

Magazine Coverage of Welfare Recipients
1969-1996: Media Rituals and American Society
(公的扶助受給者のメディア報道 1969-1996 :
メディア儀礼とアメリカ社会)

Tomoko Kanayama*

SUMMARY IN JAPANESE: 本論文は公的扶助受給者の報道におけるメディアの役割を、メディアの儀礼的視点から考察したものである。本研究では、ニクソンからクリントン政権までの27年間にわたって米国の代表的な雑誌で報道された公的扶助関連記事について内容分析を行った。その結果、これらの報道は定期的な儀礼としての機能を帯びていることが認められ、米国に存在してきた「貧困は罪深い」という共通の信念を読者が確認する機会となっていたことが示唆された。このような信念は17世紀のイギリス社会で発生し、その伝統を引き継ぐ米国社会にも受け継がれてきたことは明らかであり、また公的扶助の受益者についての報道を読者が、習慣的かつ、儀礼的に消費する際に影響を与えていたと理解できる。公的扶助の受益者たちと社会への貢献者としての納税者という二つの異なる立場は、報道を通じて、両者間が調和されるよりは、むしろ納税者の公的扶助受給者に対する敵意を強調することになった。米国では植民地時代同様、近代においても貧困者に対する「辱め」や「卑しさ」の観念が、メディアを通じた儀礼によって継続的に示されてきたのである。

* 金山 智子 Institute for Media and Communications Research, Keio University, Tokyo, Japan.

Introduction

"We all know the typical family on welfare today is very different from the one that welfare was designed to deal with 60 years ago."¹ These are the words of former President Bill Clinton upon signing the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act on August 22, 1996. This welfare reform bill was the end of the 61-year-old social welfare system established by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on August 14, 1935.

For six decades the media in the United States paid great attention to people on welfare and welfare reform. While some media scholars revealed stigmatic or stereotypical images of welfare recipients in media portrayals, some studies observed that media framing of these people shaped public perceptions toward them. Through previous studies, most grounded in the transmission view of communication (i.e., the media are the starting points and the audience is the terminus), we learned how the media play a role in creating messages about welfare recipients, transmit them to the public, and influence audiences' views toward these people in society.

The media, however, have another role; that is, to maintain a ritual order.² The ritual view of communication has become more critical in questioning in what ways the media act as channels of connection between different parts of society. Carey in particular suggests that we should understand how the media play a role in maintaining society in time with representation of shared beliefs, not by bringing people together and harmonizing differences but by dividing and reinforcing antagonism.³ However, until now we have not known what specific kinds of shared beliefs were presented in the coverage of people on welfare and how different parts of society were connected by it. This study explores how the media have played a role over time in maintaining a ritual order in society through their coverage of people on welfare.

Social Welfare in America

In the United States, the concept of "social welfare" was developed in connection with the social problems of the industrial era in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.⁴ Its roots, however, could be traced to the establishment of the Poor Law of 1601 in England.⁵ In 1572, Queen Elizabeth signed a statute of Parliament

that was the first legislation to levy a general tax to provide funds for poverty relief and to institutionalize overseers of the poor and collectors for taxes.⁶ In a period of political, religious, and economic changes in England, the Poor Law was established in 1601. It legislated three classes of the poor: 1) “the able-bodied poor,” 2) “the impotent poor,” including the disabled, the old, the sick, the demented, and mothers with young children, and 3) “dependent children,” who were orphans and foundlings and deserted by their parents.⁷

The Poor Law was reformed in 1834 to reduce the cost of poor relief. The able-bodied had to reside in the workhouse (a highly stigmatized institution) to receive relief, and all impotent poor were placed in the same institution. Charles Dickens depicted a little boy’s life in the workhouse in *Oliver Twist* in the 1830s.⁸ This book was so popular that it awakened interest in the poor in British society. Thus, the Poor Law was based on the principle of less eligibility and punitive stigmatization of relief recipients⁹ and implied that being poor was a crime.¹⁰

In the seventeenth century the American colonists inherited the concept that paupers, beggars and vagrants were criminals, and the law of the American colonies incorporated the principle of the Poor Law. The pauper was treated as a morally deficient person and local newspapers announced paupers with a list of their names and the amount of their relief allowances.¹¹ Those poor who resided for a long time and complied with the moral standards of the neighborhood were considered “worthy poor,” whereas all others were regarded as “unworthy poor.”¹² The town or the county had the responsibility to maintain the poor. Poorhouses, almshouses or workhouses were established, and the poor had to live together regardless of gender, illness, age, and other conditions.¹³ Thus, the poor remained the poor during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when the principle of the Poor Law was prevalent in America.

In 1854, President Franklin Pierce vetoed a bill that would grant public land to the states for building mental hospitals. He insisted that the federal government should not help the insane, otherwise all the needy would have to be helped.¹⁴ This resulted in abstention by the federal government from the development of social welfare for eighty years. Moreover, due to the depression of 1930, the unemployed rapidly increased and governmental aid was in urgent need. Despite this, President Herbert Hoover refused federal aid based upon his belief that the American way of handling the emergency was through private charities, not tax money.¹⁵

On August 14, 1935, the signal landmark act in America social welfare history was adopted. Roosevelt signed the Social Security Act as a part of the New Deal programs to provide security against the great disturbing factors in life, especially unemployment and age. This law has been amended over time, but it still serves as the basis of the American social welfare system.¹⁶

With the civil rights movement in the 1960s social welfare was an important political agenda for two presidents in particular: John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson.¹⁷ Under the slogans of "War on Poverty" and "the Great Society" more welfare programs and laws were enacted, including food stamps, Medicaid, and Medicare, to help not only the aged and unemployed but the disabled, women with dependent children, and non-whites. Thus the people who would need welfare were determined in the evolution of American social welfare policies.

Literature Review

"The ideological beliefs that fuel contempt for welfare recipients are deeply rooted in age-old debates about the causes of poverty and public assistance."¹⁸ Scholars in various disciplines have paid attention to what are typical images of welfare recipients among the general public. The stigmatic or stereotypical image of welfare recipients has been recognized as a major social issue. Fiske, Xu, and Cuddy, for example, investigated society's perceptions of social group traits. They found that welfare recipients were the only group substantially both disliked and disrespected among 17 outgroups (e.g., retarded people, migrant workers, Jews, gay men, and rich people).¹⁹ Another study also revealed that people viewed welfare recipients as being more idle, more dishonest, and more fertile than they actually were.²⁰ As such, these studies are evidence that negative or stereotypical images of welfare recipients have firmly existed in U.S. society.

These stereotypical images are fostered by "a process of socialization that involves a gathering of views from a variety of sources, of which media is one."²¹ Media scholars thus have been concerned with the media effects on the construction of such stereotypical images. Many of these studies criticized African Americans being disproportionately portrayed in negative stories on poverty.²² Other studies presented single mothers as more likely to be focused on in media coverage of welfare recipients by showing that the media often depicted them as immoral and neglectful, and responsible for their own poverty.²³

Moreover, since poverty has caused serious social welfare issues to arise, scholars have investigated how media framing of welfare recipients shaped or distorted public opinions of them. For example, Entman identified that stories about poverty focused on behavior that threatens community well-being and/or on the suffering on the poor,²⁴ while Iyengar and Ryan found that the media tended to frame poverty in either an episodic or a thematic issue.²⁵ In addition, poverty is viewed as “the product of political economy,” resulting from styles of dominance, the way power is exercised, and the politics of distribution.²⁶ Grounded in critical theories that connect discourse, ideology and power, de Goede observed how media framing was used in political debate on welfare reform, resulting in naturalizing conservative concepts.²⁷ Sotirovic explains how cultivation of the same images of welfare people through the media would effect audiences as follows:

Media use may not directly change opinions but may both reinforce and challenge individuals’ understanding of the issue by inviting the use of particular frames. Media may not present issues ideologically in the sense of directing audiences toward a certain position, but repeated focus on the same images and ideas restricts access to alternative views and narrows the thinkable solutions to problems.²⁸

In sum, many studies have contributed to understanding media effects in constructing the images of people on welfare, which are often intertwined with racial and gender issues in society and dominant power in political economy, thereby shaping homogenous, negative public perceptions of these people.

Theoretical Framework

Carey emphasizes that communication scholars need to think not only about political and social orders, but also a ritual order.²⁹ A ritual view centers on “the sacred ceremony that draws persons together in fellowship and commonality,” so it is directed toward “the maintenance of society in time with representation of shared belief.”³⁰

Nations exist not only in geographic space but also in media space. Carey articulated:

Symbolic space, while bounded, is inherently vaguer than geographical space because it refers to the points at which people pass out from under the sacred canopy of the nation: the system of meanings, values and identities which legitimate membership. There are places (and occasions) where people are marked, or mark themselves, as apostates, heretics, outsiders, interlopers, subversives, traitors or simply, UnAmerican.³¹

Carey particularly focuses on how the media play a role in explicit rituals of degradation and excommunication, since "rituals of shame, degradation and excommunication are official and sanctioned ceremonies in all societies from the simple to complex."³² Alexander and Jacobs also point out that such semiotic systems of civil society provide "the structured categories of pure and impure into which every member, or potential member, is made to fit."³³ As they argue, "through this historical and cultural process of semiosis, civil society becomes organized around a bifurcating discourse of citizen and enemy, defining the characteristics of worthy, democratic citizens and also of unworthy, counter-democratic enemies."³⁴

With this ritual view of communication, local newspapers in the American colonies era presumably played a ritual role in announcing paupers as morally deficient persons. Print media replaced public occurrences staged in the village square to frame and publicize the liturgy of separation in society.³⁵ Even though the scale of society has become larger and its complexity has increased in the modern era, "rituals of shame and degradation, rituals of passage from a scared to a profane status could be conducted, literary, in *medias res* (Carey's italics)."³⁶

Media scholars including Carey have investigated the media and ritual, focusing particularly on media events (i.e., special events such as the Olympic games, Senate Watergate hearings, the marriage of Prince Charles and Princess Diana).³⁷ Couldry, however, argues that media ritual can also be viewed through the various narratives and consumption of media that we are connected to every day in the social world.³⁸

The two versions are sides of the same coin: the exceptional sense of togetherness we may feel in media events is just a more explicit (ritualized) concentration of the togetherness, which, in a routine way, we act out when we switch on the televisions or radio, or check a news Website, to find out 'what's going on'.³⁹

Taken together, the media may maintain a ritual order in their coverage of people on welfare, which is not a special event but routinely reported in society. Although the ritual order of media coverage of welfare recipients has gained little attention from previous studies, it is important for us to understand this dimension of the role of the mass media in society. By addressing weaknesses in the literature, this study attempts to develop an understanding of how the media have played a role in maintaining a ritual order through their coverage of people on welfare by examining magazine coverage of welfare recipients over time.

This study seeks answers to the following research questions based upon theoretical perspectives of media rituals:

RQ1: What role did the media play through coverage over time of people on welfare?

RQ2: How do the media maintain a ritual order through their coverage of people on welfare?

RQ3: What common values or beliefs were confirmed by examining media coverage of welfare recipients over time?

Methodology

This study examined three national newsmagazines: *Time*, *Newsweek*, and *U.S. News & World Report*, because these magazines have large circulations and coverage of general interest, and have been continuously published for many decades. All articles of the three magazines listed under the *Readers' Guide* categories of "social welfare" and "public welfare" were examined in this study. This study examines 268 total articles (*Time* 51; *Newsweek* 88; *U.S. News & World Report* 129). Because the media seem to have paid a significant amount of attention to welfare reform, this study extensively looks at magazine coverage from 1969 when President Richard Nixon proposed the welfare reform plan, until 1996 when Clinton signed the welfare reform bill.

To examine the role of the media in coverage of people on welfare, this study analyzes the content of each article selected for the study in a qualitative manner. With a definition that "rituals are actions which, because of their patterning, stand in for wider values and frameworks of understanding," Couldry elaborates media framing in the context of ritual as follows.⁴⁰

1. The actions comprising rituals are structured around certain *categories and/or boundaries* (Couldry's italics).
2. Those categories suggest, or stand in for, an underlying *value* (Couldry's italics).
3. This 'value' captures our sense that *the social* (Couldry's italics) is at stake in the ritual.

Based upon this model, this essay focuses on the following four aspects in content analysis:

1. What was the primary theme(s) of the coverage?
2. How were people on welfare categorized in the coverage?
3. Whose voices were mainly used to structure boundaries in the coverage?
4. What value was underlined in boundary or category distinctions among people on welfare in the coverage?

In addition, since social welfare has been closely related to political and social matters, chronologically analyzing these contents in conjunction with social and political changes helps us understand the role of the media in society over time.

Nixon, Ford, Carter, and the Working Poor: 1969-1980

On August 9, 1969, President Nixon presented the Family Assistance Plan to the nation on television and radio, saying, "The present system often makes it possible to receive more money on welfare than on a low-paying job. This creates an incentive not to work; it also is unfair to the working poor ... I propose that we abolish the present welfare system and adopt in its place a new family-assistance system."⁴¹ Under the slogan "the New Federalism,"⁴² Nixon planned to provide money to the poor based on a poverty index and require them to work in return.⁴³

A number of articles covered debates on Nixon's plan. As he introduced "the working poor" as a new category, many articles focused on who would be the working poor, and what kind of people they were. According to a September article in *U.S. News & World Report*, the "working poor" were "People working for wages below what the Government defines as a 'poverty line'."⁴⁴ A three-page article in *U.S. News & World Report* on September 22, 1969 began with the following introduction: "Prolonged debate on the Nixon plan is certain. Mean-

while, taxpayers who pay the bill for welfare wonder—How does the relief system really work now? What kinds of people get welfare checks? Are they pampered?”⁴⁵ This article showed 10 welfare recipients, describing why they went on welfare, how much they earned by themselves and from welfare, and how they spent money to feed a family. Large illustrations were displayed with a cutline, for instance, “Disabled father in Los Angeles gets welfare to support wife and a retarded daughter” and “Chronic case in Alabama. A deserted mother tries to raise five children on \$84 a month.” The article concluded:

That’s a glimpse into the world of welfare, where 10 million Americans depend on a government dole for all or part of their living. Almost half are children, often illegitimate. Many are black. Some are “third generation” welfare families, and they are having children who also are headed for the welfare world. Many, too, are sick people, disabled by inherited defects or sudden disease.

Of those now on welfare, few work ... some are lazy, unmotivated and untrained. But others are on the job when and as they can be. They often are penalized ... for their efforts. One of the big goals of Mr. Nixon’s plan is to give the ‘working poor’ more money, if they continue to work.⁴⁶

A July 1970 issue of *U.S. News & World Report* included an interview with Daniel P. Moynihan, an adviser to Nixon on domestic policies. Moynihan noted, “Remember that a quarter of the American population has an I.Q. [intelligence quotient] under 85 ... God makes some smart people and He makes some dumb people ... They can do useful work, but not the kind of work for which anyone would pay a lot of money.”⁴⁷

Moreover, some articles brought the racial issue into welfare reform.⁴⁸ An article in *U.S. News & World Report* on August 18, 1969, reported that the problem on Aid to Families of Dependent Children (AFDC) became more serious because of “growing Negro populations.”⁴⁹ Moynihan⁵⁰ also addressed in his interview, which was supposed to focus more on the welfare plan, various black issues from blacks’ birth rate to the black silent majority. “If you solve the social-class problems, most race problems would disappear,”⁵¹ he commented.

In April 1970, while Nixon’s welfare reform plan was bogged down in political chaos,⁵² the magazines wrote more about the existing welfare system. On Febru-

ary 8, 1971, *Time* and *Newsweek* published articles focusing on welfare recipients. A five-page article in *Time* featured six short and four long stories on these people.⁵³ Details in these stories included the reasons they went on welfare, the types of aid they relied on, and the amount of money they received from welfare. The article included eight pictures that highlighted non-white people, for example “non-white people waiting for petitioning legislators,” “blacks waiting at a welfare office,” “a black mother with five children at a motel,” “welfare client in Harlem apartment,” and “home of welfare recipient in Tennessee.” The article explicated what it meant to be poor: “To be poor in 20th century America is to suffer the heightened frustration and deeper bitterness of watching the trillion-dollar gross national product paraded on a television set standing in a barren room. It is also to endure a dehumanization that only serves to make welfare clients even less able to care, or want to care, for themselves.”⁵⁴

Newsweek's article, “Welfare—the Shame of a Nation,” also illustrated people on welfare in seven pages. “Rage, hysteria—and tears—are all staples of the U.S. welfare system,” the article noted.⁵⁵ A story featured in the article was “The Shame of the Cities,” portraying welfare recipients’ lives in New York City:

Mrs. Dorothy Neal has never heard of Charles Dickens, but that compassionate portraitist of Victorian squalor would know all about Mrs. Neal. Certainly there is something quintessentially Dickensian about New York City’s Broadway Central Hotel, where the 31-year-old black welfare recipient currently lives with her nine children and with 300 other welfare families who, for a complex range of reasons, have been unable to find low-cost apartments ... Some doors sagged on broken hinges, the bilious green walls were grimy and graffiti-stained and the gagging stench of excrement oozed from a hallway toilet.

In Room 493, Mrs. Neal stared dully as an enormous cockroach skittered across a table, fell to the floor and disappeared under the filthy carpet. “I sleep on the floor,” she said wearily. “We only have one bed, you know, and so sometimes I sleep on the floor.” Mrs. Neal sighed as she gazed around the room, which contained only one dilapidated dresser, a table, one small soiled chair, a packing trunk and the rickety bed. Down the hall from Mrs. Neal’s room, hot water hissed from a broken tap in the men’s room. “I just make it,” she finally said quietly. “I just make it.”⁵⁶

In those days, AFDC recipients mushroomed because of a swelling number of female-headed families, and it became an urgent issue in welfare reform. A February 1971 article in *U.S. News & World Report* reported, "A big factor in New York's welfare spiral is 'desertion'—either the husband leaves home or his wife claims that he does. In many cases, the father never really deserts. He just stays out of sight so the woman can get on AFDC rolls."⁵⁷ Meanwhile, "the images of the AFDC mother with her swarm of fatherless children typifies the indolent, irresponsible poor, carelessly breeding public charges. The reality is less extravagant," *Newsweek* reported.⁵⁸

After 1971, "who are in poverty" and "who are poor" became main topics in such articles. An article in *U.S. News & World Report* in July 1971 described what was poverty in America: "Today, in a richer America, the criterion of poverty is 'deprivation' or 'disadvantage'—poverty that is not absolute in itself, but relative to others' affluence."⁵⁹ One year later, this magazine again dealt with the same topic. The profiles of the poor were presented with graphs, charts, and tables, which indicated "the richest nation in the world may always have a large number of 'hard-core' poor who need help to maintain even a minimum-level existence."⁶⁰

Shana Alexander, a *Newsweek* columnist, commented on October 30, 1972 that "We still blame the poor for being poor ... The poor ought not be punished for being poor. Access to food, clothing, shelter and medical care is a basic human right."⁶¹ Milton Friedman criticized Alexander's perspective, writing in his *Newsweek* column that "If I have the 'right' to food in this sense, someone must have the obligation to provide it. Just who is that? If it is Ms. Alexander, does that not convert her into my slave?"⁶² In 1973, Nixon's Family Assistance Plan could not pass the Senate and eventually it was abandoned.⁶³

In 1975, Gerald Ford became U.S. president. He shelved Nixon's guaranteed income because of its cost. While he had no particular social welfare plan, the number of welfare recipients had skyrocketed, especially middle-class people due to inflation and unemployment.⁶⁴ In September 1975, *Time* reported, "If there is one thing that politicians and the public agree on—and have agreed on for a decade or more—it is that the U.S. has the world's worst welfare mess."⁶⁵ Social welfare was a top priority in America at that time.

Under these circumstances, *U.S. News & World Report* published a six-page special report on June 7, 1976. The article extensively covered debasement of the poor on welfare: "Welfare recipients are depicted as bewildered victims who are

shunted from one office to another, harassed by constantly changing regulations, forced to break up their families and even discouraged from finding the jobs that would break their circle of poverty.”⁶⁶ The article described the two feelings toward the poor typical of Americans—sympathy and conviction to help them, and fear of being cheated by them. The article then explained the distinction between ‘deserving poor’ who became poor through no fault of their own, and ‘undeserving poor’ who received benefits for a long time without working.⁶⁷ Four welfare recipients, including an urban white, a Puerto Rican, a black and a rural white, were presented in the article. Typical depictions of these people were how they went on welfare, how much they received, and how they viewed welfare. For instance, the title of one story was “A Thief or a Liar”:

Mrs. Janice W, 28, is an unemployed typist who is divorced and has a young son. For the last 2½ years she has been drawing welfare benefits of \$238 a month. From that amount, she spends \$40 monthly to buy \$90 worth of food stamps. “We can’t eat properly on \$90 a month,” ... “I don’t know how people manage with older children, certainly not with teenagers. And I don’t blame people on welfare who take toilet paper and soap out of public rest rooms.” The welfare program forces you to be a thief or a liar. “If welfare finds out that you got an extra \$30 by selling a table, they deduct it from your next check. So you learn quickly to not tell.”⁶⁸

This story ended with her fears and hopes for the future.

In 1977, when Jimmy Carter became president, he basically followed Nixon’s guaranteed income concept, which was to provide single cash payments and to require work of those who were able-bodied.⁶⁹ The poor and poverty remained main topics of welfare issues covered by the magazines. On August 8, *U.S. News & World Report* noted that “The President sees it as a cure for the ‘pauperization’ of a large segment of American society; opponents fear it may only drag more families into the demoralizing cycle the welfare supposedly has inflicted on many recipients.”⁷⁰

In August, Paul A. Samuelson, a columnist for *Newsweek*, wrote: “It is still true in 1977 that our society is divided between those in poverty and the rest ... Instead, to be in poverty is to be old. To be black. To have been uneducated. To be a female head of household. Changes in family composition turn out to be crucial factors.”⁷¹ “Is Poverty Dead?” was the title of one *Newsweek* article in

October 1978. The article reported that the nation should focus more on the root causes of poverty and the redefinition of poverty “involving not material hardship but spiritual deprivation.”⁷² *U.S. News & World Report*’s article of January 1979 also provided a view of the causes and nature of poverty:

At opposite poles are the sociologists who see poverty primarily as a situational problem characterized by misfortune, and the anthropologists, who believe a large segment of the poor is caught in a self-perpetuating culture of poverty. Whatever put them there, millions of people find themselves trapped in a cycle that apparently has no beginning and no end. A legacy of poverty passes from one generation to the next.⁷³

The black poor in particular became a “permanent underclass.” “While other racial and ethnic groups have climbed the income ladder, the black poor feel an economic and social isolation previously unknown in this country,”⁷⁴ as the article explained.

The public has awakened to the importance of the social welfare issue. Carter, however, failed to reform social welfare during his presidency as the previous two presidents did. It was left to the next president to solve the welfare mess.

During 10 years with three administrations, stories on welfare recipients typically appeared in these magazines, when a new welfare system was proposed by a new administration or when the existing welfare system became a serious problem. Even though the welfare system was supposed to be a main theme in many articles, these stories often spent more pages on what kind of people would be on welfare. Welfare recipients were labeled with names such as “working poor,” “deserving poor,” “undeserving poor,” “hard-core poor,” and “permanent poor,” each of which attached to a rank among these welfare people. The media, as observed, gave details in central coverage of who were welfare recipients and how they lived, as if it were a glimpse into another world, sometimes called “the world of welfare.” These articles often invited elite people, including politicians, editors and other intellectuals, to give their opinions of welfare recipients as well as the welfare system. These comments typically took the taxpayers’ position, blaming with little sympathy welfare people who lived on their taxes. What it meant to be poor seemed to be a core theme of many articles, and the reader might find or confirm the answer through words that repeatedly appeared in such articles: “dehumanization,” “deprivation,” and “pauperization.”

Reagan and the New Poor: 1981-1988

“Workfare” was proposed by former president Ronald Reagan, a successful welfare reformer while governor of California. In it, able-bodied welfare recipients would take public service jobs to repay a part of their benefits. Reagan hoped to cut nearly \$12 billion from welfare programs, including food stamps, housing subsidies, AFDC and Medicaid. Since the workfare plan had caused fear, anger, and opposition among social groups and welfare recipients, a number of articles dealt with it.⁷⁵ *Newsweek* published “How the Poor Will Be Hurt” on March 23, 1981. The article introduced criticism from social service organizations, such as “a psychological assault on the poor,” and “pennies taken from the poor hurt far more than dollars taken from the wealthy.”⁷⁶ An unexpected conclusion, however, was that “workfare may make taxpayers feel better, and, consequently, is good politics in the Reagan era.”⁷⁷

While the workfare plan was under attack by social groups and welfare recipients, the Reagan administration offended these groups with the protection of taxpayers’ rights. An article in *Time* pointed out that in April 1981, “In this view, a compassionate Government should continue to assist the disadvantaged, but the proper level of help has to be determined by the interests of society as a whole.”⁷⁸ *U.S. News & World Report* published the article, which had previously appeared in the *New York Times*, describing a taxpayer’s mixed feelings toward welfare families. The article said:

While window-shopping at a lobster pound and bemoaning the astronomical prices, I spoke to the owner. “See this?” he said while fanning food stamps. “The only lobster sales I’ve had today were paid for by these. Sad commentary, huh?” Huh, indeed. I left, half-heartedly clutching a small package of frozen fish ... It’s not that I begrudge the needy. It’s just that I begrudge living less well than they do.⁷⁹

In July 1981, \$35 billion in budget cuts were passed by Congress.⁸⁰ The issues of poverty or the poor appeared in half of all 22 articles in 1982.⁸¹ On January 4, 1982, *Time* introduced the story that the government distributed 30 million pounds of surplus cheese to the poor.⁸² This event was well illustrated by *Newsweek’s* article in February:

The scene conjured up images of the Great Depression. Thousands of poor people, including pensioners and young mothers with infants swaddled in blankets against the biting chill, stood in line for hours outside Washington ... to receive their share of the 30 million pounds of surplus government-owned cheese that President Reagan has agreed to give away to America's poor.⁸³

A six-page article in *Newsweek* was an extensive report on the issues of the poor and welfare recipients. It displayed large pictures of "a welfare black mother," "a family in Appalachia," "a black elderly woman on the bed," and "a family holding a foreclosure notice."⁸⁴ The article portrayed who were poor and how they became poor:

They are young and old, black and white: increasingly, they are women ... heading households of children who risk perpetuating the cycle of poverty into yet another generation. They live in the cities and in the country-sides, in the shadows of Atlanta's gleaming new high rises and on dairy farms in southwestern Wisconsin. They are the "working poor" who toil as waitresses and day laborers and live on the edge. And they are the "new poor," a group pushed below the poverty line by a go-slow economy—and in danger of becoming the "permanent poor," a growing group for whom the temporary crutch of welfare has turned into a straitjacket of lifelong dependency.⁸⁵

The "new poor" was focused on in *U.S. News & World Report* in August 1982.⁸⁶ "The Victim List" also was supplied in showing the new poor, including "displaced factory workers and government employees whose jobless benefits have expired." "Most are shocked at suddenly finding themselves in the same predicament as those who have been on welfare for years,"⁸⁷ the article noted.

The year of 1982 ended with *Newsweek's* article, "The Hard-Luck Christmas of '82." The pictures showed a homeless family parked outside Houston, an old black man with a charity gift, an old white man having a bowl of soup, a girl held by a volunteer Santa, and a huge crowd of unemployed steelworkers lining up for free supplies. Americans knew little about those people's lives. This was the theme of the article:

It is good to be reminded that Americans' best impulses are still close enough to the surface to be touched by television, but as a medium of social justice the 6 o'clock news is woefully inadequate ... Many can be almost invisible, unless you're looking for them: criss-crossing the nation in their battered station wagons with baby strollers lashed to the roofs, heads bowed in grace at the anonymous long tables of Help House ... They represent the only aspect of American life that has been uplifted by the continuing recession: a much better class of poor person, better educated, accustomed to working, with strong family ties.⁸⁸

As Dickens⁸⁹ portrayed life in the workhouse in the 1830s, *Time* depicted life in the shelter on Bannon Street in California on March 14, 1983:

House rules are strict: residents are awakened every day at 6 a.m. and receive a bed check at 9 a.m. Liquor, drugs and sex are forbidden, and smoking is not allowed in the dormitories. For entertainment, the shelter provides Bible classes and Alcoholics Anonymous meetings. For up to seven days a month, the 70 or so men and women who live at the shelter must work at menial tasks around the county.⁹⁰

"A lot of people refuse to go through the application process when they see that Bannon Street is the option,"⁹¹ a director of social welfare department noted in the article.

Since 1981, more than half of the states had taken welfare programs to welfare recipients on AFDC and food stamps. Nevertheless, the number of welfare recipients on AFDC did not decline. In December 1984, an article in *U.S. News & World Report* indicated the "feminization" of the poor as the biggest generator of persistent poverty.⁹² These women, called "dependent underclass," were unmarried mothers, mothers with many children, and women who had not earned any income before going on AFDC. In addition, "society's untouchables"⁹³ were described as the people who were released from mental hospitals due to mental-health care cut and became homeless eventually. The article said, "Whether labeled 'underclass' or 'new poor,' the ranks of the needy—at least by the official poverty definition—have swelled during the Reagan years."⁹⁴

"Messages from a Welfare Mom" was brought to readers in *Newsweek* on May 23, 1988. One single mother on welfare wrote eight messages in the article.⁹⁵ This

was the only article carrying the welfare single mother's direct voice (neither edited nor interviewed) to readers in the 1980s. In October 1988, the Family Welfare Reform Act was passed by Congress, not only for poor people or taxpayers but also for bi-partisans, especially Democrats concerned with taking the next administration.⁹⁶

Because welfare reform was a top priority under the Reagan administration, the magazines frequently covered welfare issues during his presidency. A new type of welfare recipient was categorized as "new poor" compared to lower ranked ones, such as "dependent underclass" and "permanent poor." Also, in this media coverage welfare recipients were often mentioned as "them," separated from most Americans who were called "you" or "us." These magazines vividly depicted the welfare recipients' lives that "Americans" could not generally see, or even know in their lives. The primary tone of most stories toward people on welfare seemed un-sympathetic. Rather, it was like a fiction, which might make the reader surprised, angry, or despise the poor. Little chance was given for welfare recipients to voice their feelings or thoughts in the media.

Bush, Clinton, and Unmarried Mothers: 1989-1996

When George Bush became president in 1989, more social problems such as recession, crime, immigration issues and teenage pregnancy existed. The welfare reform bill of 1988 would not work well.⁹⁷ In addition, the Bush administration took little action on welfare policy. The welfare issue, as a result, became much messier. Many articles concentrated more on who people on welfare were than on the causes of social problems. In other words, those on welfare were described as the root of social problems.

In 1989, *Newsweek* brought up the issue of "welfare migrants" who migrated from one state (or county) to another in seeking higher welfare benefits. The article noted that "Growing numbers of welfare migrants have put a strain on schools, created a housing crunch, introduced street gangs and driven up the crime rate ... Though not all newcomers are minorities, the debate has raised the ugly specter of racism in a state relatively unused to it."⁹⁸

Barbara Ehrenreich's essay in December 1991 touched upon the issue of blacks on welfare: "Come on, my fellow white folks, we have something to confess ... friends, the biggest secret known to whites since the invention of powdered

rouge: welfare is a white program.”⁹⁹ She closed, “We can keep pretending that welfare is a black program and a scheme for transferring our earnings to the pockets of shiftless, dark-skinned people. Or we can clear our throats, blush prettily and admit that we are hurting too.”¹⁰⁰

The government’s role in changing amoral behavior had been pushed by some politicians, specifically Clinton, the governor of Arkansas. In a January article of *Newsweek*, George F. Will, a columnist, described a behavior modification toward the poor called “new paternalism”:

There is an emerging consensus that government has an interest in, and a right to attempt, behavior modification among those who are sunk in dependency on public assistance. So there is a need to know more about what government can legitimately do to nurture in citizens the character traits requisite for personal independence. There is a less sentimental and less politically timid assessment of what constitutes “caring.” Americans are recurring to the Victorian distinction between the “deserving” and “undeserving” poor.¹⁰¹

In April 30, 1992, the Los Angeles riots occurred. This event again cast a spotlight on the problems of poverty and urban decay.¹⁰² In a *Newsweek* article, Mickey Kaus described the “black underclass” who were economically left over in the city and could survive because of the welfare programs. He stressed, “Without welfare, those left behind in the ghetto would have had to move to where the jobs were. Without welfare, it would have been hard for single mothers to survive without forming working families ... Welfare is how the underclass [unhappily, unintentionally] survives. Change welfare, and the underclass will have to change as well.”¹⁰³

Thus, rising in the constellation of issues were “civic disorder, violent street crime, a seemingly permanent establishment of the dysfunctional poor and a newer establishment of the ‘shelterized’ homeless”¹⁰⁴ as well as the creation of “a more polarized society in which haves and have-nots glare at each other across a widening economic and social chasm.”¹⁰⁵ Clinton, the democratic presidential candidate, vowed that “in my administration we’re going to put an end to welfare as we have come to know it” under his slogan “New Covenant.”¹⁰⁶

In 1993, Clinton became the forty-second president of the United States. As promised, he proposed welfare reform. It would provide two years of cash

assistance and generous education, training, child-care support and a tax credit by eliminating AFDC programs with swelling number of recipients.¹⁰⁷ His plan was not different from those that Nixon, Carter and Reagan promised to slash the dole—putting able-bodied adults to work. A big difference was individual responsibility for welfare recipients.

While “individual responsibility” was argued lively, many articles had covered the issues of unmarried mothers, especially teenage mothers. Robert J. Samuelson’s *Newsweek* article in September 1993 covered black teenage mothers. He said more black teens became single mothers than whites because of a mixture of societal trends, economic changes, and the family patterns of American black culture.¹⁰⁸ He concluded, “more important, emphasizing the moral principle that people shouldn’t have babies before they’re ready to take care of them. Everyone agrees on this principle, and the differences lie in how, if at all, it can be reinforced by government policies.”¹⁰⁹

One single mother’s anger, suspicion, irony, and fight against the welfare policy were introduced in *Newsweek* on December 6, 1993. “Is this really such a major financial burden? I believe we’re targeted because we’re an easy mark. Because we have no money, there are no lobbyists working on our behalf either in Washington, D.C., or in local legislatures.”¹¹⁰

On December 13, “The Out-of-Wedlock Question” described how the government viewed the immorality of those who were unmarried mothers and teenage mothers. Quotes from administrators and politicians were included. One was from Danna Shalala, a Health and Human Services secretary; “Teenagers are not small adults ... That they are [giving birth to so many children] ought to horrify all of us.’ ... ‘I don’t like to put this in moral terms, but I do believe that having children out of wedlock is just wrong.’”¹¹¹ Another quote said, “the draconian solution proposed by political scientist Charles Murray—denying welfare to anyone who has a child out of wedlock, and placing in orphanages those children whose parents can’t support them ... ‘I’d like to see the Murray solution tried somewhere—just to see, y’know, what might happen,’ said a dyed-in-wool, but curious, White House liberal.”¹¹²

In an editorial in *U.S. News & World Report* on December 13, Michael Ruby reported that nearly one of every three births was out of wedlock and two out of three African-American babies were born to single mothers.¹¹³ Michael Barone warned in an article on December 20 that society might move toward “dystopia” due to affluent unwed mothers as well as illegitimate children, and racial and ethnic quotas.¹¹⁴

In 1994, more articles covered the issue of unmarried mothers and teenage mothers.¹¹⁵ In a *Newsweek* essay on March 21, George F. Will questioned whether welfare mothers would have fundamental rights to make decisions about family composition, conception and childbirth without undue governmental intrusion.¹¹⁶ The story of the extended family of one woman was introduced, based on the report of Charles M. Sennott of the Boston Globe:

She has had seventeen children. One died, two others are in Puerto Rico. The other 14, ranging in age from their early 20s to 40s, are all on welfare. Rivera, 65, has 74 grandchildren, "virtually all of whom have come of age in the welfare system and many of whom are beginning to apply for welfare themselves," ... Rivera's 15 great-grandchildren are a fourth welfare generation.

The Rivera family of about 100 may be costing taxpayers from \$750,000 to \$1 million a year. One of Rivera's daughters, who does not work because of what she calls "anxiety attacks," gets \$820 a month, plus Medicaid, plus a subsidized apartment. When Sennott asked her about taxpayers' anger, she said, "Just tell them to keep paying," and slammed down the phone.¹¹⁷

"The Vicious Cycle" was the cover story of *Time* on June 20, 1994. This eight-page pictorial article displayed subheads such as, "When young, single women have children, it almost guarantees they will be poor. Can welfare reform break the pattern?" and "Everyone recognizes that dealing with births out of wedlock is the central issue of welfare reform."¹¹⁸ The article began with this story:

One day this past winter there came a defining moment in the fight over the true cause of America's moral breakdown. It was the day police in Chicago arrived at a small apartment, opened the door and faced 19 children living in a squalor so wretched that one child pleaded to a female officer, "Will you be my mommy? I want to go home with you." ... "Body count, yes, body count. Kids dying, kids abused, kids cut up, ... This isn't child neglect, its child endangerment." The Chicago story was a classic example of how a big-hearted, deep-pocketed government ends up subsidizing disaster. In all, the six mothers who live in filth were collecting \$5,496 a month in welfare payments. The system will keep on paying such women as long as they

keep having children, don't get married and don't get a job.¹¹⁹

After illustrating other stories, the article reported that "Since teenage mothers form the hard core of the welfare population, consuming \$34 billion in benefits a year, and are the least likely to climb out of poverty, [Clinton] has made teen-pregnancy prevention a pillar of his program."¹²⁰

Four articles focused on this issue but from different angles. Two articles described psychological reasons causing teen pregnancy.¹²¹ A June article in *Newsweek* told how teenage fathers felt about marriage and responsibility to babies: "Anthony visits his 1-year-old son in Boston regularly ... He often helps buy clothing and food for the child ... 'Marriage is a big step, ... I want everything to be right. I might have a baby with her, but I haven't found Miss Right.' In his peer group, sex happens when you're a kid, babies when you're a teen and weddings—maybe—when you're an adult."¹²²

Barbara Ehrenreich's essay in *Time* introduced the feminine points of view to the debate on illegitimacy in August 1994.

In English common law, an out-of-wedlock child was *filius nullius*, meaning child of no one. This kid was a bastard; the mother, being single and female, counted for nothing at all. The immediate victims of the new welfare rhetoric will be the children of poor single women.

But the ultimate targets of the antiwelfare rhetoric are women, and not only the poor ... She's officially manless, in defiance of the patriarchal norm, just like any brazen executive class single mother by choice. At the same time, she's irritatingly "dependent," like the old-fashioned, cookie-baking mom ... the welfare mom is too poor and despised to mount a defense.¹²³

While the magazine carried articles about teenage and unmarried mothers on social welfare, immigrants also became a problem for social welfare in 1994.¹²⁴

In 1995, some articles reported the reality of welfare reform and the social changes. The cover story of *U.S. News & World Report* on January 16 illustrated seven hurdles that prevented AFDC recipients from working: "skills and aptitude," "experience and attitude," "depressed and disabled," "domestic abuse," "drinking and drugs," "unwed teenage mothers" and "money and manpower."¹²⁵ It said:

Many women are hobbled not only by their lack of experience but also by their casual attitudes toward punctuality, dress and co-workers. Caseworkers tell of welfare mothers who believed they could skip work to pick up a free Thanksgiving turkey, did not know it was bad form to wear high-top sneakers and a cowboy hat to a job interview or thought they had to quit work because a child got chickenpox.

Rebecca Ybarra was once employed as a stocker in an electronics-assembly plant, earning as much as \$7 an hour. But since she went on AFDC nine years ago, the high school dropout has worked only sporadically ... She eliminates some jobs because "I'm not really a morning person" and rules out the 3 p.m.-to-11 p.m. shift because "then I wouldn't get to see my kids." Still, she says she wants to work and hopes her two children will one day look to her as a role model rather than as someone who sits home watching TV "just waiting for a check."¹²⁶

Joe Klein described how social conditions were different from those 100 years ago in two issues of *Newsweek*.¹²⁷ He questioned whether stigmatization would work to reduce the underclass on welfare. By indicating the sexually irresponsible culture of poverty today, the article said, "It is impossible to stigmatize the poor if our society is shameless."¹²⁸

While single welfare mothers were under fire from politicians and scholars, *Time* in July 1995 wondered what solution was most likely to be taken by politicians:

Who's the latest public enemy No. 1? The unwed mom. "The epidemic of illegitimacy is our most serious social problem," says Bill Clinton. "It drives everything else," says Charles Murray, ... "crime, drugs, poverty, illiteracy, welfare, homelessness."

What to do? Most everyone, it seems, has the same answer: cut off payments to mothers who have additional kids while on welfare.

"Nonsense," says Daniel Moynihan, ... "We really don't know what to do, and anyone who thinks that cutting benefits can affect sexual behavior doesn't know human nature." Guess who's won this argument so far.¹²⁹

The public knew who was the final winner in the argument on August 22, 1996, when Clinton finally signed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act after going through huge political and social controversies. The bill made "the social contract between the government and the poor."¹³⁰ Since then, the articles have covered the new welfare system, not people on welfare.

Thus, people on welfare were also focused on by the magazines, as intertwined with political and social issues, under the Bush and Clinton administrations. In these articles various types of welfare recipients were portrayed, including "welfare migrant," "black underclass," "the dysfunctional poor" and "unmarried mother (or unwed mom)." Typical portrayals of these people and their lives were as stupid, shameful, immoral, hopeless, abysmal, hated, and/or hostile. Welfare people's voices were occasionally used in their stories not for giving an opportunity to defend them but for emphasizing such negative images further. On the other hand, politicians, administrators, editors, and columnists who were concerned with societal deterioration had added many more voices to these articles, blaming these welfare recipients as the root of social problems and the enemy of the American public. Although these magazines often introduced an individual, episodic, or extreme case of people on welfare, their conclusion or discussion was always extended to a social or even national issue.

Conclusion

For 30 years, when a new administration introduced welfare reform policy or social problems increased, the media brought the world of welfare before the public. This media coverage, regardless of changes of government and welfare reform policy, focused most on "who the people on welfare were," "how they became poor" and "how they lived" in this world.

Readers were told similar stories over and over. Not to work despite being able-bodied is a crime. Not to comply with the moral standard or social norm of society is considered sinful. Apparently, the concepts inherited from the seventeenth century firmly remain today. Carey mentioned that reading a newspaper could be perceived "more as attending a mass, a situation in which nothing new is learned but in which a particular view of the world is portrayed and confirmed."¹³¹ An underlying order of things is manifested in various material forms, according to Carey.¹³² From his point of view, readers might not learn new things in the

magazine coverage of welfare recipients but have their belief confirmed that being poor is sinful. In this sense, magazine coverage might be viewed as a ritual ceremony periodically provided to readers to confirm this common value.

British scholars Peter Golding and Sue Middleton point out that "While throughout the Victorian period effort never ceased to keep the principles of 1834 aloft, a burgeoning newspaper press became available to give house room to the slogans, mythologies, passion and debate surrounding society's continuing bewilderment about what to do with the poor."¹³³ The similarity of this British press to American newsmagazine coverage of welfare recipients can be seen in this study. Given typical feelings in the coverage of people on welfare and from bipartisan political debates and opinions from experts in the field, readers might share their bewilderment, participate in the debate, or get advice from such experts with regard to what they would do with people who needed welfare.

Welfare recipients have gradually changed since Roosevelt established the social welfare system in 1935. The magazines not only played a role in describing who was on welfare but also in categorizing those who were the sinners in society over time. The articles in the three magazines particularly focused on who were the new people falling into these categories by indicating new names or labels such as "working poor," "new poor," "dependent underclass" and "permanent underclass." However, the two fundamental categories, "deserving" and "undeserving," seemingly have not changed. Golding and Middleton argue:

The language and arguments of class were replaced by an assumed national consensus voiced by a press ... It fixed an understanding of social reform and poverty in the moral rhetoric of late-Victorian liberalism firmly into the vocabulary and tone of popular journalism at its birth. At the same time it undoubtedly helped prevent the radicalization of a Labour movement approach to poverty by confirming the divisions between casual and respectable poor, between the residuum and the deserving, in fact and in beliefs.

This might be applied to magazine coverage, which always discriminated between the deserving poor and undeserving poor, no matter who was labeled with new categories. This also could be explained by the fact that the magazines extensively focused on the "undeserving poor" such as unwed mothers, the black underclass, immigrants and the homeless, and covered much less the "deserving poor" including the aged, the disabled and the mentally ill. In essence we can

understand that the two classes of the poor, the “worthy poor” and the “unworthy poor” established in the eighteenth century, has continued in society, and the media might represent it ritually.

“Under a ritual view, then, news is not information but drama.”¹³⁴ Throughout many descriptions about welfare recipients in magazine coverage were nonfiction or real stories rather than simple facts or informative episodes. Such stories portrayed awful or terrible lives, unusual or deviant behavior by those people, or dramatic events that happened to them. The pictures in the articles also were sometimes shocking, sometimes sad, and sometimes unbelievable. These stories and pictures were typically dramatized in the articles, to involve readers in the stories. Carey indicated that readers engage in a continual shift of roles or of dramatic focus through dramatized stories, and join the world through the drama as an observer at play.¹³⁵ With this perspective, readers might be involved in a world of poverty as an observer for a moment.

As observed, a similar pattern existed in structuring these stories in the magazine coverage for many years. These stories first presented how little money people on welfare received and how their lives were like hell, so readers might feel compassion, deep pity or surprise. These stories also typically showed how vast amounts of (tax) money were actually used by a whole nation for helping these people. With this story development, perhaps, the readers’ sympathy for people on welfare was wiped away. Instead, it might lead them as taxpayers to feel angry toward “the social enemy” who wasted their money. That might be interpreted as a ritual act, about which Carey wrote: “In testimony to a still fertile historical metaphor, we often call the search for victims collectively subject to these rituals a ‘witch hunt.’”¹³⁶

In conclusion, based upon the ritual view of communication, this study explored how newsmagazine coverage of welfare recipients contributed to maintaining the common belief that being poor in the United States is sinful, a notion inherited from the Poor Law in the seventeenth century. This study also showed how the media contributed to connecting two worlds—people in the world of welfare and people outside the world of welfare—not by reconciling these two but by reinforcing hostility toward people on welfare. Regarding further study, it might be beneficial to examine how media coverage of welfare recipients changed after the welfare reform bill was enacted by Clinton in 1996.

Notes

- 1 Tim McNulty, "Clinton signs Welfare Reform; strict benefit curbs, state role key points," *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, 23 August 1996.
- 2 See Tamar Liebes and James Curran, eds., *Media, Ritual and Identity* (London: Routledge, 1998); James W. Carey, *Communication as Culture: Essays on Media and Society* (New York: Routledge, 1989).
- 3 See Carey, *Communication as Culture*; James W. Carey, "Political ritual on television," *Media, Ritual and Identity* (London: Routledge, 1998).
- 4 Walter A. Friedlander, *Introduction to Social Welfare* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1961), 5. According to him, social welfare is defined as "the organized system of social services and institutions, designed to aid individuals and groups to attain satisfying standards of life and health, and personal and social relationships which permit them to develop their full capacities and to promote their well-being in harmony with the needs of their families and the community."
- 5 *Ibid.*, 15-62.
- 6 See *Ibid.*, 15-16; and Ralph Dolgoff, Donald Feldstein, and Louise Skolnik, *Understanding Social Welfare* (New York: Longman, 1997), 52-53; Before this law was established, there existed several laws including the statute of 1531 and 1536 that strictly prohibited the able-bodied poor to beg. See Dolgoff, Feldstein, and Skolnik, *Understanding Social Welfare*, 51.
- 7 Friedlander, *Introduction to Social Welfare*, 16-17. During the fourteenth century, the two classes of the poor were already initiated: "the able-bodied poor" who could earn their living and "the impotent poor" who were unable to work, including the blind, the lame, the aged, the sick, young children, and pregnant women. The Poor Law of 1601 set the pattern of public relief under governmental responsibility for Great Britain for 300 years. See *Ibid.*, 12-13.
- 8 Even today, "Oliver Twist" is sometimes used as a metaphor of the severe life in a shelter, almshouse, or workhouse. "Dickensian" is used to indicate typical harsh poverty-stricken living conditions. See *Encarta World English Dictionary* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999), 500.
- 9 Dolgoff, Feldstein, and Skolnik, *Understanding Social Welfare*, 59.
- 10 Friedlander, *Introduction to Social Welfare*, 25.
- 11 *Ibid.*, 68.
- 12 *Ibid.*, 69.
- 13 *Ibid.*, 71-73.
- 14 Dolgoff, Feldstein, and Skolnik, *Understanding Social Welfare*, 79.
- 15 Friedlander, *Introduction to Social Welfare*, 118. Hoover finally signed the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, which loaned the state and local government money for relief and public work relief projects. See *Ibid.*, 120.
- 16 See Dolgoff, Feldstein, and Skolnik, *Understanding Social Welfare*, 94; and Friedlander, *Introduction to Social Welfare*, 132-33.
- 17 John H. Ehrenreich, *The Altruistic Imagination: A History of Social Work and Social Policy in the United States* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985), 158-86.

- 18 Hearther E. Bullock, Karen Fraser Wyche, and Wendy R. Williams, "Media Images of the Poor," *Journal of Social Issues* 57, no. 2 (2001): 234.
- 19 Susan T. Fiske, Jun Xu, and Amy C. Cuddy, "(Dis)respecting versus (Dis)liking: Status and Interdependence Predict Ambivalent Stereotypes of Competence and Warmth," *Journal of Social Issues* 55, no. 3 (1999): 473-89.
- 20 John B. Williamson, "Beliefs About the Welfare Poor" *Sociology and Social Research* 58 (1974): 163-75.
- 21 Paul Spicker, *Stigma and Social Welfare* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1984), 132.
- 22 Rosalee A. Clawson and Rakuya Trice, "Poverty As We Know It: Media Portrayals of the Poor," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 64 (2000): 53-64; Martin Gilens, *Why American Hate Welfare: Race, Media, and the Politics of Antipoverty Policy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 102-32; and Martin Gilens, "Race and Poverty in America: Public Misperceptions and the American News Media," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 60 (1996): 515-41; Jill Quadagno, *The Color of Welfare: How Racism Undermined the War on Poverty* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).
- 23 Bullock, Wyche, and Williams, "Media Images of the Poor," 229-46; Deirdre M. Kelly, "Stigma Stories: Four Discourses About Teen Mothers, Welfare, and Poverty," *Youth & Society* 27, no. 4 (1996): 421-49.
- 24 Robert M. Entman, "Television, Democratic Theory and the Visual Construction of Poverty," *Research in Political Sociology* 7 (1995): 139-59.
- 25 Shanto Iyengar, "Framing Responsibility for Political Issues: The Case of Poverty," *Political Behavior* 12, no. 1 (1990): 19-40; Charlotte Ryan, "The Media War over Welfare," *Peace Review* 8, no. 1 (1996): 13-19.
- 26 Michael B. Katz, *The Undeserving Poor: From the War on Poverty to the War on Welfare* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1989), 7.
- 27 Marieke de Goede, "Ideology in the US Welfare Debate: Neo-Liberal Representations of Poverty," *Discourse & Society* 7, no. 3 (1996): 317-57.
- 28 Mira Sotirovic, "Effects of Media Use on Audience Framing and Support for Welfare," *Mass Communication & Society* 3, no. 2&3 (2000): 290.
- 29 Carey, *Communication As Culture*, 34.
- 30 *Ibid.*, 18.
- 31 Carey, "Political Ritual on Television," 44-45.
- 32 *Ibid.*, 42.
- 33 Jeffrey C. Alexander and Ronald N. Jacobs, "Mass Communication, Ritual and Civil Society," *Media, Ritual and Identity* (London: Routledge, 1998), 24.
- 34 *Ibid.*, 30.
- 35 Carey, "Political Ritual on Television," 43.
- 36 *Ibid.*, 43.
- 37 See James Curran and Tamar Liebes, "The Intellectual Legacy of Elihu Katz," *Media, Ritual and Identity* (London: Routledge, 1998), 4-7.
- 38 Nick Couldry, *Media Rituals: A Critical Approach* (London: Routledge, 2003), 6-7.
- 39 *Ibid.*, 7.

Magazine Coverage of Welfare Recipients 1969-1996

- 40 *Ibid.*, 26-27.
- 41 Richard Nixon, "Nixon's 4-Front War on Poverty," *U.S. News & World Report*, 18 August 1969, 78.
- 42 "Nixon's New Deal," *Newsweek*, 18 August 1969, 17.
- 43 "Guaranteed Income for Everybody?" *U.S. News & World Report*, 18 August 1969, 20-22.
- 44 "If You Have Questions on Welfare Plan," *U.S. News & World Report*, 1 September 1969, 54-55.
- 45 "How the Relief System Works Now," *U.S. News & World Report*, 22 September 1969, 76.
- 46 *Ibid.*, 78.
- 47 "What's Wrong with Welfare—Answers from Nixon's Adviser," *U.S. News & World Report*, 15 June 1970, 65.
- 48 See "Guaranteed Income," 20; "Welfare: Second Thoughts," *Newsweek*, 25 August 1969, 18-20; and "Why the Welfare Bill is Stuck," *Newsweek*, 7 December 1970, 22-23; and "What's Wrong," 64-68.
- 49 "Guaranteed Income," 20.
- 50 Moynihan reported "The Negro Family" in 1967. His argument was that the key to the tangle of poverty in which many of the black poor were enmeshed was family structure and slavery was the consequence of poverty. Although this report led to a storm of controversy, Moynihan's argument was widely influential. See Ehrenreich, *The Altruistic Imagination*, 165-66.
- 51 "What's Wrong," 67.
- 52 See "Setback for Reform," *Newsweek*, 18 May 1970, 46; "New Approach on Aid to Poor," *U.S. News & World Report*, 22 June 1970, 98; and "Why the Welfare," 22-23.
- 53 "Welfare: Trying to End the Nightmare," *Time*, 8 February 1971, 14-23.
- 54 *Ibid.*, 16.
- 55 "Welfare—The Shame of a Nation," *Newsweek*, 8 February 1971, 22.
- 56 "Welfare—The Shame," 24-25.
- 57 "Welfare Out of Control—Story of Financial Crisis Cities Face," *U.S. News & World Report*, 8 February 1971, 32.
- 58 "Welfare—The Shame," 23.
- 59 "Any End to Poverty?: America's Big Problem," *U.S. News & World Report*, 12 July 1971, 53-55.
- 60 "Can Affluent America End Poverty?," *U.S. News & World Report*, August 1972, 23.
- 61 Shana Alexander, "The Crime of Poverty," *Newsweek*, 30 October 1972, 53.
- 62 Milton Friedman, "Is Welfare a Basic Human Right?," *Newsweek*, December 1972, 90.
- 63 "Crackdown on Welfare Begins to Take Hold," *U.S. News & World Report*, 19 February 1973, 37.
- 64 "Why the Lid on Welfare is Blowing off Again," *U.S. News & World Report*, 5 May 1975, 24-26.
- 65 "Billions to Pay, and a Spreading Revolt," *Time*, 1 September 1975, 24-26.
- 66 "Welfare Mess: Any Hope of Solution?," *U.S. News & World Report*, 7 June 1976, 33.
- 67 *Ibid.*, 34.
- 68 "A Close-up of Life on Relief," *U.S. News & World Report*, 7 June 1976, 34.
- 69 Dennis A. Williams and Christopher MA, "Welfare Reform," *Newsweek*, 8 August 1977, 18.
- 70 Donald C. Bacon, "Another Go at the Welfare Mess: Will it Work?," *U.S. News & World Report*,

- 8 August 1977, 45.
- 71 Paul A. Samuelson, "Welfare Reform," *Newsweek*, 29 August 1977, 64.
- 72 Harry Anderson and Gerald C. Lubenow, "Is Poverty Dead?," *Newsweek*, 9 October 1978, 85-86.
- 73 Donald C. Bacon, "America's War on Poverty—Is It a No-Win Struggle?," *U.S. News & World Report*, 22 January 1979, 22.
- 74 *Ibid.*, 23.
- 75 See "One City's Food Stamps," *Time*, 2 March 1981, 28-29; "Putting the Poor to Work" *Time*, 23 March 1981, 10; David M. Alpern et al., "How the Poor Will Be Hurt," *Newsweek*, 23 March 1981, 23-24; Jeannye Thornton, "Where Budget Cuts Stir Biggest Protest," *U.S. News & World Report*, 4 May 1981, 22-23; and Tom Morganthau and Vern E. Smith, "Though New Welfare Rules," *Newsweek*, 18 May 1981, 43.
- 76 Alpern et al., "How the Poor," 23.
- 77 *Ibid.*, 24.
- 78 George J. Church, "Are There Limits to Compassion?," *Time*, 6 April 1981, 12.
- 79 "A Worker: 'I Begruge Living Less Well Than the Poor Do'," *U.S. News & World Report*, 30 March 1981, 46.
- 80 James Kelly, "Those Cuts: How Deep Is Deep?," *Time*, 28 September 1981, 20.
- 81 See Michael Reese et al., "Life Below the Poverty Line," *Newsweek*, 5 April 1982, 20-28; Tony Fuller, "I'm Real Scared," *Newsweek*, 5 April 1982, 22; Vern E. Smith, "Saying No to Welfare," *Newsweek*, 5 April 1982, 26; Tom Morganthau and Diane Weathers, "Poverty's Bottom Line," *Newsweek*, 26 April 1982, 35; Lawrence D. Maloney, Jeannye Thornton, and Benjamin M. Cole, "Poverty Trap: No Way Out?," *U.S. News & World Report*, 16 April 1982, 31-35; Douglas C. Lyons and George White, "The Faces of Poverty—One Old ... And One New," *U.S. News & World Report*, 16 April 1982, 32-33; "A New Count of America's Poor," *U.S. News & World Report*, 26 April 1982, 6; "Redefining Poverty," *Time*, 3 May 1982, 24; Meg Greenfield, "The War About Poverty," *Newsweek*, 3 May 1982, 92; "This Winter's Worry: The Newly Poor," *U.S. News & World Report*, 6 December 1982, 11; and Jerry Adler et al., "The Hard-Luck Christmas of '82," *Newsweek*, 27 December 1982, 12-16.
- 82 "A Mess However It's Sliced," *Time*, 4 January 1982, 63.
- 83 Michael Reese, Diane Weathers, and Renee Michael, "Let Them Eat Cheese," *Newsweek*, 1 February 1982, 21.
- 84 Michael Reese et al., "Life Below," 20-28.
- 85 *Ibid.*, 20.
- 86 Maloney, Thornton, and Cole, "Poverty Trap," 31-35.
- 87 *Ibid.*, 34.
- 88 Adler et al., "The Hard-Luck Christmas," 13.
- 89 See footnote number 8.
- 90 "Giving Them the Dickens," *Time*, 14 March 1983, 33.
- 91 *Ibid.*
- 92 Lawrence D. Maloney, Maureen Walsh, Richard L. DeLouise, "Welfare in America: is it a flop?," *U.S. News & World Report*, 24 December 1984, 40-41.

Magazine Coverage of Welfare Recipients 1969-1996

- 93 *Ibid.*, 41.
- 94 *Ibid.*
- 95 Ramona Parish, "Messages from a Welfare Mom," *Newsweek*, 23 May 1988, 10.
- 96 Mickey Kaus, "Is It Hype or True Reform?," *Newsweek*, 19 October 1988, 45.
- 97 Donian Friedman, "Why the Welfare Mess Gets Messier," *U.S. News & World Report*, 25 November 1991, 30.
- 98 James N. Baker, Tim Padgett, and Gregory Certo, "Welfare Migrants: Getting a Cold Shoulder in Wisconsin," *Newsweek*, 14 August 1989, 23.
- 99 Barbara Ehrenreich, "Welfare: A White Secret," *Time*, 16 December 1991, 84.
- 100 *Ibid.*
- 101 George F. Will, "A Sterner Kind of Caring," *Newsweek*, 13 January 1992, 68.
- 102 See Mickey Kaus, "Yes, Something Will Work: Work," *Newsweek*, 18 May 1992, 38; Thomas Sancton, "How to Get America Off the Dole," *Time*, 25 May 1992, 44; and John Leo, "A New Deal For the Underclass," *U.S. News & World Report*, 25 May 1992, 29.
- 103 Kaus, "Yes, Something," 38.
- 104 John Leo, "The Politics of Responsibility," *U.S. News & World Report*, 20 January 1992, 20.
- 105 Sancton, "How to Get America," 47.
- 106 David Whitman and Dorian Friedman, "His Unconvincing Welfare Promises," *U.S. News & World Report*, 20 April 1992, 42.
- 107 David Whitman, "Welfare," *U.S. News & World Report*, 5 October 1992, 40.
- 108 Robert J. Samuelson, "Should We Think the Unthinkable?," *Newsweek*, 13 September 1993, 43; He cited many points from the article, "Endangered Family," *Newsweek*, 30 August 1993, 16-27, and the series of six teenage mother's stories by Leon Dash in the *Washington Post* from January 1986 till February 1986.
- 109 Samuelson, "Should We Think," 43.
- 110 Teresa McCrary, "Getting Off the Welfare Carousel," *Newsweek*, 6 December 1993, 11.
- 111 Joe Klein, "The Out-of-Wedlock Question," *Newsweek*, 13 December 1993, 37.
- 112 *Ibid.*
- 113 Michael Ruby, "The Children's Crusade," *U.S. News & World Report*, 13 December 1993, 112.
- 114 Michael Barone, "Slouching toward Dystopia," *U.S. News & World Report*, 20 December 1993, 34.
- 115 See Richard Lacayo, "Unraveling the Safety Net," *Time*, 10 January 1994, 25-27; George F. Will, "Orwell in New Jersey," *Newsweek*, 21 March 1994, 84; Nancy Gibbs, "The Vicious Cycle," *Time*, 20 June 1994, 24-31; Nancy Gibbs, "Learning How to Say No," *Newsweek*, 13 June 1994, 29; George F. Will, "About Those 'Orphanages'," *Newsweek*, 12 December 1994, 88; David Whitman and Matthew Cooper, "The End of Welfare—Sort of," *U.S. News & World Report*, 20 June 1994, 28-37; Steven Waldman et al., "Welfare Booby Traps," *Newsweek*, 12 December 1994, 34-35; Steven Waldman, "Taking On the Welfare Dads," *Newsweek*, 20 June 1994, 34-35; Barbara Ehrenreich, "Real Babies, Illegitimate Debates," *Time*, 22 August 1994, 90; and David Whitman et al., "The White Underclass," *U.S. News & World Report*, 17 October 1994, 40-53.
- 116 Will, "Orwell in New Jersey," 84.

- 117 *Ibid.*
- 118 Gibbs, "The Vicious Cycle," 24-31.
- 119 *Ibid.*, 25.
- 120 *Ibid.*, 26.
- 121 See Klein, "Learning How," 29; and Waldman et al., "Welfare Booby Traps," 34.
- 122 Waldman, "Taking On the Welfare," 34.
- 123 Ehrenreich, "Real Babies," 90.
- 124 See Nancy Gibbs, "Keep Out, You Tired, You Poor...", *Time*, 3 October 1994, 46-47; Margaret Carlson, "Alienable Rights," *Time*, 31 October 1994, 39; Magot Hornblower, "Making and Breaking Law," *Time*, 21 November 1994, 68, 78; Waldman et al., "Welfare Booby Traps," 34; Richard Lacayo, "Down on the Downtrodden," *Time*, 19 December 1994, 30-34; Dorian Friedman and Penny Loeb, "The Myth of the Parasites," *U.S. News & World Report*, 3 October 1994, 38; Jim Impoco and Mike Tharp, "California Tries to Give Back the Tired and the Poor," *U.S. News & World Report*, 21 November 1994, 42; and Mortimer B. Zuckerman, "Beyond Proposition 187," *U.S. News & World Report*, 12 December 1994, 124.
- 125 David Whitman et al., "The Myth of Reform," *U.S. News & World Report*, 16 January 1995, 31-39.
- 126 *Ibid.*, 33.
- 127 See Joe Klein, "Bowling for Virtue," *Newsweek*, 23 January 1995, 26; and Joe Klein, "Imminent Victorians," *Newsweek*, 6 February 1995, 26.
- 128 Klein, "Imminent Victorians," 26.
- 129 Michael Kramer, "The Myth About Welfare Moms," *Time*, 3 July 1995, 21.
- 130 Bill Turque and John McCormick, "Washington Washes Its Hands," *Newsweek*, 12 August 1996, 42-43.
- 131 Carey, *Communication as Culture*, 20.
- 132 *Ibid.*, 19.
- 133 Peter Golding and Sue Middleton, *Images of Welfare: Press and Public Attitudes to Poverty* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984), 19.
- 134 Carey, *Communication as Culture*, 21.
- 135 *Ibid.*, 20.
- 136 Carey, "Political Ritual on Television," 42.

