the 'real' rulers of America are somehow behind the scenes rather than before the public each and every day" (Domhoff, 1967: 3).

Sampling

It was decided that the universe for this study would consist of all cover subjects on TIME Magazine from 1946 to 1971 inclusive. In these 26 years, 1,352 issues of the magazine were produced. As this number was rather large, a sample was drawn. An initial requirement of validity is that the sample be representative of the universe about which generalizations are made. Random sampling "... is applicable when every source can be considered equally important for purposes of the study", as was the case here (Holsti, 1969: 130). With the aid of a table of random numbers, 13 issues were chosen for each year. This amounted to 338 covers on which 395 persons appeared.

Occasionally, (especially in later years) substitutions were necessary. This happened when the cover was devoted to events (e.g. anti-war demonstration), phenomena (e.g. camera craze) and

the like, or did not show recognizable persons; or when the persons portrayed were symbolic (e.g. American student), historical (e.g. Abraham Lincoln, Jesus Christ) or unidentifiable (e.g. actors in a Polish movie). When substitutions were called for, the issue after the one chosen in the sample was taken: if it, too, was unacceptable (i.e. there were no identifiable people on the cover or it was already in the sample) then the issue immediately preceding the original was taken. The purpose was to get a substitute as close as possible to the original date. Appendix A is a list of the names and positions of the persons who constituted the sample that was used.

Questionnaire

Berelson said, "In cases where the narrative is woven around particular persons, they are the most convenient units on which to base an analysis" (1952: 140). That clearly applies in this situation. Thus, a questionnaire was devised and filled out for each identifiable cover subject (see Appendix B). It sought to determine two basic types of information: that relating to magazine layout and organization (e.g. color or black and white, section in which the story appeared) - how the subject was treated artistically, and personal information about the subject (e.g. age, sex, education, occupation, etc.). Subsequent investigation revealed that a number of these pieces of information were irrelevant, notably 2 (American or Canadian), 3 (cover type), 10 (size of portrait), 31 (accomplishment), 34 (marital status), 35 (children) and 36 (man of the year). The NCRC rating was also not used as extensively as it might have been.

About such ratings, the findings of Charles Winick who conducted a similar study, are pertinent. He discovered that about a third of the occupations of TIME cover subjects are not included on the rating scale "... suggesting that marginal or unusual occupations are sometimes associated with celebrityhood" (1963:

305). Occupations such as professor, scientist, minister and architect, he went on to say, had only minor representation on the cover. Nevertheless, the high rankings of government officials constituted the "clearest overlap" of public perception of occupations and their representation on the covers. An attempt was made in the present study to rank both the occupation of cover subjects and their fathers, but since estimates had to be made frequently, the results are at best arbitrary.

The same may be said of an item that was later added to the questionnaire - classification according to Klapp's typology. Without tabulating the frequency of positive and negative statements, a single qualitative judgment was made about which view of the person most closely characterized the major theme - hero, villain, fool or ambivalent. This was a very subjective measure - the present writer's impression of TIME's impression of the subject - and should not be regarded as definitive.

There was a similar problem in deciding whether or not the cover subject's achievement was his own or that of an organization with which he was associated. Therefore, this measure, too, is arbitrary.

In the other instance where a judgment had to be made, i.e. cultural theme of the story, the problem of validity was not important. The theme of the story could usually be determined by the section in which it appeared or by its focus of attention.

All other variables could be objectively determined. It was assumed that the frequency with which each occurred in the sample was a valid indicator of concern, focus of attention, value, importance, etc., and thus, each was given equal weight. Modified frequency counts which weight variables for qualitative differences were used in two cases only - the number of persons on the cover and relative positions of each.

Coding

When data had been collected for all 395 cases (it was ne-

cessary to go to other sources to get some information not included in the TIME stories), a coding scheme was devised (see Appendix C) which generally employed the variables used on the questionnaire. Added to this number were father's occupation, occupational inheritance, reason for the story and whether or not the case was a substitute.

The data were transferred to coding sheets (see Appendix D), then punched onto IBM cards and processed by computer. A great deal of the needed information was obtained from initial frequency distributions. By cross-tabulating each variable with intervals of five years, time trends became evident. Other cross-tabulations (age, sex, race, religion, education, nationality and occupation) were also performed.

Chapter 9

Findings

As will be shown in some detail shortly, the people who appear on the cover of TIME Magazine are members of the elites described by C. Wright Mills and Suzanne Keller, and generally conform to traits characteristic of these groups. When an individual receives TIME's unique form of status conferral, he must, almost by definition, be a large-scale hero, villain or fool. But the types of people chosen for portrayal, with regard to their occupation, personal characteristics and areas of concern and interest, are sufficiently restricted to permit grouping of them into a number of elites. Furthermore, their occupations and personal characteristics indicate what sort of positions are valued and what kind of people are considered suitable to fill, and indeed epitomize, such positions.

TIME, it has been argued, appeals to a large segment of American society by mirroring their concerns, beliefs, attitudes, etc. Also, as part of a "big business" enterprise, it is inclined to reflect "establishment" values in support of the status quo. TIME recognition is given to persons, events and phenomena which, if not yet part of the status quo, are at least prevalent and entrenched enough to merit nationwide attention. When changes occur in cover subjects, and hence in elites, the contention here is that these may be reflections of changes in American values. Even changes in artwork, if they are consistent, may be significant.

Basic Frequency Distributions and Time Trends

The first variable considered was if a particular person had been in the original sample or if it had been necessary to find a substitute. Less than 10 per cent of the cases were substitutes. When the 26 years were broken down into five-year

intervals, it was found that substitutes made up 3.0 per cent of the cases in the first period (1946-1950), 9.2 per cent in the second (1951-1955), 4.5 per cent in the third (1956-1960), 4.5 per cent in the fourth (1961-1965) and 20.8 per cent in the fifth (1966-1971 - six years). This indicates a sharp move since 1966 away from person-centred covers to issue-oriented themes. Also, in the later years, when people appeared on the cover, they were more likely to do so in groups. In the first period, 95.5 per cent of the covers featured one person and none had more than two; in the last period, the corresponding proportion was 60.4 per cent, with covers portraying as many as five identifiable people. But only in this last period did they appear in the background (3.3 per cent of the total). On earlier covers, all subjects were given "equal billing".

Color covers dominate (97 per cent overall), although there was a slightly greater proportion of black and white covers in more recent years. Similarly, most of the covers were painted or drawn portraits (79.4 per cent). Photographs accounted for 15.2 per cent, caricatures and cartoons 4.3 per cent and other media one per cent. In later years, TIME editors seem to have been more willing to experiment with their covers. Whereas in the first period 97 per cent of the covers were painted portraits, in the last period this medium accounted for only 58.8 per cent of the covers. Almost one-fourth were photographs; 14 per cent were caricatures and four per cent employed other artistic forms.

Cover subjects' stories were more likely to appear in the front half of the magazine (55.1 per cent) which is devoted to public affairs, than in the back half (44.9 per cent). When each five-year period was examined separately, this tendency held for all except the years 1960 to 1965 when only 48.3 per cent of the cover subjects had their stories in the front. However, by the last period, 59.4 per cent were in the first half, the greatest proportion ever.

More telling, perhaps, is the section in which each subject's story was placed. Overall, the section entitled The U.S. led with 33 per cent, followed by The World (19 per cent), Business (9.6 per cent), Sport (5.8 per cent) and Science (5.1 per cent). (If Cinema, Show Business, Radio-Television, Theatre and Music were grouped together, they would account for 11.9 per cent and rank third). However, examination of Table 9-1 reveals a number of interesting trends. The greatest percentage of U.S. subjects and the least of World subjects occurred in the last period, indicating perhaps more American concern with internal matters. Business subjects reached their zenith in the third period (1956-1960) when they constituted 17.9 per cent. Sports underwent an almost steady decline from 10.6 per cent in the first period to 1.9 per cent in the last. The large percentage of Science subjects in the fourth period and, indeed, overall, is misleading, since in 1961 a cover story was done on "the American scientist" which featured 15 individuals.

The cultural themes of stories in which the subjects were involved confirm the pattern revealed by the sections. Almost one-third were of a political nature; more than one-fifth dealt with art and culture (this includes serious art, popular art and sports). Social concerns, business and industry, and military matters each accounted for about 10 per cent. Science made up about eight per cent. Finally, society and tradition represented about three per cent, as did religion and philosophy. When five-year intervals were examined, politics emerged in each as the dominant theme, although it tied with art and culture in the first. Between the first and fifth periods, politics experienced a net gain of 6.1 percentage points (28.8 per cent to 34.9 per cent). It reached its apex in the third period (1956-1960), undoubtedly because of two national elections which occurred in those years. Business decreased from 12.1 per cent to 5.7 per cent; society and tradition also dropped (6.1 per cent to 1.9 per cent). Military stories were, of course, closely related to world events

Table 9-1

Section in Which Cover Subjects Appeared by Date

<u>Section</u>	<u>1946- 1950</u>	<u>1951- 1955</u>	<u>1956- 1960</u>	<u>1961- 1965</u>	<u>1966- 1971</u>
art	.0%	3.1%	.0%	1.1%	.9%
behaviour	.0	.0	.0	.0	.9
books	1.5	4.6	.0	2.2	.9
business	7.6	9.2	17.9	7.9	6.6
cinema	4.5	3.1	3.0	.0	3.8
education	4.5	1.5	.0	2.2	1.9
environment	.0	.0	.0	.0	.9
Latin America	3.0	3.1	3.0	.0	.0
law	.0	.0	.0	1.1	1.9
medecine	.0	4.6	.0	.0	.0
modern living	.0	.0	.0	6.7	1.9
music	6.1	.0	.0	1.1	6.6
people	1.5	1.5	.0	.0	.0
press	1.5	.0	1.5	.0	.9
religion	1.5	3.1	1.5	4.5	.9
science	.0	.0	1.5	20.2	.9
show business	.0	.0	6.0	3.4	7.5
sport	10.6	10.8	9.0	1.1	1.9
TV-radio	6.1	.0	3.0	.0	1.9
theatre	1.5	.0	.0	.0	.0
U.S.	27.3	30.8	29.9	25.8	46.2
war in Asia	4.5	4.6	.0	.0	.0
World	<u>18.2</u>	<u>20.0</u>	<u>23.9</u>	<u>22.5</u>	<u>13.2</u>
total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	68	65	67	89	106

and ranked third and fourth respectively in the second and fifth periods, reflecting interest in the Korean and Vietnam Wars. Social concerns (economics, agriculture, education, urban development, crime, etc.) increased from 9.1 per cent in the first to 14.2 per cent in the last period, where they ranked third, ahead of the military.

A finer breakdown of cultural themes reveals the leading five to have been general political (10.9 per cent), popular art (10.7 per cent), business and industry (8.6 per cent), defense (8.4 per cent) and elections (7.9 per cent) (see Appendix C for other categories). Table 9-2 shows changes that occurred over the years. Dramatic increases were experienced in the following areas: general political, political personalities, and popular art; diplomacy, business and industry, sport, and society and tradition underwent the sharpest declines.

Reasons for a story's having been written were divided into three groups. The first, hard news versus soft news, refers to the necessity of running the cover story that week because it was linked to ongoing events and was topical at that moment. Throughout the entire 26 years, cover stories had this urgency less than one-third of the time. More than twice as often (69.5 per cent) they were "soft" news which could easily have appeared a week or even a month earlier or later. However, in more recent years, there was a decided increase in hard news, rising as it did from 22.7 per cent of the cover subjects' stories in the first period to 36.8 per cent in the fifth.

Over half the stories referred to continuing situations; less than one-third could be considered faits accomplis and only 14.2 per cent concerned events that were about to occur. As time went on, advances became fewer, dropping from 18.2 per cent to 9.4 per cent.

A plurality of the cover subjects (31.2 per cent) appeared for their own sake; another 3.6 per cent for their actions. Slightly more than one-quarter were tied to an event (25.6 per

Table 9-2

Cultural Theme by Date

<u>Theme</u>	<u>1946-</u> <u>1950</u>	<u>1951-</u> <u>1955</u>	<u>1956-</u> <u>1960</u>	<u>1961-</u> <u>1965</u>	<u>1966-</u> <u>1971</u>
general					
political	6.1%	6.2%	16.4%	11.2%	13.2%
political -					
personality	4.5	6.2	7.5	1.1	11.3
political -					
election	7.6	13.8	10.4	2.2	7.5
political -					
diplomacy	9.1	1.5	10.4	10.2	2.8
business	10.6	9.2	13.4	6.7	4.7
labor	1.5	4.6	.0	1.1	.9
military -					
defense	1.5	3.1	6.0	4.5	.0
military -					
warfare	9.1	12.3	3.0	4.5	12.3
economics	.0	1.5	4.5	2.2	3.8
agriculture	3.0	.0	.0	1.1	.0
education	3.0	3.1	.0	2.2	1.9
urban develop-					
ment	3.0	1.5	.0	9.0	.9
civil rights	.0	.0	1.5	2.2	2.8
crime and law	.0	.0	.0	.0	1.9
protest	.0	.0	.0	.0	.9
environment	.0	.0	.0	.0	.9
general science	1.5	3.1	1.0	16.9	.9
space	.0	.0	1.5	5.6	4.7
medecine	.0	1.5	.0	.0	.0
serious art	9.1	7.7	.0	6.7	2.8
popular art	10.6	4.6	11.9	3.4	19.8
sport	9.1	10.8	9.0	1.1	1.9
religion and					
philosophy	3.0	4.6	1.5	4.5	1.9
society and					
tradition	<u>7.6</u>	<u>4.6</u>	<u>3.0</u>	<u>3.4</u>	<u>1.9</u>
total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	68	65	67	89	106

cent). A little more than 12 per cent represented phenomena and 10.4 per cent countries. Another 9.7 per cent appeared because of their connection with organizations and institutions. Only 7.4 per cent of the subjects represented groups. Table 9-3 shows considerable fluctuation, with the most notable change the almost complete disappearance of organization-related cover stories. This is consistent with findings on achievement - 72.1 per cent of the subjects were on the cover because of their own accomplishments; 27.9 per cent had worked through organizations. Moreover, in the 1966-1971 interval, the comparable proportions were 82.1 per cent and 17.9 per cent.

Demographic and socio-economic characteristics of TIME cover subjects will be treated individually later. For the moment, it will suffice to give basic frequencies and time trends.

Of the people who appeared on the cover in these 26 years, 98 per cent were living at the time. Because historical figures were not included in the sample, this is a somewhat higher proportion than it should be. Dead persons had died recently; in fact, this was the reason for their appearance (e.g. Pope John XXIII, Robert F. Kennedy).

The most striking disproportion is the ratio of male cover subjects to female - 91.6 per cent were male. Table 9-4 shows the five-year breakdown. The fact that the largest number of females appeared in the first period may be attributed to TIME's apparent fascination with royalty in those years. Table 9-5 shows the sex distribution Winick found for each decade since the magazine's inception to the end of the 1950s (1963: 306). Apparently, there has been little if any change in attention to women.

People who make the cover are apt to do so in their 50s. More than one-third (34.9 per cent) were between 50 and 59. Next came people in their 40s (24.4 per cent), 60s (16.0 per cent), 30s (10.7 per cent) and 20s (7.9 per cent). The teens and 80s each accounted for .8 per cent. Table 9-6 shows that

Table 9-3

Reason for Story by Date

<u>Reason</u>	<u>1946- 1950</u>	<u>1951- 1955</u>	<u>1956- 1960</u>	<u>1961- 1965</u>	<u>1966- 1971</u>
person for himself	39.4%	33.8%	34.3%	13.5%	37.7%
person's action	1.5%	9.2	9.0	1.1	.0
group	3.0	7.7	4.5	19.1	1.9
organization or institution	9.1	13.9	13.4	13.4	1.8
event	25.8	20.0	16.4	29.2	31.1
phenomenon	13.6	4.6	6.0	15.7	17.0
country	<u>7.6</u>	<u>10.8</u>	<u>16.4</u>	<u>7.9</u>	<u>10.4</u>
total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	68	65	67	89	106

Table 9-4

Sex by Date

	<u>1946- 1950</u>	<u>1951- 1955</u>	<u>1956- 1960</u>	<u>1961- 1965</u>	<u>1966- 1971</u>
male	87.9%	92.3%	94.0%	92.1%	91.5%
female	<u>12.1</u>	<u>7.7</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>7.9</u>	<u>8.5</u>
total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	68	65	67	89	106

Table 9-5

Winick's Sex Distribution

	<u>1950s</u>	<u>1940s</u>	<u>1930s</u>	<u>1920s</u>
male	93.0%	90.3%	90.5%	93.1%
female	6.6	8.7	8.7	6.0
couple (both well known)	<u>.4</u>	<u>1.0</u>	<u>.8</u>	<u>.9</u>
total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

the greatest increases over the years occurred among subjects in their 20s and 30s. Although there was considerable fluctuation, the 40s and 50s remained fairly constant.

TIME cover subjects have exhibited very little racial heterogeneity - 92.4 per cent were Caucasian, 5.6 per cent Oriental and two per cent Negro. A slight decrease in Caucasians and a corresponding increase in the other races in later years is revealed on Table 9-7.

Almost three-quarters (73.9 per cent) of the cover subjects were American. Western Europeans accounted for 11.4 per cent, with British people making up more than one-third of these. Eastern Europeans and Russians ranked third (three per cent), followed by Chinese (2.5 per cent) and Southeast Asians (2.3 per cent). Over the years, Americans increased from 71.2 per cent to 78.3 per cent. Wars are undoubtedly the reason for the increase in subjects from the Middle East and Southeast Asia. The former rose from nothing in the first period to 3.8 per cent in the last; the latter from 1.5 per cent to 3.8 per cent. The most notable decrease occurred among cover subjects from the British Isles - 12.1 per cent in the first period as opposed to .9 per cent in the fifth. Although not as sharp, all Western Europeans experienced a similar drop.

About three-quarters of the subjects claimed some religious affiliation (this includes atheists and Communists). More than half were Protestants (53.2 per cent) of whom the rank order was first Presbyterians, then Episcopalians, followed by Baptists, Methodists and Anglicans. One-quarter were Roman Catholics. Of Americans alone, 66 per cent were Protestant, 24.2 per cent Roman Catholic and 8.2 per cent Jewish.

When five-year periods were examined, there was evidence of considerable change (see Table 9-8). Protestants dropped from 66.7 per cent initially to 44.7 per cent in the last period, while Catholics more than doubled. Jewish people experienced a net loss; Hindus, Buddhists and Moslems a net gain. Communists

Table 9-6

Age by Date

<u>Age</u>	<u>1946-</u> <u>1950</u>	<u>1951-</u> <u>1955</u>	<u>1956-</u> <u>1960</u>	<u>1961-</u> <u>1965</u>	<u>1966-</u> <u>1971</u>
15-19	3.0%	-	-	-	.9%
20-29	6.1	9.2	7.5	2.2	13.2
30-39	7.6	3.1	10.4	15.7	13.2
40-49	24.2	29.2	25.4	19.1	24.5
50-59	30.3	32.3	34.3	41.6	34.0
60-69	21.2	18.5	20.9	14.6	9.4
70-79	4.5	7.7	1.5	5.6	4.7
80-89	<u>3.0</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>1.1</u>	<u>-</u>
total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	68	65	67	89	106

Table 9-7

Race by Date

<u>Race</u>	<u>1946-</u> <u>1950</u>	<u>1951-</u> <u>1955</u>	<u>1956-</u> <u>1960</u>	<u>1961-</u> <u>1965</u>	<u>1966-</u> <u>1971</u>
Caucasian	93.9%	92.3%	94.0%	91.0%	91.5%
Negro	1.5	3.1	-	1.1	3.8
Oriental	<u>4.5</u>	<u>4.6</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>7.9</u>	<u>4.7</u>
total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	68	65	67	89	106

Table 9-8

Religion by Date

<u>Religion</u>	<u>1946-</u> <u>1950</u>	<u>1951-</u> <u>1955</u>	<u>1956-</u> <u>1960</u>	<u>1961-</u> <u>1965</u>	<u>1966-</u> <u>1971</u>
Protestant	66.7%	58.5%	57.8%	44.8%	44.7%
RC	14.6	30.2	17.8	20.7	35.5
other Chris.	-	1.9	-	-	-
Jewish	10.4	1.9	2.2	10.3	6.6
Moslem, Hindu,	-	3.8	11.1	3.4	7.9
Buddhist	-	1.9	11.1	19.0	3.9
Communist	6.2	1.9	11.1	19.0	3.9
none	<u>2.1</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>1.7</u>	<u>1.3</u>
total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	48	53	45	58	76

received most attention in the fourth period (1960-1965) when they constituted almost one-fifth of the total. In later years, there were fewer Anglicans and Episcopalians, but more Presbyterians and Baptists.

Table 9-9 reveals the educational attainment of cover subjects. More than two-thirds had at least a first degree. It does not show on this table, but 18 per cent of the total had law degrees. When broken down by five-year intervals, there is a noticeable trend toward more education. The proportion having high school or less decreased, while those groups with at least some college all increased. The only exception was the Ph.D. category which suffered a drop from 10.9 per cent in 1946-1950 to 2.9 per cent in 1966-1971. For Americans alone, the overall distribution of education was: primary or less - 3.9 per cent; some high school - 6.0 per cent; high school - 5.3 per cent; some college - 12.3 per cent; B.A. or equivalent - 30.6 per cent; M.A. - 28.9 per cent, and Ph.D. - 13.0 per cent.

It was possible to discover the occupations of the fathers of 360 of the TIME cover subjects. Of these, 30.8 per cent were involved in business in some way, 21.8 per cent had been engaged in professional or technical occupations, 13.6 per cent were in government, 12.8 per cent had manual jobs and 11.1 per cent were farmers. A finer breakdown showed the five most frequent occupations to be professionals, large business owners and executives, small businessmen, skilled manual workers and farm owners. Over the years, there were more cover subjects whose fathers had been in government (6.5 per cent to 14.9 per cent), business (22.6 per cent to 41.5 per cent) and recreation and aesthetics (1.6 per cent to 6.4 per cent). Numbers declined in the professions (27.4 per cent to 13.8 per cent), the military (4.8 per cent to 1.1 per cent) farm occupations (14.5 per cent to 7.4 per cent) and manual work (17.7 per cent to 13.8 per cent).

In 26.9 per cent of the cases there was some form of occupational inheritance. Of these, almost four-fifths were the

Table 9-9

Educational Attainment of Cover Subjects

<u>Education</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>
primary or less	3.1%	12
some high school	8.0	31
high school graduate	9.3	36
some college	10.8	42
BA or equivalent	33.5	130
MA or equivalent	24.5	95
PhD and beyond	10.8	42
total	100.0	388

Table 9-10

Occupational Classification by Date

<u>Occupational</u> <u>Classification</u>	<u>1946-</u> <u>1950</u>	<u>1951-</u> <u>1955</u>	<u>1956-</u> <u>1960</u>	<u>1961-</u> <u>1965</u>	<u>1966-</u> <u>1971</u>
government					
official	34.8%	41.5%	53.7%	38.2%	47.2%
business and					
labor	18.2	15.4	17.9	11.2	8.5
professional					
and technical	10.6	10.8	4.5	27.0	9.4
military	7.6	9.2	3.0	6.7	6.6
farm	-	-	-	1.1	-
manual	-	-	-	1.1	.9
recreation and					
aesthetics	27.3	23.1	19.4	10.1	25.5
other	1.5	-	1.5	4.5	1.9
total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	68	65	67	89	106

Table 9-11

Sex by Age

<u>Sex</u>	<u>15-19</u>	<u>20-29</u>	<u>30-39</u>	<u>40-49</u>	<u>50-59</u>	<u>60-69</u>	<u>70-79</u>	<u>80-89</u>
male	5.5%	5.5%	9.1%	25.8%	36.6%	17.2%	5.0%	.8%
female	9.1%	33.3%	27.3%	9.1%	15.2%	3.0%	3.0%	-

same field (e.g. politics). The remainder were either the same occupation (e.g. senator) or a family business. There was a move away from occupational inheritance, with most occurring from 1951 to 1955 (29.1 per cent) and the least between 1966 and 1971 (20 per cent). However, it should be noted that there was in reality more occupational inheritance than is indicated here, since it was judged only by the occupation of the subject when he made the cover of TIME. For example, in several cases, politicians with law degrees had fathers who were lawyers, but this was not counted as an instance of occupational inheritance.

By far, the greatest number of cover subjects were government officials (43.1 per cent). They were followed by subjects involved in recreation and aesthetics (20.8 per cent), business and industry (13.7 per cent) and the professions (12.9 per cent). Table 9-10 shows that there was fluctuation in the percentages of each group over the years. But a consistent trend is evident only in business which declined steadily. Again, the large proportion of government officials in the third period is an effect of there having been two national elections in that interval. A finer breakdown shows the five most frequent occupations to be: elected national government officials (22.8 per cent), appointed national government officials (14.5 per cent), business owners and executives (12.2 per cent), professionals (11.9 per cent) and popular artists (11.2 per cent).

As mentioned above, trying to classify cover subjects according to Klapp's scheme was an arbitrary process. Nevertheless, about 84 per cent were treated as heroes, eight per cent as villains and three per cent as fools. TIME was ambivalent about the remainder. In later years, the proportions of heroes and ambivalents rose while villains and fools declined.

Sex

It has already been noted that males are overwhelmingly dominant as TIME cover subjects. In fact, only 33 women fell in

the sample. Appendix E contains a list of these women and their occupations. Despite their meagre representation, it is worth examining the types of women who are chosen for this recognition, in which areas they are most likely to be seen, and how this has changed through the years.

More than half the male cover subjects appeared in the front of the magazine; only one-third of the women did so. Regarding the section in which their stories were carried, for men the five most frequent were The U.S. (35.2 per cent), The World (18.8 per cent), Business (10.5 per cent), Sport (6.1 per cent) and Science (5.5 per cent). The five most frequent for women were The World (21.2 per cent), Show Business and Cinema (each 18.2 per cent) and Modern Living, Music and The U.S. (each 9.1 per cent). Moreover, in many sections, there were no cover stories on women at all (Art, Behaviour, Business, Education, Environment, Law, Medicine, Press, Religion, Science, Television, Theatre and War in Asia). The two most important sections of the magazine, The U.S. and The World, were 97.7 per cent and 90.7 per cent male.

Table 9-11 shows the ages of male and female cover subjects. More than half the men were over 40, while more than half the women were under 40. When race was considered, female Negroes received more attention than males, although the numbers are so small that percentages are meaningless. Nevertheless, only 1.7 per cent of the males were Negro as compared with 6.1 per cent of the females. Almost three-quarters of the men on TIME were Americans, whereas 63.6 per cent of the women were. Much of this difference can be attributed to the attention TIME paid royalty in the early years - overall, 15.2 per cent of the women were British.

Almost three-quarters of the TIME men had obtained at least a first degree. None of the women had more than this, and about three-quarters had less.

Considering the section of the magazine in which their stories were contained, their respective ages and educational at-

tainment, differences in occupation between men and women cover subjects are not surprising. About 45 per cent of the men were government officials, 18.3 per cent were engaged in recreation and aesthetics and 14.7 per cent were large business owners and executives. Almost half the women (48.5 per cent) were involved in recreation and aesthetics, 24.4 per cent were government officials and 21.2 per cent were wives or daughters of famous men. The rather large percentage of women in government is due to the fact that so many of them were royalty.

A clearer picture of the distributions is given by their fields of endeavour. For men, politics came first with 30 per cent, followed by business (11.9 per cent) and government administration (9.4 per cent). Women were concentrated in fewer fields, the top three being entertainment (50 per cent), tradition (25 per cent) and serious music, art and literature (14.3 per cent).

A difference that existed in occupational inheritance (26.2 per cent for men versus 43.3 per cent for women) can also be attributed to the female royalty. In fact, royalty was the only occupational category in which the actual number of females (6) was greater than the number of males (2).

It has been observed previously that soft news more than doubled hard news as a reason for doing a story. However, as expected, men were more often connected with urgent events than women - 31.2 per cent of the men were involved with hard news as opposed to 15.2 per cent of the women. When women did make the cover, they were more likely to have done so for their own sake than were men. Two-thirds of the women were portrayed because of themselves, but only 28 per cent of the men were cover subjects for this reason. Consistent with this is the finding that 97 per cent of the women were on the cover because of their own achievement, whereas this was true of only 70 per cent of the men, who were more apt to work through organizations.

TIME treated women more gently than men. Of the 33 women

in the sample, 32 were heroes of some sort and one (Eva Peron) was a fool. All the ambivalents and villains were male. Nonetheless, there were some interesting changes in the type of hero TIME women tended to be. There was a shift away from pinups and charmers to splendid performers (showmen). And judging by the stories about Golda Meir and Indira Gandhi, these ladies would most properly be classified as top dogs, or even strong men.

But changes in TIME covers do not signal any radical change in the role of women. Klapp noted that there has long been a problem for women in the United States: "Glory is concentrated in hero types, the bulk of which in American culture - possibly eight-ninths - cannot properly be called feminine" (1962: 97). He counted a total of 239 hero types of which 25 were specifically feminine, 78 specifically masculine and 136 shared by both sexes. Thus, there was one feminine type for every three masculine types. In addition, much of the choice for women was confined to two types of glory: the submissive, faithful mother-sufferer-helper or the erotic queen, who may use her charms as a means of power over men but does not strike out for herself. "This imbalance seems ... to mean that there is a greater attraction, in terms of glory, in men's roles than women's roles, or in that neutral field where sex is 'lost', that is, does not matter" (Klapp, 1962: 97). Yet Klapp was optimistic that the imbalance would diminish under the impact of mass communication, co-education, economic and technological development and military crises, all of which favor sexual equality. The decline of monarchs and the rise of talented female performers and female political leaders on the covers of TIME is perhaps some slight indication that this may be happening, but it is certainly not proof. (Note that neither of the political leaders are American). The fact that female representation has remained under 10 per cent and that it is even less in areas like government and politics shows, instead, that the situation has changed very little since the end of the Second World War.

Formal leadership remains a man's role. Few women are elected to public office, few are appointed. In recent years, there has been an increase in aspiration and achievement in this field. "Nevertheless, the overall picture remains one of severe under-representation of women in public offices in general and in the upper levels in particular" (Bell et al, 1961: 35). The same pattern holds in business where women are unlikely to be among top leaders, exceptions being conspicuous by their rarity. As for the military, "male dominance of the military in the United States is so well known as to need no proof" (Bell et al, 1961: 39).

Explanations of why women do not take a more active part in public affairs tend to focus on the cultural definition of a woman's role. Accepted both by men and women, this definition restrains women from career lines that would qualify them for public office. Also, the social differentiation based on sex roles in the United States is not accompanied by significant political cleavages between men and women. They are often on the same side of public issues over which opinions may be demarcated by other criteria of social differentiation such as class, race, etc. "Politics and public affairs may remain non-salient arenas for women ... except under very rare circumstances when public issues affect them in particular" (Bell et al, 1961: 54).

Age

It has already been shown that the average age of TIME cover subjects is in their 50s. An interesting trend was that the older an individual, the more likely was his story to appear in the front of the magazine (see Table 9-12). In most sections, especially the more important ones like The U.S. and Business, at least a plurality and often a majority of the cover subjects were in their 50s. The exceptions were Cinema and Show Business which were dominated by 30-year-olds; Music, Sport and People where persons in their 20s prevailed, and Behaviour and Modern Living,

Table 9-12

Age by Half of Magazine

<u>Half of Magazine</u>	<u>15-19</u>	<u>20-29</u>	<u>30-39</u>	<u>40-49</u>	<u>50-59</u>	<u>60-69</u>	<u>70-79</u>	<u>80-89</u>
front	33.3%	29.0%	42.9%	51.0%	60.6%	69.8%	68.4%	-
half	<u>66.7</u>	<u>71.0</u>	<u>57.1</u>	<u>49.0</u>	<u>39.4</u>	<u>30.2</u>	<u>31.6%</u>	<u>100.0</u>
total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	3	31	42	96	138	63	19	3

Table 9-13

Occupational Classification of Age Groups

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>15-19</u>	<u>20-29</u>	<u>30-39</u>	<u>40-49</u>	<u>50-59</u>	<u>60-69</u>	<u>70-79</u>	<u>80-89</u>
government								
official	33.3%	19.4%	28.6%	40.6%	47.4%	55.6%	63.2%	-
business and								
labor	-	-	2.4	15.6	14.6	22.2	15.8	33.3
professional								
and technical	-	3.2	14.3	14.6	16.1	6.3	15.8	33.3
military	-	-	14.3	3.1	10.2	4.8	-	-
farm	-	-	-	-	.7	-	-	-
manual	-	3.2	2.4	-	-	-	-	-
recreation and								
aesthetics	33.3	67.7	35.7	24.0	10.2	9.5	5.3	33.3
other	<u>33.3</u>	<u>6.5</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>.7</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	3	31	42	96	138	63	19	3

which did not occur often, but when they did, focused on people in their 60s.

On the whole, Negroes tended to be younger than Caucasians and Orientals older.

As might be expected, educational achievement increased with age, although a number of those in their 60s, 70s and 80s had less than high school (14.2 per cent of the 60s, 26.4 per cent of the 70s and 33.3 per cent of the 80s).

The younger a cover subject, the more likely was his achievement to have been his own rather than connected with an organization. Fifty-year-olds had the greatest proportion of organization-related achievements (37.2 per cent); 20-year-olds the least (6.5 per cent).

Table 9-13 indicates the percentage of each age group that fell into various occupational classifications. Slightly more than two thirds of those in their 20s were engaged in recreation and aesthetics. The older a subject, the more likely he was to be involved in government, business and the professions. Also, in each of these areas and the military, 50-year-olds were the modal group (see Table 9-14).

More than half (62.4 per cent) the hard news cover stories featured persons 50 and over, while 53.6 per cent of the soft news stories were pegged to people under 50. Fifty-year-olds were the modal groups in each category when other reasons for the story were considered - the time element (advance, fait accompli, continuing situation) or the focus of attention (person, event, phenomenon, etc.).

Interestingly, advancing age marked a decline in subjects' propensity to be heroes: 93.5 per cent of the 20-year-olds received heroic treatment as compared with 86.1 per cent of the 50-year-olds, 68.3 per cent of the 60-year-olds and 73.7 per cent of the 70-year-olds. The greatest proportion of villains (20.6 per cent) and fools (6.3 per cent) in any age groups were among the 60-year-olds. This constituted 43.3 per cent of all villains and 36.4 per cent of all fools. However, 7.3 per cent

Table 9-14

Age of Occupational Groups

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>15-19</u>	<u>20-29</u>	<u>30-39</u>	<u>40-49</u>	<u>50-59</u>	<u>60-69</u>	<u>70-79</u>	<u>80-89</u>
government official	.6%	3.5%	7.1%	22.9%	38.2%	20.6%	7.1%	-
business and labor	-	-	1.9	27.8	37.0	25.9	5.6	1.9
professional and technical	-	2.0	11.8	27.5	43.1	7.8	5.9	2.0
military	-	-	23.1	11.5	53.8	11.5	-	-
farm	-	-	-	-	100.0	-	-	-
manual	-	50.0	50.0	-	-	-	-	-
recreation and aesthetics	1.2	25.6	18.3	28.0	17.1	7.3	1.2	1.2
other	12.5	25.0	12.5	25.0	12.5	12.5	-	-
N	3	31	42	96	138	63	19	3

of the 50-year-olds and 10.5 per cent of the 70-year-olds were treated ambivalently. Because of the small number of persons in their 70s (19), the 50-year-old ambivalents were 47.6 per cent of the number so treated.

It would seem that the middle-aged, particularly those in their 50s, are the "control generation". They are the people who hold the positions crucial in Mills' concept of a power elite. It is they who are connected with powerful organizations. When a crisis or other "hard news" event occurs, they are the centre of attention. The fact that they are treated ambivalently more often than any other age group is another indication of their power - if writers' notions of the wariness with which powerholders are regarded are true.

Race and Ethnicity

Since 92.4 per cent of the cover subjects were Caucasian and only two per cent Negro, an examination of how other variables were related to race seems rather pointless. Nonetheless, omission is just as telling as inclusion.

Caucasians were most equitably distributed between the front and back of the magazine. Of a total of 365 Caucasians, 53 per cent appeared in the front as did 62.5 per cent of the eight Negroes and 90.9 per cent of the 22 Orientals.

For Orientals, this was not surprising as only one was American; 10 were Chinese, eight Southeast Asian and three Japanese. Three-quarters (six out of eight) of the Negroes were American, as were 78 per cent of the Caucasians.

Although it cannot be taken as proof, there is some confirmation of the cliché that persons of other racial groups must be over-qualified and then over-achieve in order to receive the attention that is more readily accorded whites. Of the Caucasian cover subjects, 67.9 per cent had obtained at least a B.A.; the corresponding percentages for Negroes and Orientals were 75 per cent and 85 per cent respectively. Also, when achievement was

considered, over 85 per cent of both Negroes and Orientals had worked individually, as opposed to 71.2 per cent of Caucasians. But this may simply be an indication of organizations' reluctance to employ members of the two former groups.

The most frequent occupational classification of fathers of Caucasian cover subjects was business (32.3 per cent); for Orientals it was farm (42.1 per cent), and for Negroes, manual (50 per cent). Thus, it was hardly unexpected that Negroes and Orientals who must over-achieve for recognition exhibited considerably less occupational inheritance than Caucasians (15 per cent versus 28 per cent).

Only three Negroes (one of whom, Senator Edward Brooke, was American) were government officials; three were professionals and the other two were an opera star and a soul singer. This is essentially congruent with results of other studies which have shown that Negroes rarely occupy important elected federal offices or receive high political appointments. The statistical under-representation of Negroes among the officer corps of the military is reflected in their complete absence from this group on TIME covers.

Since most of the Orientals were not American, it is not surprising that more than 85 per cent of them were government officials who represented their countries in the cover stories. More than 40 per cent of the Caucasians were government officials, too, but Caucasians were distributed most evenly among other occupations, notably business (14.5 per cent), the professions (12.1 per cent) and the military (7.4 per cent).

Orientals were the only racial group involved in more hard than soft news (59.1 per cent of them were tied to hard news stories). About 30 per cent of the Caucasians and 25 per cent of the Negroes were cover subjects for hard news stories. This is consistent with the finding that none of the Orientals appeared for their own sake - 63.6 per cent were representatives of their country, the rest played second fiddle to an event. On the other hand, 62.5 per cent of the Negro cover subjects (5)

were chosen because of themselves; two were linked to events and one represented his country.

The Klapp classification by race is interesting. There were no Negro villains; seven of the eight were given heroic treatment; one was a fool. In contrast, an equal number of Orientals were considered heroes and villains (\$10 each); there was one fool and one ambivalent.

When country of origin was considered, it turned out that 92.1 per cent of the Americans (who made up 78 per cent of all cover subjects) had been born in the United States. Western Europe was the birthplace of 5.1 per cent, and Eastern Europe or Russia, one per cent. Canada produced another one per cent.

The ethnic backgrounds of American cover subjects were more varied. Anglo-Saxons accounted for 63.1 per cent of the total, followed by the Irish at 13.2 per cent, then Germans (9.1 per cent), Eastern Europeans or Russians (3.5 per cent) and Italians (2.4 per cent). Excluding the British Isles, 17.7 per cent of the Americans were of Western European heritage. Over the 26 years, the percentage of Anglo-Saxons remained fairly constant. Most notable gains were made by the Irish (9.1 per cent to 13.3 per cent) and Italians (1.5 per cent to 5.7 per cent).

The white Anglo-Saxon or Western European model that was previously suggested as being typical of elite groups dominated TIME covers, whether or not the subjects were American. The scant number of Negroes was particularly revealing. One of the Negro covers included in the sample appeared on an issue devoted entirely to Black America. In 1972, TIME also saw fit to publish an issue on women. Negroes and women, in these cases, were treated as phenomena. It was almost a one-shot deal. TIME, having done its duty by these two groups, then felt absolved and could again concentrate on more "important" items. However, in all fairness, it should be pointed out that cover subjects concerned with civil rights stories rose from nothing in the first five-year period to 2.8 per cent of the total in the last.

Even so, although he was referring specifically to Negroes, Andrew Hacker's remarks seem to fit TIME's treatment of both Blacks and women:

... White America, which pays most of the country's taxes and elects all save a handful of its lawmakers, cannot be stirred beyond a conversational concern. Indeed, simply talking about "race" and "poverty" earns comfortable incomes for no small number of publishers, publicists and social scientists (1970: 108).

Occupation

The occupation of people who have appeared on the cover of TIME is a good indication of whether or not they fit the descriptions of heroes and elites given in previous chapters and, conversely, whether or not the heroes and elites chosen by TIME are similar to those defined by social scientists.

Charles Winick's analysis of TIME covers from 1923 to 1959 was based on the assumption that they mirrored changes in American life. For example, at the most obvious level, he noted a spurt in military portrayals during World War II and a decline in business celebrities in the Depression years. The steady decrease in society leaders, he said, reflected this group's generally diminishing importance in American life.

Table 9-15 shows the percentage of each occupation Winick found on the covers of each decade (1963: 304). The top five in each 10-year period were:

- 1920s - U.S. government and politics; foreign government and politics; business, sport; writing
- 1930s - U.S. government and politics; foreign government and politics; sport; writing; business
- 1940s - foreign government and politics; U.S. government and politics; U.S. military; foreign military; business
- 1950s - U.S. government and politics; foreign government and politics; business; U.S. military; sport

He concluded: "... There do not appear to be significant differences in the occupations of celebrities appearing in the magazine cover stories over the decades" (1963: 308). He

Table 9-15

Proportion of Personalities by Occupation on
TIME Magazine Covers in Per Cent

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>1950s</u>	<u>1940s</u>	<u>1930s</u>	<u>1920s</u>
acting	4.3%	4.8%	4.6%	2.3%
U.S. government and politics	25.5	16.1	26.2	24.0
foreign government and politics	21.5	22.3	23.7	22.0
writing	3.1	2.8	6.4	6.6
singing	1.4	1.4	1.5	.9
comedy	.5	.8	.2	.3
sport	5.3	3.4	7.3	7.4
music	1.1	2.4	2.1	2.3
art, photography, industrial				
design, architecture	1.8	1.6	2.1	1.1
entertainment	1.4	1.2	2.3	3.1
television personality	3.3			
U.S. military	5.8	14.7	.4	2.9
foreign military	11.4	12.9	1.0	2.3
business	10.6	6.0	5.8	11.1
education	2.2	.8	3.7	2.0
dance	.2	.2		
fashion	.5	.6	.2	.3
society	.4	.6	2.7	2.9
religion	3.1	2.6	2.5	3.1
medecine and science	4.2	2.4	4.8	3.7
labor	1.3	2.4	2.5	1.1
other	1.1	.2		.6
N	569	503	481	350

speculated that this relative stability may be related to underlying characteristics common to all celebrities. It might be suggested that Shils' conception of prestige is operative here.

Table 9-16 shows that the results of a classification of the occupations of subjects in the present study according to Winick's design, overall and divided into five-year intervals. Most prominent are changes in cover subjects' occupations in the last period (1966-1971). Large gains were made in acting, singing, and government and politics. Medicine and science gained, too, but the large percentage in this category in the fourth period was the result of a single cover which portrayed 15 scientists. The biggest declines occurred in foreign government and politics and business. The 5.7 per cent classified as "other" in the last period is a reflection of new social concerns and new magazine sections inaugurated to treat them (e.g. Environment).

Comparison with Winick's study thus shows little difference except in the fifth period. Here is as good a place as any to point out that most changes in any variable examined occurred in this five-year interval, and again to note that Henry Luce died in 1967. Rather than indicating a change in American society, these trends may be the effect of withdrawal of Luce's influence. In this regard, the decline of business and foreign government and politics are particularly suspect.

But there is also a general feeling that the second half of the last decade brought about real changes of opinion and belief in America. To attribute all alterations of focus to the freeing of TIME from Luce's presence would be to invest him with perhaps more dictatorial power than he actually did possess or have the opportunity to exercise. Examination of other attributes of cover subjects' occupations seems worthwhile in spite of his possible influence.

General trends in occupations have already been noted. Table 9-17 gives a detailed breakdown of the occupations of TIME cover subjects. Although it is unwieldy, the table does illus-

Table 9-16

TIME Sample Cover Subjects
by Winick's Classification

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>1946- 1950</u>	<u>1951- 1955</u>	<u>1956- 1960</u>	<u>1961- 1965</u>	<u>1966- 1971</u>	<u>overall 1946-1971</u>
acting	3.0%	1.5%	4.4%	1.1%	9.4%	4.3%
U.S. govt and politics	25.4	20.0	27.9	19.1	33.0	25.6
foreign govt and politics	13.4	18.5	23.5	15.7	10.4	15.7
writing	4.5	4.6	1.5	4.5	1.9	3.3
singing	-	1.5	-	1.1	5.7	2.0
comedy	-	-	-	-	-	-
sport	9.0	10.8	8.8	1.1	1.9	5.6
music	6.0	-	2.9	1.1	.9	2.0
art, photography, industrial design, architecture	-	3.1	-	4.5	.9	1.8
entertainment	3.0	1.5	1.5	-	.9	1.3
TV personality	6.0	-	2.9	-	2.8	2.3
U.S. military	6.0	4.6	1.5	5.6	5.7	4.8
foreign military	-	4.6	1.5	1.1	1.9	1.8
business	10.4	10.8	17.6	9.0	6.6	10.4
education	3.0	3.1	-	2.2	1.9	2.0
dance	-	-	-	-	-	-
fashion	-	-	-	-	-	-
society	4.5	1.5	2.9	4.5	1.9	3.0
religion	3.0	4.6	1.5	4.5	.9	2.8
medecine and science	1.5	4.6	1.5	23.6	5.7	8.1
labor	1.5	4.6	-	1.1	1.9	1.8
other	-	-	-	-	5.7	1.5
N	68	65	67	89	106	395

Table 9-17

Cover Subjects' Occupations in Detail

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>1946- 1950</u>	<u>1951- 1955</u>	<u>1956- 1960</u>	<u>1961- 1965</u>	<u>1966- 1971</u>
president, dictator, premier	9.1%	13.8%	16.4%	6.7%	17.9%
monarch	4.5	4.6	3.0	-	-
vice-president, cabinet, agency chief, Supreme Court	6.1	6.2	20.0	14.6	10.4
senator, representative, MP	6.1	10.8	4.5	2.2	9.4
party leader	-	1.5	-	1.1	.9
diplomat	1.5	-	3.0	5.6	-
state governor	1.5	1.5	-	1.1	2.8
mayor	3.0	-	-	5.6	.9
state and city official	1.5	-	-	1.1	1.9
candidate	1.5	3.1	6.0	-	1.9
social concern leader	-	1.5	-	1.1	.9
business owner, executive	13.6	10.8	17.9	10.1	6.6
union official	1.5	4.6	-	1.1	.9
military commander	6.1	9.2	3.0	2.2	2.8
other officer	1.5	-	-	1.1	-
astronaut	-	-	-	4.5	3.8
natural scientist	-	3.1	-	4.5	-
physical scientist	1.5	-	1.5	14.6	.9
social scientist	-	-	-	1.1	2.8
serious music - composer, conductor	6.1	-	-	-	-
serious music - performer	-	1.5	-	1.1	.9
popular music - composer, conductor	-	-	3.0	-	-
popular music - performer	-	-	-	1.1	5.7

Table 9-17
(cont'd)

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>1946- 1950</u>	<u>1951- 1955</u>	<u>1956- 1960</u>	<u>1961- 1965</u>	<u>1966- 1971</u>
theatre - director, writer, producer	1.5%	-	-	1.1%	-
theatre - performer	-	-	-	-	.9
cinema - director, writer, producer	-	1.5	1.5	-	.9
cinema - performer	3.0	1.5	4.5	1.1	8.5
radio and TV - director, writer, producer	1.5	-	-	-	-
radio and TV - performer	6.1	-	1.5	-	1.9
sports - coach, trainer, owner	4.5	1.5	3.0	1.1	-
sports - player	3.0	9.2	4.5	1.0	1.9
press - owner, publisher, editor	1.5	-	-	-	.9
press - writer	3.0	-	1.5	-	.9
literature - writer	3.0	4.6	-	3.4	.9
religion - leader	-	4.6	-	4.5	1.9
religion - lower echelons	-	-	-	1.1	1.9
philosopher	1.5	-	1.5	-	-
education - administrator	3.0	1.5	-	1.1	1.9
education - instructor	-	-	1.5	-	-
art and architecture - administrator	-	1.5	-	-	-
art and architecture - artist	1.5	1.5	-	1.1	.9
criminal	-	-	-	-	1.9
other	<u>1.5</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>4.5</u>	<u>2.8</u>
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	68	65	67	89	106

trate trends that have been observed before. Particularly conspicuous was the net gain experienced by political leaders and the sharp drop in big businessmen, especially in the last period.

Military commanders were most prominent from 1951 to 1955 (9.2 per cent). There was an almost equal proportion of military men (7.8 per cent) in 1961-1965, but only half of these were commanders; the rest were astronauts and other officers.

As far as entertainment is concerned, serious music declined while popular music rose; theatre, radio and television received less attention as time went on, while cinema performers got almost three times that of the first period (3.0 per cent to 8.5 per cent). Sports-related subjects went from a high of 10.7 per cent in the second period to 1.9 per cent in the last.

Occupational backgrounds of cover subjects took into account all their previous positions if they were different from the one they occupied when they were on the cover. There was considerable overlap, as many had been in a number of fields. Results tended to confirm Mills' idea of the interchangeability of positions that goes on among the power elite. Table 9-18 shows the various occupational backgrounds of cover subjects through the years. Overall, the military ranked first, as 15.3 per cent of the subjects had such a background. Politics and business tied for second with 15 per cent each. Government administration was third (12.2 per cent) and law fourth (11.9 per cent).

Of the three groups with which Mills mainly concerned himself, government officials exhibited the most diverse backgrounds: 29.5 per cent had experience in government administration, 24.3 per cent in law, 18.4 per cent in politics, 17.8 per cent in the military and 13.6 per cent in business. Most businessmen had held other positions in the business world (57.5 per cent). But 16.7 per cent of them had worked in some form of manual employment. However, this is high, as labor leaders, too, who tend to have manual backgrounds, were included in this category. Nearly six per cent of the businessmen had been govern-

Table 9-18

Cover Subjects' Occupational Background

<u>Background</u>	<u>1946- 1950</u>	<u>1951- 1955</u>	<u>1956- 1960</u>	<u>1961- 1965</u>	<u>1966- 1971</u>
military	16.7%	15.4%	10.6%	12.8%	14.7%
military and politics	3.0	-	3.0	-	1.0
politics	3.0	1.5	6.1	3.5	2.9
law and politics	3.0	3.1	-	1.2	-
law	-	9.2	9.1	4.7	13.7
law and govt admin	6.1	3.1	1.5	1.2	2.9
government administration	1.5	3.1	10.6	9.3	8.8
govt admin and politics	1.5	3.1	1.5	5.8	1.0
govt admin and business	-	4.6	3.0	1.2	2.0
business	10.6	12.3	21.2	11.6	9.8
govt admin and education	1.5	-	-	-	1.0
education	10.6	3.1	6.1	22.1	6.9
science	3.0	1.5	4.5	3.5	2.0
entertainment	12.1	3.1	9.1	4.7	17.6
sport	6.1	9.2	3.0	1.2	2.0
serious music	6.1	1.5	1.5	1.2	1.0
art and architecture	1.5	1.5	-	3.5	1.0
literary	-	-	-	3.5	1.0
journalism	4.5	9.2	4.5	-	2.9
manual labor	3.0	6.2	3.0	3.5	4.9
farm	1.5	-	-	1.2	-
religion	-	4.6	-	4.7	2.9
royalty	<u>4.5</u>	<u>4.6</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N (387)	68	65	66	86	102

ment administrators, 3.8 per cent lawyers and 1.9 per cent politicians. The military evinced most homogeneity - 96.1 per cent of them had single-mindedly followed military careers. Only two of the total 26 had held other positions - in business and in politics.

As might be expected, education and occupation were associated. Only 30.4 per cent of those in the fields of recreation and aesthetics had at least a first degree; 62.9 per cent of the businessmen did, 80.5 per cent of the government officials, 88 per cent of the military and 96.1 per cent of the professionals.

The occupations of cover subjects' fathers reveal that for those who could be considered Mills' power elite, there was a decidedly upper, or at any rate upper-middle, class trend. The fathers of government officials could be classified as follows: government - 24.2 per cent; business - 26.1 per cent; professions - 15.9 per cent. Another 17.8 per cent were farmers, often an asset for politicians who wish to link themselves with traditional America. Businessmen showed the greatest degree of occupational inheritance - 60.8 per cent of their fathers were also in business. Another 15.9 per cent were professionals. Military leaders' fathers were most often business or military men (26.1 per cent each); 17.4 per cent were professionals. A similar proportion were manual laborers, thus making the military the group which showed most occupational mobility. However, manual work was the field of 10.2 per cent of government officials' fathers and 9.8 per cent of the businessmen's fathers. Cover subjects engaged in recreation and aesthetics most frequently had businessmen for fathers (28.9 per cent), followed by professionals (22.4 per cent) and then manual workers (19.7 per cent).

Mention has been made of the difficulty in assigning occupational prestige ratings to TIME cover subjects. Nonetheless, an attempt at estimation was made. Table 9-19 shows the ratings for both the cover subjects and their fathers according to 1947

Table 9-19
Occupational Prestige Ratings (NORC) of
Cover Subjects and their Fathers
(1947 and 1963)

and 1963 scales. The cover subjects are consistently higher, but the actual difference may be even greater than indicated here. Those on the cover of *TIME* tend to epitomize their occupations and cannot be considered just another practitioner. For instance, medical doctors are rated much higher than writers. Ernest Hemingway's father was a doctor, but assigning him a higher rating than his son does not seem logical.

Government officials were treated with more mixed feelings than any other group. The great majority (71.9 per cent) were heroes, but 15.2 per cent were villains (frequently these were not Americans), 4.1 per cent fools and 8.8 per cent ambivalents. In contrast, more than 90 per cent of the businessmen were heroes, 3.7 per cent each were villains and ambivalents and 1.9 per cent fools. None of those engaged in recreation and aesthetics were seen as villains; 92.7 per cent were heroes. All military personnel were heroes.

Table 9-20 shows how often subjects with certain occupational classifications were involved in the various story themes. Professionals seemed to spread themselves around more than most other groups, while recreation and aesthetics people all tended to be concentrated in one field. Businessmen, too, 74.1 per cent of whom were involved with business-related stories, did not branch out too much. Stories dealing with social concerns in which they played a part occurred primarily in the last decade. More than one-quarter of the military represented science stories, however, these all entailed space exploration.

Ethnic backgrounds of *TIME*'s Americans in the various occupational categories except recreation and aesthetics, and to some extent the professions, tended to be Anglo-Saxon. More than two-thirds of the government officials were of such descent. Another 19 per cent were Irish and 11.4 per cent German. The high proportions of the two latter groups were the effect of the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations.

Nearly three-quarters of the businessmen were Anglo-Saxon. Next came those of German stock (12.8 per cent) and then the Irish (6.4 per cent).

Table 9-20

Cover Subject's Occupation by Theme of Story

<u>Theme</u>	<u>Occupation</u>							
	<u>govt</u> <u>offi-</u> <u>cial</u>	<u>business,</u> <u>labor</u>	<u>profes-</u> <u>sional</u>	<u>mili-</u> <u>tary</u>	<u>farm</u>	<u>manual</u>	<u>R&A</u>	<u>other</u>
political	67.3%	5.6%	7.8%	7.7%	-	-	4.9%	-
business and industry	-	74.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
military	13.5	5.6	2.0	61.5	-	-	-	-
social concerns	14.6	9.3	21.6	-	100.0	50.0	-	12.5
science	.6	-	41.2	26.9	-	50.0	-	-
art and culture	-	5.6	5.9	-	-	-	93.9	12.5
religion and philosophy	-	-	21.6	-	-	-	1.2	-
society and tradition	<u>4.1</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>75.0</u>
total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	171	54	51	26	1	2	82	8

More than 85 per cent of TIME's military men were Anglo-Saxon. The remainder were of Western European descent.

The American professionals, many of whom were scientists (24 of 50), exhibited greater ethnic variety. Slightly more than half were Anglo-Saxon; German and East European-Russian each accounted for 9.8 per cent. The Irish made up 4.9 per cent, while 16.8 per cent traced their ancestry back to other Western European countries.

TIME's American artists, entertainers and sports figures showed most ethnic heterogeneity. As a single category, this group was, in itself, also the most heterogeneous as to occupation, including as it did sportsmen (players and managerial officials), popular artists (actors, singers, journalists) and high artists (serious actors, artists, writers, singers). Of the Americans, 56.4 per cent were Anglo-Saxon, 16.1 per cent Irish, 14.5 per cent of other Western European descent and 8 per cent East European or Russian. There were two Negroes.

A composite picture of the typical TIME cover subject would depict a white, middle-aged (50s), Protestant (Presbyterian) government official of Anglo-Saxon ancestry. He would have at least a B.A. and might have spent some time in the military or a business (in which his father was likely to have been engaged).

These findings are disjointed, but they do seem to confirm the results of other studies of the characteristics of public figures. To put them in their proper light, several groups that have received attention from a number of authors will now be examined more closely. Most studies were done around 1960, so it should be possible, by comparison, to see how they have changed in the last decade. The groups are: politicians, political appointees, businessmen, military leaders, scientists, religious leaders, entertainers and labor leaders.

Chapter 10

Special Groups

Politicians (Appendix E contains a list of elected politicians and candidates who fell in the sample)

Every society requires regulation of the interactions of its members and integration of common goals. The result has been development of political roles in a government structure. Internally, government's main functions are the ultimate enforcement of norms, final arbitration of conflicting interests and overall planning and direction of society. Externally, it is concerned with the handling of war and diplomacy. Thus, government officials, and especially politicians, have the potential to make a great impact on a nation's life.

Yet there is a reciprocal relationship. "... Every epoch selects and forms its own representative political men - as well as prevailing images of them Many of the images of politicians that prevail today are, in fact, drawn from earlier epochs" (Mills, 1956: 226).

The perfect image for an American politician is one akin to that of Abraham Lincoln, the "sacred symbol of idealism in the United States" (Warner, 1959: 271). Warner traced three dominant symbolic themes that compose the Lincoln image: 1) the common man, which expressed the egalitarian ideals of the new democracy; 2) rags to riches, in which Lincoln, by earning his superior status, proved that all common men could, and 3) sacrifice of his life for national unity. Few politicians try to attain the third element (although recent events suggest that it may be thrust upon them unawares). However, in The People's Choice, William B. Brown showed that campaign biographies emphasize the other two. Nonetheless, "the public apparently forms an image of a leader on the basis of considerable ignorance of him either as a person or as an individual subscribing to a specific set of political principles" (Bell et al, 1961: 141). For politicians themselves

this may be fortunate, as studies of their socio-economic characteristics and the current study of TIME cover politicians, show that their actual traits do not closely approach the ideal image.

TIME confirms previous investigations which found the average elected official to be in his 50s. Since the turn of the century, senators have tended to be in their 50s, while members of the House of Representatives were somewhat younger. Senior persons are more likely to hold powerful positions (e.g. committee chairman, Speaker).

The racial homogeneity of politicians in America is only now beginning to change. Until 1967, there had been no Negroes in the Senate since Reconstruction. The election of Edward W. Brooke was considered exceptional enough to warrant a TIME cover story.

Elected national politicians tend to be of white, Anglo-Saxon ancestry. However, with local government, the situation of ethnic minorities is different. In 1930, Zink found three-quarters of city bosses to be foreign-born or second-generation members of one of the largest ethnic groups in the city. Nor is it now uncommon for a third-generation Irish-American who aspires to political success to stress his Irishness. For example, the following city mayors who appeared on TIME covers were Irish: William O'Dwyer, Richard Daley and Samuel Yorty. A New York mayoralty candidate, Mario Procaccino, was Italian.

Earlier studies found Roman Catholics and Jews to be statistically under-represented in Congress, while Presbyterians and Episcopalians were over-represented. According to the TIME covers, the situation as regards Catholics and high status Protestants has been rectified in the last decade. But not one American politician in the sample was Jewish. Furthermore, the decline of Presbyterians and Episcopalians may appear greater than it is in reality. Many of the later political cover stories featured Richard Nixon who is a Quaker.

As early as 1940, studies showed that at least 75 per cent of

American politicians had college degrees and many had done post-graduate work, over half of these in law. The tendency for politicians to be college graduates has become greater over the years, if TIME politicians are any indication.

Before entering politics, many of these leaders had careers in business or the professions, especially law. In 1940, 97 per cent of the senators had held positions in the top 15 per cent of the labor force prior to election (Bell et al, 1961: 101). Of the senators in Congress from 1949 to 1951, 57 per cent had been lawyers, 12 per cent other professionals and 24 per cent proprietors or officials (Bell et al, 1961: 101). The TIME senators showed no tendency to diverge from this pattern. "Senators ... are men of generally high occupational status who have bettered their social positions only slightly through political activity" (Matthews, 1954: 15). People from lower socio-economic groups may be getting elected to the Senate, but they do not appear on the cover of TIME.

Representatives had similar backgrounds. From 1949 to 1951, 56 per cent had been lawyers, 13 per cent other professionals and 22 per cent proprietors or officials (Bell et al, 1961: 101). Perhaps because the figures are from an earlier date (1930-1940), state governors were not so favored: 52 per cent had been lawyers; eight per cent other professionals and 25 per cent proprietors or officials. The TIME Representatives and Governors did not have occupational backgrounds dissimilar to these, the exception being Ronald Reagan, an ex-actor.

It should also be noted that experience in political positions other than the ones they held at the time of their cover appearance is typical of the majority of politicians, especially at higher levels. "These national leaders, then, are men who have made politics a significant part of their careers" (Bell et al, 1961: 102).

None of the characteristics of politicians observed so far does real damage to the ideal image. But discrepancies are evi-

dent when one looks at their social origins. Few were "common men" who went from rags to riches and, in later years, this type seemed to be getting even scarcer.

American political decision-makers tend to be sons of professionals, proprietors and officials, and farmers, although the last category has dropped off with advancing urbanization, thereby making it harder for politicians to hearken back to their rustic roots. From top elected federal officials down through state and local political elites, leaders are apt to come from the middle or upper class. If TIME covers may be taken as an indicator, there even seems to be a tendency for politicians to be drawn from the extreme upper class: in 1970 and 1971 there were five senators in the sample - the fathers of three of them (James Buckley, John V. Tunney and Edward Kennedy) were millionaires. But this should not be surprising. "So long as the system of stratification in a society is generally accepted, one must expect people to look for political leadership toward those who have met the current definition of success and hence are considered worthy" (Matthews, 1954: 21).

Yet are they? It was previously shown that when Klapp's Classification was applied to TIME cover subjects, government officials received the greatest proportion of villain and ambivalent ratings (admittedly, many were foreigners, but the statement is still true when nationality is controlled). "Moral distrust of the high and mighty is of course an old American custom" (Mills, 1956: 339). The most consistent element of the American attitude toward political leadership is ambivalence. Politicians have the power that Shils believed to be so necessary in the attribution of charisma and, consequently, prestige. As powerholders, politicians are admired for what they can accomplish, but at the same time, feared and distrusted for deprivations they may inflict.

Historically, Americans have not been led to expect too much from their political leaders. The arbitrariness and control of

colonial governors, the Jacksonian spoils system, the corruption of the "gilded age" and the rise of city bosses and political machines in the twentieth century all contributed to cynicism about the political process. "The people came to believe that government itself was corrupt, inefficient and downright dirty" (Belsley, 1947: 22).

By its very nature, government invites attack. It is held responsible for the ills of society, many of which ~~may~~ arise out of private activity. But when criticism is concentrated on one target, it hits with exaggerated impact, intensified by the fact that "governments conduct their business in a goldfish bowl" (Belsley, 1947: 22). Their weaknesses are brought to light and magnified by moral standards different from those which apply to private activity. "... Governments and public officials are judged by their failures rather than their successes" (Belsley, 1947: 22).

More recent disenchantment with politicians may be the result of a rise in the twentieth century of synthetic heroes, a trend observed by Lowenthal, Klapp and Fawn M. Brodie. Such a hero is created artificially by propaganda and public relations mechanisms. Brodie observed: "California students have seen what was originally a pure public relations creation - B-string movie star Ronald "Reegan" - become Ronald Reagan, a law-and-order hero to the majority of the California electorate" (1970: 50).

Oddly enough, Governor Reagan himself was the only politician in the TIME sample who actually had traversed this route. But worth noting is a recent increase in stories dealing with politics and entertainment. This is contrary to the trend discovered by Lowenthal wherein turn-of-the-century magazine biographies of politicians yielded to heroes of consumption several decades later. The increase of both politicians and entertainers on TIME covers may suggest that these occupations, more and more, lend themselves to the same kind of treatment. Perhaps Klapp's grandstanders will, indeed, inherit the earth. A writer in a

recent edition of Saturday Review asked: "What can you do when Warren Beatty is giving political speeches and George McGovern is having his teeth capped?" (Reeves, 1972: 6).

Political Appointees (Appendix E contains a list of American political appointees that fell in the sample)

Unlike politicians, government officials who are appointed do not have to make a "hit" with the electorate, despite their involvement in vital national affairs. Whereas politicians are apt to be regarded as personalities, highly placed bureaucrats are seen as incumbents of offices.

Appointees represented about eight per cent of the TIME sample. Their positions ranged over a broad spectrum, from Peace Corps director to Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, but more attention was given to Secretaries of State (7) and Defense (5) than any other positions.

Together with the president and vice-president, these political appointees who form the cabinet or are the chiefs of major departments, bureaus, agencies and commissions, are in charge of crucial executive decisions.

Their socio-economic characteristics are similar to politicians', although the white, Anglo-Saxon Protestant tendency of those who appeared on TIME was somewhat more pronounced. All were white males ranging in age from 38 (Robert Kennedy) to 78 (Hugo Black), but with 50-year-olds predominating. This is in keeping with results of other studies which found the highest government posts to go to men in their late 40s and early 50s. In 1955, the average age of appointment was 48. Ambassadors and Supreme Court Justices were slightly older, their average age at appointment being 55 to 59 (Bell et al, 1961: 56).

At least two-thirds of the TIME appointees were of Anglo-Saxon descent and most were Protestant.

Educationally, the TIME sample confirmed patterns noted by other investigators who found 80 per cent to be college graduates

and 60 per cent to have done post-graduate work. None in the sample lacked a first degree. The tendency for them to have come from middle-class business, professional or farm homes, as did the politicians, was also evident.

Mills' charge that there were strong links between political appointees and the corporate world was borne out by the TIME appointees whose occupational backgrounds tended to be either business or law (corporate law). An extreme example of this was Charles E. Wilson. He appeared on the cover in 1949 as president of General Motors, and then again in 1953 as Secretary of Defense.

These top bureaucrats were invariably portrayed by TIME as heroes. This, however, was congruent with public opinion, at least in the early years. A 1966 survey of public perceptions of appointed federal officials found them to receive an "overwhelming stamp of approval" (Jennings et al, 1966: 371). Characteristics most often ascribed to appointees by the public were capability, administrative talent and business backgrounds. They were not seen as politicians - they did not have to make deals, solicit support in exchange for favors or compromise their ideals to stay in office. The authors concluded: "In sum, the 'supportive consensus' for appointees seems generally operative for various sections and strata of the American public." (Jennings et al, 1966: 375). TIME's treatment of such men reflects this consensus.

Business Executives (Appendix E contains a list of the businessmen who fell in the sample)

"Big business" is a term that calls to mind the few largest industrial manufacturing companies in the country. Mills defined chief executives as "... the men who occupy the top two or three command posts in each of those hundred or so corporations which, measured by sales and capital, are the largest" (1956: 127). Businessmen made up about 11 per cent of the TIME sample.

Like high government appointees, the corporate elite does

and 60 per cent to have done post-graduate work. None in the sample lacked a first degree. The tendency for them to have come from middle-class business, professional or farm homes, as did the politicians, was also evident.

Mills' charge that there were strong links between political appointees and the corporate world was borne out by the TIME appointees whose occupational backgrounds tended to be either business or law (corporate law). An extreme example of this was Charles E. Wilson. He appeared on the cover in 1949 as president of General Motors, and then again in 1953 as Secretary of Defense.

These top bureaucrats were invariably portrayed by TIME as heroes. This, however, was congruent with public opinion, at least in the early years. A 1966 survey of public perceptions of appointed federal officials found them to receive an "overwhelming stamp of approval" (Jennings et al, 1966: 371). Characteristics most often ascribed to appointees by the public were capability, administrative talent and business backgrounds. They were not seen as politicians - they did not have to make deals, solicit support in exchange for favors or compromise their ideals to stay in office. The authors concluded: "In sum, the 'supportive consensus' for appointees seems generally operative for various sections and strata of the American public." (Jennings et al, 1966: 375). TIME's treatment of such men reflects this consensus.

Business Executives (Appendix E contains a list of the businessmen who fell in the sample)

"Big business" is a term that calls to mind the few largest industrial manufacturing companies in the country. Mills defined chief executives as "... the men who occupy the top two or three command posts in each of those hundred or so corporations which, measured by sales and capital, are the largest" (1956: 127). Businessmen made up about 11 per cent of the TIME sample.

Like high government appointees, the corporate elite does

not consist of identifiable personalities but chairs in top offices. Also like government officials, the decisions executives make while doing their jobs are "important catalysts of social change" (Hacker, 1970: 65). Nor do they have to face popular elections. Until recently anyhow, the ideology of private enterprise insulated them from public scrutiny.

On the national scene, businessmen provide a large number of reputational leaders. Hunter's 1959 study found that businessmen (38) ranked second to government (48) in the type of occupation those considered leaders were apt to engage in.

Thus, except for government leaders themselves, whose formal roles necessarily bring them into the decision-making arenas of public affairs, businessmen constitute the most common occupational category among those Hunter considers as composing the top leadership structure of the United States (Bell et al, 1961: 111).

Their representation on TIME covers fits this notion, and moreover, characteristics of those portrayed were consistent with traits of business leaders found in other studies.

All save one, Elizabeth Arden, were male, and the story which brought her to the cover was not business but sport (she owned the favorite that was to run in the Kentucky Derby). Studies have generally found that business leaders tend to range in age from about 45 to 64. The age range for TIME's businessmen was 39 to 86, but the average was about 56. The youngest (and largest) group was that which appeared from 1955 to 1960. The average age of these 13 businessmen was 53. From 1946 to 1950 and 1966 to 1971, they averaged 58 years. Another study found that in 1950, the average age of reaching presidency or board chairmanship was 52, while incumbents averaged 61.

An increase in the average age of top executives since the turn of the century was attributed by various authors to a change in typical business careers. More persons work their way to the top within a company now rather than achieving such a position as a result of organizing a corporation or investing in it. There is some support for this in the TIME sample, as in several

cases younger executives actually did organize their own companies, e.g. Dean Wooldridge, Simon Ramo and Frank Pace. Significantly, these men were all involved in electronics, a comparatively new field in which there was room to organize. However, the number is so small that it can hardly be considered proof. Younger executives may also have inherited their positions, as did David Rockefeller and Giovanni Agnelli, both of whom were 47 when they appeared on TIME.

All business leaders in the sample were Caucasian except Akio Morita, owner of Sony. There were no Negroes. But considering the traditional opportunity patterns for Negroes in business, this is not unexpected. Once again, Anglo-Saxons predominated among Americans, although there did seem to be a little more latitude than was evident among government bureaucrats. Of special interest is the fact that two of TIME's American business leaders, Louis Marx and Jack Straus, were Jewish.

It was noted in a previous chapter that businessmen tend to have less education than government officials; but they are by no means illiterate. Mills' figure of 60 per cent with college degrees is comparable to the sample's 62.9 per cent.

"Most studies indicate that the business elite are sons of other businessmen or of professionals" (Bell et al, 1961: 106). This was true of the TIME sample where the trend was even more pronounced. Mills found that 57 per cent of American businessmen had fathers also in business; 60 per cent of the TIME sample did. Mills' 12 per cent and Kellier's 15 per cent of executives whose fathers were wage-earners corresponds to less than 10 per cent of the TIME group. Higher class origins became more pronounced among them in later years.

Perhaps most noteworthy of all is that TIME's businessmen were overwhelmingly treated as heroes. In a 1957 article, David Hamilton suggested that entrepreneurs were the cultural heroes of western society. In the drama of economics, consumers who desire products make their wants known to the entrepreneur who then per-

forms the miracle of production. The entrepreneur, gifted with foresight, initiative and enterprise, "... is a creative genius and master of ceremonies" (Hamilton, 1957: 250). In addition, technological advance is seen as originating with the early captains of industry as, in a circular relationship, products of invention and discovery were dependent upon the prior state of industrial arts. "The entrepreneur sits astride a strategic pass along the stream of technological development from which position he allows or disallows the further development and application of already-available new technological possibilities" (Hamilton, 1957: 253).

But with the growing complexity of modern technology, the two attributes of the earlier entrepreneurial role, business and industry, were separated and the entrepreneur became more concerned with finance. He does not and cannot develop industrial arts, yet the myth persisted. "To the present day, the entrepreneur is looked upon as a 'captain of industry'" (Hamilton, 1957: 254).

This applied equally to corporate managers in a large corporation.

In a society in which pecuniary transactions, the conglomeration of money capital, the creation of stocks and bonds, and the determination of ownership, with all of the concomitant rights pertaining thereto must precede any large technological undertaking, it is easy to attribute a causal role to the pecuniary manipulation and to the manipulator of that pecuniary activity - the entrepreneur. Thus, to his activity is attributed all economic progress (Hamilton, 1957: 254).

No matter that the entrepreneur had become a permissive, not a creative, agent. Hamilton concluded:

In Western capitalism, the entrepreneur is a cultural hero; in paying deference to him we are presumably doing nothing more than recognizing that he is the prototype of the fabulous capitalist ancestors who first began to calculate rationally (pecuniarily) and thereby set us on the road of modern science and technology (1957: 256).

In a 1951 study of public attitudes toward big business, Burton R. Fisher and Stephen B. Withey found that as a purely

productive and employment-creating machine, big business received almost no criticism from the general public. Seventy-six per cent of those questioned said the good effects outweighed the bad; only 10 per cent believed the opposite. The general picture was one of "... widespread recognition of the tremendous advantages accruing to the country as a result of big business' accomplishments" (Fisher and Withey, 1951: xiii). Another study at the end of the 1950s listed five "blessings of bigness" felt to have resulted from the character of American business: 1) it was the pace-setter of the American economy; 2) only big-ness could handle the job of production; 3) mass production gave rise to goods of uniform quality at low cost; 4) it had allowed heavy investment in research and development, and 5) it provided jobs and the opportunity to work (Gardner and Rainwater, 1959: 485). Perhaps the most important finding of this latter study was that public opinion was largely governed by personal experience. As a whole, the results of both studies tended to confirm Hamilton's ideas about feelings toward business at that time.

But both investigations also detected a degree of wariness and suspicion in the public attitude. The image of businessmen is open to more than one interpretation. The hallmark of the business ethic is getting ahead. "... The characterization of the businessman as actively oriented toward getting ahead in the world is pervasive - in the mass media as well as in everyday experience" (Kilpatrick et al, 1964: 221). Table 10-1 which compares public evaluations of businessmen and top government appointees, shows that with respect to honesty and public service, business is lacking (Kilpatrick et al, 1964: 224). Also, the drive to get ahead which typifies businessmen is not an admired trait in all situations. Thus, when times are good, business is apt to receive approbation, but under changed circumstances, there is sufficient fear lurking beneath the surface to radically alter public conceptions.

Table 10-1

Evaluations of Top-Level People in the Federal Service and in
and in Private Business

	honesty	interest in serving the public	how well respected they are	ability	drive to get ahead
general employed public	+ .6	+ .4	- .2	- .4	- 1.0

(+ indicates civil servant better)

average number answering = 1,093

Source: Franklin P. Kilpatrick and others, The Image of the
Federal Service (Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institu-
tion, 1964), 224.

This may be what happened with TIME. The magazine is too much of a big business to suddenly change its approving attitude, even with the departure of Luce. But economic recession, the consumer movement and an industry-produced environmental crisis have certainly changed public opinion. Perhaps this is why business covers declined between 1966 and 1971. There was also a change in the type of hero businessmen were depicted as being, possibly to compensate for their souring image. Top dogs and smart operators were supplanted by group servants and benefactors.

However, the drop in portrayals of businessmen may simply reflect new realities. Economic problems have become such that they are amenable to solution only by government, not by individual companies, no matter how large. Of 10 cover stories dealing with economic matters as social problems, six had government officials as cover subjects; only two were businessmen.

Military (Appendix E contains a list of military cover subjects)

Military roles have the task of maintaining internal order and external security. In the mid-1950s, Mills was able to say of America: "From Shay's Rebellion to the Korean War there has been no period of any length without official violence" (1956: 177). Fifteen years later that statement could be expanded to include Vietnam. Hence, it is somewhat surprising to discover that at no time did military figures exceed 10 per cent of the cover subjects, and averaged about seven per cent. (A considerable proportion of these were astronauts). In fact, in absolute numbers, more government officials (24) were connected with military stories than the military itself (16). However, aside from astronauts, those American military leaders who did make the cover of TIME fit the description of the military elite advanced by other authors.

The majority of the military elite has been found to be white Anglo-Saxons in their mid-50s and early 60s. So it was on the cover of TIME. While some of the astronauts adhered to less

"prestigious" faiths (there was a Roman Catholic and a Christian Scientist), upper echelons were high status Protestants, as had been observed by Mills.

Those in high positions were graduates of military academies. Thus, their careers tended to follow a prearranged pattern. It may be the type of education they received which caused them to resemble each other externally:

... Their uniforms often seem to include their facial mask and certainly its typical expressions. There is the resolute mouth and usually the steady eye, and always the tendency to expressionlessness; there is the erect posture, the square shoulders and the regulated cadence of the walk. They do not amble; they stride (Mills, 1956: 195).

Not one of TIME's military leaders was portrayed smiling - intrepid is probably the best word to describe these portraits - they all looked as if they were squinting into the sun.

But this impression of a "soldier" is deceptive, for as Mills pointed out: "The general and the ~~admiral~~ are more professionalized executives than the inherited images of fighting men would suggest" (1956: 189). Of the 17 military commanders in the sample, only six appeared because of individual action or achievement; the others were tied to organization-oriented stories.

Social class backgrounds of the military elite tend to be upper middle rather than truly higher or lower class. "Social origins and early backgrounds are less important to the character of the military man than any other higher social type" (Mills, 1956: 192). The TIME sample, as noted in the previous chapter, bore this out.

In America there has been a traditional dislike of the military despite the veneration they receive as heroes. All American military leaders were seen by TIME as heroes, but it is significant that from 1966 to 1971 only three members of the United States' top brass fell in the sample. There was no lack of cover stories on the Vietnam War, but cover subjects were more likely to be either Vietnamese or American government officials.

This may be a reflection of American disenchantment with military endeavours per se. On the other hand, it does seem to indicate that Mills' fears of military domination of politics and government have not come to pass, although this small trend in magazine covers can hardly be construed as authoritative proof.

Scientists (Appendix E contains a list of the scientists in the sample)

The spectacular growth of science in the last century has been mirrored in corresponding growth of influence their leaders and spokesmen can command. Keller said that in the twentieth century, political leaders must make room for scientists who increasingly will share the moral responsibilities and problems of those in high places. In view of this, it is rather puzzling that scientists played so small a part on the covers of TIME.

The sample included 25 individuals who could be considered scientists, but 15 of them appeared on one cover in 1961. There were 13 physicists, three chemists, three medical researchers, two geneticists, one astronomer and three social scientists (two economists and a psychologist). All the social scientists appeared since 1965; 20 of the natural and physical scientists did so before that date.

Exclusively male, the scientists were slightly younger than the typical cover subject, their average age being 49.5. With one exception (a Russian) all were white Americans. But they exhibited greater ethnic heterogeneity than most other groups - slightly less than half were of West or East European descent. It was not possible to discover the religious affiliation (if any) of half of them, although here, as in other areas, Protestants were most numerous; three were Jewish, none were Roman Catholic.

Virtually all had at least a master's degree; most had received doctorates. Their careers tended to have followed the scientific path with little deviation. Typically, they had done

research and taught university. Physicists in particular were apt to have been involved in government research of a military nature. As in other studies, TIME's scientists were mostly recruited from business and professional families.

A number of writers have suggested that the 10 or 15 years following the Second World War were the "golden age" of science. Since then, the once-wholehearted approval given to the scientific community has waned. "Science is identified in the public mind largely with the manipulation of the material world" (Morison, 1969: 152). Mention has already been made of links thought to exist between business and technological development. Science also became identified with successive revolutionary changes in military technology and with nationalist competition in scientific spectacles as a surrogate for competition in military power. This identification benefited science from Sputnik (1957) to about 1963, but then doubts began to arise. Particularly for the generation that does not remember World War II,

... the obvious alliance between the scientific community and the military is an evil thing: far from making the world more secure, it has produced an uneasy balance of terror, with the weight so great on both sides that any slight shift may lead to unimaginable catastrophe (Morison, 1969: 152).

Whether working with the military or business, science's contributions to increased production have lately been viewed with skepticism. Rapid exhaustion of natural resources and contamination of what is left have, in part, been blamed on science. Nor is it clear that all goods and services produced have increased human happiness.

"The continuing momentum of science toward goals of its own choosing appears to be coupled ever less closely to solving problems of clear and pressing consequence to human welfare" (Morison, 1969: 153). In no case was a TIME scientist portrayed as anything but a hero (brain), but the decline of natural and physical scientists in the last period and the appearance of

social scientists may be a reflection of public attitudes about priorities confronting society.

Religious Figures (Appendix E contains a list of religionists in the sample)

"In an extremely advanced society built on scientific technology, the priesthood tends to lose status, because sacred tradition and supernaturalism drop into the background" (Davis and Moore, 1953: 50). Such would seem to be the case in the United States, if TIME cover stories may be considered an indicator. Despite Luce's interest in religion, the sample contained only 14 subjects whose field of endeavour could be considered religious or philosophical. (Only eight were American). Moreover, no more than three of the stories (two of which were about philosophers; the third about an Indian holy man) could be considered truly religious; six dealt with church organization; the other cover subjects were involved in political and social matters.

The average age was somewhat older than usual for cover subjects - 58.9. They all had at least the equivalent of a first degree.

Although the number is too small to draw any conclusions, it is interesting to note that there was considerable occupational inheritance among the Protestants, six of whose fathers were ministers. This, of course, was not the case with Roman Catholics, three of whom came from lower-class backgrounds.

In the earlier years, most of TIME's religious covers featured denomination heads, but the Berrigan case in 1971 may be an example of the changing function of religion postulated by Laski, i.e. increased involvement with the community and decreasing preoccupation with doctrinal controversies and theological problems.

But secularization of religious values is not complete. "Religion survives because frustration is built into the very structure of society; there is no absolute coincidence between

moral behaviour and reward" (Keller, 1963: 289). "Even in a secularized society some system must exist for the integration of ultimate values, for their ritualistic expression, and for the emotional adjustments required by disappointment, death and disaster" (Davis and Moore, 1953: 50). Most people would like to embrace some kind of religious outlook. Thus, TIME did a cover story on astrologer Carroll Richter.

The seemingly scant attention paid by TIME to religious affairs may also be due to a sampling error. Religious stories lent themselves to symbolic or historical treatment, and as a result, were excluded from the sample. For instance, a cover story on the Jesus Movement which featured a portrait of Christ was not included.

Entertainers

These people may be grouped into three distinct sections: high arts, popular arts and sports. The first two are what have generally been considered to be cultural elites. They include people like poets, painters and actors whose role is to criticize, debate and challenge; to question established opinions, explore new ideas and widen experience and knowledge. "They must arouse interest, controversy, sympathy, opposition, or be ignored - which amounts to their death sentence" (Keller, 1963: 291). They represent expressive traits associated with individual creativity, idiosyncrasy and nonconformity to traditional values. Thus, they are expected to conform to the popular image of "creative nonconformity". Maybe this is why there was ambivalence in TIME's view of them. The majority were treated as heroes, but, by Klapp's scheme, independent spirits (bohemians) were almost as plentiful as splendid performers and pinups.

Other investigators have found the elites of stage, screen, sports and the arts to be more accessible and allow individual talent and motivation to play a greater part in membership than do other elites. The TIME sample would seem to support such

findings.

A. High Arts (serious music, theatre, writing, art)

There were 19 cover subjects whose occupations fell into this category - 16 men and three women. Their average age was 49. Only one was a Negro. Less than half (eight) were American; six of the rest were British, three West European and two Russian. Of the Americans, three were of Anglo-Saxon descent, and two each were Irish and Russian. So it was that the Anglo-Saxon American model typical of TIME covers did not apply to this elite.

Considering the group as a whole, less than half (42 per cent) were Protestants; more than one-quarter (26 per cent) were Roman Catholic and about 15 per cent were Jewish. More than three-quarters had at least some college; 53 per cent had the equivalent of a B.A. Nevertheless, they were less well-educated than the average cover subject. Like other groups, they tended to come from business and professional families. However, the fathers of three had been manual laborers; a like number had fathers in the same field of endeavour, and therefore, occupational inheritance was operative to some degree.

Over the years, TIME featured fewer such persons on the cover (more than half appeared between 1946 and 1951) and those that did appear tended to be American.

B. Popular Arts (popular music, theatre, cinema, journalism, radio, television)

The decline of high artists was more than compensated for by a rise in popular artists. In all, 41 persons in the sample were so classified, 21 of whom appeared in the last period, 1966 to 1971. There were 28 men and 13 women.

It should be observed that members of this group were more apt to appear on covers portraying more than one individual than were other elites. This was particularly so in the later years.

The average age was 36.8, but it dropped from 42.5 in the first period to 33.3 in the last. Only one person was a Negro, the rest were Caucasians. Popular artists were more inclined than high artists to be American - more than three-quarters. The rest were Canadian, British or West European.

Of the Americans, 58.8 per cent were Anglo-Saxon; Irish and West European heritages each accounted for 14.7 per cent and East European, 8.8 per cent. For the group as a whole, it was possible to determine the religious affiliation of only 17 - eight Protestants, five Roman Catholics and four Jews.

In 1941, Leo Rosten published the results of an investigation of film stars which revealed one-fifth to be college graduates. Although the TIME sample contains entertainers from other fields, educationally they were similar to the stars of 1934-1941 examined by Rosten. College graduates made up 23 per cent of the total. Another third had some college. This was especially the case in later years. About 15 per cent were high school graduates, 23 per cent had some high school and five per cent had not gone beyond the primary grades.

Working class fathers have been shown to be more common among entertainment elites, and the TIME sample did not contradict this, as 18.3 per cent had fathers engaged in manual work. Nevertheless, business and the professions accounted for 60 per cent of the fathers. The remaining 21 per cent were also entertainers, hence there was considerable occupational inheritance, especially in the last period. A 1958 study by Sidney Wilhelm and Gideon Sjoberg of entertainers on magazine covers from 1950 to 1956 discovered 30 per cent to be children of laborers. The smaller percentage in the present study is due to the inclusion of writers and directors in the group, who tended to have parents in higher status jobs.

Keller postulated a trend - as the social prestige of this group increased, an increase in college-educated and middle and upper-class recruits might result. To some extent, this was evident in the last period of the TIME sample. But another explana-

tion might be the rather high degree of occupational inheritance. Older entertainers have made enough money to put themselves comfortably into higher socio-economic levels and send their children to college. Thus, when these children eventually decide to follow the same career, they are often upper-class, college-educated individuals.

C. Sports

The steady drop in sports figures has previously been remarked upon. Twenty sample covers portrayed sports personalities, but three-quarters of them appeared in the first half of the 26 years under investigation. They were all American male Caucasians. Thirteen were players whose average age was 39.9; the seven managers, owners, coaches and trainers averaged 49.3. Eleven people were involved in team sports; nine played as individuals.

Ethnically, there was not as much diversity as among popular artists. Sixty per cent were Anglo-Saxon, 20 per cent Irish and the rest were West or East European. There were 10 Protestants, nine Roman Catholics and one Jew. Twelve had at least some college but these were mostly owners and coaches. Their fathers' occupations were divided equally among manual work (50 per cent) and business and the professions. There was no occupational inheritance.

Labor

Both Mills and Keller saw labor as a minor power compared with "true" elites in politics, business and the military. In the mid-1950s, Mills stated:

... The current crop of labor leaders is pretty well set up as a dependent variable in the main drift with no role in the power elite. Neither labor leaders nor labor unions are at the present juncture likely to be "independent" variables in the national context (1956: 265).

Public evaluations of labor during the 1940s had also been

uniformly low (Bell et al, 1961: 143). However, in 1963, Hodge, Siegel and Rossi noted an increase in the prestige accorded union officials between 1947 and 1963, while most other occupations went down.

That these titles should experience increasing prestige, despite the sensational government investigations into the conduct of labor officials during the past decade, is perhaps indicative of the extent to which unions have been assimilated by, and have themselves adopted a more accommodating attitude toward, the established order (Hodge et al, 1963: 203).

This may be. However, TIME's attention to union leaders was, at best, scant, lending credence thereby to Mills' contention. The sample contained only six covers which featured union leaders: David Dubinsky, Phil Murray, Walter Reuther, Bertram Powers and George Meany (twice).

Nevertheless, if they may be taken as representative of the labor elite, they tended to confirm several stereotypes. Other studies have found that minority group members are often among labor leaders. Powers was the only Protestant Anglo-Saxon in this group; Murray and Meany were Irish Catholics, Dubinsky a Polish Jew and Reuther a German Lutheran. Reuther was alone in holding a university degree; none of the others had completed high school. There was much occupational inheritance, as only Powers' father had not also been a union official.

But on the whole, TIME's inattention to labor does not augur well for their significance.

The Prevalence of Lawyers

A final word should be said about the law as an avenue to elite status. By any criterion, the job of a lawyer commands prestige. Specialized performance of this role requires specialized education and apprenticeship. De Tocqueville said that the high public esteem of lawyers derives from their possession of superior information necessary, but not available, to all. Using Shils' ideas, one may say that lawyers have an intimate connection

with order and power. When society changes quickly, they have a dual role: to keep informed about the past and stay abreast of changing conditions. "In a dynamic society, therefore, lawyers are both guardians of the old order and creators of the new" (Keller, 1963: 326).

Nearly one-fifth of the TIME sample had law degrees, although only a little more than half of these were or had been practising law. Among all government officials, almost one-quarter had legal backgrounds and 30 per cent of the politicians did so.

Law as a suitable background for politicians is consistent with the modern conception of a lawyer as the paid servant of his client. Since his task is to ~~make~~ the best possible case from his client's point of view, the lawyer must in some measure be a "specialist in human relations" and a "mediator of forces", characteristics also essential to politicians. (Matthews, 1954: 15). Lawyers are apt to come into contact with politics by the very nature of their work, as they can dispense advice necessary to every responsible policy-maker. Moreover, compared with other high status fields of endeavour, the law changes relatively slowly. Hence, lawyers can, with the least danger, leave their jobs for the risks of a political career. Once it becomes traditional for political leaders to be lawyers, a self-perpetuating process is set in motion.

Chapter 11

Conclusion

The people on the cover of TIME are the elites of American, and indeed, world society. When TIME put someone on its cover, particularly in the early years, they were likely to be at the very top of their callings - not just a politician, but the President of the United States; not just a clergyman, but the Archbishop of Canterbury; not just a businessman, but the president of General Motors; not just a criminal, but the boss of a Cosa Nostra family. People who make decisions make news, and consequently, make the cover.

TIME's apparent reflection of public opinion (less attention to business and science, more to politics and social concerns) suggests that it is, to some degree, a valid indicator of changes in American society. When TIME confers status on an individual by featuring him on its cover, he or what he stands for is usually something on which public attention is already focused. TIME reinforces the status quo or, at least, gives its stamp of recognition to changes. Rarely is TIME in the vanguard by bringing new people or phenomena to public view.

There was a decided emphasis on practical achievement which reached its apex in the mid-Fifties and early Sixties. According to Talcott Parsons (1954), American society has as a primary goal the maximization of production of valued possessions and cultural accomplishments which facilitate achievement of legitimate individual goals. The most directly valued achievement is one which is practical and visibly eventuates in production. Thus, businessmen were one of the main centres of attention. Scientists, too, engaged in technological advance, received their share of the limelight. "Not so much ideas per se but their results are appreciated" (Klapp, 1962: 32). But the later decline of businessmen and physical scientists, and

the rise of popular artists runs counter to this outlook. The introduction of the year's new car models no longer warrants a cover story.

The same process that Johns-Heine and Gerth noted - an emphasis away from the titan success theme toward the common man as a bearer of group virtues - seems to be operative. This contrast was observed between the period after World War I and the Depression in the earlier study, and roughly corresponds to changes in TIME from the 1950s to the 1960s. It would seem, then, that economic conditions have considerable influence on society's heroes. The post-war boom in business and businessmen gave way to depression- and recession-inspired concern with the common man. In the 1960s, TIME did a number of covers on typical Americans - the worker, the student, the fighting man, youth, middle-Americans, etc. Nevertheless, the "rise of the common man" as a cover subject was balanced to some degree by people like the politicians whose fathers were millionaires.

Despite the latter group, continuance of a long-term shift from ascription to achievement is indicated. This is not to say that the upper echelons of all fields are wide open. According to Keller, "... where the boundaries of elites are sharply drawn, the pull of social class and social status is still extremely powerful, though no longer all powerful The 'proper' poor do not need as much higher formal education as the 'less desirable' rich" (1963: 317). Yet she pointed out that the latest generation of elites contains the highest percentage with less favored characteristics, for example, popular artists and scientists. Ethnically and religiously, this is true of the TIME cover subjects, but not so far as education and father's occupation are concerned. However, this may simply be a reflection of generally rising standards of education and living. What is suggested is that opportunities for education, necessary for high status positions, are more available.

The rise of the expert is inevitable in a society which

stresses practical achievement. The very concept of expertness allows little room for ascription. Success comes only after years of hard work in a specialized field. Expertness is "virtuosity in the application of institutionalized skills" and is characteristic of identifiable cover subjects, no matter what their field (Gerver and Bensman, 1954: 226). For Keller, the fact that elites were becoming increasingly specialized challenged "... C. Wright Mills' contention that the interchangeability of the power elite has increased in recent years" (1963: 213). Institutional elements that are conditions for the existence of differentiated expertise would also seem to militate against interchangeability. These elements are:

- 1) development of scientific technology with a history of demonstrable results requiring
- 2) ever-increasing social division of labor and
- 3) segmentation of work tasks occurring as part of
- 4) a rise in bureaucratic organization resulting in
- 5) physical and social alienation of individuals from others in and out of the organization (Gerver and Bensman, 1954: 229).

But while the tasks they perform are ever more specialized, the bureaucratic settings in which experts work are increasingly similar, whether they be businessmen, government officials, churchmen or even criminals. Moreover, in some cases such as business and politics where interchangeability was still possible, it occurred to some degree. The bureaucratization of politics, i.e. emphasis on political appointees, is of special note in this connection.

But the rise of popular entertainers on TIME covers may indicate that people are interested in reading about those who have not been engulfed by bureaucracy. There are institutional pressures on bureaucracy to formalize relationships and operate within an impersonal atmosphere "... wherein spontaneity and uniqueness are discouraged" (Lane, 1953: 146). Spontaneity and uniqueness are the very qualities essential to successful entertainers.

To some extent, this may apply to politicians who also tend to be individualists. But whereas considerable editorial judg-

ment may be exercised in putting entertainers on the cover, the appearance of politicians is more closely linked to immediate newsworthy events. Mills has observed that "changes in the American structure of power have generally come about by institutional shifts in the relative positions of the political, the economic and the military orders"(1956: 269). As mirrored on TIME, these changes have been in favor of the political. Keller noted that in the United States, the top elite appears to represent public rather than more narrow, segmental objectives, consisting as it does of a small group of national officials - the President, his cabinet and Congress - responsible for safeguarding the national interest and welfare. Keller's prediction that there would be increasing emphasis placed upon the executive branch of government is borne out. Throughout the years, American presidents and cabinet members (especially Secretaries of State and Defense) were frequent cover subjects. In the later periods, they were even more prominent.

Keller saw economic achievements as losing their primacy as the main measure of social progress. "Accordingly, national anxieties and national pride in accomplishment focus on political rather than economic elites" (Keller, 1963: 97).

During the Fifties, the interconnection of business, government and the military was very evident among cover subjects. Not infrequently, business executives portrayed were heads of aerospace or electronic companies fulfilling government contracts. While the tension of the Cold War years prevailed, such people could be cast as heroes aiding America's race with Russia for arms and space conquest - and international prestige.

Interconnection was probably just as great in the 1960s. But stories revealing such an interrelationship would have been focused primarily on matters of actual warfare - in Vietnam. More pressing concerns about what was happening on the battlefields and who was ordering it attracted attention instead. Stories centred on either government decision-makers or military leaders. Businessmen whose companies helped the war effort were

not portrayed. Also, the Vietnam War was an unusual atypical one. Conceptions of the "enemy" that had been prevalent in the Fifties (Communism) became unclear. Public support diminished.

Another possible explanation for the decline of business (aside from the obvious one of economic recession which necessitated government intervention) is the possibility that TIME was responding to other feelings and attitudes that came to the fore in the Sixties. "Current assumptions require that expressions of individuality be more than economic" (Hacker, 1970: 164). This is largely a view held by youth. "The generation which has come to fruition in this era differs from all of its near and distant predecessors" (Hacker, 1970: 10). "The great difference between the generations ... lies in what they take for granted" (Hacker, 1970: 185). Because they do not remember a time when the benefits of business, industry and technology did not exist, younger people are less inclined to treat them with respectful gratitude. They are more willing to criticize the bad effects. For example, the environmental movement owed much to the protest of youth. TIME's eventual response was to inaugurate a new section called "Environment".

Also, secure in their possession of considerably more than basic material needs, younger people sought other avenues of meaning. The hippie, drug, anti-war and Jesus movements received their impetus from the young. TIME did cover stories on each of these. "New movements succeed or fail to the extent that they capture the attention of youth, ever in search of a faith of their own" (Keller, 1963: 246).

In times of rapid social change, youth, who experience changes not as such but as absolutes, are more in tune with current affairs than their elders. Hence, perhaps it is not surprising that TIME's cover subjects have become progressively younger. They might be younger still and the focus might be seen to have shifted even more toward social and spiritual concerns if stories in which youth played a part had lent themselves to individual artistic treatment and could have been included in the

sample. As it was, although more covers were devoted to youth-oriented themes, the nature of those themes and new artistic techniques usually ensured that they would be portrayed as events or phenomena rather than pegged to an individual. As a result, the sample is biased in favor of "establishment" personalities.

Although in the earlier years, too, many covers, notably those dealing with business matters, concerned events, they were often connected with formal organizations. The chiefs of these organizations were portrayed on the covers and the stories were built around them.

In the Sixties, events and phenomena, particularly those in which youth played a key role, tended not to be organization-oriented. Moreover, it was often impossible to discern a leader or even any single individual who represented the story. Consequently, it seems that the effort to link every story to a single cover subject was abandoned. Pairs, groups, crowds and covers devoid of people altogether became more common. TIME's original idea that "people make the news" seems to have undergone some revision in the face of overwhelming events.

The majority of people on the cover are heroes. True, there has been an increase in ambivalent treatment of them - TIME is less inclined to see things in black and white - but only rarely does an out-and-out villain appear. What seems to be the case is that once a role loses heroic stature (e.g. businessman) it simply disappears. It does not become villainous, it just fades away to be replaced by other roles more in keeping with popular ideas of heroism.

The true villains that have been featured on the cover were apt to be Communists - Russian, Chinese, Cuban, etc. In later years, there was a softening of attitude toward them. In any case, it could never really be argued that TIME's scant portrayal of the "enemy" was sufficient to produce the solidifying effects mentioned in an earlier chapter. But it is encouraging insofar as the array of villains brought to public notice was not

great and thus does not signal the weakening of control that Klapp feared. However, it is evident that relativism is more prevalent. Recent doubts about just who is the "enemy" are, perhaps, in part responsible for the increasingly ambivalent attitude of the magazine.

The influence of the young may have affected TIME's apparent swing in interest from international to national affairs. Of course, it is also a response to increasing problems and discontent at home which eventuated in more domestic "news". The almost inevitable characterization of Communists as villains has, as noted, been relaxed, particularly since Luce's death. But leaders of other countries, too, have lost prominence as cover subjects. Unless they are involved in "world-shaking" events (e.g. Arab-Israeli War, India-Pakistan War), they are seldom portrayed. Royalty and similar "society"-oriented stories are no longer chosen for the cover. It is possible that the trend in attention heralds a new era of American isolationism, but such a conclusion is not warranted on the basis of TIME covers alone.

The decline of businessmen and rise of cover subjects connected with social concerns is an indication of the rise of group servants and fall of sharp operators as admired hero types. It seems to mark the return of more traditional qualities in the constitution of heroes.

More entertainers in later periods lends some support to Klapp's notion of the accent on the physical, but a corresponding loss of inner, spiritual qualities is not evident. In fact, there seems to be more focus on issues that combine elements of spirituality with social concerns. Also, the decline of sports figures is at variance with Klapp's predictions.

There is a tendency for not only entertainers, but also other groups like politicians, to be presented as "splendid performers". All groups, realizing what is necessary to have an effect, have become "audience-directed". But they are performing

in fields that have a more enduring value, as defined by public opinion.

However, it would be wrong to think that grandstanding for media attention has become rife in all sectors. The prestige of particular occupations and positions, derived of course from the roles connected with them, is still sufficient to be noteworthy. By no means all of TIME's more recent cover subjects have been chosen because of the "hit" they made. Some occupy positions whose nature ensures that they will be involved in important events. Shils' conception of power is yet a significant clue as to who will be on TIME.

The TIME data do not serve as evidence of the proliferation of elites. The cover has become more accessible to people of diverse backgrounds, but the spheres of concern which are represented by individuals have not only failed to increase, but have become more restricted. Although TIME covers have broadened their scope, when a single person is pictured, he is still apt to be a member of a small number of elites.

"... Shifts of focus toward or away from a given elite or value occur in different periods" (Breed, 1958: 116). In 1963, at its fortieth birthday party, the publisher of TIME restated his belief that people make the news and said that TIME disagreed with the conventional stereotype of dehumanized society. Presumably, the intention was to continue to write stories around individuals. Yet in 1969, Clay S. Felker was able to say of TIME: "Perhaps most significant has been the change in focus of the cover stories from the institutionalized personality 'profile' to the issue-oriented story" (1969: 10). According to Felker, this reflected first, an egalitarian political trend (The Age of the Common Man, One Man-One Vote), and second, a growing idea that it is the system, not the man, that counts. In form and function, cover stories are increasingly like articles in The Atlantic and Harper's, except that they are more directly related to the news.

But the change in TIME covers may simply be a response to competition, chiefly from Newsweek. Newsmagazines "... do not reflect the news, they reflect the newsmagazine format"(Antupit, 1969: 65). Newsweek took a new, more imaginative approach to covers earlier than TIME. This may have influenced TIME's shift to the portrayal of issues, phenomena and events without necessarily tying them to an individual.

Yet now, when an individual does appear, the accompanying story is more likely to be about him rather than about something of which he is merely representative. Moreover, even where events and phenomena are concerned, it is impossible to escape the influence of individuals. Although somewhat outdated, the following statement refers to people who have all been TIME cover subjects more than once, and still applies to decision-makers today:

Both evidence and commonsense argue that at levels of top leadership men like De Gaulle, Johnson, Nasser and dozens of others, by the force of their personalities and the shape of their beliefs, are able to structure and modify conflicts and antagonisms in ways not predictable on the basis of role and systemic variables alone (Findlay et al, 1967: 233).

TIME cannot yet evade the necessity of portraying individuals on its cover, and by their nature, these individuals will be the heroes and elites of society.

Appendix A

TIME Sample Cover Subjects

1946

<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
Robert Ellesworth	Lockheed Aircraft president
Stanislaw Mikolajczyk	Polish vice premier
Danny Kaye	comedian
Francisco Franco	Spanish dictator
George C. Marshall	American envoy to China
Laurence Olivier	actor
Gustav T. Kuester	state representative
Elizabeth Arden	cosmetics company president
Edward H. Crump	Democratic committeeman
Jo Davidson	sculptor
James B. Conant	Harvard president
Frank Leahy	Notre Dame football coach
Joseph W. Martin	House of Representatives speaker

1947

<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
James F. Byrnes	American Secretary of State
George C. Marshall	American Secretary of State
Elizabeth	British princess
Leo Durocher	Brooklyn Dodgers manager
William A. Patterson	United Airlines president
Arthur Vandenburg	Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairman
Eva Peron	Argentinian first lady
Hedda Hopper	gossip columnist
Cyril G. Illingsworth	oceanliner captain
Harold Stassen	presidential candidate
John A. Kramer	tennis champion
C.S. Lewis	writer
Rebecca West	writer

1948

<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
Benjamin Britten	composer
Rienhold Niebuhr	theologian
Roy A. Roberts	newspaper president and manager
Arturo Toscanini	conductor
George H. Gallup	pollster
William O'Dwyer	New York mayor
James H. Duff	Pennsylvania governor
Igor Stravinsky	composer
Juliana	Dutch queen
J. Robert Oppenheimer	physicist
Anastasio Somoza	Nicaraguan dictator
Chiang Kai-Shek	Nationalist Chinese premier
Drew Pearson	newspaper columnist

1949

<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
Ben Hogan	golf champion
Charles E. Wilson	General Motors president
Mao Tse-Tung	Communist Chinese chariman
Juan T. Trippe	Pan American Airlines president
Milton Bealle	comedian
James A. Van Fleet	American army general
Benjamin A. Jones	race horse trainer
Margaret	British princess
Fletcher Bowron	Los Angeles mayor
Elizabeth Taylor	actress
David Dubinsky	union president
Robert M. Hutchins	Chicago University president
Charles Munch	conductor

1950

<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
Glen McCarthy	oil millionaire
Arthur Godfrey	radio and television star
Charles F. Brannan	American Secretary of Agriculture
Joseph Stalin	USSR premier
Omar N. Bradley	Joint Chiefs of Staff chairman
K.C. Wu	Formosan governor
Curtis E. Lemay	American Air Force general
Oliver P. Smith	American Marine general
Robert A. Taft	American senator
John A. Hartford	A&P chairman
George L. Hartford	A&P treasurer
Christopher Fry	playwright
William Boyd	television star (Hopalong Cassidy)
Frank N. Stanton	CBS president

1951

<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
Margaret Truman	American president's daughter
Harry S. Truman	American president
James A. Van Fleet	American Army general
Frederick B. Rentschler	United Aircraft president
James G. Thurber	cartoonist and author
Matthew B. Ridgeway	American Army general
Jean de Tassigny	French Army general
William M. Boyle	Democratic National Committee chairman
Joseph R. McCarthy	American senator
Graham Greene	writer
Winston Churchill	British prime minister
Ramon Magsaysay	Philippine Secretary of Defense
Henry C. Lodge, Jr.	American senator

<u>1952</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
	Gordon Dean	Atomic Energy Commission chairman
	Elizabeth	British queen
	Robert B. Mathias	decathlon champion
	Phil Murray	union president
	George W. Merck	drug company chairman
	Mohammed Naguib	Egyptian Army general
	Wallace K. Harrison	architect
	John Williams	American senator
	Adlai Stevenson	presidential candidate
	Dwight D. Eisenhower	presidential candidate
	Alfred Jacobsen	Amerada Petroleum president
	Gerald W.R. Templar	British general
	Francis H. Taylor	Metropolitan Museum director
<u>1953</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
	Elizabeth	British queen
	Harold S. Vance	Studebaker president
	Friedrich Dibelues	Berlin bishop
	Vinoba Bhawe	Indian holy man
	Alcide de Gasperi	Italian premier
	Charles E. Wilson	American Secretary of Defence
	Mickey Mantle	baseball player
	Lyndon B. Johnson	Senate minority leader
	Cornelius Shields	sailing champion
	Shirley Booth	actress
	Alfred C. Kinsey	zoologist
	Frederika	Greek queen
	John Lattner	Notre Dame halfback
<u>1954</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
	Heinz Nordhoff	Volkswagen president
	Paul Magloire	Haitian president
	Nathan M. Pusey	Harvard president
	Jonas E. Salk	medical researcher
	Richard A. Butler	British Chancellor of the Exchequer
	Briggs S. Cunningham	racing car driver and builder
	Sam Snead	golf champion
	Jacob Arbenz	Guatemalan president
	John S. Cooper	American senator
	Clement Attlee	British ex-prime minister
	Clifford Case, Jr.	Senate nominee
	Ernest Hemingway	writer
	Walt Disney	Disney Productions president

1955

<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
Wayne Morse	American senator
Richard L. Neuberger	American senator
Alfred M. Pride	American Navy admiral
Ichiro Hatoyama	Japanese premier
George Meany	union president
Chiang Kai-Shek	Nationalist Chinese premier
Walter P. Reuther	union president
Nikolai Bulganin	USSR premier
Thurgood Marshall	NAACP counsellor
Casey Stengel	New York Giants manager
George K. Funston	New York Stock Exchange president
Theodore F. Adams	Baptist Church leader
Louis Marx	Marx Toys president
Roy Collins	Florida governor

1956

<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
Harlow H. Curtice	General Motors president
Sherman Adams	presidential Chief of Staff
Rowland R. Hughes	American Budget Director
Lo Jui-ching	Chinese Public Security Minister
Pierre Poujade	French deputy
Ralph T. Reed	American Express president
Dwight D. Eisenhower	American president
Stavros Niarchos	shipping tycoon
William M. Martin, Jr.	Federal Reserve Board chairman
Hugh D. Daugherty	football coach
Richard M. Nixon	American vice-president
Dwight D. Eisenhower	American president
Richard M. Nixon	American vice-president
Anthony Eden	British prime minister

1957

<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
William Fife Knowland	Senate minority leader
Charles L. Van Doren	quiz show winner
Carrol M. Shanks	Prudential Life president
Dean E. Wooldridge	electronics company president
Simon Ramo	electronics company vice-president
Hussein	Jordanian king
Herbert Brownell, Jr.	American Attorney General
John L. McClellan	American senator
Earl Warren	Supreme Court Chief Justice
Kim Novak	actress
Edward R. Murrow	broadcast journalist
Ludwig Erhard	German Economics Minister
Philip	British prince consort
Maria Schell	actress

1958

<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
Nikita Khrushchev	USSR premier
Neil McElroy	American Secretary of Defense
Frank Pace, Jr.	General Dynamics president
James C. Hagerty	White House press secretary
Sukarno	Indonesian president
Walter F. O'Malley	Los Angeles Dodgers president
Charles de Gaulle	retired French general
Gamal A. Nasser	Egyptian president
John A. Thach	American Navy admiral
Edmund G. Brown	California gubernatorial candidate
Charles H. Goren	bridge champion
Nelson Rockefeller	Rockefeller Centre chairman
Mao Tse-Tung	Communist Chinese chairman

1959

<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
Charles de Gaulle	French president
Ralph Cordiner	General Electric chairman
Sekou Toure	Guinean president
Paul Tillich	theologian
Michiko Shoda	fiancee of Japanese crown prince
Christian A. Herter	American Secretary of State
James A. Van Allen	physicist
Harsen Smith	Chris-Craft chairman (boats)
Dwight P. Robinson	investment company chairman
Shirley Maclaine	actress
Jacques Soustelle	French Minister Delegate
Rocky Colavito	baseball player
Charles G. Mortimer	General Foods chairman

1960

<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
Romulo Betanecourt	Venezuelan president
James Reston	newspaper columnist
Elwood R.G. Quesada	Federal Aviation Authority chief
Ingmar Bergman	movie director
Arnold Palmer	golf champion
John H. Loudon	Shell Oil director
Nikita Khrushchev	USSR premier
Douglas MacArthur II	American ambassador to Japan
Che Guevera	Cuban National Bank president
Dag Hammarskjold	United Nations Secretary General
Henry C. Lodge	vice-presidential candidate
Paul Bagwell	gubernatorial candidate
Alan J. Lerner	librettist
Frederick Lowe	composer

1961

<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
John F. Enders	medical researcher
Willard F. Libby	chemist
Linus C. Pauling	chemist
Isador I. Rabi	physicist
Edward Teller	physicist
Joshua Lederberg	geneticist
Donald A. Glaser	physicist
Robert B. Woodward	chemist
Charles S. Draper	physicist
William Shockley	physicist
Emilio G. Segre	physicist
Charles H. Townes	physicist
George W. Beadle	geneticist
James A. Van Allen	physicist
Edward M. Purcell	physicist
Samuel Rayburn	House of Representatives Speaker
Valerian Zorin	Soviet delegate to the United Nations
Leontyne Price	opera star
Jean Kerr	playwright
Alan B. Shepard, Jr.	astronaut
Charles E. Jeanneret	architect
Eugene C. Blake	Presbyterian Church leader
John Patterson	Alabama governor
J.D. Salinger	writer
Mongli Slim	United Nations president
Jean Monnet	Common Market founder
Jackie Gleason	actor

1962

<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
John K. Galbraith	American ambassador to India
Edwin O. Reischauer	American ambassador to Japan
George F. Kennan	American ambassador to Yugoslavia
Krishna Menon	Indian Defense Minister
Robert F. Wagner	New York mayor
Richard J. Daley	Chicago mayor
John F. Collins	Boston mayor
Samuel W. Yorty	Los Angeles mayor
Lewis W. Cutler	Houston mayor
Evgeny Evtushenko	poet
William E. Ogle	physicist
Paul D. Harkins	American army general
Mrs. Winston F. Guest	socialite
Delbert E. Webb	building corporation president
David Rockefeller	bank president
John M. Kemper	prep school headmaster
George W. Anderson	American chief of naval operations
Nikita Khrushchev	USSR premier
Joan Baez	folk singer

1963

<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
Wilbur D. Mills	House Ways and Means Committee chairman
Robert S. McNamara	American Defense Secretary
Bertram A. Powers	union president
John	Pope
Robert F. Kennedy	American Attorney General
Robert S. Shriver, Jr.	Peace Corps director
Arthur M. Ramsay	Archbishop of Canterbury
William L. Pereira	architectural firm president
Mao Tse-Tung	Communist Chinese chairman
Chou En-Lai	Communist Chinese premier
Teng Hsiao-Ping	Communist Chinese vice-premier
Liu Shao-Chi	Communist Chinese cabinet minister
Charles B. Thornton	Litton Industries chairman
Harold Wilson	British Labour Party leader
Lyndon B. Johnson	American president
Guy de Rothschild	bank president

1964

<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
Thomas C. Mann	American Assistant Secretary of State
Maurice C. de Murville	French Foreign Minister
John Cheever	writer
Lido A. Iacocca	Ford general manager
Gerald Kennedy	Methodist Church leader
Nguyen Khanh	South Vietnamese premier
Lady Bird Johnson	American first lady
Hugo L. Black	Supreme Court justice
Edmund N. Bacon	city planning director
Ara R. Parseghian	Notre Dame coach
Lamot du Pont Copeland	Dupont president
Paul E. Carlson	medical missionary
Dorothy B. Chandler	fund raiser

1965

<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
Jack I. Straus	Macy's chairman
Evsei Liberman	economist
Chen Yi	Communist Chinese Foreign Minister
Aleksei A. Leonov	cosmonaut
James R. Risner	American Air Force lieutenant-colonel
Norton W. Simon	Hunt Foods chairman
Edward H. White II	astronaut
James A. McDivitt	astronaut
Mrs. W.J. Anderson	housewife
Ho Chi Minh	North Vietnamese president
William Pickering	physicist
Lyndon B. Johnson	American president
Charles B. Shuman	American Farm Bureau Federation president
Francis Keppel	HEW Assistant Secretary

1966

<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
William C. Westmoreland	American Army general
Dean Rusk	American Secretary of State
Maarten Schmidt	astronomer
Hubert H. Humphrey	American vice-president
Danny Escobedo	murderer
Thich Tri Quang	South Vietnamese Buddhist leader
Robert S. Shriver, Jr.	Office of Economic Opportunity director
Robert McNamara	American Secretary of Defense
Charles Tillinghast, Jr.	Trans-World Airlines president
Luci Baines Johnson	American president's daughter
Patrick Nugent	president's daughter's fiance
James Thompson	investment company president
Hendrik Verwoerd	South African prime minister
Samuel W. Yorty	Los Angeles mayor

1967

<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
Edward W. Brooke, III	American senator
Virgil Grissom	astronaut
William White	astronaut
Roger Chaffee	astronaut
Richard M. Helms	CIA director
Henry R. Luce	publisher
James S. McDonnell	aerospace company owner
William C. Westmoreland	American Army general
Frank M. Johnson	district judge
Johnny Carson	television talk show host
Kingman Brewster, Jr.	Yale University president
Sandy Dennis	actress
Tony Smith	sculptor
Nelson A. Rockefeller	New York governor
Ronald Reagan	California governor
William F. Buckley, Jr.	columnist, editor, publisher

1968

<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
Lyndon Baines Johnson	American president
Hubert H. Humphrey	American vice-president
Robert F. Kennedy	American senator
Wilbur D. Mills	House Ways and Means Committee chairman
Samuel B. Gould	university chancellor
Vo Nguyen Giap	North Vietnamese Defense Minister
Bobby Hull	hockey player
Robert F. Kennedy	American senator
Charles de Gaulle	French president
Aretha Franklin	singer
Abe Fortas	Supreme Court Justice
Nathaniel A. Owings	architectural firm founder
Denny McLain	baseball player
Dan Rowan	television comedian
Dick Martin	television comedian
Paul	Pope
William P. Rogers	American Secretary of State

1969

<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
Giovanni Agnelli	Fiat president
Richard M. Nixon	American president
Mia Farrow	actress
Dustin Hoffman	actor
Richard M. Nixon	American president
Carroll Righter	astrologer
Nguyen Van Thieu	South Vietnamese president
Dwight D. Eisenhower	retired American president
Gamal A. Nasser	Egyptian president
Neil Armstrong	astronaut
Richard M. Nixon	American president
Melvin Laird	American Defense Secretary
Nguyen Van Thieu	South Vietnamese president
Nicolae Ceausescu	Rumanian president
Leonid Breshev	Communist Party leader
Strom Thurmond	American senator senator
Golda Meir	Israeli premier
Mario A. Procaccino	New York mayoralty candidate
John Lindsay	New York mayor
Robert Wagner	retired New York mayor
Milton Friedman	economist

1970

<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
Jamie Robertson	singer
Richard Manuel	singer
Rick Danko	singer
Garth Hudson	singer
Levon Helm	singer
Jane Fonda	actress
Peter Fonda	actor and director
Henry Fonda	actor
Jesse Jackson	Operation Bread-basket director
Gunter W. Grass	writer
Mike Nichols	director
Alan Arkin	actor
Edward Heath	British prime minister
Alfred Nakak	development coroporation director
Henry Ford II	Ford chairman
Willian P. Rogers	American Secretary of State
Gamal A. Nasser	Egyptian president
Richard M. Nixon	American president
James Buckley	American Senator
William Brock	American senator
Adlai E. Stevenson III	American senator
John V. Tunney	American senator

1971

Name

Occupation or Position

Ali McGraw	actress
Philip Berrigan	priest
Daniel Berrigan	priest
Creighton Abrams	American Army general
George C. Scott	actor
Anwar Sadat	Egyptian president
Akio Morita	Sony owner
James E. Carter	Georgia governor
Joseph Colombo, Sr.	Cosa Nostra family boss
George Meany	union president
B.F. Skinner	psychologist
Jeff Fenholt	actor
Beverly Sills	opera star
Edward Kennedy	American senator
Indira Gandhi	Indian prime minister
Yahya Khan	Pakistani president

Appendix B

TIME Dovers Content Analysis

1. date - _____
2. cover - American _____ Canadian _____
3. type of cover - _____
4. number of persons on cover - _____
5. person number - _____
6. position - principal _____ not principal _____
7. color - color _____ black and white _____
8. treatment - _____
9. medium - _____
10. size of portrait - _____
11. section story appeared in - _____
12. Half - front _____ Back _____
13. life - dead _____ alive _____
14. name - _____
15. official title - _____
16. sex - male _____ female _____
17. age - _____
18. race - _____
19. father's occupation - _____
20. nationality - _____
21. country of origin - _____
22. ethnicity - _____
23. religion - _____
24. education - _____
25. occupational background - _____
26. present occupation - _____
27. field of endeavour - _____
28. occupational classification - _____
29. NORC rating - _____
30. cultural theme - _____
31. accomplishment - own _____ reflected glory _____
33. achievement - individual _____ organization _____
34. marital status - _____
35. number of children - _____
36. man of the year - yes _____ no _____
37. reason for story - _____

Appendix C

Coding System

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
1	<u>Sample or Not</u> 1=drawn from sample 2=not drawn from sample
2	<u>Date - Year (01-26)</u>
3	<u>Date - Five-Year Periods</u> 1=1946-1950 2=1951-1955 3=1956-1960 4=1961-1965 5=1966-1971
4	<u>Date - Halves</u> 1=1946-1958 2=1959-1971
5	<u>Person Number (001-395)</u>
6	<u>Number of Persons on Cover (01-15)</u>
7	<u>Position</u> 1=principal 2=not principal
8	<u>Color</u> 1=color 2=black and white
9	<u>Medium and Treatment</u> 1=painted or drawn portrait 2=caricature or cartoon 3=photograph 4=other
10	<u>Half of Magazine</u> 1=front 2=back
11	<u>Section in Which Story Appeared</u> 01=art 02=behaviour 03=books 04=business 05=cinema 06=education 07=environment 08=Latin America 09=law 10=medecine 11=modern living

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>	-162-
	12=music	
	13=people	
	14=press	
	15=religion	
	16=science	
	17=show business	
	18=sport	
	19=television (radio)	
	20=theatre	
	21=US	
	22=war in Asia (Korea)	
	23=world	
12	<u>Life</u>	
	1=alive	
	2=dead	
13	<u>Sex</u>	
	1=male	
	2=female	
14	<u>Age</u> (17-85)	
15	<u>Race</u>	
	1=Caucasian	
	2=Negro	
	3=Oriental	
16	<u>Nationality</u>	
	01=American	
	02=British	
	03=French	
	04=German	
	05=Italian	
	06=other Western European	
	07=Eastern European and Russian	
	08=Middle Eastern	
	09=African	
	10=Indian and Pakistani	
	11=Chinese	
	12=Japanese	
	13=Southeast Asian	
	14=Central or South American	
	15=Canadian	
17	<u>Country of Origin</u>	
	01=United States	
	02=British Isles	
	03=France	
	04=Germany	
	05=Italy	
	06=other Western European	
	07=Eastern Europe or Russia	
	08=Middle East	
	09=Africa	
	10=India or Pakistan	

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
	11=China 12=Japan 13=Southeast Asia 14=Central or South America 15=Canada
18	<u>Ethnicity</u> 01=Anglo-Saxon 02=Irish 03=French 04=German 05=Italian 06=other Western European 07=Eastern European or Russian 08=Middle Eastern 09=African (Negro) 10=Indian or Pakistani 11=Chinese 12=Japanese 13=Southeast Asian 14=Central or South American 15=American Indian
19	<u>Religion</u> 00=don't know 10=Protestant 11=Anglican 12=Baptist 13=Episcopalian 14=Methodist 15=Presbyterian 16=other Protestant 20=Roman Catholic 30=other Christian 40=Jewish 50=Moslem, Hindu, Buddhist 60=Communist 70=none
20	<u>Education</u> 00=don't know 10=primary or less 20=some high school 21=some military academy 30=high school 31=military academy 40=some college 41=some military college 42=some technical, business or teachers' college 50=BA or equivalent 51=military college 52=technical, business or teachers' college 60=MA or equivalent 63=law degree 64=MD 70=PhD and beyond

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
21	<u>Achievement</u> 1=individual 2=organization
22	<u>Winick Classification</u> 01=acting 02=US government and politics 03=foreign government and politics 04=writing 05=singing 06=comedy 07=sport 08=music 09=art, photography, design, architecture 10=entertainment 11=television 12=US military 13=foreign military 14=business 15=education 16=dance 17=fashion 18=society 19=religion 20=medecine and science 21=labor 22=other
23	<u>Father's Occupational Classification (1)</u> 0=don't know 1=government official 2=business, industry, labor 3=professional and technical 4=military 5=farm 6=service 7>manual 8=recreation and aesthetics 9=other
24	<u>Father's Occupational Classification (2)</u> 0=don't know 1=government official - elected 2=government official - appointed 3=government official - clerical 4=business - large owners and executives 5=business - small owners and executives 6=clerks and salesmen 7=union officials 8=professional and technical 9=top military 10=officers 11=enlisted men

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
	12=farm owners and managers
	13=farm laborers and foremen
	14=service
	15=skilled
	16=semi-skilled
	17=unskilled
	18=high arts
	19=popular arts
	20=sports
	21=other
25	<u>Father's Field of Endeavour</u>
	01=agriculture
	02=business
	03=crime
	04=diplomacy
	05=government administration
	06=politics
	07=education
	08=entertainment
	09=music, art, literature
	10=sports
	11=journalism
	12=labor
	13=law and justice
	14>manual work
	15=medecine
	16=science and technology
	17=military
	18=religion
	19=tradition
26	<u>Occupational Inheritance</u>
	0=don't know
	1=no
	2=yes (same general field, e.g. politics)
	3=yes (same occupation, e.g. clergyman)
	4=yes (family business, e.g. Ford)
27	<u>Subject's Occupation</u>
	01=president, dictator, premier, etc.
	02=monarch or other royalty
	03=vice-president, cabinet, Supreme Court, agency chief
	04=senator, representative, MP
	05=party leader
	06=diplomat
	07=state governor
	08=mayor
	09=state or city official
	10=social concern leader
	11=business owner, president, manager, etc.
	12=union official

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
	13=military commander
	14=other officer
	15=astronaut
	16=natural scientist (medical, biological)
	17=physical scientist
	18=social scientist
	19=serious music - composers and conductors
	20=serious music - performers
	21=popular music - composers and conductors
	22=popular music - performers
	23=theatre - directors, producers, writers
	24=theatre - performers
	25=cinema - directors, producers, writers
	26=cinema - performers
	27=radio and TV - directors, producers, writers
	28=radio and TV - performers
	29=sports - coaches, trainers, owners
	30=sports - players
	31=press - owners, editors, publishers
	32=press - writers and columnists
	33=literature - writers
	34=socialite
	35=religion - leader
	36=religion - lower echelons
	37=religion - philosophers
	38=education - administrator
	39=education - instructor
	40=art and architecture - administrator
	41=art and architecture - artist
	42=criminal
	43=other
	44=candidates
28	<u>Subject's Occupational Classification (1)</u>
	1=government official
	2=business, labor, industry
	3=professional and technical
	4=military
	5=farm
	6=service
	7>manual
	8=recreation and aesthetics
	9=other
29	<u>Subject's Occupational Classification (2)</u>
	01=elected government official - national
	02=elected government official - state
	03=elected government official - city
	04=appointed government official - national
	05=appointed government official - state
	06=appointed government official - city
	07=large business owners and executives
	08=union officials

Variable

Code

09=professional and technical
10=military - top levels
11=military - officers
12=farm owners and managers
13=service
14>manual
15=high arts
16=popular arts
17=sports
18=other

30

Subject's Field of Endeavour

01=agriculture
02=business
03=crime
04=diplomacy
05=government administration
06=politics
07=education
08=entertainment
09=serious music, art, literature
10=sports
11=journalism
12=labor
13=law and justice
14>manual work
15=medecine
16=science and technology
17=military
18=religion
19=tradition

31

Subject's Occupational Background

01=military
02=military and politics
03=politics
04=law and politics
05=law
06=law and government administration
07=government administration
08=government administration and politics
09=government administration and business
10=business
11=government administration and education
12=education
13=education and science
14=science
15=entertainment
16=sport
17=serious music
18=art and architecture
19=literary
20=journalism
21>manual labor
22=farm
23=religion

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Code</u>
	24=royalty
32	<u>Cultural Theme of Story (1)</u>
	1=political
	2=business and industry
	3=military
	4=social concerns
	5=science
	6=art and culture
	7=religion and philosophy
	8=society and tradition
	9=other
33	<u>Cultural Theme of Story (2)</u>
	01=general political
	02=political - personality
	03=political - election
	04=political - diplomacy and international affairs
	05=business and industry
	06=labor
	07=military - defense
	08=military - warfare
	09=economics
	10=agriculture
	11=education
	12=urban development
	13=civil rights
	14=crime and law
	15=protest
	16=environment
	17=general science
	18=space
	19=medecine
	20=serious art
	21=popular art
	22=sport
	23=religion and philosophy
	24=society and tradition
	25=other
34	<u>Reason for Story</u>
	<u>First digit</u>
	1=hard news - must go that week
	2=soft news - could have appeared other week
	<u>Second digit</u>
	1=advance - event about to occur
	2=fait accompli - event has occurred
	3=continuing situation

Variable

Code

Third digit

1=person for himself - personality profile

2=person's action

3=group

4=organization

5=institution

6=event

7=phenomenon

8=country

35

Klapp Classification

1=hero

2=villain

3=fool

4=ambivalent

Appendix D

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	

6	
7	
8	
9	
10	

11	
12	
13	
14	
15	

16	
17	
18	
19	
20	

21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

26	
27	
28	
29	
30	

31	
32	
33	
34	
35	

36	
37	
38	
39	
40	

41	
42	
43	
44	
45	

46	
47	
48	
49	
50	

51	
52	
53	
54	
55	

56	
57	
58	
59	
60	

61	
62	
63	
64	
65	

66	
67	
68	
69	
70	

71	
72	
73	
74	
75	

76	
77	
78	
79	
80	

Appendix E

TIME Sample Women

<u>Year</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
1946	Elizabeth Arden	cosmetics company president
1947	Elizabeth	British princess
	Eva Peron	Argentinian first lady
	Hedda Hopper	gossip columnist
	Rebecca West	writer
1948	Juliana	Dutch queen
1949	Elizabeth Taylor	actress
	Margaret	British princess
1951	Margaret Truman	American president's daughter
1952	Elizabeth	British queen
1953	Elizabeth	British queen
	Shirley Booth	actress
	Frederika	Greek queen
1957	Kim Novak	actress
	Maria Schell	actress
1959	Michiko Shoda	fiancee of Japanese crown prince
	Shirley MacLaine	actress
1961	Leontyne Price	opera star
	Jean Kerr	playwright
1962	Mrs. W.F. Guest	socialite
	Joan Baez	singer
1964	Lady Bird Johnson	American first lady
	Dorothy B. Chandler	fund-raiser
1965	Mrs. W.J. Anderson	housewife
1966	Luci B. Johnson	American president's daughter
1967	Sandy Dennis	actress
1968	Aretha Franklin	singer
1969	Mia Farrow	actress
	Golda Meir	Israeli premier
1970	Jane Fonda	actress
1971	Ali McGraw	actress
	Beverly Sills	opera star
	Indira Gandhi	Indian prime minister

TIME Sample American Politicians - National

<u>Year</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Position</u>
1946	Joseph W. Martin	House of Representatives Speaker
1947	Arthur Vandenburg	Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman
1950	Robert A. Taft	Senator
1951	Harry S. Truman	President
	Joseph McCarthy	Senator
	Henry C. Lodge, Jr.	Senator
1952	John Williams	Senator
1953	Lyndon B. Johnson	Senate Minority Leader
1954	John S. Cooper	Senator
1955	Wayne Morse	Senator
	Richard L. Neuberger	Senator
1956	Dwight D. Eisenhower	President
	Dwight D. Eisenhower	President
	Richard M. Nixon	Vice-President
	Richard M. Nixon	Vice-President
1957	William F. Knowland	Senate Minority Leader
	John L. McClellan	Senator
1961	Samuel Rayburn	House of Representatives Speaker
1963	Wilbur D. Mills	House Ways and Means Committee Chairman
	Lyndon B. Johnson	President
1965	Lyndon B. Johnson	President
1966	Hubert H. Humphrey	Vice-President
1967	Edward W. Brooke, III	Senator
1968	Lyndon B. Johnson	President
	Hubert H. Humphrey	Vice-President
	Robert F. Kennedy	Senator
	Wilbur D. Mills	House Ways and Means Committee Chairman
1969	Richard M. Nixon	President
	Richard M. Nixon	President
	Richard M. Nixon	President
	Strom Thurmond	Senator
1970	Richard M. Nixon	President
	James Buckley	Senator
	William Brock	Senator
	Adlai Stevenson III	Senator
	John V. Tunney	Senator
1971	Edward M. Kennedy	Senator

TIME Sample American Politicians - State and City

<u>Year</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Position</u>
1946	Gustav T. Kuester	state representative
1948	William O'Dwyer	New York mayor
	James H. Duff	Pennsylvania governor
1949	Fletcher Bowron	Los Angeles mayor
1955	Roy Collins	Florida governor
1961	John Patterson	Alabama governor
1962	Robert F. Wagner	New York mayor
	Richard J. Daley	Chicago mayor
	John F. Collins	Boston mayor
	Samuel W. Yorty	Los Angeles mayor
	Lewis W. Cutrer	Houston mayor
1966	Samuel W. Yorty	Los Angeles mayor
1967	Nelson A. Rockefeller	New York governor
	Ronald Reagan	California governor
1969	John Lindsay	New York mayor
	Robert Wagner	ex-New York mayor
1971	James E. Carter	Georgia governor

TIME Sample American Political Candidates

<u>Year</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Position Sought</u>
1947	Harold Stassen	president
1952	Adlai Stevenson	president
	Dwight D. Eisenhower	president
1954	Clifford Case, Jr.	senator
1958	Edmund G. Brown	governor
1960	Henry C. Lodge	vice-president
	Paul Bagwell	governor
1969	Mario A. Procaccino	mayor

TIME Sample American Political Appointees

<u>Year</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Position</u>
1946	George C. Marshall	American envoy to China
1947	James F. Byrnes	Secretary of State
	George C. Marshall	Secretary of State
1950	Charles F. Brannan	Secretary of Agriculture
1952	Gordon Dean	Atomic Energy Commission Chairman
1953	Charles E. Wilson	Secretary of Defense
1956	Sherman Adams	Chief of Staff
	Rowland R. Hughes	Budget Director
	William M. Martin, Jr.	Federal Reserve Board Chairman
1957	Herbert Brownell, Jr.	Attorney General
	Earl Warren	Supreme Court Chief Justice
1958	Neil McElroy	Secretary of Defense
	James C. Hagerty	White House Press Secretary
1959	Christian A. Herter	Secretary of State
1960	Elwood R.G. Quesada	Federal Aviation Administration Director
	Douglas MacArthur II	American ambassador to Japan
1962	John K. Galbraith	American ambassador to India
	Edwin O. Reischauer	American ambassador to Japan
	George F. Kennan	American ambassador to Yugoslavia
1963	Robert S. McNamara	Secretary of Defense
	Robert E. Kennedy	Attorney General
	Robert S. Shriver, Jr.	Peace Corps Director
1964	Thomas C. Mann	Assistant Secretary of State
	Edmund N. Bacon	city planning director
	Hugo L. Black	Supreme Court Justice
1965	Francis Keppel	Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare
1966	Dean Rusk	Secretary of State
	Robert S. Shriver, Jr.	Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity
	Robert S. McNamara	Secretary of Defense
1967	Richard M. Helms	Central Intelligence Agency Director
	Frank M. Johnson	district judge
1968	Abe Fortas	Supreme Court Justice
	William P. Rogers	Secretary of State
1969	Melvin Laird	Secretary of Defense
1970	William P. Rogers	Secretary of State

TIME Sample Businessmen

<u>Year</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Position</u>
1946	Robert Ellesworth	Lockheed Aircraft president
	Elizabeth Arden	cosmetics company president
1947	William Patterson	United Airlines president
1949	Charles E. Wilson	General Motors president
	Juan T. Trippe	Pan American Airlines president
1950	Glen McCarthy	oil millionaire
	John Hartford	A&P chairman
	George Hartford	A&P treasurer
1952	George Merck	drug company chairman
	Alfred Jacobsen	Amerada Petroleum president
1953	Harold S. Vance	Studebaker president
1954	Heinz Nordhoff	Volkswagen president
	Walt Disney	Disney Productions president
1955	George Funston	New York Stock Exchange president
	Louis Marx	Marx Toys president
1956	Harlow H. Curtice	General Motors president
	Ralph T. Reed	American Express president
	Stavros Niarchos	shipping magnate
1957	Carrol M. Shanks	Prudential Life president
	Dean E. Wooldridge	electronics company president
	Simon Ramo	electronics company vice-president
1958	Frank Pace, Jr.	General Dynamics president
	Nelson Rockefeller	Rockefeller Centre chairman
1959	Ralph Cordiner	General Electric chairman
	Harsen Smith	Chris-Craft chairman
	Dwight P. Robinson	investment company chairman
	Charles Mortimer	General Foods chairman
1960	John H. Loudon	Shell Oil director
1962	Delbert E. Webb	building corporation president
	David Rockefeller	bank president
1963	William L. Pereira	architectural firm director
	Charles B. Thornton	Litton Industries chairman
	Guy de Rothschild	bank president
1964	Lido A. Iacocca	Ford general manager
	Lammot Copeland	Dupont president
1965	Jack I. Straus	Macy's chairman
	Norton W. Simon	Hunt Foods director
1966	Charles Tillinghast, Jr.	Trans World Airlines director
	James Thomson	Merrill and Lynch director
1967	Henry R. Luce	publisher
	James S. McDonnell	aerospace company owner
1968	Nathaniel A. Owings	Architectural firm founder
1969	Giovanni Agnelli	Fiat director
1970	Henry Ford II	Ford chairman
1971	Akio Morita	Sony owner

TIME Sample Military Figures

<u>Year</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation</u>
1949	James A. Van Fleet	American general
1950	Omar N. Bradley	Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff
	Curtis E. Lemay	American general
	Oliver P. Smith	American general
1951	James A. Van Fleet	American general
	Matthew B. Ridgeway	American general
	Jean de Tassigny	French general
1952	Gerald W.R. Templar	British general
1955	Alfred M. Pride	American admiral
1958	Charles de Gaulle	French general
	John S. Thach	American admiral
1961	Alan B. Shepard, Jr.	American astronaut
1962	Paul D. Harkins	American general
	George W. Anderson	American admiral
1965	Aleksei A. Leonov	Soviet astronaut
	James R. Risner	American lieutenant-colonel
	Edward H. White II	American astronaut
	James A. McDivitt	American astronaut
1966	William C. Westmoreland	American general
1967	Virgil Grissom	American astronaut
	William White	American astronaut
	Roger Chaffee	American astronaut
	William C. Westmoreland	American general
1969	Neil Armstrong	American astronaut
1971	Creighton Abrams	American general

TIME Sample Scientists

<u>Year</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation</u>
1948	J. Robert Oppenheimer	physicist
1953	Alfred C. Kinsey	zoologist
1954	Jonas E. Salk	medical researcher
1959	James A. Van Allen	physicist
1961	John F. Enders	medical researcher
	Willard F. Libby	chemist
	Linus C. Pauling	chemist
	Isador I. Rabi	physicist
	Edward Teller	physicist
	Joshua Lederberg	geneticist
	Donald A. Glaser	physicist
	Robert B. Woodward	chemist
	Charles S. Draper	physicist
	William Shockley	physicist
	Emilio G. Segre	physicist
	Charles H. Townes	physicist
	George W. Beadle	geneticist
	James A. Van Allen	physicist
	Edward M. Purcell	physicist
1962	William E. Ogle	physicist
1965	Evsei Liberman	economist
	William Pickering	physicist
1966	Maarten Schmidt	astronomer
1969	Milton Friedman	economist
1971	B.F. Skinner	psychologist

TIME Sample Religious Figures

<u>Year</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
1946	Rienhold Niebuhr	theologian
1953	Friedrich Dibelues	Berlin bishop
	Vinoba Bhave	Indian holy man
1955	Theodore Adams	Baptist Church leader
1959	Paul Tillich	theologian
1961	Eugene C. Blake	Presbyterian Church leader
1963	John	Pope
	Arthur Ramsay	Archbishop of Canterbury
1964	Gerald Kennedy	Methodist Church leader
	Paul E. Carlson	medical missionary
1966	Thich Tri Quang	South Vietnamese Buddhist leader
1968	Paul	Pope
1971	Philip Berrigan	priest
	Daniel Berrigan	priest

TIME Sample High Arts

<u>Year</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation</u>
1946	Laurence Olivier	actor
	Jo Davidson	sculptor
1947	C.S. Lewis	writer
	Rebecca West	writer
1948	Benjamin Britten	composer
	Arturo Toscanini	conductor
	Igor Stravinsky	composer
1949	Charles Munch	conductor
1950	Christopher Fry	playwright
1951	Graham Greene	writer
1952	Francis H. Taylor	museum director
1954	Ernest Hemingway	writer
1961	Leontyne Price	opera soprano
	J.D. Salinger	writer
1962	Evgeny Evtushenko	poet
1964	John Cheever	writer
1967	Tony Smith	sculptor
1970	Gunter Grass	writer
1971	Beverly Sills	opera soprano

TIME Sample Popular Arts

<u>Year</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation</u>
1946	Danny Kaye	comedian
1947	Hedda Hopper	gossip Columnist
1948	Drew Pearson	journalist
1949	Milton Berle	comedian
	Elizabeth Taylor	actress
1950	Arthur Godfrey	radio and television entertainer
	William Boyd	actor
1951	James Thurber	cartoonist and writer
1953	Shirley Booth	actress
1957	Kim Novak	actress
	Edward R. Murrow	journalist
	Maria Schell	actress
1959	Shirley Maclaine	actress
1960	Ingmar Bergman	director
	James Reston	journalist
	Alan J. Lerner	librettist
	Frederick Lowe	composer
1961	Jean Kerr	playwright
	Jackie Gleason	actor
1962	Joan Baez	singer
1967	Johnny Carson	television talk show host
	Sandy Dennis	actress
	William F. Buckley	journalist
1968	Aretha Franklin	singer
	Dan Rowan	comedian
	Dick Martin	comedian
1969	Mia Farrow	actress
	Dustin Hoffman	actor
1970	Jamie Robertson	singer
	Richard Manuel	singer
	Rick Danko	singer
	Garth Hudson	singer
	Levon Helm	singer
	Peter Fonda	actor and director
	Henry Fonda	actor
	Jane Fonda	actress
	Mike Nichols	director
	Alan Arkin	actor
1971	Ali McGraw	actress
	George C. Scott	actor
	Jeff Fenholt	actor

TIME Sample Sports Figures

<u>Year</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Occupation or Position</u>
1946	Frank Leahy	football coach
1947	Leo Durocher	baseball manager
	John A. Kramer	tennis player
1949	Ben Hogan	golfer
	Benjamin Jones	race horse trainer
1952	Robert B. Mathias	decathlon champion
1953	Mickey Mantle	baseball player
	Cornelius Shields	sailing champion
	John Lattner	football player
1954	Briggs Cunningham	racing car driver
	Sam Snead	golfer
1955	Casey Stengel	baseball manager
1956	Hugh D. Daugherty	football coach
1958	Walter O'Malley	baseball team president
	Charles Goren	bridge champion
1959	Rocky Colavito	baseball player
1960	Arnold Palmer	golfer
1964	Ara R. Parseghian	football coach
1968	Bobby Hull	hockey player
	Denny McLain	baseball player

Bibliography

1. Antupit, Samuel N. "Laid Out and Laid Waste: On the Visual Violation of American Magazines", The Antioch Review, XXIX (Spring, 1969), 57-66.
2. Arnstine, Donald G. "Value Models and Education: Content in the Popular Arts", The Journal of Educational Sociology, XXXV (September, 1961), 41-48.
3. Bagdikian, Ben H. "Bias in the Weekly Newsmagazines", in Reo M. Christenson and Robert O. McWilliams, eds. Voice of the People - Readings in Public Opinion and Propaganda. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962, 148-164.
4. Barkocy, Michael A. "Censorship Against Time and Life International Editions", Journalism Quarterly, XL (Autumn, 1963), 517-524.
5. Barber, Bernard. Social Stratification - A Comparative Analysis of Structure and Process. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1957.
6. Bauer, Raymond A. and Alice H. Bauer. "America, 'Mass Society' and Mass Media", Journal of Social Issues, XVI (Autumn, 1960), 3-66.
7. Bell, Wendell and others. Public Leadership - A Critical Review with Special Reference to Adult Education. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1961.
8. Belsley, G. Lyle. "Why Bureaucracy is Belittled", Personnel Administration, IX (January, 1947), 19-23.
9. Berelson, Bernard. Content Analysis in Communication Research. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1952.
10. Berelson, Bernard and Patricia J. Salter. "Majority and Minority Americans: An Analysis of Magazine Fiction", in Bernard Rosenberg and David Manning White, eds. Mass Culture - The Popular Arts in America. New York: The Free Press, 1957.
11. Bernstein, Marver H. "Political Ideas of Selected American Business Journals", Public Opinion Quarterly, XVII (Summer, 1953), 258-267.
12. Breed, Warren. "Mass Communication and Socio-Cultural Integration", Social Forces, XXXVII (December, 1958), 109-116.

13. Brodie, Fawn M. "The Political Hero in America: His Fate and His Future", The Virginia Quarterly Review, XLVI (Winter, 1970), 46-60.
14. Brooks, Harvey. "Physics and the Polity", Science, CLX (26 April, 1968), 396-400.
15. Chamberlain, John. "Harry Luce and the Russian Century", National Review, XXIII (May 18, 1971), 524-525, 550.
16. Davies, Robertson. Fifth Business. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1970.
17. Davis, J.W. "Existentialism: A Reaction to the Age of Organization", Western Political Quarterly, XVI (September, 1963), 541-547.
18. Davis, Kingsley and Wilbert E. Moore. "Some Principles of Stratification", in Reinhard Bendix and Seymour Martin Lipset, eds. Class, Status and Power - Social Stratification in Comparative Perspective. New York: The Free Press, 1953, 47-53.
19. Domhoff, G. William. Who Rules America? Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey; Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
20. Ellis, R. Hobart, Jr. "Can Anybody Hear Us?", Physics Today, XXI (February, 1968), 120.
21. Ellison, Jerome and Franklin T. Gosser. "Non-Fiction Magazine Articles: A Content Analysis Study", Journalism Quarterly, XXXVI (Winter, 1959), 27-34.
22. Felker, Clay S. "Life Cycles in the Age of Magazines", Antioch Review, XXIX (Spring, 1969), 7-13.
23. Findlay, David J. and others. Enemies in Politics. Chicago, Illinois: Rand McNally and Company, 1967.
24. Fisher, Burton R. and Stephen B. Withey. Big Business as the People See It - A Study of a Socio-Economic Institution. University of Michigan: The Survey Research Center Institute for Social Research, 1951.
25. Fulford, Robert. "Why Do Magazines Look the Way They Do?", Imperial Oil Review, LI (September, 1967), 10-17.
26. Gardner, Burleigh B. and Lee Rainwater. "The American Image of Big Business", in W. Lloyd Warner and Norman H. Martin, eds. Industrial Man - Businessmen and Business Organizations. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959, 482-487.

27. Gerbner, George. "On Content Analysis and Critical Research in Mass Communication", Audio-Visual Communication Review, VI (Spring, 1958), 85-108.
28. -----. "Press Perspectives in World Communication: A Pilot Study", Journalism Quarterly, XXXVIII (Summer, 1961), 313-321.
29. -----. "Toward 'Cultural Indicators': The Analysis of Mass Mediated Public Message Systems", in George Gerbner and others, eds., The Analysis of Communication Content - Developments in Scientific Theories and Computer Techniques, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1969, 123-132.
30. Gerver, Israel and Joseph Bensman. "Towards a Sociology of Expertness", Social Forces, XXXII (March, 1954), 226-235.
31. Hacker, Andrew. The End of the American Era. New York: Atheneum, 1970.
32. Hamilton, David. "The Entrepreneur as Cultural Hero", Southwestern Social Science Quarterly, XXXVIII (December, 1957), 248-256.
33. Hodge, Robert W. and others. "Occupational Prestige in the United States, 1925-1963", in Celia S. Heller, ed. Structured Social Inequality - A Reader in Comparative Social Stratification. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1969, 192-204.
34. Holsti, Ole R. Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969.
35. Inglis, Ruth A. "An Objective Approach to the Relationship Between Fiction and Society", American Sociological Review, III (August, 1948), 526-533.
36. Jarrell, Randall. "A Sad Heart at the Supermarket", Daedalus, LXXXIX (Summer, 1960), 359-372.
37. Jennings, M. Kent and others. "Trusted Leaders: Perceptions of Appointed Federal Officials", Public Opinion Quarterly, XXX (Fall, 1966), 368-384.
38. Johns-Heine, Patrick and Hans H. Gerth. "Values in Mass Periodical Fiction, 1921-1940", in Bernard Rosenberg and David Manning White, eds. Mass Culture - The Popular Arts in America. New York: The Free Press, 1957, 226-234.

39. Keller, Suzanne. Beyond the Ruling Class - Strategic Elites in Modern Society. New York: Random House, 1963.
40. Key, V. O., Jr. Public Opinion and American Democracy. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.
41. Kilpatrick, Franklin P. and others. The Image of the Federal Service. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1964.
42. Klapp, Orrin E. Heroes, Villains and Fools - The Changing American Character. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962.
43. ----- . Symbolic Leaders - Public Dramas and Public Men. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1964.
44. Kracauer, Siegfried. "National Types as Hollywood Presents Them", Public Opinion Quarterly, XIII (Spring, 1953), 53-72.
45. Lane, Robert E. "Businessmen and Bureaucrats", Social Forces, XXXII (December, 1953), 145-152.
46. Larsen, Roy E. "Our Franchise to Publish Comes from the Public ...", Journalism Quarterly, XXI (December, 1944), 297-303.
47. Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and Robert K. Merton. "Mass Communication, Popular Taste and Organized Social Action", in Bernard Rosenberg and David Manning White, eds. Mass Culture - The Popular Arts in America. New York: The Free Press, 1957, 457-473.
48. "Letter from the Publisher", TIME, June 22, 1959, 9.
49. "Letter from the Publisher", TIME, May 10, 1963, 10-11.
50. "Letter from the Publisher", TIME, April 30, 1965, 25.
51. "Letter from the Publisher", TIME, August 5, 1966, 15.
52. Lewis, Lionel S. "Political Heroes: 1936 and 1960", Journalism Quarterly, XLII (Winter, 1965), 116-118.
53. Lowenthal, Leo. "Historical Perspectives of Popular Culture", in Bernard Rosenberg and David Manning White, eds. Mass Culture - The Popular Arts in America. New York: The Free Press, 1957, 46-58.
54. ----- . Literature, Popular Culture and Society. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961.

55. Matthews, Donald R. "United States Senators and the Class Structure", Public Opinion Quarterly, XVIII (Spring, 1954), 5-22.
56. McQuail, Denis. Towards a Sociology of Mass Communications. London, England: Collier-Macmillan Limited, 1969.
57. Merrill, John C. "How Time Stereotyped Three U.S. Presidents", Journalism Quarterly, XLII (Autumn, 1965), 563-570.
58. Meyerhoff, Barbara G. and William R. Larson. "The Doctor as Culture Hero: The Routinization of Charisma", Human Organization, XXIV (Fall, 1965), 188-191.
59. Mills, C. Wright. The Power Elite. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.
60. Morison, Robert S. "Science and Social Attitudes", Science, CLXV (July 11, 1969), 150-156.
61. "Paintings commissioned for TIME covers: exhibition in Royal Ontario museum", Executive, December, 1965, 19.
62. Parsons, Talcott. "A Revised Analytical Approach to the Theory of Social Stratification", in his Essays in Sociological Theory. New York: The Free Press, 1954, 386-439.
63. Parsons, Talcott and Winston White. "The Mass Media and the Structure of American Society", Journal of Social Issues, XVI (Autumn, 1960), 67-77.
64. Peterson, Theodore. Magazines in the Twentieth Century. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1964.
65. ----- "Why the Mass Media are That Way", The Antioch Review, XXIII (Winter, 1963-64), 405-423.
66. Reeves, Richard. "The Stars Shone Bright on George McGovern", Saturday Review, LV (July 8, 1972), 5-6.
67. Rivers, William L. The Opinionmakers. Boston: Beacon Press, 1965.
68. Root, Robert and Christine V. Root. "Magazines in the United States: Dying or Thriving?", Journalism Quarterly, XLI (Winter, 1964), 15-22.
69. Rosten, Leo. "The Intellectual and the Mass Media", Daedalus, LXXXIX (Summer, 1960), 333-346.
70. Royko, Mike. Boss - Richard J. Daley of Chicago. New York: E.P. Dutton and Company, Inc., 1971.

71. Shils, Edward. "Charisma, Order and Status", American Sociological Review, XXX (April, 1965), 199-213.
72. ----- . "Mass Society and Its Culture", Daedalus, LXXXIX (Summer, 1960), 288-314.
73. Simpson, Richard L. "A Modification of the Functional Theory of Social Stratification", Social Forces, XXXV (December, 1956), 132-137.
74. Sutton, Horace. "Scotty Reston of the Times: The One, The Only - And the Last?", Saturday Review, LV (January 29, 1972), 13-17.
75. Tumin, Melvin M. Social Stratification - The Forms and Functions of Inequality. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
76. Warner, W. Lloyd. The Living and the Dead - A Study of the Symbolic Life of Americans. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1959.
77. Winick, Charles. "Trends in the Occupations of Celebrities: A Study of Newsmagazine Profiles and Television Interviews", The Journal of Social Psychology, LX (June, 1963), 301-310.
78. Wirth, Louis. "Consensus and Mass Communications", American Sociological Review, XIII (February, 1948), 1-15.
79. Withey, Stephen B. "Public Opinion about Science and Scientists", Public Opinion Quarterly, XXIII (Fall, 1959), 382-388.
80. Wolseley, Roland E. Understanding Magazines. Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press, 1969.
81. Wood, James Playsted. Magazines in the United States. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1971.
82. Wright, Charles R. "Functional Analysis and Mass Communication", Public Opinion Quarterly, XXIV (Winter, 1960), 605-620.